



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 333/20

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday September 2, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes
Roi Chang
Russell Coney
Matt Inpanbutr
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Ian Macleod
Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on agenda.

Ms. Doherty notified members that Manish Chalana's term ended, and board member count was eight. She said that quorum is now five.

090220.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
August 5, 2020

090220.2**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Barnes arrived at 3:35 pm.

Jeff Murdock wrote that Historic Seattle supports the designation of the Swedish Club. Eugenia Woo read these comments at the meeting. She said Historic Seattle believes it retains significance under the following criteria:

C, for its significant association with the Scandinavian community in Seattle;
D, as it embodies distinctive characteristics of Scandinavian modernism and Mid-Century modernism in the city;
E, because it is an outstanding work of the firm, Steinhart, Theriault & Anderson, and;
F, for its prominence of spatial location and as an easily identifiable feature of the neighborhood.

The supplemental report characterizes the building as a “visual and cultural icon in the city.” As the Board discussed during nomination, it is the view from Dexter, heading north, as the street bends to the west to accommodate Lake Union, that is the most iconic view of the Club, and which makes it a “visual icon.” The shimmering aluminum *brise soleil* system, hung in front of the recessed walls and windows of the building, is the most recognizable feature of the building. As such, one can think of the south elevation as being as significant as the entrance facade on Dexter. In fact, for public activities such as Sunday Swedish pancake breakfasts, access to the building is provided at the entrance on the south side.

We believe that development on the south lot can be pursued, while still maintaining this view corridor of the building. Through Controls and Incentives, as well as through the Certificate of Approval process, the city Landmarks ordinance provides the ability to balance maintaining the integrity of the landmark with allowance for sensitive development.

We also support the designation of significant interior features that characterize the property, particularly the monumental stair rising through the double height volume of the public space.

Historic Seattle is grateful to the Swedish Club for its excellent stewardship of this landmark property, and for its commitment to recognize its significance through its formal designation”.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular said he was commenting on Battelle Talaris site on behalf of the Laurelhurst Community Club; written comment (in DON file). He said they were excited that there is now an on-site security person and thought it would be effective in preventing vandalism. He urged the board to not approve the retroactive fencing. He said that given the upcoming scope of work that owner will be going through, there is a lot of work and they should be able to follow the Certificate of Approval process. He said if items come up, changes should be documented; talk with staff and board and work up proposal to do that. He said to do

that on site is not sufficient. He said to be clear that following the process will be beneficial.

Deb Barker read from her letter (in DON file): “I was fortunate to be able to vote for the Battelle/Talaris property to become a City of Seattle Landmark during my 6+ years on the Seattle Landmarks Board. The Board was grateful that Landscape Architect Richard Haag spoke to us about his memories of the project, which gave us all a greater understanding of the entire site.

Since the Battelle/Talaris designation, the ownership team has been before the ARC and the Landmarks Board numerous times with various proposals for maintenance, proposed development scenarios, briefings, etc. Unfortunately, the number of retroactive requests for tree maintenance and/ or tree removal along with fence installations was alarming. It felt as if there was a concerted effort by Battelle/Talaris owners to act first and ask for forgiveness later. I voiced my dismay at what felt like callousness disregard of formal landmark processes by the property owners and voted against the many retroactive requests.

Which is what you have before you - *another retroactive proposal*. As in the past, the owner will contend that there are extenuating circumstances for their retroactive action, and that THIS fencing (chain-link panels resting on cement blocks around parts of the property) is in the landmark's best interest.

What they are not saying is that they have:

#1- Proposed modifications to the existing Seattle Landmarks ordinance to exclusively benefit the Battelle/Talaris property via the 2020 Omnibus Bill pending before the City Council but without seeking Landmarks staff or Landmarks Board opinion, *and*

#2 - Obtained a SEPA Determination of Significance (DS) for the ' subdivision, construction of housing, change of use, building demolition, alteration of landscape features, etc. on a landmarked site,' with a Sept. 15, 2020 Scoping meeting to prepare for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

With both of these actions in play at the same time , I urge you to hit the Landmark pause button on another retroactive forgiveness request for the Battelle/Talaris property until such time as the Omnibus bill is decided by City Council and the EIS process is concluded.

Please, deny the Battelle/Talaris fencing request. At a minimum, please ask the applicant about their proposed code change and how the chain link/cement block fencing will endure through the EIS process”.

