



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 332/22

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, August 3, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lawrence Norman

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Matt Inpanbutr

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Meeting participation was by the WebEx Event link, telephone call-in line, or in person.

ROLL CALL

080322.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club spoke in support of the Battelle proposal updates which she said gives some predictability. She said ownership of the buildings is vital to maintenance of the site. She said she would like to see

better spatial design and more architectural character in line with the existing site. She said demolition needs study and said changes are expensive. She said daycare is an intense use of the site and building. She said she believes there is a path forward.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle said written comments about Battelle-Talaris were submitted (in DON file). He said his comments would be consistent with the letter. He said it is possible to construct a reduced number of homes and still generate a return. He asked to see the financial resources referenced. He advocated for preserving Building G and said this landmark is a complex one.

080322.2 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

080322.21 former Fire Station #26 / South Park Neighborhood Center
8201 10th Avenue S
Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty said there is a signed agreement, but a 15-day notice is required so she will schedule it for board consideration for August 17, 2022.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Former Fire Station #26 / South Park Neighborhood Center, 8201 10th Avenue S. for one month.

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

080322.22 Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building
103 Pike Street
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a five-month extension to the second meeting in December.

Ian Morrison said they are working with staff exploring reasonable economic use element and need more time for review.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Hotel Elliott / Hahn Building, 103 Pike Street for five months.

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

080322.23 Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building
2234 2nd Ave
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a four-month extension. She said the owner is working through permitting for an addition.

Ian Morrison said the project needs to go through MUP but has received Design Review recommendations. He said they are moving forward to obtain the MUP and will submit preliminary Certificate of Approval soon.

Mr. Macleod said that Belltown Lofts burned to the ground and asked if there were impacts here.

Mr. Morrison said there was no impact to this building.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building, 2234 2nd Avenue for four months.

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

080322.24 Cassel Crag
1218 Terry Avenue
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a five-month extension and said ownership is exploring reasonable economic use. She said it is an apartment that has been used for medical offices; the owner is Virginia Mason.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Cassel Crag, 1218 Terry Avenue for five months.

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

080322.25 University of Washington Faculty Club
4020 E Stevens Way NE

Ms. Doherty explained the boundary and how it relates to the base of the building and overall building footprint. She summarized the agreement.

Mr. Macleod said it is reasonable and the kitchen addition is non-historic.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the University of Washington Faculty Club, 4020 E. Stevens Way NE.

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

080322.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

080322.31 former Cooper School / Youngstown Cultural Arts Center
4408 Delridge Way SW
Proposed above grade cisterns for rainwater collection

David Bestock, Delridge Neighborhoods Development Authority proposed three cisterns: one on the northwest and two on the east. He said the covered driveway is only used by residents. He said the east corner has the West Seattle Tool Library and the cisterns will be visible to its users. He said the kiosk is not in the proposal, but they would like to do it if possible. He said the new downspout will be at a slight angle.

Jack Harris, Stone Soup Gardens said tanks will be placed so not to block light to building and be unobtrusive.

Ms. Doherty said the board can request additional information or a separate application for the kiosk or can approve if it doesn't adversely impact the building.

Ms. Wasserman said she could see clearly that the sign wouldn't hurt the building. She supported amending the motion to allow the sign.

Ms. Caton supported inclusion of the sign. She said the cisterns serve a great purpose and she saw no adverse impact.

Mr. Macleod support adding the sign noting it educational.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the cisterns at the former Cooper Elementary School, 4408 Delridge Way SW, as per the attached submittal as amended to include sign as discussed.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

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 121866.*
 - a. The proposed cisterns are small when compared to the scale of the school, and are in locations that do not adversely impact the building exterior or site.
2. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 B, C, D and E are not applicable.
3. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic 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/HW/TC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

080322.32

Green Lake Branch Library

7364 E Green Lake Way N

Proposed alterations to the site, and building exterior and interior

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork said the Green Lake Branch Library is one of five Carnegie libraries in Seattle. He said that some modifications have been made to the building. He said this project proposes: seismic retrofit to meet a higher damage control level; accessibility upgrades; interior renovation for better function, patron services, seating, etc.; environmentally sustainable design. He said the non-original service stair would be rework for a loading dock. He proposed a new ramp to connect sidewalk and bus stop leading to a regraded and lowered plaza and new entry vestibule. He said internal elevator connects both floors. He said non-original stair would be removed for loading dock / book delivery, lower grade of west parking area to bring new access ramp up to plaza and entry to new vestibule. He provided renderings showing ramp and plaza, solid waste enclosure, new retaining wall with signage and bench with lighting underneath.

