



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 249/22

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, June 15, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Russell Coney

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Lawrence Norman

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

## ROLL CALL

**061522.1 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle spoke in support of designation of the Steinhart Anderson Theriault Office Building and said it is one of his favorites in the city. He called it a Modernist gem and one of the highlights of the Modernist Movement tour. He said it meets Criterion D. He said it is an outstanding work of the firm and meets Criterion E. He said the siting is unique and noted the glass box hovers over the site and meets Criterion F.

**061522.2 MEETING MINUTES**

May 4, 2022

MM/SC/HW/IM 6:0:0 Minutes approved

May 18, 2022 Tabled.

**061522.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

061522.31 former Fire Station 26 / South Park Neighborhood Center  
8201 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue S  
Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty explained they are actively negotiating and requested a two-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the former Fire Station 26 / South Park Neighborhood Center for two months.

MM/SC/IM/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.32 Battelle Memorial Institute and Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Request for an extension

Nathan Rimmer requested a six-month extension and noted the plan to do a Board briefing July 20, 2022. He said ARC has reviewed the project.

Ms. Doherty said ARC reviewed recently and another is coming.

Ms. Johnson said it is a reasonable request.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Battelle Memorial Institute and Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street for six months.

MM/SC/IM/HW 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.33 Seattle Times Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street

Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary requested four-month extensions for the Office building and Printing Plant. She said first drafts have been sent over and are in review process.

Ms. Sodt said four months is adequate.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Office Building addition at 1120 John Street for four months.

MM/SC/DB/HW 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.34 Seattle Times Printing Plant  
1120 John Street  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Printing Plant at 1120 John Street for four months.

MM/SC/DB/IM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.35 Knights of Columbus  
700-722 E. Union Street  
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary explained they are exploring uses and tenants. A MUP was issued for residential portion on parking lot. She requested a four-month extension.

Mr. Coney asked about some of the designated features.

Ms. Sodt noted the interior volume and two main spaces above the gym.

Ms. Clawson said they are trying to find a user for the building.

Mr. Coney asked if the new multi-family project touches this building.

Ms. Clawson said it does not.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Knights of Columbus Building at 700-722 E. Union Street for four months.

MM/SC/IM/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.36 The Showbox  
1426 First Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary said the tenant remains operational and the building is active. He said they have submitted materials to the City and requested a four-month extension.

Mr. Macleod said it has been a long time since this project was seen by the board and asked what the direction is.

Mr. McCullough said it is not possible to achieve economic use and retain interior features. He said they looked at ways to preserve interior and reincorporate into the new with no way found to keep all and still get a return. He said at some point they will go over material to see if there is agreement or if it will go to the Hearing Examiner. He said they are looking at the recent Hearing Examiner decision on 1001 Westlake and being responsive. He requested a four-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Showbox at 1426 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue to the meeting on October 19, 2022.

MM/SC/IM/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.37 Donahoe Building / Bergman Luggage  
1901-1911 3rd Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the owner died and the building has not been sold. She suggested keeping it linked to the White Garage in hopes there will be a good mutual outcome.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Donahoe Building / Bergman Luggage at 1901-1911 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for four months.

MM/SC/IM/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

061522.38 White Garage  
1915 Third Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary said the building has been sold and noted his clients had a relationship with the Donahoe Building group under contract when the Donahoe Building owner passed away. He said they are not in contract and have submitted for addition to the White Garage. He said they will take a fresh look with new design team. He requested a four-month extension.

Mr. Macleod said he looks forward to seeing the project at ARC.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Garage at 1915 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for four months.

MM/SC/DB/IM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**061522.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

061522.41 Hiawatha Playfield  
2700 California Avenue SW  
Proposed site alterations and improvements

Landscape Architect Karen Kiest explained the original Olmsted park in West Seattle has the greatest integrity of any Olmsted park in the city. She noted the original site plan with the wading pool, field house, oval ballfield, tennis courts, formal play area, trees, gym and track. She said the primary change is the expanded gym and noted the field is now oblong rather than oval. She said play area has been replaced a couple times and the track has been converted to softball field.