Janice Sutter, Friends of Battelle-Talaris said that a fence was put up three days after the property was designated a City landmark. She said the property was open for 50 years before that with no problems. She said the neighbors enjoyed walking there and had good relationship with the owners. She said the fence is a spite fence. She said threatening ‘no trespass’ letters have been sent so there is no walking through property from bus. She said they got rid of all the renters there so there is no one left on site. She said she is glad there is a person there now. She said to say no to the fence and to make sure the property is maintained.

Colleen McAleer represented Laurelhurst Community Club and said she has been involved with the property since it was built. She said she supported the security system. She said it has been seven years since the property was designated. She said cleanup of site is good. She said the big aluminum cyclone fence was put up, unapproved. She said the owner has made changes to the site without permission. She said the board has been gracious. She said the current plan is to build 67 home sites and take out two existing buildings. She expressed concern for the pattern of disregard for the landmark board and process. She said special language was tagged onto an omnibus bill that would change board purview and process.

Ms. McAleer supported designation of the Swedish Club and said it is fabulous.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society said he supported what he heard about Battelle. Regarding Queen Anne Boulevard, he acknowledged the need to replace the trees and hopes Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) will consult neighbors who consider protection of the boulevard important.

Mr. Herschensohn supported designation of the Swedish Club including the exterior of the building and the interior foyer/lobby.

Judith Bendich, Friends of Ravenna-Cowen said they were able to get North Ravenna historic designation. She noted the fantastic work of the Landmarks Preservation Board. She did not support the Omnibus bill. Regarding Battelle fencing she said it was done in February with no warning to public and is seeking retroactive approval. She said to do this is nasty and a derogation of the rules; she said they know the rules. She said this should not be countenanced again or ever.

090220.3 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

090220.31 Queen Anne Boulevard
Proposed selective removal of trees

Proposed removal of twenty-four trees. Replacement trees to be considered in a future application.

Kevin Bergsrud, Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) said the boulevard was planned in 1908 and built in 1911-16. He said the Ordinance covers the 3.7-mile loop. He said that inventories and tree plans have been developed over the years. He said in 2018 DOPAR put money toward an Olmsted Park study. He said the Queen Anne section focused on Bigelow Avenue N.

Nich Johnson, Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) provided a condition assessment.

Ms. Doherty said documents were provided to board members and the full tree survey is available for review.

Mr. Bergsrud said this is the first of two applications, and this one is for permission to remove the trees. He said they will seek approval to plant other replacement tree

species that are not susceptible to the same disease, and they need time to determine what those species are.

Mr. Johnson said the trees listed on the survey are all dead/dying; the disease can be spread to like trees. He said they are searching for a tree and it is challenging to find a replacement tree type to avoid this problem.

Mr. Coney asked if there is evidence of causes other than natural, that are killing the trees.

Mr. Johnson said there is a wide assortment of issues. He said an underlying factor is the recent years of drought, longer and hotter days, has created stress and made the trees more susceptible. He said that each set of trees experience their own issues. All causes are natural, and some are from an introduced fungus. He said they are working on coming up with a list of appropriate replacement trees and want them to be planted spring or fall of 2021.

Mr. Kiel asked if their strategy is to wait for a year and hope things reset.

Mr. Johnson said the lumber industry poured money into research; not much has been done for urban forestry and there isn't a lot of data on how to handle these diseases. He said leaving the site vacant for a year would gain nothing. He said the best strategy is to find the right tree. The proposed timing is related to the preferred planting season.

Mr. Coney asked if there are adequate funds to complete the project.

Mr. Johnson said there is, and money will be made available to replant.

Ms. Doherty said there is a full tree survey and Arborist report for every tree.

Mr. Bergsrud said DOPAR conducted a neighborhood walk for interested members of the public, to explain the tree damage and disease issues.

Mr. Johnson said all the trees recommended for removal carry too much risk and they can't safely retain them. He said the issue is what to replace them with to keep the Boulevard character.

Ms. Doherty said the Staff Report has a condition that speaks to DOPAR representative coming back to board for report for approval of the tree species, where, and timing for board review and planting.

Mr. Kiel said it makes sense.

Mr. Johnson said having the replacement tree selected by next spring is reasonable with replanting in spring or fall next year. He said typically best planting time is October – that would be 13 months.

