



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 462/22

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, December 7, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Matt Inpanbutr

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Padraic Slattery

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

## **ROLL CALL**

### **120722.1 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Colleen McAleer , Laurelhurst Community Club commented on the Battelle-Talaris project. She said that while on the right idea, the project has diverged more from the character of the site. She asked the Board to look at the characteristics of the

site. She said the proposed railings with glass and horizontal line are not fitting with original railing type. She suggested a window study. She said the shed roof style at the pond houses distracts from serene quality, and is becoming busy and divergent. She preferred something else be proposed.

Spencer Howard, NW Vernacular spoke to the proposed Battelle-Talaris project, noting the loss of historical character and integrity of the original design. He said the proposed design removes two landmark buildings and is an incompatible subdivision. He said the design alters the topography. He said the entire site is landmarked. He said cost factors are not considered incentives. He noted the development plan is deficient, and there is no relation between improvements and impacts to site. He requested additional information.

**120722.2**

**MEETING MINUTES**

September 21, 2022 and October 5, 2022          Tabled.

**120722.3**

**CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

120722.31

University National Bank

4502 University Way

Proposed exterior alterations

Eric Aman, Mithun proposed tenant improvements to accommodate new interior use. The existing alley access door will be replaced to accommodate code required egress. The new door is on secondary façade and will be insulated and painted to match existing finishes. He said a large window at the southwest corner of the building will be added where the ATM was removed; it will be similar in scale to previous historic images of a corner window in that location, while meeting current energy code requirements.

Ms. Doherty asked clarification on window type.

Mr. Aman said it is fixed, not a casement window.

Mr. Macleod asked if they considered restoring the original pedestrian entry on the corner following removal of ATM.

Michael Oaksmith, Hunters Capital said the altered corner (from bank entry doors to bank display window) occurred in the 1920s.

Ms. Johnson said it seems reasonable and it is nice to have the window opening recreated at the corner. She said she had no issue with the alley door work.

Mr. Macleod agreed and was glad the ATM has been relocated. He said it is good to see main floor's interior activity from the outside; it is good activation.

Mr. Oaksmith said that all of the new 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor interior elements will be located away from the windows so the exterior will retain its character and look.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the design and retained visibility into the space.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the presentation and had no problem with the proposed design. She said the use is a great addition to the neighborhood.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations at the University National Bank Building, 4502 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 126569.*
  - a. The alley is a secondary façade and the change is not impactful.
  - b. The overall proportion of the window is similar to a previous condition, and recreates transparency at the building corner.
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 looked at an alternative for a fixed door or full height aluminum storefront at the corner. However, the proposed wood window and masonry kneewall is more compatible with the historic materials and proportion of the earlier window condition.
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:

*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            6:0:0    Motion carried.

*Ms. Caton joined the meeting at 4:05pm.*

120722.32    Nathan Eckstein Middle School  
3003 NE 75<sup>th</sup> Street  
Proposed replacement of windows

Detailed report in DON file.

Marc Tegen, Stemper Architectural Collaborative proposed replacement of windows as part of larger exterior renewal project. He went through condition of operable windows and provided examples of corrosion. He said that much of the original glass has been replaced over the years due to vandalism and breakage. He went over types and configurations of windows to be replaced. He noted the need for asbestos abatement.

Window replacement at Nathan Eckstein Middle School is being proposed as part of a larger exterior renewal project with the expressed purpose of bringing this school to a like-new exterior condition and ensure its continued use through the foreseeable future. Window replacement is being undertaken in response to maintenance concerns, feasibility, and impacts associated with a school-wide window refurbishment project; concerns brought forth by teachers and staff of Nathan Eckstein Middle School regarding the impacts to the learning environment due to thermal, air barrier, and acoustical performance of the Historic Steel framed windows, support frames, and rough openings; safety concerns relating to glass breakage in and around operable windows. With Landmarks Board Approval, a limited amount of historic window replacement and in-situ mock-ups will occur during the summer of 2023 followed by larger window replacement projects over the summers of 2024 and 2025. The rest of the exterior renewal project is a separate project, and will include: a roof replacement and recoating project, in-kind repairs or replacement of the school's reeded sheet metal parapet flashings and roof top metal wall cladding, brick mortar joints repairs, exterior concrete crack repairs, refurbishment of exterior entry doors and hardware, and repairs/relocation/replacement of glass block masonry units.