Ms. Kiest explained that limbs from conifers and firs have been dropping on the play area and noted the need to relocate the play area to a safer location in the park. She said the 'waxing moon' option references Olmsted's plan and that the play area would be offset with a lawn. She said the plan was updated to keep the basketball court in similar location to current, expand land area around the spruce, fitness area in same location, asphalt would be reduced, and concrete increased with an overall reduction of hardscape.

Clara Pang, with Karen Kiest's firm noted the special stone slab and aggregate finishes on the circle.

*Mr. Schmitt arrived at 4:20 pm.*

Ms. Pang said the rest of the concrete would have the standard broom finish. She said asphalt would be used only at basketball court and vehicle areas. She said gravel paths would connect to existing gravel paths and wood fiber would be used in the play area. A new picnic bench would be added east of swing and boulders would be added in planting areas. New swings and an omni spinner would be added to the 2-5-year-old play area.

Mr. Barnes asked about the proposed surface in the play area.

Ms. Pang said engineered wood fiber product is spec'd. She said the chips meet the same requirements as other surfaces. Turf is called out as alternative to wood chips. She said the swings area has wood chips as well.

Mr. Barnes asked how the wood chips would be maintained over time.

Ms. Pang said conversations have been ongoing with Seattle Parks personnel, Shannon Nichols who is trying to sign into the meeting.

Mr. Macleod said concrete is a better choice than asphalt.

Ms. Johnson appreciated the proposed plan and said it maintains the original park organization.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for recreational area improvements at Hiawatha Playfield, 2700 California Avenue SW, 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 113090.*
  - a. The proposed area for alterations has previously been altered from the historic plan.
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 proposed relocation of the active play equipment and sport court appears reasonable, and less impactful to the park layout than other alternate locations.
  - b. The proposed relocation of play equipment is to mitigate the safety concern for falling tree limbs.
  - c. Removing the mature trees appears to be more impactful than relocating the play area.
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 (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/IM/DB 5:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Schmitt abstained.

### 061522.5 DESIGNATION

061522.51 Steinhart Theriault Anderson Office Building  
1264 Eastlake Avenue E

Andrew Phillips, DoCoMoMoWeWa said the Steinhart Theriault Anderson (STA) Office Building was on one of their first organized tours in 2003. He said that much has changed in the neighborhood and noted the importance of saving the building. He noted the restrained use of form and material and said the building embodies the method of construction and is an example of outstanding work of the designers. He said the Steinhart Theriault Anderson building was owner-occupied noting the success of the design. He said the building is easily identified and is an important billboard to the modern architectural movement. He thanked the building owners for their stewardship.

Susan Boyle, DoCoMoMoWeWa said that Eastlake was an early established neighborhood in the city due to transportation and industries. She said the insertion of I-5 was a dramatic change to the area – beautiful homes were demolished, the addition of noise but also creating a defining entry giving Eastlake an ‘island’ identity. She noted the duality of the early history and modern history – L’Amourita, Lake Union Steam Plant, and the mid-century Pacific Architect and Builder Offices and Egan House. She said because of its location the house is a billboard / identifier for Eastlake. She said the STA building has been on tours for the last two decades and has been recognized. She said the building is also on city surveys and DAHP survey.

Ms. Boyles provided context of the building in the neighborhood and the site. She said the building is constructed on a sloped site and raised on a plinth of stone with simple box on top. She noted the deck area and said the courtyard space has been infilled. The landscape exhibits native plants, stones in asphalt for naturalistic aspect. She noted the simple vigorous framing plan and open plan design which exhibited at the time the newness of open space rather than hierarchy of space.

Ms. Boyle noted the reduced palette of the exterior elevator and the rectilinear screening, wood cladding that emphasized the structure. She read from “A Guide To Seattle” written by Victor Steinbrueck in 1953, the year that the National held its convention in Seattle. He wrote this book that has one hundred selected pieces of architecture that go back beginning with indigenous, long houses to the mid-century period. “The unique characteristics of today's Seattle architecture are these freedoms of expression encouraged by the newness of the country. Designed for a mild climate and soft rainfall, averaging 32 inches annually. Varied and skillful use of wood adaptation to hilly topography. And orientation to beautiful views of mini snowcapped mountains innumerable lakes and lots of Puget sound”. She said she thought that captures what this building design did and does.