Mr. Barnes supported the application and suggested 14-months to allow adequate time.

Ms. Wasserman agreed with providing a reasonable time frame. She said it is sad the trees are dead and dying. She said she believes the Arborist report.

Mr. Inpanbutr said any risk is too much and asked if there are any ground issues that need remediation.

Mr. Kiel said there a lot of trees and there may be a couple with special issues.

Mr. Coney appreciated public comment. He said it is appropriate to remove the trees and he concurred with 14-month time frame.

Ms. Chang agreed with the proposal and the timeline. She appreciated the detail of the report and said it was helpful. She agreed with setting 14-month timeline which allows for spring or fall planting.

Mr. Macleod concurred. He noted the thorough report and said it makes sense for the trees to go. He said he trusted the timeline was sufficient.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed removal of trees on Queen Anne Boulevard, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed removal of these trees affects the features of the landmark. But the applicant has demonstrated the need to perform this work to address safety concerns, and to try and protect the longevity of other remaining trees.
2. The proposed size and species of replacement trees is required to be reviewed and approved by the Landmarks Board. These new trees shall be replanted within 14 months.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KJ/RC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

090220.32

Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary directed board members to page 3 of presentation that had an aerial photo showing where fence was installed. She said the board has told them to keep the property secure. She said the property is now vacant; all tenants have moved out. She said they installed fencing where natural barriers and other fences did not exist to ensure not trespassers would come on to property. She said a construction fence is one of the first levels of alert telling someone this is not a place you should go. She said the board wanted to know what the security plan is for the property. She went over the February 11, 2020 document written by Steven Goff, (in DON file). She said the key things they are trying to have is no trespassers, no vandalism and no campers – all things the neighborhood would also support. She said in addition to the security fencing, they have done other things they think are

effective: a full-time employee or watch person lives onsite, a temporary security fence was added, entrance gates, and security cameras for additional surveillance. She said they can ramp up if necessary. She said they have decided not to board up the buildings at this time. She said the public comment was interesting. She noted requests for security fencing at other landmarks including Seven Gables, and 4th and Bell. She said they are doing what they think is best to secure the building. She noted SMC 25.12.750 about the extent to which changes would affect the landmark and said the fencing is temporary and reversible. She said the alterations are reasonable and will signal to people it is closed to the public. She said it is necessary to meet other Ordinance or legal requirements. She said if you don't put up fencing, did you do enough to discourage trespassers. She said there is a pond there as well.

Mr. Kiel asked for clarification that Ms. Clawson mean they didn't need a Certificate of Approval (CofA).

Ms. Clawson said yes and that they did not involve the whole length. She said they didn't alter or significantly change significant features. She said if it is not an alteration no permit is required. She said significant change definition is not there.

Ms. Doherty said the staff considers this an alteration, although it is easily reversible. She said whether or not the alteration requires a permit is not the hurdle. When you change the paint colors of a landmark, it requires a Certificate of Approval, even though it does not require a permit. She said the 6' fence that is there now was installed without a C of A. She noted that the 4' fencing that is there was installed before the nomination meeting, so the Board was not involved. The 4' driveway gates were installed after the nomination, but the staff determined that no C of A was required for the gate alone.

Mr. Kiel said the property for the entirety of its life was open to the neighborhood. He asked what has changed.

Ms. Clawson said it is vacant now. She said before, there were lots of users, and residents as well. She said now no one is there. She said neighbors liked to walk their dogs there and it is hard to say who can and can't come in. She said it is not supposed to be open to the public.

Mr. Barnes asked if there has been occasion to remove people.

Ms. Clawson said a couple times. She said someone tried to set a fire in the grass. She said it hasn't been frequent. She said they didn't think they needed a C of A. She said the neighbors complained and they were told to apply for C of A.

Mr. Barnes asked about goal of project and if there is a start date.

Ms. Clawson said there is no start date.

Ms. Doherty said the board has seen a number of briefings for development proposals including townhomes and a school. She said the property owner has an active application for single family homes; the board has not approved anything yet but will see a briefing in the upcoming months.

Mr. Barnes noted they have fencing to keep people out but no date when work will begin.

Mr. Kiel said the board hadn't heard anything.

