



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 17/24

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall, Room L2-80

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, February 7, 2024 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Lawrence Norman

Katie Randall

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Dean Barnes

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Padraic Slattery

Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

**020724.1**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle cited written comments he sent (in DON file) and comment numerous schemes have been presented over ten years. He

said the proposed design does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards (SOI) because the design changes the landmark too much. He asked for fewer houses and for design to honor the heart of the site. He said current design negatively impacts the character defining features of the site. He said 48 houses are proposed, he suggested reducing that number to 42-43.

*Ms. Randall joined the meeting at 3:32 p.m.*

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club said the proposed design doesn't meet the Secretary of Interior Standards (SOI). She provided an overview of the project since 2005 and noted the multiple iterations and continued significant impacts to the landmarked site. She said the board is not at fault, the project never meets the standards. She suggested exploring Special Tax Incentives.

Shelley Gill, Laurelhurst community member said she supported the project. She said the owners have done lots of design. She has been following the project and toured the site. She said all stakeholder interests should be considered.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular sent written notes (in DON file). He said 50% of the site is proposed to be demolished including two buildings. He requested an alternate scheme be explored, retention of Building G and minimize impact to site. He said the applicant failed to include Special Tax Incentives and Historic Tax Credits in their analysis – 20% of costs is a lot of money for a project this scale. He expressed concern about the destruction of features that characterize the property.

Jan Sutter, Friends of Battelle-Talaris and Laurelhurst community member said she helped nominate the landmark. She said she was concerned about lack of environmental protections that should be in effect. She said she was concerned that the eagle and its nest would be lost. She said the large volume of dirt will be used to fill the area. She said the pond used to have fish in it. She said an environmental impact assessment should be done.

**020724.2**

**MEETING MINUTES**

November 15, 2023

MM/SC/KR/HW

8:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Inpanbutr abstained.

**020724.3**

**CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

**020724.31**      Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ  
1915 E Fir Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 3-month extension. She said she recently met with the owner representatives on site, and she is working on a new draft.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ at 1915 E. Fir Street for three months.

MM/SC/MI/LN  
9:0:0  
Motion carried.

**020724.32**      Caroline Horton House  
627 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue E  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 6-month extension. She said the owner is developing economic hardship information for consideration.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Caroline Horton House at 627 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue E for six months.

MM/SC/MS/TC  
9:0:0  
Motion carried.

**020724.33**      Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for an extension to September 18, 2024.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill said the building is part of a two-tower office development. He said a change in the market has impacted the project. He said owners, Kilroy are excited about the development and wants to complete the MUP. He explained they expect to go through Design Review and then to return to Architectural Review committee (ARC) by the end of March. He said the focus is to bring it to completion this year. He said the fire department notified them to close the building. He said the elevator is not working and the fire pump is not working. He said they will secure the

building and increase security patrol. He said there is a fire escape on the east side.

Ms. Sodt said she appreciated the check-in and that securing the building is a good idea. She said she is glad they are moving ahead with the MUP. She supported the request for an extension.

Mr. Macleod asked about briefings for this project.

Ms. Sodt said briefings had been provided to ARC and the full board two or three times. The response was positive, and the project appeared to be progressing well.

Mr. McCullough said the plan is to maintain every other floor and create a bridge connection to the new building. He said the floor-to-floor height is 10'.

Mr. Macleod noted there was board support for the project. He said the extension request was reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building at 601 Stewart Street until September 18, 2024.

MM/SC/BP/KR

9:0:0

Motion carried.

**020724.34**

Seattle Times Block

1120 John Street

Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill explained the request for a 4-month extension. She noted difficulty in the market. She said they have a MUP and Certificate of Approval and are now figuring out permits. She said they are exploring potential other non-office use and may revise the MUP or do a new Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Sodt said she supported the extension to June 5, 2024.

Mr. Macleod supported the extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times block at 1120 John Street until June 5, 2024.

MM/SC/MS/HW

9:0:0

Motion carried.

**020724.35**

Baker-Linen Building

1101 E. Pike Street

Request for extension

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a 4-month extension. She said there is a draft Controls and Incentives agreement, and they have their MUP and Certificate of Approval. She noted changes in the market but said they are ready to go.

Mr. Macleod asked if there were energy code issues.

