



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 35/23

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, January 18, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Kristen Johnson

Lawrence Norman

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Taber Caton

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Acting Chair, Roi Chang called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

011823.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

011823.2 MEETING MINUTES
November 16, 2022

MM/SC/MS/HW 5:0:2 Minutes approved. Mr. Barnes and Ms. Chang abstained.

011823.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

011823.31 Freeway Park
700 Seneca Street
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained active negotiations with Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPAR) are ongoing and close to finished. She said SPAR would come before board with briefing on proposed maintenance and changes. An extension of three months was requested.

Ms. Chang noted support for extension.

Action: I moved to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Freeway Park, 700 Seneca Street for three months.

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

011823.32 former Steinhart Anderson Theriault Office Building
1264 Eastlake Avenue E
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for six-month extension. She noted the owner was unable to attend meeting. She said, according the property owner they are in the process of drafting an MOU to look more fully at design with the adjacent property owner's participation. She said another design briefing is anticipated and more time to explore options is needed.

Ms. Chang said it is reasonable.

Mr. Schmitt asked why MOU would be required.

Ms. Doherty said it is not a requirement for this process, but the owner is letting the Board know they are having conversations with the adjacent property owner.

Ms. Wasserman said a six-month extension is reasonable for this 'lovely, fragile building'.

Mr. Schmitt agreed.

Mr. Barnes supported the extension.

Action: I moved to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for former Steinhart Anderson Theriault Office Building, 1264 Eastlake Avenue E., for six months.

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

011823.33

Evans Pool

7201-7359 E Green Lake Drive N
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for an extension and noted negotiations with SPAR are ongoing. She said SPAR is working through feasibility, final review, and signatures process.

Action: I moved to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Evans Pool, 7201-7359 E. Green Lake Drive N. for six months.

MM/SC/MS/HW 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Chang abstained.

011823.4

BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chang asked for update on the City Council's vote on the Seattle First National Bank landmark ordinance.

Ms. Sodt said CM Herbold made an amendment to the original Ordinance excluding the north parking area but retaining controls on the bank. CM Lewis made an amendment to exclude additional site elements like drive-thru and sign tower. She said that while there are controls on the building, there are no controls on the parking lot and other features like the drive-thru and sign features. She said there was a lot of public comment in favor of original ordinance and the subsequent amendments by CM Herbold and CM Lewis. She said a Certificate of Approval is required for alterations to the building exterior, and adjacency review of development when required by SEPA. She said she understood that CM Herbold studied development scenarios to understand real possibilities for the north parking lot. CM Herbold said there are other residential development that have occurred on similar sized sites. Ms. Sodt said preservation of the building and the potential construction of housing are not at odds.

Ms. Wasserman said there are no plans for development on this site and she said she is appalled that some council members were talking about it as a sure thing. She said Council President Juarez did a good job explaining. She noted concern that some council members seemed so unaware of what the Landmarks Board does. She said she shudders to think about this issue coming up again.

Mr. Barnes noted misconceptions that landmarks and housing don't work together.

Ms. Wasserman said one council member just didn't like the building and they said it never should have been landmarked, which was out of line because it IS a landmark. Ms. Wasserman said she was startled by what they didn't know.

Ms. Sodt said she hoped the letter sent by the Landmarks Board is a starting point and that this discussion should not be housing OR preservation, when it can be

BOTH/AND. She said some education is needed about how incentive zoning works in the city, what TDR/TDP is, and who benefits.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the letter the Board sent.

Mr. Barnes asked if there are still separate committees in City Council.

Ms. Sodt said there are. She said that the Historic Preservation program reports to CM Morales' committee, and this is where it started.

Mr. Barnes asked if it would be beneficial to go to the committee to explain the process.

Ms. Sodt said she has had some meetings with CM Morales, but it would be helpful to go before the committee in a public forum with some of the Board members.

Mr. Slattery noted an article in the Daily Journal of Commerce in which he said City Council tried to illustrate support of affordable housing and it made the Board look shady. He said the article never mentioned if the site was intended to be used for affordable housing.

Ms. Johnson said there are multiple low-income housing developers that may be helpful in the Council education process.

Ms. Sodt said she has presented some examples to CM Morales, but it would be helpful to present the topic more broadly. She said the conversation by some isn't just about affordable housing, it is just about new development, as if development is going to help affordable housing by paying into the MHA. She said it is complex.

Ms. Wasserman said there is no current plan for new development on this site; it was someone's theoretical about housing that isn't planned.

Ms. Sodt said there is no proposal to sell or develop the landmarked property, it was all just theoretical. She said when negotiating Controls and Incentives, the property owner wanted the whole site included in the controls because they wanted the TDP incentive. She said there is not as much TDP available now with the changed ordinance, but there are other development incentives with a landmark on the property. CM Herbold noted the FAR bonus that can be used.

Mr. Barnes suggested talking to some contacts at LIHI and SHA.

Ms. Sodt said she worked with them on the Yesler Terrace Steam Plant property, and she thought they got some incentives for that.

Mr. Schmitt suggested sharing summary of public comments.

Ms. Sodt said it will hopefully jumpstart the conversation.

Ms. Johnson left the meeting at 4:09 pm.

Ms. Doherty said that John Hempelmann, legal counsel for Steinhart, Anderson, Theriault Building ownership had just joined the meeting. She noted for Mr. Hempelmann that the Board had just approved a six-month extension for the negotiation of Controls and Incentives for that property.

Mr. Slattery asked about inclusion of eastern parcel into potential development and how that changes the dynamic of their proposal.

Mr. Hempelmann said they are trying to negotiate an MOU with the east property owner and noted consolidating property ownership is not easy. He said they asked SDCI if a cantilevered building approach is possible. SDCI said it is if the approach is consistent with zoning regulations and the consolidation of lots has been approved. He said he can provide email from Bradley Wilburn, SDCI.

Ms. Doherty said the ownership is exploring concepts about what potential development could be rather than an actual project at this time.

Mr. Hempelmann said that is accurate.

Ms. Chang thanked Mr. Hempelmann for the update.