Ms. Clawson said they applied for Preliminary C of A in January to build 67 homes and remove trees. The City determined it was significant and would need SEPA review and EIS. She said they haven't started scoping for EIS.

Mr. Kiel said realistically it could be years; it is not a fast process and likely won't happen in 2021.

Ms. Doherty said the EIS scoping meeting is coming up soon. She said the EIS process is where the design team will look at alternatives including building fewer houses on site and preservation of all original buildings.

Mr. Kiel asked if there will be multi-family housing.

Ms. Clawson said no, as it is zoned for single family.

Mr. Kiel said the omnibus is not in the board's purview. He asked what games are being played with change in Code as mentioned in public comment and letters. What are the potential scheduling impacts to the site and what counts as temporary?

Ms. Clawson said they have been clear that the new buildings will be single family use. The use of existing landmark buildings needs to be something else. She said the proposed Omnibus change adds two words. Landmarked structures can already have other uses 'and site' was added. She said doing a subdivision this size is not easy. She said the existing buildings may need new surface parking and the text change could allow that use to occur.

Mr. Coney asked who the owner property owner is.

Ms. Clawson said 4000 Properties.

Mr. Coney asked if Bruce McCaw is the owner.

Ms. Clawson said yes.

Mr. Coney asked if the whole project could be sold to Quadrant Homes.

Ms. Doherty clarified that the application being considered is for the 4000 Properties LLC.

Ms. Chang said the timeline could be a long one and asked if more permanent fencing is a possibility.

Ms. Clawson said it could be a possibility and a separate Certificate of Approval would be required. Single family homes will need fencing.

Mr. Kiel asked if they had considered a smaller area of fencing.

Ms. Clawson said it is more about control of the buildings; they are trying to discourage public access to property. If there is vandalism, they would possibly board up the buildings. She said they would have to come back.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if there has been a decrease in unwanted activity.

Ms. Clawson said there is not a ton of activity but there have been a few incidents – someone slipped through the fence and was chased off.

Mr. Macleod asked how long the on-site/live-in security has been there.

Ms. Clawson said since before February; she thought since 2019.

Mr. Barnes asked if there have been additional incidents of trespassing since the live-in security person has been there.

Ms. Clawson said there have been a couple, four, not a ton.

Mr. Kiel asked what the problem is with allowing historical use patterns to persist especially now with a live-in person on site. He said pathways through the property have been used by the neighborhood, pathways have been used to Children's Hospital. He asked how is this other than what the neighbors say it is.

Ms. Clawson said it is odd that a property owner is being asked to have property open to any / all. She said we can't select who can and who can't use the site from a legal perspective. She said it is not a spite thing. She said this fencing went up when the buildings became vacant. She said sites change and what they are used for. It is not a good idea to have people cut through. The person on site is an employee, a property manager but not a security guard. If people do come in, it is trespassing.

Mr. Coney said the existing fencing was 4' tall and the new fence is higher. He said certain areas are not fenced where there are blackberries and gates can be closed.

Ms. Clawson said that places not fence are where homes have fences on west side. She said there it a right of way along the west side. She said that is how people could penetrate without going through yard.

Mr. Kiel said the west edge abuts a right-of-way, not private property.

Mr. Barnes noted he was struggling; as a property owner he would want to protect his property. He said there is live-in security. He said there have been few incidents. He said that because the site has always been a neighborhood resource and he questioned what relationship with the neighbors they have created by cutting them off. He asked how long the site will be like this; it could be 2021 or 2022. He said protecting property is losing goodwill from neighborhood at the same time.

Ms. Wasserman said she remembered that the neighborhood didn't want the conference center when it was built. She said it is private property and she understands the need for fencing. She said she was unhappy that it was a retroactive application. She said it needs a fence, but this fence is ugly.

Mr. Macleod said the site was landmarked before his time. He appreciated public comment and Deb Barker's comments. He said it is challenging. He said he sees both arguments. He said it is private property and there is need to protect the landmark. He said it seems excessive as it is a landscape rather than a building. He said he lives near Seward Park where there is a live-in caretaker. He said you can tell the difference between a dog walker and a vandal. He noted the precedent of granting retroactive approval is troubling. He said as a community asset he would like no fence because it is disruptive to the landscape. He said it is a procedural issue.