Ms. Clawson said there is progress on energy code relief. She said the owner is exploring how to power the building without creating a huge transformer room; the discussion is ongoing.

Ms. Sodt said the property owner will want to take advantage of Special Tax Incentives. She supported the extension request.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Baker Linen Building at 1101 E. Pike Street for four months.

MM/SC/MS/LN

9:0:0

Motion carried.

**020724.36**

Knights of Columbus

722 E. Union Street

Request for extension

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a 4-month extension. She said the building is hard to lease and they are looking for a unique user first and will then do the Controls.

Ms. Sodt asked if there were any security measures.

Ms. Clawson said she had not heard of any.

Ms. Sodt said there was graffiti.

Mr. Macleod said the request was reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Knights of Columbus Building at 722 E. Union Street for four months.

MM/SC/MS/KR

9:0:0

Motion carried.

**020724.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

**020724.41 University National Bank**

4502 University Way

Proposed signage, and minor exterior alterations

Eric Aman, Mithun proposed to add exterior signage, temporary removal and reinstallation of window for construction staging, installation of a dryer vent, addition of door opening in interior vestibule and replacement of security gate. He said a 50" diameter sign would be installed on the corner and will reuse previous bracket attachment points from removed Wells Fargo sign. The proposed sign has been reduced from 60" diameter in response to ARC comments. He said the sign will hang off bracket; a section detail showed attachment detail and how the existing bracket fastens into the reveal. He said a second, smaller sign would be installed under the entry canopy and will hang from minimal penetrations into the soffit plaster. He said the height of the sign is 9'-5" which meets code. He said the temporary removal of the window will allow the contractor to thread new steel beams into the upper floor; the window will be replaced following steel delivery.

Mr. Aman proposed opening an arched door in the west interior vestibule to match the north vestibule. He said that hardware on existing doors will be retained but will remain locked. He proposed replacement of the east exterior vestibule security gate. He said the proposed gate would have panic bar and vertical posts to match the color of existing window trim. He said the gate swing is the same depth as the opening.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said the applicant was responsive to ARC comments. She supported the application.

Ms. Wasserman concurred and said she was pleased with the materials selected. She appreciated the reduction in the sign size on the corner. She supported the application.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked about visibility of the east security gate through the existing transom.

Mr. Aman said the intent is to move the steel posts behind the glass and to paint them the same dark brown to minimize visual impact.

Mr. Macleod asked if the beam delivery could be done from the alley side.

Mr. Aman said no, and noted the 65' size, equipment required, and room needed for navigation make the requirements specific.

Ms. Chang asked if the corner sign would sit proud of the clock face.

Mr. Aman said it would be proud of clock face and that placement of the sign was determined by pre-existing attachment points.

Ms. Randall appreciated the sensitive reuse of existing attachment points and said the sign is relatively unobtrusive. She said she supported the application.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the willingness to reduce the size of the sign and said it lines up with window ledge and clock better and is a huge improvement over the previous bank sign.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations and signage at the University National Bank, 4502 University Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 125643.
  - a. The proposed signage, gate and vents appear to have little impact and are easily reversible.
  - b. The temporary window removal, protection, and reinstallation are necessary for construction access, and to execute the interior building improvements.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
  - a. No alternatives were provided as they did not seem necessary, and none were requested by the Board.

3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.
4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below:

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/MS/BP

9:0:0

Motion carried.

**020724.5**

**BRIEFINGS**

**020724.51**

Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center

4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street

Briefing on proposed development

Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr recused themselves and left the meeting. Ms. Doherty noted that they still had a quorum with 7 Board members present, although a quorum was not necessary for the proposed briefing.

Bob Baldwin, Bassetti thanked board members for their efforts on the project over the years. He said they have listened to board member comments and worked in collaboration with the board. He went through the history of the project since the site was landmarked in 2013 and said multiple designs and design iterations have been presented for board consideration. He spoke of the complexity of the project given community engagement and regulatory processes and whatever they do, it must be sustainable through perpetuity.