She said when I-5 was under construction there were mudslides and this sophisticated design had the building lifted above all that. She said the open space to the west allows views of the lake. She said the cantilever of steel frame and building mass projects it forward in a dramatic way. She said the simplicity of the design is engaging and provides a sense of mystery and a unique form cantilevered over the stone base. She said the simple steel box has glazing that largely covers the entire north façade as well as west façade. She noted the transparency that provides views through and from the building. She said the building is remarkably

intact thanks to the stewardship of owner and occupants. She said a luminous plastic ceiling is no longer there and some of the fiberglass screens on the interior have been removed.

She said that Einar Anderson is recognized as the primary designer of the building. She said the firm was really invested in Modernism. In assuring that architecture and engineering were brought together, they used innovative materials such as precast concrete and created curtain wall buildings. She said the firm did work primarily with schools, churches, non-profit groups; they also did residential work. She said Einar Anderson died in 1970 at 45 which she said was a real loss because she thought he would have gone on to do many more outstanding buildings.

Ms. Boyle provided context of the period noting Northwest Regionalism but also expressions in other vocabularies of Modernism. She said the innovation of the 1950s gave rise to the big explosion of talent in the World's Fair.

She provided examples of the Modern style in the Eastlake area and noted the Egan House, Asian Art Museum, Paul Kirk Building, Pacific Architect and Builder building. She said in the 1950s-60s the Eastlake was a low rent and industrial area that likely allowed young architects to purchase property and build these relatively inexpensive buildings for themselves.

John Hempelmann of Cairncross & Hempelmann, attorney for the property owners said the building was purchased as a retirement asset and that the owners are not developers. He said they invested their savings to retire. He said they are in the commercial fishing business and bought this property as a way of investing savings for retirement. He said when we talk about incentives and controls and the ordinance and regulations, there are no incentives in the current code or regulations that will offset the burden that the owners are going to experience by having this building designated as a landmark. He said they will not be able to redevelop the site, and the value of this property in the city for a property owner is going to be significantly depressed. He said the owners are not intending to contest the designation of the building. He wished there was a way the current city regulations could take advantage of the significant development potential of this property, specifically by transferring unused floor area ratio which is substantial here. He said it is going to be lost if it cannot be utilized. There is no way under city current city of regulations to transfer the current unused floor area ratio or development rights someplace else in the city. He said they have talked with the proponents of the nomination and designation about an effort to change that so that the owners, along with other landowners in the city who are faced with designations can find some way to salvage some value from their property. But to be candid he said, getting the legislation to make these this a sending area, or to have a citywide sending area for designated landmarks is a very heavy lift. There's a lot of competition for density bonuses from other programs in the city and not everybody in the city appreciates the history and preserving the history of Seattle. The owners understand that, but thinks this is preserving Seattle's architectural history at the expense of someone's retirement asset, without compensating them, and that is inherently unfair to the owners.



Mr. Hempelmann reiterated that the owners will not oppose the designation of the structure: the structure includes the building, the screen, it obviously includes the foundation that appears to be clad with the beautiful rock from the Mount Baker area, the little walk away into the building, that's part of the structure. He said they do not support designation of the entire site. He said the comments, nomination, and all of the supporting documents are about the structure. He said he heard a couple of comments about the landscaping which at this point is mostly ivy, an invasive species. He asked that the special stones in the driveway and the landscaping not be designated because the record doesn't support them. He asked that when the matter is brought before the board for designation, that we request that the designation be specifically addressed to the structure which includes the foundation, entryway and not to the entire site.

Owner Bob Breskovich thanked everyone and said that Mr. Hempelmann captured it well. He said that he and his wife purchased the property in 2009 at the height of the great recession. He thanked Ms. Doherty for her patience and walking him through this process.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Barnes said he was very impressed with the structure and architectural design. He said he was educated on the uniqueness of the structure. He supported designation on criteria E and D.

Ms. Wasserman said she has sympathy for the owners, but the site is an integral part of it. She said you could pick up the building and move it without losing something. She said for that reason she supported Criterion F as it is outstanding if you go by there, but that she would be okay with just D and E. She said the site needs to be part of the designation. She said it is way too easy to lose mid-century architectural heritage.

Mr. Macleod appreciated hearing the owner and owner representative comments and noted it is not often that a nomination is done by outside parties. He said he was sympathetic and understood the challenge. He said there are imperfections in how preservation happens but the goal today is to assess the landmark status of the building. He echoed Ms. Wasserman's comments and said this is a really fantastic building. He supported designation on criteria D, and F because it is certainly the landmark as one comes around Fairview Avenue. He said it stands out and there is synergy between the simplicity of this building and the prominence both on the site and in the neighborhood as a whole. He said it is poetic in a way. He said he appreciated Ms. Boyle's observation of this building being of an era where upstart architects could afford to buy a small plot of land and build these small and wildly experimental buildings. He said more than just the actual design itself there is an important factor in the historicity of this building in a way. He said it's not just that it's a nice clean mid-century sort of minimalist building but it's certainly of an era economically and socially. He supported designation on criteria D, E and F.

Dr. McKinney said everyone has been so eloquent, there is nothing meaningful to add. She supported designation.

Mr. Schmitt concurred with what had been said and that he supported designation on criteria D, E, and F. He noted the simplicity of the structure, the location and the building acting as a billboard. He said the building is an anchor point, and also a specific moment in time.

Mr. Coney said the architects and period of design have been well covered. He hoped that landmark designation would have zero impact on its financial performance, or that it would improve it. He said tenants appreciate knowing they are renting a City Landmark. It shouldn't cause financial harm. He invited Mr. Hempelmann and the owners to petition Mayor Harrell to help the landmarks preservation board pursue a more equitable TDR or TDP program across the city. He said that zoning can be downzoned and whole swaths of a neighborhood or a city or retail area could be downzoned and there is no compensation. He supported designation of the exterior of the building, but not the entire site. He suggested putting a boundary around the building that could be worked out in Controls and Incentives discussion, that would also exclude landscaping. He said there are other avenues of redress for the owner such as going to the Hearing Examiner.

Ms. Johnson said she didn't have much to add and that she supported designation on criteria D, E, and F. She said there is a modesty to the building which feels like a throwback in a way. She said these days people build big and this is a little gem. She said there is a lot of public support for designation and she leaned toward F because it is a recognizable location the way it is perched above the street on the corner. She said that the board typically includes the exterior of building and the site, not so much because of the landscaping on the site is critical but it is more about creating a type of boundary around the building that requires review. Controls and Incentives could reduce further what is controlled assuming Controls and Incentives goes forward. She said what is really special about this building is the architecture, that it was of a specific time, and representative of the work they did. She expressed sympathy toward the owners but noted the board has to lean on the code and the standards. She said there is support for designation on criteria D, E, and F.

Ms. Doherty said she would be happy as part of negotiations to meet onsite with the owner and representative to look at boundaries and be responsive to comments by Ms. Johnson and Mr. Coney regarding limiting the amount of site around the building and landscape.

Mr. Barnes said he was comfortable with boundary being part of the negotiated process.

Mr. Coney said it is a constrained site and hopefully a satisfactory Controls and Incentives agreement can be reached with the owners. He said the board has always worked well with owners making changes to a landscape when it is thoughtfully done and integrated with the building, and not garish. He said to include the site and scale back in the Controls and Incentives negotiations.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Steinhart Theriault & Anderson Office Building at 1264 Eastlake Avenue E for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site, and the exterior the building.

MM/SC/IM/HW            7:0:0    Motion carried.

**061522.6            BOARD BUSINESS**

Dr. McKinney announced that she has a publisher for her memoir.