Ms. Johnson noted the retroactive approvals for tree removals, landscape changes over the year. She said the board asked for a management plan and it has been hard to get that. She said she agreed that it is private property that the owner is asking to be secured. She said the application is retroactive and the fencing looks temporary. She suggested a timeline and security plan for the site. She said the site could be open during the day like a park.

Ms. Wasserman supported requesting a timeline and noted it is going to be a long time.

Mr. Coney said he had concerns. There have been few incidents at this site; the fence is an overreach and a knee jerk reaction. He questioned why the site was vacated while generating income. He said he understood that public access had been allowed over the years and noted the bus and hospital pathways. He said the fence is an overreach and should be removed. He said if there is a future problem to come ask for approval. He said the site is hidden and unless someone knows about it, it is not apparent. He noted that Seattle Center is well-maintained without a fence. He said the fence is an overreach; spite or not.

Ms. Chang said she agreed. She said between briefings and summaries it is clear that both sides make sense. She said trespass is an issue; it is private property. She said she understood why the fence was put up but wondered how long it will be up. She said it doesn't really do more than the fence that is already up – 4' vs. 6'. She wondered if warning signs about trespassing might be more effective. She said that if she were to support the application, it would be with a time limit, no trespass signs put up, or different type of fencing to fill in the gaps.

Mr. Inpanbutr said there are so many issues at play. He wondered what would have happened had the fence not gone up. It doesn't seem the board can say what is safe and what is not. He said it seems like this issue is arising out of past history. If it fails, would they come through again? Regarding fence, he noted timing issue and degradation of property. He said he was leaning toward 'no' and said applicant should go through a proper design review process.

Ms. Johnson struggled with the idea of precedent. She didn't want to say it can be closed off. She said if the applicant had gone through proper channels it might have been a different review.

Mr. Kiel said he was torn, and it is frustrating. He said the ownership has taken a strict approach of "the Landmarks Board can't tell me what to do". He said

ownership is not playing in great faith and noted retroactive approvals over and over. He said it was frustrating to give the benefit of the doubt and yet again review another retroactive project. He said the timeline is critical, the fence could be up for 10 years. He said he didn't buy that it is temporary. He said you could say paint is temporary. He said it is an unusual landmark; it is a landscape mostly. He said boarding up buildings and fencing would be an eyesore; a landscape is not at risk and a fence is not protecting it. He said it is private property and the community is incorrect in its perception about rights to the land. He said the ownership is within its rights to get a fence that compliments and responds to the landmark. He said ownership should think about how it contributes to the community and if a permanent fence were to be reviewed, he would look for a visual connection with the neighborhood and to be aesthetically pleasing to the architecture on site.

Ms. Wasserman asked if the applicant could come back with a different proposal if this application is denied.

Ms. Doherty said they could with a different type proposal, not the same proposal.

Mr. Barnes asked what was designated.

Ms. Doherty said the entire site and the exteriors of the buildings.

Mr. Kiel said this is a significant piece of Rich Haag's legacy; the landscape architect's work.

Mr. Barnes asked why housing is being allowed.

Mr. Coney said if the application came as a regular Certificate of Approval, he wouldn't approve it. It should be scaled back to something more appropriate. He said there have been very few incidents and there is not even a need.

Mr. Kiel said there has been no demonstration of need and he noted visual impacts to the landmark. He said there is lots of hill area where fencing could be installed and not seen. He said not to be so literal about property rights and do it in a sensitive manner that is not such an eyesore.

Mr. Macleod concurred. He said it is private property and public access does not hold water. He said as it is, it is overkill. He said it need to be scaled back and they need to re-engineer a solution.

Ms. Wasserman said applicant should come back with a plan to secure the property more thoughtfully.

Ms. Johnson said the site is private property. She said applicant should come back with less obtrusive fencing strategy.

Mr. Macleod, Mmes. Chang and Wasserman concurred.

Mr. Kiel said to stop the retroactive stuff. He said fencing should be more compatible and located differently. He said it should be more sensitive, compatible to the site.

In response to the Board's comments, Ms. Doherty said she drafted an alternate motion. She read it to the Board. Based on their feedback she added a line and read it to them. She then emailed it to all of the Board members.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board deny the retroactive application for the proposed perimeter fence on the Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center campus, at 4000 NE 41st Street, as it does not comply with the *Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation*. The applicant has also not demonstrated a need for this fence in addition to the existing fence behind it. The Landmarks Preservation Board would consider alternatives that are more compatible with the Landmark.