Nathan Rimmer, 4000 Property LLC provided the history of current ownership and this project. He said his company purchased the property in 2000 as a development site; they are a for-profit entity. They got a Master Use Permit in 2004 to demolish all of the buildings and trees, but could not make the project work at that time. That permit expired in 2009. In 2012



they applied for a contract rezone to build low-density multifamily housing and did a lot of outreach. The surrounding community was vehemently opposed to the proposal and asked City Council to deny it, which they did. So, the owner sought to redevelop the full site as single family homes when the landmark nomination process was underway in 2013. Mr. Rimmer said the City of Seattle has had many opportunities to increase the zoning on this site, starting with the Comprehensive Plan, and they have not done that. As the owner, they have explored some different ideas for the property with briefings to the Landmarks Board and community meetings in Laurelhurst, looking for options that were economically viable. In 2018, Quadrant Homes looked to purchase the site to build 62 single-family homes, which was the beginning of this Certificate of Approval application. Quadrant stepped away in 2020 and the 4000 Property LLC took it on. He indicated they are hoping to have the Board take an action soon, as they close their reviews with SDCI on the Master Use Permit. He thinks a less philanthropic owner would have defaulted to the potential 82 lot single-family lot plat, but said they have tried to work within the Landmarks process to develop a different solution that also works for them financially. He feels like they are not maximizing their opportunity at the property and leaving a lot on the table. He thinks what they are proposing will be a legacy project for the city.

Jordan Kiel, Bassetti explained that originally Quadrant Homes had brought the design application to the board and noted 64 homes were proposed at that time, buildings E and G were proposed to be removed, defining features of the landscape not acknowledged, parking for commercial buildings would not be retained, no tree analysis, eastern groves not acknowledged, and oak grove would not be preserved, among other things. He cited SMC 25.12.750 A and B and noted the site had been designated under standards C, D, E, and F. He said the property owner objectives were to respect the landmark while developing the site in compliance with the underlying zoning; leave positive legacy for the community while making a reasonable return on investment; and position the landmark to be able to sustain itself in perpetuity by sharing maintenance costs across many stakeholders.

Mr. Kiel explained the evolution of use and design of site and provided schematics from early design to today. He said the original Battelle site was designed as a think tank with planned future expansion. He explained how architect Bill Bain thought about expandability and how they approached siting the way Mr. Bain did, using the buildings to shape outdoor spaces with attention to the idea of outdoor rooms. He said they explored designs reducing the number of houses until they got to 48 houses. He said the addition to Building D makes sense for the development and is critical to the economics of the project.

Mr. Baldwin said that for every lot removed, the HOA costs to the homeowner go up. He said they heard from the board that 62 houses was too many houses, and said that they are at 48 today.

Jim Keller, Site Workshop cited the Secretary of Interior Standards for Cultural Landscapes. He said they looked at every element designed by Richard Haag. He said defining elements include the oak grove, heart of campus/pond, park like setting, pedestrian network, buildings A, B, C, D, E, F, and transitional neighborhood buffer. He cited the tree survey and proposed selective removal of trees that are not thriving. He said it is time to remove the Lombardi Poplars; they were planted to provide initial screening of the site while the trees grew. He said they used the tree survey/map to determine placement of houses. He said since 2018, 40 trees have fallen and that there has been no stewardship. He said of the 433 trees on site they propose to remove 229 and retain 204. He said 11 are in hazardous condition. He said the wetland is overgrown with invasive species and proposed to bring the pond back and retain water levels. He said there were 150 trees on the site when it was first completed.

Mr. Kiel said there is significance to the changes over time and said that the landscape changes and grows. He said it is a balancing act to bring back healthy wetlands, to repair and replace where possible, and to be thoughtful in approach to design. He said buildings A, B, and C are age-challenged and provided renderings indicating existing conditions and proposed repair or replacement options. He proposed replacing elevated walks and railings with new to match original installation. He noted the poor condition of the exposed rafter tails on Building D. He proposed enclosing the breezeway to create a vestibule and said they would use a light touch to preserve views. He said glass would be installed over top of the rafters. He proposed repair of cedar siding as needed, replacement of existing windows and existing entry doors. He proposed punched openings in the lower level. He provided rendering of evolution of Pond Houses design noting the quieter design at the lower level.

Ms. Randall said 53 units are noted in the operating budget slide and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Rimmer said six units are proposed in buildings A, B, and C.

Ms. Randall noted the number should be 54. She asked if the 50,000 square feet includes the addition.

Mr. Kiel said it did.

Mr. Rimmer went through square footage: 15,000 square feet upstairs, 7,000 square feet downstairs, 3,000 square feet on mezzanine level, and 5,000 square feet in dining hall totaling 30,000 square feet. He said the remainder is from the addition.

Ms. Chang asked about the next steps in the city review process.

Mr. Baldwin said they are deep in the Master Use Permit (MUP) process in the fifth-round reviews. He said they expect the MUP in the next month and will then start the final submission for the Certificate of Approval application process. He said early on they did a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and published a draft and then the law changed. He said public comments were received and they have responses prepared but the law changed, and the EIS is no longer required. He said they will start the construction documents shortly.

Ms. Chang asked if there are updates on requests for information.

Mr. Baldwin said they have been trying to track and keep their presentations with the board consistent with all of the updates they have had to do for their MUP.

Mr. Rimmer said he is confident that what is being presented is all lined up pretty closely. He said at this stage, this is getting more to the minutiae.

Mr. Norman asked what the house prices would be.

Mr. Baldwin said \$450 per square foot.

Mr. Rimmer said the size would be about 3,200 square feet, small for the neighborhood.

Mr. Norman asked if that would be \$1.5 to build.

Mr. Rimmer said yes. He said the selling price would be \$2 million. He said the model has to be set up to support the HOA fees needed to keep it up – things like landscaping.

Mr. Norman noted the high price analysis and asked if it would start being a gated community at some point.

Mr. Baldwin said there are already houses of that price point in this community and it would feel like walking around Laurelhurst, there would be no gates.

Mr. Rimmer said there would also be tenants, workers, etc. coming into the community because of the commercial nature of Buildings D and F.

Mr. Norman asked about expectations of exclusivity and that it could start to feel like a private community.

Mr. Rimmer said it is. He said the commercial space would be like a restaurant in a high-end condominium development.

Mr. Macleod asked if that would impact occupancy.

Mr. Rimmer said it would and they can't predict the market and this commercial space is not run of the mill office space. He said that is two years out. He said they have to work through the market cycles.

Mr. Macleod said considering how long the project has gone on it would be good to have updates going forward.

Ms. Randall asked if zoning restrictions impact minimum lot size.

Mr. Rimmer said the site is zoned Neighborhood 3 with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. He said there is 35% lot coverage.

Mr. Kiel said a number of lots have easements for roads and open space. He said the houses are nestled into the "park".

Mr. Rimmer said there are no big yards. He said the whole campus is a big "yard", there are no defined fences between the lots.

Mr. Macleod asked about plans for A, B, and C buildings, if they would be cottage apartments and if they would be restored.

Mr. Rimmer said they could easily be duplexes.

Mr. Baldwin said they are too big and chopped up to be single homes but could be split into two smaller duplex units. That is the current proposal.

Mr. Kiel said the sunken living room area goes out to the deck. He said the head height is too low to fill in the sunken living room.

Mr. Macleod noted the environmental review and asked what conditions must be met in the wetlands.

Mr. Baldwin said they would do a complete restoration. He said it is a mess now and is full of invasive species. He said they would increase the buffer around it, and they would keep the historic road.

Mr. Keller said the entire wetlands would be stripped and replanted.

Mr. Kiel said a setback is required and the road impinges on that. They would adjust the buffer to do it the right way and create a healthy wetland.

Mr. Baldwin said the wetland is very small and what is shown is the actual zone. He said the public comment about in-fill was ill informed. He said the work has to conform to existing grade. He said because of the soil condition and goal to do a soft touch, all buildings are on pin piles and conform to existing grade.

Mr. Rimmer said the heat map presented with cuts and fills shows almost nothing.

Mr. Keller said the project is saving the pine grove and is using pilings to save trees.

Ms. Doherty said she recalls a briefing in the last 3 – 4 months where the wetlands were discussed. She said comments were made about taking out that little boardwalk and changing so that you had a kind of less invasive overlook. She said she thought those regulations are in and are still being applied to the site. She asked if this site plan is representative of where it's currently at.

Mr. Rimmer said they pulled the boardwalk out because the City said there was a lot of structure in the wetland buffer. He said that was a regulatory change that they had to make.