Mr. Aalfs said unexcavated space beneath the building would be captured; new structure will be created to do that. He said other interior changes include a new door, book drop, elevator that will provide access to both levels. He said the large boiler space will be used for staff room, nursing, and toilets. He said three reading rooms on the upper level along with a small book processing room would altered to create two new study rooms, a private toilet, and renovated service area. He proposed seismic retrofit will involve new structural element; concrete walls at the lower level inside next to existing walls; steel moment frames with no diagonals, three of which would be exposed. He provided existing and proposed renderings for comparison. He showed detail of how steel beam fits into proportion of wood and plaster cornice.

He proposed to remove one section of wood room divider to allow for open circulation. He said they want to re-use perimeter bookshelves but they are not deep enough. He proposed removal of shelves with retention of verticals and said insertion of adjustable system. He proposed modifying delivery of air and indicated how air grills fit into bookshelves. He said the new would be installed in the same manner to retain the same look and feel as exists now. He said the proposed square perforated grill matches what is there now. He said new wood windows and door

would match original. He said large pendant lights would be relamped with LED and controls; historic light fixture to be retained.

Mr. Barnes asked for clarification on access.

Mr. Aalfs said there is no way to add elevator at front without radically impacting the front. He said on the inside there is no way to get an at-grade entrance at front, but it was possible at the back with capturing of unexcavated space. He said a generous entrance plaza was created so it will feel welcoming. He said the project creates more spaces for people including three reading rooms and a discovery area which will be a hub of discovery in which to browse and learn about what is available in the library system. He said there are dedicated areas for teens and children.

Ms. Caton asked why the cheek walls are tall at ADA area.

Mr. Aalfs said the driveway is being lowered about 2' while protecting existing tree at same time. The cheek wall is as low as possible, and the preference was to have it at vehicle bumper height.

Mr. Macleod supported the project.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed site improvements, and exterior and interior building alterations at the Green Lake Branch Library, 7364 E Green Lake Way N, as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

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 121106.*
 - a. The proposed alterations and changes to the site, and building exterior and interior, do not dramatically alter the characteristics of the designated features.
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. The applicant has demonstrated the need and there are no reasonable alternatives.
3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 C, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance.*

- a. The proposed accessibility improvements are to comply with a code that allows a person to independently use a site and building.
 - b. The proposed seismic improvements to the unreinforced masonry building are to comply with the code level of Damage Control, so that it will be more likely to remain intake and in safe operation following a significant earthquake.
4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 D and E are not applicable.
 5. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

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

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

Ms. Johnson left meeting at 4:55 pm.

080322.4 BRIEFINGS

080322.41 Griffin Building/Sheridan Apartments
 2005 – 2011 Fifth Avenue
 Briefing on proposed redevelopment

Craig Davenport provided overview of earlier briefing and noted the development of massing and tapered massing.

Ellen Mirro, Studio TJP provided a historic timeline of the buildings noting building associations, Gothic Style of the Griffin and relationship to the monorail (see historic resource report in DON file). She surveyed the building and made recommendations for treatment of the windows where almost nothing original remains. She said terracotta would be rehabilitated and connected back to building. She noted structural deterioration and exposed rebar. She noted the distinctive character of the Sheridan Building and said terracotta would be restored and nonoriginal sash windows would be replaced. She said the cornice would be removed and reinstalled.

Ms. Mirro said steel sash windows with wood mullion trim reinstalled are proposed for the Griffin Building and will be as close as possible to original while meeting energy code. She said original wood frame windows on the Sheridan Building are intact and said guidance is requested for insertion of new. She noted intention to retain original proportions of windows while keeping them at the same plane.