MM/SC/MI/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

090220.4 DESIGNATION

090220.41 Swedish Club

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and provided a virtual walk around the site and elaborated on primary façade and entry, partial brise soleil in the south façade. He said that the screen is constructed from cast aluminum segments and was put on by members of the club. He said portions of damaged screen were removed due to careless loading and unloading. He noted the intimate garden with fountain on the north side, another garden on the south. He said the entry door pulls were a gift from the architect in memory of his father. He said the entry lobby is a two-story space with a grand staircase. He said the main floor houses offices, meeting rooms and a library with large meeting space on the lower floor. He said the dining room is on the upper floor with the south portion a lounge.

He said the building can convey its significance. He said it has integrity of design. He said originally the building was perceived as a brightly lit lantern on east side. He said Minoru Yamasaki's Reynolds Metal Building is a possible design inspiration. He said there was compromise with no western entry canopies, no elevator. He said the original entrance was heavier. He said the original south façade concept was expanded metal panel with corrugated pierced metal. They chose a less expensive aluminum option. He said the screen was never installed above the handrail on the east side; on the south and north façades it was removed down to the handrail height.

Mr. Johnson went over changes to the building. He said the cloak room was lost, four windows were added, a partition wall was added at the northwest corner. He said a corridor was inserted through original private dining room for the upper floor lounge. He said there is enough integrity to meet the designation standards.

He said the building did not meet criteria A or B. He said the building is indirectly linked to Century 21 Exposition as it was to be a showplace for Swedish culture. He said John Nordeen pulled boosters together to raise money for the building but was not significant. He said the building meets Criterion C as a hub for activity for the Swedish community. He said the building lights up like a shimmering jewel at night. He said it has derivative elements of the International Style and may or may not meet Criterion D. He said

Criterion E is met with architect Einar Anderson who designed dozens of notable buildings including schools, residences, library, religious buildings. He said his firm was one of the premier architectural offices and this is an outstanding work of theirs. He said the building meets Criterion F and said there is nothing obscuring the building; the south parking lot is lower, and he noted the view from Lake Union. He said he supported designation of south parking lot.

Ms. Chang asked if the entry canopies are included as part of original building.

Mr. Johnson said they were added in the mid-1960s. He said the labor to add them was probably donated by members who included metal fabricators and a general contractor. He said the project was financed by donations by the Swedish community.

Ms. Chang said it was interesting that the building was built in phases, and how they got the funding. She asked about the driveway damage.

Mr. Johnson said the report and photos was done two years ago and it is likely repaired by now.

Mr. Coney thanked Mr. Johnson for the excellent report and said he appreciated the sketches and extras provided. He asked about onerous restrictions or controls on property regarding the parking lot.

Mr. Johnson noted changes in board composition over the years have impacted the process. He said some individuals have been more flexible and others micromanage more. He said the board is made up of individuals who each have their own agenda. He said possible redevelopment of the parking lot is good.

Mr. Macleod asked about original materials / fittings.

Mr. Johnson said the dining lights were recent gift from a club member. He appreciated that the original exterior lights are intact.

Owner Presentation

Kristine Leander, Executive Director of the Swedish Club thanked board and staff for their support and said the Swedish Club is happy to designate the building.

Susan Boyle, BOLA said the property owner wants to exclude the south and east parking lots from designation. She summarized a May 19, 2020 memo (in DON file). She said the original site plan does not include either parking lot; one was stated to be developed on a different plan/time. The building used to be more visible than it is now. She said the original span of metal was changed out and they chose a different screening material which was put on two façades. She said the beacon quality of the building is only in the evening. She said that is no view up Dexter Avenue; the building is austere on the north and south sides.

Jessica Clawson went through SEPA policies as described in May 19, 2020 memo. She said policies are already in place.

Ms. Boyle said all landmark properties have unique features, and none are alike. Yet in several other similar cases, where a private club was located on a larger site, the Landmarks Preservation Board chose to designate only the site of the building and perimeter yards and not larger adjacent parcels. She said the Knights of Columbus building property was designated and the parking lots were excluded. The 1923 Women's University Club was designated as a building and its site; the adjacent garage was not designated. She noted there are other examples of designated historic properties, including non-profit, public, and community-based buildings, where the designation excluded portions of site vary including the Bricklayers Building, Egan House, Golden Gardens Bath House among others. She said some properties don't need all of the site to convey significance.

