



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 98/25

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, April 2, 2025 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes (DB)

Taber Caton (TC)

Matt Inpanbutr (MI)

Ian Macleod, Chair (IM)

Lora-Ellen McKinney (LEM)

Lauren Miles (LM)

Lawrence Norman (LN)

Becca Pheasant-Reis (BP)

Katie Randall (KR)

Harriet Wasserman (HW)

Board Members Absent

Roi Chang Vice-Chair (RC)

Staff Present

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Key

BM Board Member

AP Applicant

SM Staff Member

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

040225.1 ROLL CALL

040225.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, provided comment in support of the Wilde-Streatfield House nomination, asking the Board to carefully consider the garden.

040225.3 MEETING MINUTES

March 19, 2025

MM/SC/HW/BP

7:0:3

Minutes approved. BMs Barnes, Inpanbutr, Macleod, McKinney, Miles Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman approved. BMs Caton, Norman, and Randall abstained.

040225.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

040225.41 Bullitt House

1125 Harvard Avenue E

Request for extension

The owner, Seattle Parks and Recreation requested a 6-month extension. SM Doherty supported the request.

Action: Motion to approve a 6-month extension for the Controls & Incentives negotiations for the Bullitt House at 1125 Harvard Avenue E.

MM/SC/KR/DB

10:0:0

Motion approved unanimously.

040225.5 NOMINATION

040225.51 Wilde-Streatfield House 2409 11th Avenue W

Professor David Streatfield introduced the house and the garden and said that historic properties have the great capacity to provide joy.

Susan Boyle and David Peterson presented the nomination application on behalf of Professor Streatfield (see nomination application and presentation package). Susan Boyle said that this special residential property that meets several of the designation criteria. Associated with Madeliene Wilde and David Streatfield – the house is clearly an expression of the careers of these people. Also associated with development of Queen Anne neighborhood. Meets criterion D. Outstanding work of the designer/builder FW Barnes; meets criterion E. Inside/outside relationship, views in an out – important part of the character of the house. Trying to create a garden that didn't overwhelm house and provided different places to be. Important to emphasize the place brought great joy to the people who lived in it.

BM McKinney appreciated the garden as an environment for the home, and asked about the planting selection and trees on the site.

BM Randall asked about the years the garden development was undertaken – 1991. She also asked for more information on the history of the recent occupants of the house.

BM Barnes requested clarification on the interior spaces and features, noting what may be original vs. altered.

BM Pheasant-Reis noted the layering of history for this property and different eras to consider.

Professor Streatfield noted that the madrona has never been irrigated – only water it gets is from the rain. It is a delicate species and this particular tree is exemplary. Noted that it can be seen in the 1930s photographs.

BM Caton excited to see a garden for consideration, inherently ephemeral. Noted criterion E for the house and site.

BM Wasserman said it is lovely to consider both the house and garden. She supported nomination, and was uncertain if interiors needed to be considered.

BM Inpanbutr thanked the nominators and supported the nomination of the house and the garden. He said it is a magical place. Less interested in the interior features. It is about house and garden and how they relate to each other.

BM Barnes supported nomination of the exterior of the house and the garden, and said he could hold back on interiors if fellow Board members agreed. Looking forward to future discussion of the criteria at the designation meeting.

BM Miles supported nomination and thanked the nominators for their presentation. Noted it is a special natural landscape.

BM Randall is a bit on the fence, would like more detail about designation standards. More detail on criterion B and more detail on Criterion D on the

style and method of construction. What are the distinctive qualities of the house? Most persuaded by work of M. Wilde and active work in the garden. Historiography of historic preservation – caring for and restoring historic houses and gardens. Supportive of the exterior and the site. The house interior is nice, but does not need to be included to convey significance.

BM McKinney would like to know more about the architecture and Craftsman style of this house. She noted the significance of the garden as obvious.

BM Pheasant-Reis said it is a nice house, so what makes this house specifically stand out – the steep slope design and how it relates to the steep hilly site. Help to understand how the house tells the story of that type of design. Would like to see a site plan to understand where everything lays out on the site.

BM Norman would also like to know more about the distinction of the architecture. He supported the recommended features and did not want to add interior spaces.

Chair Macleod supported nomination of the site and exterior of the house. Thinks it meets criterion D and noted his appreciation of vernacular architecture in the Pacific NW. He said you know Craftsman when you see it, as you do here. He said the details of the house and the site specificity are clear to him, but understands why fellow Board members may request more information.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Wilde-Streatfield House at 2409 11th Avenue W for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the house; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for May 7, 2025; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MI/HW

10:0:0

Nomination approved unanimously.

040225.6 BRIEFING

040225.61 Memorial Wall 401 5th Avenue N

Gareth Loveridge, Swift Company, provided more detail regarding how they will support and protect the Memorial wall during demolition of the stadium. He showed alternatives for how they will cap the portions of wing wall that will be cut away from the stone portion of the Memorial itself. Provided early concepts for the new displays that will occur on the new wall at the back of the Memorial structure. Described some design changes related to the plaza.

Board questions.

BM Inpanbutr asked if any consideration of the termination detail at the top of the wall that would determine your design approach to the end cap detail? Question of whether waterproofing of the end of the wall – the assumption is that there would be a cover or flashing over the top of the wall. Gareth Loveridge said they will study it further.

Chair Macleod asked about the functional difference between the end detail options. Gareth Loveridge said y hope to use the first option, but have an alternate in case they experience issues when saw cutting the wing wall.

BM Miles left at 6:00 p.m.

BM Randall left at 6:03 p.m.

Chair Macleod asked what the timeline is for construction on this project? Demolition of the stadium is intended to begin in the middle or end of June – the timing of the sequence for the Memorial Wall is in July putting the tiebacks and put the support structure towards the fall. The timing depends on issuance of the permits.

Chair Macleod asked about the new fencing abutting the wall? Gareth Loveridge showed an image and said product cut sheets will be included in the application documents.

BM Wasserman thanked the applicant for the presentation. She is fine with the planting plan. Understand the option 1 vs option 2.

BM Pheasant-Reis appreciated the planting plan and had no issue with either option 1 or 2, but agreed with the applicants' priority of option 1. Appreciated seeing the proposal for the new back of the wall structure. Said it will be neat to see where the design goes from here.

Chair Macleod said the treatment of the new plaza is really nice, buffering from the parking lot and as a memorial space. The landscaping works well, and is excited to see the lighting and fountains working. Clever to put lighting sunk in the basins. Bracing/construction plan looks reasonable. Restoration treatment seems sound and following the National Park Service briefs.

BM Barnes says he thinks the work on this has been outstanding – the design will be very appealing to those who visit.

BM Inpanbutr said it was a really thoughtful design approach across team, minimizing interventions – hoping to achieve option 1 end wall design, but not at the expense of damaging the end wall condition of the stone.

Chair Macleod asked if another briefing is needed prior to a Certificate of Approval application? SM Erin Doherty said this was intended to be the last briefing before submitting their full Certificate of Approval application.

040225.7 BOARD BUSINESS