Ms. Doherty said there was a question about the eagle's nest mentioned in public comments. She said if she was misstating it, the applicant should tell her, but she was pretty sure that the applicant is still complying with the setbacks required to for the tree where the nest exists.

Mr. Rimmer said there is a permit process. He said Seattle doesn't even really regulate that at all. The eagles are a delisted species. He said there is still a process to go through. He said it has been part of the master use permit review. He said there is a separate permit that gets pulled to do work that's part of the permit package but the eagle's nest and trees that surround it are still in the plan, they are just immediately to the west of that home he indicated on plan near SW entry.

Mr. Baldwin said the eagle's nest preservation is still in the plan.

Ms. Doherty asked each board member to offer comments.

Ms. Chang appreciated the thorough recap. She asked if the building heights were reduced, or elevations changed at the Pond Homes. She thought the site and grading and landscape might have changed a little.

Mr. Rimmer said the change reflects the change from the concrete base.

Mr. Kiel said the homes are the same height. He said there is a landscape overlay with trees and vegetation. He said getting rid of the concrete bases made a big difference.

Ms. Chang said the changes make the bases less obtrusive.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated changes. She said she had no problem with the houses or the group along 41<sup>st</sup>. She said she was unhappy about the inability to get multi-family on the site and noted fourplexes could have been done at two corners. She said that is a loss. She hated to see Building G gone and said it is an important part of the site. She said the proposed landscape is beautiful. She wished there was a way to get more people in.

Ms. Randall said a case has been made about the long-term cost of maintaining the site to justify the number of homes. She noted the reality of zoning. She asked for a more detailed breakdown of variation of houses across the site. She said she was stuck on the Pond Houses because of how far they extend toward the pond. She wondered if they could be smaller and more set back. She wanted to see how buildings A, B, and C penciled out and said that could help get her 'on-board'.

Mr. Schmitt said he agreed with Ms. Wasserman's comments. He noted concern with impact to landscape which is a designated feature. He said it is artificial and the team did a good job of showing how the site was meant to mature in the eyes of the original architects. He noted the expense of stewardship. He noted the character-defining features should be retained per the Secretary of Interior's Standard #2. He said it is difficult to square with economic/financial piece and that the single-family zone demands a certain structure to the economics. He said that economics is not germane to discussion. He said everything else is excellent.

Mr. Kiel asked Ms. Doherty to clarify the role of the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Ms. Doherty said in addition to the SOI there are sections of the Seattle Municipal Code 25.12.750 A and B that are relevant. She noted that these sections of the code are regularly cited in the Staff Reports for Certificate of Approval applications. She said those are items the board needs to consider. She said she is happy to talk with board members one on one if they have questions about that.

Mr. Norman said he had similar concerns. He said certain areas would be nice for multi-family development. He said he was trying to understand the economic argument being presented. He wondered if the project could be phased to take advantage of possible future changes in zoning that might allow multi-family development.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis concurred with Mr. Norman's comments. She said the design is good and the direction the design has gone is great and works well with constraints established. She noted reservations with and is grappling with the number of non-reversible changes happening. She said the non-reversible removal of buildings and construction of houses are not short-term changes and won't revert back. She said phasing of a project is not in board purview. She said the project should not be done lightly and she has not come to terms with it how much is being changed. She said it isn't clear to her if this proposal goes too far.

Mr. Macleod said he echoed Ms. Pheasant-Reis and Mr. Norman's comments. He said he loves the actual architectural design elements and that watching the evolution of the design has been stunning. He said what was laid out with constraints squeezes every last square foot of open space yielded good design. He said his issue is with density and coverage on site and how it is addressed. He said pulling houses closer together is clever. He said all changes are large and dramatic. He said there is a lot of new building coverage upon the historic landscape, it is a harder concept to grasp. He said B is sensitive to structure. He expressed concern about the amount of landscape being built on this landmark site. He said Building G is a baffling building but is important architecturally and is significant. He said he asked if they had considered incentives by keeping it. He said once it is gone, it is gone. He said he still has reservations about the proposal.

Mr. Rimmer appreciated the board's input and said they have gotten enough feedback.

Mr. Norman expressed concern about economics, he said the houses were all the same, the site is in disrepair. He suggested adding a cultural component that would encourage public interest.

**020724.6**

**BOARD BUSINESS**