Ms. Leander said the Swedish Club did not support including the parking lots, which allows for their future development.

Mr. Coney said not to make comparisons amongst landmarks because each one is uniquely situated.

Mr. Kiel asked where the property line is relative to the south façade and setbacks.

Ms. Boyle indicated on site plan. She noted the truncated shape of the south parking lot and the parking lot to the west is not shown on the site plan.

Mr. Kiel asked if the driveway is part of the parcel.

Ms. Boyle said both driveways are.

Mr. Barnes asked if they make money from the parking lots.

Ms. Leander said they use the parking lots for members and don't make money from it. She said they have one across the street that makes money. She said they do rentals and need the parking lots for events. She said they have thought about development but have no plans at this point.

Mr. Barnes asked the rationale for excluding the parking lots from designation.

Ms. Boyle said the design intent of the original building or site was not vehicular in nature and the design doesn't emphasize one side or another. She said the parking lot to the east was purchased after the building was complete. She said they owned the property to the south. She said club members support designation of the building.

Ms. Wasserman said landmarking will preserve views of and through the building. She hoped interior lobby and stairs would be included.

Ms. Doherty said the Board nominated the entire building interior.

Mr. Kiel asked about adjacency reviews.

Ms. Doherty said Tom Quackenbush in Historic Preservation program reviews them.

Ms. Sodt said that many adjacency reviews are done as part of SEPA; sometimes requests are received for mitigation and sometimes it has already been provided.

Mr. Kiel asked about what kind of review would be done for views of building.

Ms. Clawson said they have had to do mitigation for public view protection as Dexter Avenue is a view corridor. She said there are instances up and down the corridor where view is required of Lake Union. She said they have to apply policies that are already there.

Mr. Kiel said that one view strongly fits Criterion F and asked how that would be protected.

Ms. Clawson cited the SEPA code.

Mr. Kiel asked if they are relying on someone to interpret what the protected view is.

Ms. Clawson said the view of the building up Dexter is included. She read from SMC 25.05.675.P.1 and 2 and said it is the City's policy to protect views of landmarks.

Mr. Kiel said this view is important and should be in the record and be enforced.

Ms. Boyle said views from this building are beautiful and provide a 180' view northeast, east, and southeast. She said that is why screening was removed in some areas and lowered in others. She said when things re-open she hopes for a board tour.

Mr. Coney asked why ownership was opposed to including parking lots in designation.

Mr. Kiel said that owners typically limit encumbrances on land.

Ms. Leander said they want flexibility to possibly develop the property. She said inclusion of parking lots would tie their hands in a way to get funds to maintain the club.

Ms. Boyle said in the past, it was felt the board has over-reached. She said it is no longer that way. She said it is not unreasonable to feel they don't want to run that risk. She said they have been good stewards of the property.

Mr. Coney said there is a fair amount of turnover of the board. He said a little oversight by the Landmarks Board is not unwarranted.

Ms. Johnson supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She said the building is interesting; it is of its time. She said it is not the best example of this type of Modernism. She said the best part is the metal screen. She said the crux of the building is the metal screen; the south side has been modified. She said the building is not the best example of Einar Anderson's work although she supported Criterion D. She supported inclusion of interior elements – two story volume, stair material, brick wall, stair, screen. She did not support inclusion of parking lots because it would impose too many constraints on the owner. She said adjacency review works. She said she understands the desire to preserve view.

Mr. Macleod said he is a member of the Swedish Club and noted he was not involved in the preparation of the report.

There were no objections to his continued participation by board or ownership.

Mr. Macleod supported designation on criteria C and D. He said the building is not a superlative example for Criterion B but it is distinctive. Regarding Criterion E he questioned what defines 'outstanding' and said it is hard to pin down a style for them, they are all outstanding. He said he leaned toward including the whole site, including parking lots. He said future development could be reviewed as a Certificate of Approval so the board could have input. He supported inclusion of more than interior foyer but said it was hard to define what specifically. He noted the exposed brick, railings, spatial organization of staircase and entry.