Peter Sherrill summarized the current design process and noted early guidance that the tower location should be off the Griffin Building. He walked through the design iterations to the preferred option. He noted the challenge of three connected parcels and maintaining floor plates. He said the courtyard would be aligned with original courtyard. He noted the intent to respect the volume and program of the building. He said ground level uses would remain the same. Main arched entry of the Griffin would provide office access and the main arched entry of the Sheridan would be residential access. He said there would be minimal impact on the landmark with fewer branching columns. He said they would maintain the Griffin interior volume. The floor heights of Griffin and Sheridan buildings would be reconstructed at same heights as when built.

He said the addition would be in New Formalism style with design inspiration from tree and branch forms. He said the tower would be pushed as far north as possible to maintain integrity of the Griffin Building. The interface between the new tower and the existing building has been sculpted to reduce impact. He said the alley massing would stay true to original landmark volumes and be distinct from each other. He said the terracotta turns the corner. He said all terracotta would be restored and indicated which terracotta would be replaced.

Mr. Sherrill provided material board noting the light colors to highlight historic features.

Mr. Davenport said the team looked for support of overall design and approval of proposed windows, exterior lighting and attention to terracotta.

Mr. Norman asked to see the image showing the columns going up through building.

Mr. Davenport noted the 18" octagon shaped columns are not too large; interior volume would be rebuilt to match existing size and dimensions. The tower is out over the Griffin Building; there will be interior columns at Griffin.

Mr. Barnes said he was amazed at the look and feel of what has been accomplished but asked if the new construction would take away from historic buildings.

Ms. Mirro said she tried as much as possible to maintain original mass of landmarked structures. The addition makes it feasible to reduce impact on historic structures. She said the team has taken the board's advice to respect the original massing volumes.

Mr. Barnes said it looks like 300' elevation of building.

Mr. Davenport said it is 400'.

Mr. Barnes asked if upper floors was all mixed use.

Mr. Davenport said it is all apartments.

Mr. Barnes said he was impressed with the innovation to make this work.

Ms. Mirro said the team is looking for feedback on windows and lighting, especially the Hope windows. She questioned if the windows on the Sheridan should be aluminum-clad or if they would stay with all wood. She said it would impact the size of the window opening.

Mr. Schmitt asked the opacity of windows.

Mr. Davenport said there would be no tinting; the windows would remain ultra-clear to maintain historic look. He said the rest of the tower would have coatings.

Ms. Caton commented to keep the original proportion of windows as close as possible to original.

Mr. Barnes concurred and said to keep them as close to original as possible and to minimize impacts to the landmarked buildings.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the efforts to follow ARC recommendations. She said the team has done a lot of work. She preferred keeping the windows as close to original as possible. She appreciated the lighting. She said the project is moving in the right direction and she appreciated the presentation.

Mr. Norman appreciated the branching design. He said the team has shown ways to keep the landmarks intact and still get full out of the new building.

Mr. Schmitt said the design looks like a tree sprouted up.

Ms. Chang appreciated that Griffin would be kept as is and Sheridan would be kept as close as possible. She noted the floor alignment and column placement. She appreciated the lighting and the historic nature of the building. She asked about window size differences.

Ms. Mirro said to keep the original frames they have to put in a whole window. If they use aluminum product, it is closer to the original size of window. Original window material is wood, original opening size closer with aluminum.

Ms. Chang asked about comparison in longevity, wood versus aluminum.

Ms. Mirro said there isn't a preference.

Mr. Macleod said an aluminum clad wood option retains original material and retains façade composition. He said it is reversible. He said the lighting is a lovely idea and the fixtures are unobtrusive. He said he wasn't a fan of tacking an addition on top a landmark but appreciated this design. He said he likes the Yamasakian influence.

080322.42

Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation / exterior alterations

Presentation in DON file.

Nathan Rimmer, 4000 Property LLC provided introduction to the project and noted the project is more than any one building; the presentation would provide a holistic look at the site. He said they would present a 3-D video to walk the board through the site and project.

Dan Miles, Bassetti Architects went through density of the 18-acre site with seven landmark buildings and overview of earlier concepts for the site. He said the board had requested additional site analysis on the impacts of removing Building G and more detail on how the replacement structures would interact with the heart of the campus as well as the southwest corner, and wetlands.

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects said the team wanted to verify they are headed in the right direction.

