



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 293/25

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Hybrid Meeting via Webex Webinar or Room L2-80 Boards & Commissions

Seattle City Hall, 600 4th Avenue, Floor L2

Wednesday, September 17, 2025 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Roi Chang Vice-Chair (RC)

Taber Caton (TC)

Ian Macleod, Chair (IM)

Lara Ellen McKinney (LEM)

Lawrence Norman (LN)

Becca Pheasant-Reis (BP)

Katie Randall (KR)

Erica Thomas (ET)

Harriet Wasserman (HW)

Board Members Absent

VJ Kopacki (VK)

Cameron Wong (CW)

Staff Present

Erin Doherty

Nelson Pesigan

Key

BM Board Member

AP Applicant

SM Staff Member

Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

091725.1 ROLL CALL

091725.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

091725.3 MEETING MINUTES

August 20, 2025

MM/SC/BPR/HW

5:0:3

The motion to approve the minutes passed. Chair Macleod, BMs McKinney and Thomas abstained.

September 3, 2025

MM/SC/HW/KR

5:0:3

The motion to approve the minutes passed. BM Caton, Thomas and McKinney abstained.

091725.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

091725.41 Lloyd Building

601 Stewart Street

Request for extension

The applicant is requesting a six-month extension to explore alternative plans that incorporate adaptive reuse scenarios for the Lloyd Building and be

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

reconsidered at the March 18, 2026, meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Board.

MM/SC/KR/TC

8:0:0

The motion passed and approved unanimously.

091725.5 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

091725.51 University Heights Center / former University Heights School

5031 University Way NE

Proposed interior alterations, convert former coat room to restrooms

SM Doherty mentioned that this presentation did not go to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC). The board had seen a similar type of project for the same building and most of the board members would know about the building. SM Doherty added that if the board feels like any potential alternatives that might be discussed in the ARC are relevant, present them as needed.

Applicant Ron Wright described a nearby project renovating a hallway area to add a kitchen for childcare spaces, which has already been approved and permitted. The current proposal includes adding restrooms in a previously unused space for coats, designed to be removable in the future to restore the hallway to its original condition. The project also includes a small exterior component for restroom venting, previously approved for a different design. The overall goal is to enhance the daycare facilities while maintaining the building's historic character.

Vice Chair Chang joined at 3:50 p.m.

BM Pheasant-Reis inquired about the color of the louver.

Applicant Wright noted that the selected color will match the exterior paint to blend with the siding, and efforts are being made to conceal it as much as possible.

Applicant Wright also mentioned that the historic wood wainscot and flooring in one of the restrooms will be salvaged. It will be replaced with sanitary sheet vinyl, and the original wood flooring will be preserved for future use.

Vice Chair Chang asked whether the plumbing penetrations would go through existing walls, newly constructed walls, or through the floors.

Applicant Wright clarified that the plumbing penetrations will go through the new walls, with exterior impact limited to a previously approved location.

Chair Macleod inquired about the doors, specifically noting that one of the bathroom enclosures has two doors and asking about their intended purposes.

Applicant Wright explained that one bathroom will have two doors to meet licensing requirements, allowing it to serve both the adjacent classroom and function as a common area restroom.

Chair Macleod asked whether the wainscoting would remain in place with the new finishes and the addition of a partition wall between the two rooms.

Applicant Wright responded that the project aims to minimize disruption and address uncharacteristic details around the doors.

Chair Macleod asked about the exhaust duct and whether the existing ceiling is a dropped ceiling or if the duct will be installed below ceiling level.

Applicant Wright replied that the classroom ceiling is exposed and not part of the protected space. The plan is to lower the ceiling in the bathrooms, eliminating the tall ceiling in the area.

Chair Macleod commented that if inline fans are required, there should be sufficient space to install them outside of historic areas.

BM Thomas inquired about the licensing and the age group the classrooms are intended to serve.

Applicant Wright noted that placing the bathroom in the hallway area provides flexibility to accommodate various age groups.

BM McKinney asked whether potential risks and safety concerns related to classroom and restroom design had been considered.

Applicant Wright confirmed all applicable code requirements are being followed to address safety risks and concerns.

BM Wasserman expressed support for the project and commented on the effective use of space.

BM Randall appreciated the efforts to preserve materials such as the flooring and the integration of restrooms without enclosing the existing walls.

Vice Chair Chang also voiced support for the project and praised the thoughtful approach to preserving existing wood finishes in a reversible manner.

Acton: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed building alterations at the former University Heights Elementary School, 5031 University Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 125216.
 - a. The proposed enclosure and casework will change the appearance of the former coat room and visibility into the space, but a number of other former coat rooms have been changed in similar ways to suit the tenants' programmatic needs.
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. There are limited to no alternatives to accommodate the required restrooms.
3. The location and access to the restrooms from the classroom are to address a law, statute, regulation, code, or ordinance per SMC 25.12.750 C.
 - a. The factors of SMC 25.12.750 D and E are not applicable.
4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below:

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

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

MM/SC/LEM/KR

8:0:0

The motion passed and approved unanimously.

091725.6 BRIEFING

091725.61 Gas Works Park

1901 N Northlake Way

Briefing on selective removal of elements of the old gas plant equipment

Applicant David Graves of Seattle Parks and Recreation gave a brief presentation that discussed safety concerns to old metal structures in the old gas plant facility, highlighting the risks of slipping or falling off due to deteriorating walkways and missing components. Described the uninvited climbing that happens outside and inside the fenced area. The presentation discussed the importance of preserving the historic look of the facility while addressing safety issues.

BM Randall recused herself from the discussion.

Vice Chair Chang asked whether the fences surrounding the towers could be removed if the ladders and walkways identified as the primary safety concerns were eliminated.

Applicant Graves explained that the fence serves as institutional control under a consent decree with the Department of Ecology. The surrounding soil has not been remediated and may still contain contaminants around the towers. To eliminate access from climbers, all ladders around the towers will be removed.

Vice Chair Chang inquired whether the proposed planting and fence replacement plans had previously been reviewed by the ARC.

Applicant Graves responded that there were discussions with the ARC prior to COVID. At that time, recommendations focused on removing pedestrian walkways and exploring selective removal.

SM Doherty noted that several selective removals have occurred, along with full fence reinforcement and ladder removal via a Certificate of Approval (CofA), presented to the board in recent years due to rust and structural failure.

BM Wasserman asked whether removing the lower portions of the towers had been considered to prevent climbing, without affecting the upper sections of the towers.

Applicant Graves expressed concern about removing the lower tiers, explaining that the pedestrian walkways run down to the ground and support the upper tiers. Removing the lower sections could compromise structural integrity.

BM Wasserman appreciated the detailed presentation and the clarity on which parts are slated for removal.

BM McKinney asked whether graffiti-resistant paint had been considered, along with the possibility of designating space for artwork.

Applicant Graves noted that while graffiti is theoretically possible on towers outside the fence, the height and visibility of the towers discourage it. Graffiti resistant paint has been used, but it is often painted over. Repainting is easier for the crew than pressure washing.

BM Caton asked whether an investigation had been conducted to identify access points and vulnerabilities before deciding to remove all structures.

Applicant Graves said there are theories about access points, but no cameras or security lighting are currently in place. Individuals continue to find ways to breach the fence, including cutting the fence, crawling under gates, and climbing over barbed wire.

BM Caton asked whether activity has decreased following fence improvements.

Applicant Graves confirmed that graffiti incidents have declined, though some individuals still manage to gain access.

BM Pheasant-Reis suggested that removing walkways or broken sections might resolve many issues without requiring full removal of the framing.

Applicant Graves acknowledged that discussions have taken place, but the challenge lies in the age of the metal. Some sections are strong enough to be cut and left intact, but once removal begins, it is difficult to determine where to stop.

BM Wasserman emphasized the importance of preserving the historic appearance of the towers while addressing safety concerns.

BM Caton asked whether an assessment had been conducted on the condition of all ladders.

Applicant Graves stated no assessment has been made of individual ladder components.

Vice Chair Chang commented that the proposal to remove every piece is extreme and suggesting exploring options to retain vertical ladders and handrails while removing steps.

BM Caton asked whether a Comprehensive Plan exists to modernize the gas plant while preserving its historic integrity and balancing future growth.

Applicant Graves responded that the City is currently focused on sediment cleanup, groundwater remediation, and shoreline improvements for public access.

BM Pheasant-Reis recommended establishing a clear threshold for condition assessment during project analysis. Any necessary removals should be documented to prevent misuse of the process.

Chair Macleod remarked that the proposal to remove everything is drastic from a preservation perspective and expressed openness to selective removal and small interim intervention and also encouraged discussions with public safety officials to explore non-structural solutions to mitigate safety concerns.

Applicant Graves agreed, suggesting that making the towers less climbable and adding lighting and cameras to monitor access points would be a good starting point, and noted the desire to begin the removal work soon. Plans to submit an updated proposal for board review.

SM Doherty recommended that the proposal include an estimate of the percentage of physical material to be removed from the plant.

BM Caton requested a site visit to help the board identify the access points.

SM Doherty will coordinate with the applicant to schedule the site visit.

091725.7 BOARD BUSINESS

There was no board business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:23 pm