There are seventeen unique steel framed window types at Nathan Eckstein Middle School, ranging from fixed, to a combination of fixed and operable units. The existing steel framed windows utilize a series of standard steel profiles for head, jamb, sill, muntin, mullion, and operable sash conditions. The frames are secured by 1/16" thick roll-formed steel mullion plates (attached to brackets) embedded into concrete at the head and sills of the windows or by having the steel frame flanges cast into the building's concrete structure. The original windows are also secured to the building by a variety of painted steel plates and angles at head and jamb conditions, but these conditions are less common. The existing glazing is secured into the steel window frames and sashes with either a glazing putty, or where repaired, with a paintable silicone or urethane sealant.

The proposed replacement windows seek to replace the existing steel-framed, single-glazed windows with new steel-framed thermally insulated models. Although thermally broken & insulated glazed windows cannot provide an exact match for the historic windows, the model proposed seeks to maintain the historic windows painted steel material; return the steel windows to their original finish color; replicate the existing painted glazing putty via painted steel profile; maintain operable window locations and types; to the greatest extent possible, provide an exact or near match to the historic window sight lines, visible exterior profiles, areas of visible glass; and provide a consistent glass color and type removing the variety of glazing materials currently found around the school.

Mr. Tegen provided photo-comparison of existing windows and glass with proposed.

Mr. Barnes asked about the multiple types of existing windows.

Mr. Tegen said the configurations would remain the same.

Ms. Chang asked about schedule.

Mr. Tegen said schedule is impacted by existing conditions; once a window is removed, the opening will be boarded up while assessment is done. He said that the condition would determine approach. He said they plan to do mock-ups to facilitate future window replacement.

Mr. Macleod asked how the glass block would be handled.

Mr. Tegen said it would remain and be repaired although some would be replaced (under a separate project). He said all steel windows would be replaced.

Mr. Macleod asked how they would address conduit going through windows.

Mr. Tegen said the conduit would be relocated through the wall. He said areas next to boiler would probably require an infill panel.

Mr. Macleod said the glass blocks are stunning and he appreciated they would be restored.

Mr. Tegen said there are broken glass blocks that need replacement. He said 300-500 in-kind replacement units have been found, but 2000 more are needed. He said existing blocks would be reused in most visible locations and new threaded or frosted glass would be installed in least visible locations.

Ms. Doherty said Mr. Tegen is keeping her apprised of the problem-solving and investigating. She said she would continue to work with him on maintenance and repair elements.

Mr. Macleod asked about replacement of glass block units as a whole.

Mr. Tegen said that all that appear to be different have previously been repaired and now need to be replaced. He said they will have to make a choice where existing blocks can be moved and where the new will have to be moved.

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed and generally supported the proposed work. She said it is a big project and window replacement is needed. She said the proposed replacement window looks nice and will retain consistent appearance.

Ms. Macleod said it is a tremendous project. He appreciated the attention, effort to detail. He said they will meet energy goals and the building would retain historically appropriate look.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed select replacement of windows at Nathan Eckstein Middle School, 3003 NE 75<sup>th</sup> Street, 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 the Report on Designation.*
  - a. The select replacement of the steel windows is generally in-kind. Although the dimensions and finish are slightly different, the sash sizes and placement within the openings will be the same. The operation will also be the same.
  - b. The appearance of the glass is slightly greener, but the owner has demonstrated the need for improved performance.
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 use of exterior shading devices is more impactful to the building's appearance and will not be effective.
  - b. The use of interior shades has not been effective.
  - c. Applied films would also change the appearance of the glass, but would not perform as well as an insulated glass assembly.
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:

*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

6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Caton recused herself.

**120722.4            CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

120722.41        Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building  
103 Pike Street  
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a 120-day / 4-month extension and noted her support. She said she is still preparing a response to questions regarding the negotiations.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building, 103 Pike Street for 120 days.

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

120722.42        Mama’s Mexican Kitchen Building  
2234 2nd Ave  
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained request for 120-day / 4-month extension. She said the ownership is still working on Certificate of Approval application and she supported the extension. She said a briefing on the project would be scheduled soon.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary said they are waiting on the MUP issuance.

Ms. Johnson and Mr. Schmitt said it was reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Mama’s Mexican Kitchen Building, 2234 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue for 120 days.

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

120722.43        Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Request for extension

Nathan Rimmer requested a six-month extension and said he hoped it would be the last one requested as approval of Controls and Incentives is almost wrapped up.

Mr. Barnes asked if the process is related to the site’s project.

Ms. Doherty said they are independent and parallel processes. She said the ownership wants to get through the whole Certificate of Approval process and then complete the

agreement. She said Controls and Incentives determines what changes need a Certificate of Approval and which can be administratively approved by staff.

Ms. Johnson said six month is reasonable given the briefings.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

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

MM/SC/DB/HW 6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Caton recused herself.

**120722.5 BRIEFING**

120722.51 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Briefing on proposed development, and alterations to buildings and site

Nathan Rimmer 4000 Property LLC, said zoning changed in 2020 but was nothing substantive. He said the site was landmarked in 2013. He provided an overview of phasing of the single-family zoned site. He noted the economics of maintenance of the site. He said the project doesn't represent full economic value of the site. This owner has been willing to advance a project that we can I think we can all agree on and that will be something everybody will look back on. It won't just be another subdivision; it will be something with a very recognizable historic element to it. A very unique campus, a unique place to live and or have an office, and it will just be one of those iconic places in the city.

Bob Baldwin provided clarity on the proposed ADUs (accessory dwelling units) and noted that the building footprint doesn't increase, they are just showing the residence as including an ADU within them.

Jim Keller, Site Workshop said they have used the Secretary of Interiors Standards as a guiding principle. He said they determined that the site is 80% open space without buildings E and G, the open space along 41<sup>st</sup> Street, or the shed. He said the open space drops to 67% retaining heart of the site – topography, pond, setting, views, bridge, meadows, wetland. He said the tree canopy is important to the project. He said original landscape architect Richard Haag wanted an Oak Grove; it succeeded, and the project will retain all possible. He said pedestrian networks and roadways would be retained with planned driveways to serve two new residences. He said that the landscape is evolving. Willows were originally planted to provide quick screening while other trees matured. He said they have done their job and proposed to remove them. Mr. Keller presented the proposed landscape typologies and planting concepts for the overall site.

Brittney Denning, Bassetti Architects said that most proposed work is replacement in-kind and rehabilitation. She noted roofs, heavy concrete bases, railings, and window fenestration as historic building highlights. She said proposed railings

maintain expressive corner and rhythm of posts and have a simple glass panel. She noted they maintained details that refer to expressive elements but meet code and accessibility requirements. She noted how the Building D addition wraps around the seminar room and proposed use of storefront infill at the lobby. She said existing roofing would be removed during seismic upgrade and they would match design, color, and materials with replacement.

James Moehring, Bassetti Architects said there are 17 new house plans for the 48 lots. He said the recessive architectural characteristics reflect buildings A, B, C, D and F and how the homes are clustered.

Mr. Baldwin said they have named clusters to help communicate different areas within the property, but propose homogeneity to the entire community.

Mr. Rimmer said all of the clusters of houses have been designed based on the location on the site e.g., 'Eagle's Nest'.