Ms. Chang said she was flexible on the parking lots. She said she could work with driveway setbacks which work with driveways on south and east. She hopes that SEPA review for adjacency would happen. She supported criteria C and D and was 'on the fence' with E and F. She said Anderson did a wide range of styles and projects. She said he didn't do the full panel on all sides, so it doesn't stand out as much. She said she supported inclusion of interior entry lobby and staircase and driveway setbacks; she noted the chandelier is not original. She said that interiors walls have been moved around. She noted the patterned wall and said the lounge staircase looks original.

Mr. Coney supported designation and noted Criterion F. He said it would retain the flexibility to develop the south parking lot if designated. He cited Bleitz Funeral Home as an example of the whole site being designated and the cooperative effort to develop a portion. He said Mr. Johnson noted the wax and wane of the Landmarks Board. He said the latest make up goes with the flow more and does not put on onerous restrictions. He noted turnover of leadership at the club. He supported inclusion of entire site and noted as examples the Federal Reserve Bank the Firestone buildings where multiple stories are being added. He supported inclusion of interior lobby stair and second floor lobby and that he hoped they would be incorporated in the Bylaws and that if there are other elements, they can protect them. He said the south screen was changed over 25 years ago and he saw that as a refinement. He supported criteria C, D, E, and F. He said improvements on the site have been reduced to \$1000 per tax assessor; the ownership could see benefits to Special Tax benefits. He said view protection is important to building.

Ms. Doherty explain that the Bleitz Funeral Home landmark doesn't include the whole site; there are three lots on the westernmost side that were excluded. She said a buffer was included.

Ms. Doherty said the staff report includes the vacated alleys (or drives) on the south and east. Looking at the site plan on the south side, there appears to be an approximate 5' gap from building to driveway; with the vacated alley it is about a 17' buffer.

Ms. Wasserman supported designation and noted criteria C, D, and F as relevant. She supported inclusion of the interior lobby atrium and stairway only. She did not

support inclusion of parking lots and said there is good faith that views will be protected. She said to include garden space around building.

Mr. Barnes supported designation and noted criteria C, D, F. He said the club is a cultural icon for the City and has been beneficial. He said the building is unique and stands out. He noted the mountain view. He supported designation of exterior, interior foyer, stairwell, main floor area. He did not support upper floor because of changes. He said the parking lots could be included; Landmark Board review would protect the landmark. He said the parking lot was purchased after the building was built. He said it is hard to think they would obstruct their own view.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and to included exterior, interior lobby stairwell, second floor assembly area. He didn't support including of the east parking lot because it was not originally part of the site and was purchased later. He supported inclusion of south parking lot and said adjacency review would protect building.

Mr. Macleod asked if the view from the building is protected.

Ms. Doherty said no, that SEPA does not protect a building's view.

Mr. Kiel said the value of the building is tied to the view. He said it is hard to imagine they would develop land that would lessen the value of the property. He supported designation and noted criteria C and F. He supported inclusion of the entry, lobby and stair, and exterior. He did not support inclusion of south parking lot. He said the natural setbacks work and the corner is a defining feature. He said it is a smart design by a competent designer. He said the burden on an owner to save a corner is not worthwhile.

Discussion ensued about whether or not to include the parking lots in the designation.

Mr. Barnes and Ms. Wasserman were flexible but preferred not including the parking lots.

Mr. Coney said he wanted to include the south parking lot to preserve the view. He supported inclusion of two-story lobby volume with stair.

Mr. Johnson said she understood Mr. Coney's perspective but wasn't sure it was reasonable.

Mr. Macleod said he agreed with Mr. Coney and supported inclusion of parking lot. He said the board should have a say in the process. He said he trusted Swedish Club wouldn't sacrifice what makes the building unique.

Mr. Inpanbutr noted the good counterpoints. He said that the Swedish Club has been an incredible steward and that won't change. He said he didn't support inclusion of either parking lot noting the need for flexibility in the future. He supported designation.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Swedish Club at 1920 Dexter Avenue North, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that

the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building; two-story foyer, open stair, and landing/hall at top; and a portion of the site comprised of lots 13-17, and the vacated alleys directly south and east of these lots.

MM/SC/HW/KJ 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Kiel left at 7:35 pm.

Mr. Macleod lost connection during the vote; he was able to reconnect and voted to designate the building.

090220.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator