



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 54/26

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, March 18, 2026 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Roi Chang, Vice Chair, (RC)
VJ Kopacki (VJ)
Ian Macleod, Chair, (IM)
Lawrence Norman (LN)
Lora Ellen McKinney (LEM)
Becca Pheasant (BC)
Harriet Wasserman (HW)
Cameron Wong (CW)
Matt Zinski (MZ)

Board Members Absent

Katie Randall (KR)
Erica Thomas (ET)

Staff Present

Erin Doherty (ED)
Nelson Pesigan (NP)
Sarah Sodt (SS)

Key

BM Board Member
AP Applicant
SM Staff Member

Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

031826.1 ROLL CALL

031826.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no in-person or virtual public comments.

031826.3 MEETING MINUTES

February 18, 2026

MM/SC/MZ/BP

6:0:3

The motion passed. BMs Kopacki, McKinney and Chair Macleod abstained.

March 4, 2026

MM/SC/MZ/LEM

7:0:2

The motion passed. BMs Wong and Norman abstained.

031826.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

031826.41 Lloyd Building

601 Stewart Street

Request for extension

SM Sarah Sodt stated that the property owner is requesting an extension to August 19, 2026. She explained that the owner is still actively exploring plans

for a larger project that would include potential adaptive-reuse scenarios for the building.

A motion was made to extend the negotiations to August 19, 2026.

MM/SC/LEM/HW

9:0:0

The motion passed and was approved unanimously.

031826.5 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031826.51 Cal Anderson Park / Lincoln Reservoir

1000 E Pine Street

Proposed removal of picnic bench and slab, planting of new trees

Planting of new trees

Presenter David Graves, Seattle Parks & Recreation presented a request for approval to plant two new trees at Cal Anderson Park, explaining that the proposal had been reduced from an original plan for seven trees after coordination with Seattle Public Utilities, which must authorize planting locations due to the underlying reservoir structure.

Presenter Graves noted that Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks submitted a supportive letter and that Parks will continue working with SPU to explore additional future plantings. The two proposed trees, a Garry oak on the west side of the park, replacing an area where four dead trees were previously removed, and a ginkgo on the east side, replacing an area where six trees had failed were selected for their hardiness, compatibility with the site, and alignment with recommendations from Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks.

Presenter Graves reviewed the specific planting locations, species characteristics, and site photos, concluding that the request before the board is limited to approval of these two trees.

BM McKinney asked whether the proposed Garry oak would have adequate space to grow in the identified west-side location. Noting that Garry oaks tend to widen significantly as they mature and questioned how the tree would realistically fit between the two existing trees shown in the planting plan.

Presenter Graves explained that the Garry oak would have sufficient room to grow in the proposed west-side location, noting that while the surrounding trees are mature, their crowns can grow together and still accommodate the new tree. He emphasized that the site provides adequate root space, which was the primary consideration for the arborist.

Removal of picnic bench and slab:

Presenter Graves explained that Parks is proposing to remove a heavily vandalized concrete picnic table and its damaged concrete pad because both sit directly within the critical root zone of a large, healthy hedge maple whose roots have already begun breaking the slab.

Presenter Graves noted that the table is also not accessible, with an uneven surface, no wheelchair roll-up space, and a raised lip that creates a barrier for people with mobility challenges. Removing the table and pad would protect the tree's long-term health and allow Parks to consider a future picnic location that meets accessibility standards. Graves clarified that the nearby chessboard feature will remain.

Chair Macleod suggested to briefly address the recent correspondence exchanged with Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks, noting that the board had

received those communications and that it would be helpful to summarize the group's requests and comments for the record.

Presenter Graves explained that he had followed up with Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks, who shared additional construction photos and reiterated the group's long-standing interest in expanding the tree canopy at Cal Anderson Park. He noted that the group had no concerns about removing the damaged picnic table as long as the adjacent chessboard feature remained in place.

Their primary focus was on restoring tree cover in areas where trees have died due to climate and other factors. Presenter Graves reiterated that Parks originally proposed seven new trees, but Seattle Public Utilities approved only two locations because of reservoir constraints. He stated that Parks will re-engage with SPU in the coming month to explore additional feasible planting sites, review species options, and develop a long-term tree-planting strategy.

BM Kopacki expressed appreciation for the thoughtful attention given to ADA accessibility in the proposal, noting that the clarity and straightforward nature of the application made it easy to understand.

Vice Chair Chang added thanks to David Graves for both the presentation and the additional correspondence shared with Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks, stating that the extra context was helpful in understanding the coordination required among multiple teams, particularly given SPU's involvement, and that the additional information was deeply appreciated.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed trees and site work at Cal Anderson Park / Lincoln Reservoir, 1000 E Pine Street, 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 ORD 121042.
 - a. The proposed trees will be planted in areas that are consistent with the historic planting pattern and will not disturb the below-grade reservoir. The species were selected to be compatible with the park planting palette and to be viable in these locations.
 - b. Removal of the concrete on-grade slab will be beneficial to the root zone of the mature Hedge Maple.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
 - a. No alternatives were requested by the Board as the proposal appeared reasonable.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12.750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/LEM/HW

9:0:0

The motion passed and was approved unanimously.

031826.5 BRIEFING

031826.51 Puget Sound Power and Light Co. Utilities Building
800 Aloha Street
Briefing on proposed demolition

Presenter Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular presented that the proposed demolition of the Puget Sound Power and Light Company Utilities Building is driven by a Seattle Fire Department violation citing urgent life-safety hazards, including hazardous materials, a collapsing roof, and a nonfunctional fire-protection system.

BM McKinney asked whether any exterior portions of the building could be salvaged or preserved, given the significant structural and environmental hazards inside. She noted that some elements of the façade particularly the front elevation, appear architecturally interesting and wondered if any part of it could be retained for future incorporation into a new structure or reused in a historically meaningful way.

William Devereaux, Seattle City Light responded that while he understood the interest in salvaging exterior elements, the core issue is whether any portion of the façade could safely remain standing once the rest of the structure is removed. He explained that the primary goal is to eliminate the immediate dangers posed by the failing building, then complete the lengthy cleanup process before a future developer determines how the site will be used.

Brendan Armstrong, Seattle City Light added that the team has not yet evaluated whether the building's façade could feasibly be retained, noting that doing so would require determining whether the exterior walls could safely stand on their own with bracing. He explained that past condition assessments have shown significant spalling in the exterior concrete, exposing rebar and raising concerns about the façade's structural stability if left in place.

BM McKinney reflected on the building's long history and expressed regret that its full story may be lost if demolition is the only feasible option. She acknowledged the significant safety hazards, costs, and practical limitations described by staff, but noted her personal interest in preserving elements of historic structures when possible.

Chair Macleod noted that one of his earlier questions had been addressed through discussion but asked to briefly recap the historic significance of the building. He explained that most current board members were not serving at the time of its 2013 landmark designation and requested a concise summary of why the property was originally recognized as historically important.

SM Sodt noted that she could provide the board with the original landmark nomination and designation report, confirming that the building had been designated under Standards C and D.

BM Pheasant asked whether all parts of the building are equally unsafe, or if certain areas pose greater hazards than others. She also asked whether any specific portions require immediate demolition, or whether the entire structure must be removed under the emergency order due to uniformly dangerous conditions.

Brendan Armstrong and William Devereaux explained that conditions inside the building vary significantly by area, with past assessments showing a wide range of critical issues across mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and structural systems. Both acknowledged that evaluating whether any exterior walls could be braced and retained is a reasonable question but emphasized that such an analysis would require a structural engineering study. Vice Chair Chang and BM Wasserman both expressed appreciation for the thorough presentation and

the historical context provided, while also acknowledging the unfortunate but understandable deterioration of the building over time.

They shared an interest in exploring whether a portion of the front façade could be preserved, noting that even a small, retained element could help carry forward the story of the 1926 landmark. Both emphasized that, although future development plans are unknown, the board has a responsibility to ensure that all reasonable preservation options are examined before demolition proceeds, so that future boards and project partners understand what was considered.

William Devereaux and Brendan Armstrong explained that the next steps would involve seeking authorization to begin developing a demolition contract design, which would require assembling a capital project and initiating the public procurement process for architectural and engineering services.

Breandan Armstrong noted that this process would take at least six months before they could return to the board with a proposed plan. They anticipated presenting a phased approach outlining demolition costs, options for retaining any historically significant elements if feasible, and a strategy for meeting Seattle Fire Department safety requirements during the interim.

031826.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 pm