Mr. Moehring talked about the pond homes, the spaces in between and how they fit into the overall campus. He said the pond homes relate to the pond and how the topography cascades into the meadow area. He noted influences of Japanese-influenced plant palettes and gardens.

Mr. Keller indicated the largest existing trees that would be preserved. He said regarding the wetland homes, the view has not changed much. He said the homes would be hidden by landscape. He proposed improvements to accessible pathways and wetlands observation bridge.

The design team provided a video of pedestrian site walk-through in various locations.

*Mr. Schmitt left at 5:24 pm.*

Dan Miles, Bassetti Architects said the approach is a balanced one, to a large landmark. He said they have struck a strong balance between character defining features of architecture and landscape while maintaining economic viability.

He summarized project goals: economically viable site; complete/enhance the site in a manner consistent with the original design intent; rehabilitate remaining core landmarked buildings; retain significant groves of trees; protect park-like setting of the site; and retain the sense of respite from the city.

Mr. Rimmer noted that the Certificate of Approval, MUP, and EIS processes are running in parallel.

Ms. Doherty said the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process is administered by SDCI (Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections).

Mr. Rimmer noted the parallel processes and said they hope to get is all wrapped up in the first half of the new year. He appreciated the board's feedback over the years.

Mr. Macleod noted public comment and asked about the house that was called the 'gatehouse' and its place in the greater project site development.

Mr. Rimmer said there was not a better place to put it. He said they removed houses from the oak grove area, and the topography buries the house into the hillside. He said they have to strike a balance to make the project work. He said in the Certificate of Approval packet there is a more detailed building plan set showing it in context.

Mr. Macleod asked why it isn't relocated toward the west.

Mr. Rimmer said it would take out the Eagle's Nest trees. He said all the trees are existing.

Mr. Baldwin said it is a complicated site.

Ms. Johnson noted the ADU is within the house footprint; she asked if additional parking has been considered.

Mr. Rimmer said the city removed that requirement to increase ADUs. He noted that garages and driveways are not on the road.

Mr. Baldwin said there are parking aprons in front of some homes. He said the commercial tenant parking area would be available to all in the evening.

Mr. Barnes asked if there are replacement plans for issues with older trees.

Mr. Keller said the oak grove is being preserved and is considered young in its lifespan. He said they will be replacing the tree canopy all over the site and will exceed the existing. He said they are only removing dead, dying or hazardous trees, Willows, Cottonwoods which sprout quickly and grow fast while other trees matured. He said different types of trees were put in as a buffer. He said more native trees would be planted and none would be short-lived. He said no oaks would be removed although drought has brought stress to oak trees causing deterioration over time.

Mr. Macleod noted Building F is marked with dotted outline. He asked if that insinuated the building would be removed.

Mr. Keller said it just denotes the outline of the roof overhang above the walls of the structure.

Mr. Miles said Building F will be retained and rehabilitated.

Mr. Rimmer said in the incentives process they would seek conditional use permits for renovations, rehabilitation and commercial type use.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and noted the project's large scope. She said the overall recap was helpful. She said it was the first time she has seen all the parts and pieces together. She said she is bothered by the single family housing of the pond homes and being too close to the central core of the site. She said the rest integrates well. She said the pond homes stand out and feel more like a development while the rest are pretty hidden. She said there are no trees hiding the homes. She said buildings A, B, C are laid out more organically than the pond homes. She appreciated the ADU consideration but asked if the team had considered splitting the houses into duplexes. She also asked about timelines and if these are phases.

Mr. Baldwin said it will all be clearer when they get into the Certificate of Approval briefing packet. He said he thinks the pond home reservations may fade when board sees the details. He said the team is taking notes and will address board concerns. He said they can also address how it gets built and when it gets built.

Ms. Doherty clarified there will be one Certificate of Approval application, not multiples. She said once a Certificate of Approval application is submitted, the multiple pieces is about the remaining briefings. She said review might have to wait on SEPA and there is a lot of nuanced information. She said she will make sure all of the previous briefing documents are available for review in the interim.

Ms. Johnson noted duplexes may not possible because the zoning is single family. But said there are come conditional uses being sought for some aspects like duplexes for the A,B,C buildings.

Mr. Baldwin said that's accurate.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the lovely presentation. She said she wishes the gate house would not be there. She said there is no way to make everyone happy – there are too many ADUs or too much space to the single-family homes, or fourplexes are preferred. She said that people would not let zoning be changed. She noted the challenges presented but said she supported the efforts to have duplexes. She said dead trees must be removed. She said the site is an artificial landscape, not a natural one, which takes a lot of upkeep and that takes money.

Ms. Doherty asked the owner's team to speak to the zoning question and clarify why they believe something like fourplexes are not allowable.

Courtney Flora, McCullough Hill Leary said there is a new amendment to landmark regulations that allows uses on landmark site, otherwise not permitted in the underlying zone, by seeking an administrative conditional use. She said the criteria requires that the use be compatible with surrounding zoning and uses. She said they have talked about this a lot as a team and do not think a 'multifamily' project can comply with the criteria, when you have a lot of people saying 'no multi-family

here' with the surrounding single family development. She thinks they are walking a fine line to meet the code criteria, and thinks the proposed project will do that.

Mr. Rimmer agreed with Ms. Flora's explanation.

Ms. Doherty said in past briefings financial information was presented about homeowner dues for maintaining property, and some Board members noted that was interesting. She said that some Board comments asked for financial information that they typically see related to the code, and that Mr. Rimmer is trying to respond to that request with today's presentation. Ms. Doherty asked if there were Board questions, recognizing it might take some additional time to consider the information provided.

Mr. Macleod asked if the ADU proposal was spontaneous or incentivized.

Mr. Rimmer said from the earliest iterations the massing has always been the same. He said it is not an afterthought or addition.

Mr. Baldwin said they have always contemplated the option of ADUs and said it is an opportunity to diversify the residents economically and generationally.

Mr. Moehring said some of the houses lend themselves better to ADUs.

Mr. Macleod said he lived in an ADU and said it is not a viable solution to multi-family property. He said he understands that their hands may be tied due to public sentiment. He said versatility is important. He said the board wishes for more high-density duplexes here but understands that hands are tied.

Ms. Johnson said it is a huge project, and will take more time to look at the financial piece. She said it has come so far. She appreciated the information and the walk-through. She said it is all about balance and how much the character would change related to the economic need. She said the roof forms are dominant and thinks the landmark is still recognizable. Responding to public comment she wonders if the roof forms at NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street behind the pond house roofs are creating some of the concern that has been shared. She said the project has come a long way and is moving in a good direction.

Mr. Keller said they have control over new trees and can better screen the pond houses with landscape, which the owners will want as well. He said it would resonate and provide a nice balance.

Ms. Chang asked about financials and market value. She noted Jeff Murdock's public comment and asked what would be the difference between 45 or 40 houses.

Mr. Rimmer said the paper lot value is not adjusted from one house scenario to another. Each residential lot would be \$800,000 of value, so reducing the number of houses would be a reduction of that amount per lot removed. They approached this differently using subsection A in the code (before and after the imposition of

controls), rather than many projects where you are looking at more typical landmarks with lot line to lot line development.

Mr. Macleod said he has a particular attachment to Building G and its relationship to the sites and the roof lines and he has yet to see that mirroring expressed. He appreciated seeing three renderings, seeing the walk through seeing the houses finally fleshed out in a way. He said it is meaningful seeing the mappings but said he agreed with Ms. Chang that the pond houses still feel a little tract-house-like rather than stepping up through that hillside.

Mr. Baldwin said reflecting that condition is a very important thing moving on, in positioning these houses. He said they will get that detail to board.

**120722.6**

**BOARD BUSINESS**

**Adjourn**

**6:19 pm.**