Jim Keller, Site Workshop said the original plan shows the heart of the site is a pond and Japanese garden. He indicated viable long-term trees and impacts to them.

Mr. Miles noted utility easements that exist and create constraints to developing potential future home sites.

Mr. McConachie talked about negative domino effect; if Building G is retained it is impossible to develop many of the proposed home sites while preserving historic views and large groves of trees. He said half of the building is not ADA accessible and stepped levels makes ADA retrofit impossible. He said removing Building G protects more important areas like Oak Groves and the center core from new development He noted it has an interesting roof but is not a primary building.

Mr. Miles said the southwest corner, wetland area and oak grove are defining characteristics.

James Moehring, Bassetti Architects said they were asked to look at pedestrian views of the inner experience. He provided images from the bridge and noted materiality, roof forms and buildings that are being retained.

Mr. Keller noted the ADA path coming down in the open space and meadow and said they are using this as an opportunity to strengthen the character of the park-like setting.

A video walkabout was shown to provide context of the proposed development's impacts and the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Keller said they are getting into home cluster designs and using a lot of the same detailing and site elements that existing in the A, B, C and D. He said they all speak to

the language of the site. He said the heart of the campus would remain for the long term with new willow trees. He said that all the site and landscape features are taking cues from the way Richard Haag laid them out initially with courtyards and places for people to gather outside. He noted the important oak grove walk and said they are not changing any of the driveways or pathways; the grove is sacred space.

Mr. McConachie noted the image showing the integration of the new development into the heart of this landmark. He said the design goal has been to balance the restoration of both the historic landscape as well as the buildings. He said the site as it sits is in trouble and is very run down. He said they are excited about the opportunity to revitalize this landmark property and what they are proposing has struck a critical balance between initial investment and long-term viability. He said the proper balance is important to ensure that the landmark is sustainable for years to come.

Mr. Norman said the site has 80% green space and asked how much green space would be lost with this design.

Mr. Miles said he didn't have the numbers but would look for them.

Mr. Norman said he thought about how the greenspace that is left would become private homes.

Mr. Rimmer said it is people's back yards that are going to be part of the greenspace. He said Mr. Norman's numbers sound about right. He said it is important greenspace and they did prioritize the key important communal gathering type spaces. He said there is no way to keep all the trees, but they prioritized what is most important. He said it has been a balancing act.

Mr. Barnes asked how many houses they plan to build now.

Bob Baldwin said 48 new single family homes and three duplex homes.

Mr. Barnes asked about reduction of greenspace and reduction of trees.

Mr. Rimmer said they spent time with engineers finding opportunities for additional retention by rerouting utilities.

Mr. Keller said they are required to put back tree canopy that is removed for development; it is part of the Master Use Permit.

Mr. McConachie said there was a careful analysis of tree condition – which are healthy, which are in trouble, and which need to be removed. He said they are working around healthy trees and said that is part of the balancing act.

Mr. Barnes noted concern with dark corners and plantings at night. He asked what has been proposed to alleviate those nighttime issues.

Mr. Rimmer noted dark corners and said there are a lot of places that would be prioritized in the new development with new lighting, eyes on the property. In the future of the site a lot of those pockets would probably go away. He said they would dive into that level of detail with the board.

Mr. Miles noted he found the figures Mr. Norman requested earlier and said there is 14.1 acres of open space and in the new development plan, there would be 11.74 but 5.5 of those would be private landscaping on single family homes. The open space, not including the yards reduces 14 acres to 6.

Mr. Schmitt asked what access the public would have to the park, if any.

Mr. Rimmer said public access would be restored but it would be privately maintained because someone has to pay for that.

Mr. Miles said buildings D and F would be multi-use sites and occupied during work hours.

Mr. Schmitt asked if residents would add fences to their yards.

Mr. Miles said homeowner association design guidelines would have to be developed. He said the intent is that no fences would be allowed to distinguish private property from the publicly accessible areas. He said that would need to be part of the agreement.

Mr. Rimmer said on the pond homes they are definitely not envisioning individual fences. He said to create separation they looked at concrete pathway with shrubbery and greenspace. He said that homes along the alley and on the east side of the property would probably get some sort of a private backyard.

Mr. Keller said they don't envision fences facing into the more publicly accessible type spaces.

Mr. Moehring said they have tried to reduce the amount of pavement throughout, there are a lot of shared driveways.

Ms. Wasserman said she had been on the board a while and saw the horrid early proposals for this site. She said she was happy to see that change. She appreciated the changes and responses to board comments. She was not upset by losing Building G, that she didn't see it as a useful building. She said weighed on the side of fewer impacts to the landscape. She said she wished the entry house were not there and prefers the quiet entry originally there. She appreciated the walkthroughs and use of the software. She wished there could be some sort of multi-family building there instead of the spread out houses. She said the site is expensive to keep up and she would like to hear more about the economics of how site maintenance would be funded.

Mr. Rimmer said the A, B, C buildings are duplexes but noted it is a single-family zone site so that is a constraint right away. He said they think there is a path to the duplex type units to provide some size and pricing diversity within the neighborhood.

Ms. Chang appreciated the current result especially with reduced number of single family housing. She said it is still concerning how welcoming the space is for the general public to use. She said the entry house feels imposing and asked if that could be made smaller so it doesn't feel like you are going through someone's back yard when you are coming through that street. She prefers the entry house not be as apparent. She said she likes the size of the 41st Street neighborhood houses because they seem to match more of the older homes in the neighborhood in size and feel. She reiterated her concern that the entry house is too large and imposing. She said she would like to see the establishment of some more affordable homes for this neighborhood.

Mr. Rimmer said they took advantage of the topography and buried most of the entry house and put the garage down below, tucked in. He noted the existing oak tree there and that just the roof of the house is visible.

Mr. Macleod appreciated Ms. Chang's concerns and noted comments from Historic Seattle which he wanted to echo. He asked if there is a reason that 48 houses is the number chosen. He said he was in favor of retaining Building G in any way possible. He asked those houses would have to be relocated elsewhere rather than omitted.

Mr. Baldwin said that was a subject for another meeting. He said he has alluded to it numerous times but the economics are complex. He said the property is going to be expensive to develop and restore. He said the ongoing maintenance is a staggering number.

Mr. Macleod said a future session would be helpful. He said Historic Seattle noted that an earlier proposal had townhouses on the site. He asked if that conflicts with current zoning or could that be amended.

Mr. Baldwin said it is in conflict with the single-family underlying zone that is there. He said even turning the historic structures into duplexes would require them to get a special use permit.

Mr. Rimmer said the neighborhood is very resistant to that.

Mr. Macleod said it was before his time on the board but he remembered the zoning fight over the site and that it was unfortunate it ended up where it was. He said he would appreciate hearing more about the finances in a future briefing.

Mr. Norman appreciated the presentation. He appreciated Ms. Chang's perspective on this and asked if the team can make this more welcoming to the community to provide more diversity economically.

Ms. Caton said she was not attached to Building G. She said she would be recusing herself as she has in the past.

Mr. Macleod appreciated seeing the iterations throughout the process. He said he is still attached to Building G as part of the core. He said the grouping of single-family houses replicates the space developed there, the heart of the site. He said he understood the challenges but noted once a building is gone, it's gone. He expressed concern over accessibility physically and economically and wanted to hear more about that. He appreciated the renaming of the gate house, the entry house.

Mr. Baldwin said it is a pretty significant lift to get to the next stage and said it sounded like in general most of the core issues, the master planning issues are settling down.

Mr. Macleod said overall in general comments look good.

Ms. Doherty said she heard board some members mentioned needing a better economic understanding of what is driving the site plan. She asked the Board to clarify if she understood that correctly.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

Mr. Schmitt concurred.

Ms. Wasserman said she hasn't heard in great detail what comes next and would appreciate hearing that. She also wanted to see economic numbers, size, scope and scale. She said the numbers would feel astronomical but the board should see them and get a feel for it. She said the site is not going to be a public park. She said there should be access.

Mr. Rimmer said just to maintain the site is into seven figures so there is need for revenue to support that.

Mr. Macleod said it would be helpful to see some numbers.

080322.43 Pioneer Sand and Gravel Company Building
901 Harrison Street
Briefing on proposed redevelopment

Postponed.

080322.5 BOARD BUSINESS