



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 13/25

## MINUTES

### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

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

Seattle City Hall, 600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Floor L2

Wednesday, January 15, 2025 – 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes (DB)  
Taber Caton (TC)  
Roi Chang, Vice-Chair (RC)  
Lora-Ellen McKinney (LEM)  
Lawrence Norman (LN)  
Katie Randall (KR)  
Becca Pheasant-Reis (BP)  
Harriet Wasserman (HW)

#### Board Members Absent

Lauren Miles (LM)  
Ian Macleod, Chair (IM)  
Matt Inpanbutr (MI)

#### Staff Present

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom  
Mike de Lange

#### Key

BM Board Member  
AP Applicant  
SM Staff Member

Vice-Chair Roi Chang called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

### 011525.1 ROLL CALL

### 011525.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

None

### 011525.3 MEETING MINUTES

#### November 6, 2024

MM/SC/HW/TC

7:0:1

Minutes approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor. Vice-Chair Chang abstained.

#### November 20, 2024

MM/SC/DB/HW

8:0:0

Minutes approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor.

### 011525.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

#### 011525.31 Woodin House

5801 Corson Avenue S

Request for extension

SM Doherty explained that they submitted a draft to the property owner and are discussing details. Request for a 3-month extension for the negotiation of Controls & Incentives.

Action: Motion to approve a 3-month extension.

MM/SC/DB/KR

8:0:0

Motion approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor.

011525.32 Memorial Wall  
401 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N  
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill representing Seattle Public Schools, requested a one year extension for the negotiation period. The negotiations may be completed sooner. BM Barnes asked about the briefing on the agenda later today. Vice-Chair Chang asked if more briefings were expected over the course of the next year.

Action: Motion to approve a one year extension.

MM/SC/DB/KR

7:0:1

Motion approved. Board members Barnes, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor. Board Member Caton recused.

011525.33 The Showbox  
1426 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Request for extension

Request for an extension of the Controls & Incentives negotiations to May 21, 2025. Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, property owner representative, is in the process of putting together a submittal regarding the economics for City review. The tenant, the Showbox, is still in business and the building is occupied.

Action: Motion to approve an extension May 21, 2025.

MM/SC/KR/DB

8:0:0

Motion approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor.

011525.34 White Garage  
1915 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Request for extension

Request for extension of Controls & Incentives negotiations to May 21, 2025. Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, property owner representative, requesting an extension. Building remains occupied and in active use. Will be coming back to the Board with a Certificate of Approval to redevelop the property with a rooftop addition.

Action: Motion to approve an extension to May 21, 2025.

MM/SC/BP/TC

8:0:0

Motion approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor.

011525.35 Donahoe Building  
1901-1911 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Request for extension

Request for an extension to Controls & Incentives negotiations to May 21, 2025. Building is in probate but is currently occupied by an arts organization. They have received administrative C of As for work including seismic work on the parapet.

Action: Motion to approve an extension to May 21, 2025

MM/SC/BP/DB

8:0:0

Motion approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor.

#### **011525.4 NOMINATION**

##### **011525.41 1411 Boylston Avenue**

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle presented the nomination (details in DON file).

BM Pheasant-Reis asked about a nomination that had been prepared for all six buildings that was never presented to the Landmarks Board. AP Murdock said that Historic Seattle once owned all six buildings and focused on easements for the five they sold; this nomination is for the remaining building that they still own.

BM Barnes asked about the easements on the other buildings and what that means. AP Murdock explained that Historic Seattle is qualified to hold easements on historic properties; easements are essentially deed restrictions requiring the new owners to use best preservation practices, inspections and approvals by the easement holder.

BM Barnes asked about the remaining interior details. AP Murdock explained that the stairs and the handrails are the only remaining interior historic fabric. The units are studios and one-bedroom units.

BM Caton asked if the only interior portion Historic Seattle is looking to nominate are the interior demising wall and the stairs/handrail?

Vice-Chair Chang asked about some of the detailing and features unique to the building and the style. What is the proper terminology for the style? AP Murdock stated it is Queen Anne Free Classic. Are all doors and windows original? AP Murdock clarified that all window that have the decorative muntins are original. Some windows may have been replaced with a single plain sash. All the ornament, doors and most of the windows are intact.

BM McKinney asked about the condition of the windows. AP Murdock said all were in good condition.

Vice-Chair Chang asked if the siding and the paint color is original. Siding is either original or replaced in-kind over the years. The color is original according to Eugenia Woo of Historic Seattle; paint color analysis was done by SMR, the architecture firm responsible for the prior rehabilitation.

Board deliberation:

BM Barnes supported nominating the building, including exterior and the interior stairwell details.

BM Wasserman also supported nominating the exterior, and including the demising wall and the stairwell.

BM Randall agree d nominating the exterior and the interior demising wall and stairwells one and two.

BM Caton agreed with what had been said and agrees with including the interior stairwell and demising wall.

BM Norman agreed with nominating, and noted the interesting architecture.

BM Pheasant-Reis agreed with nominating exterior and the interior stairs and demising wall. Noted the interior demising wall is a significant feature representing the symmetrical double house.

Vice-Chair Chang found it interesting that a double residence started on First Hill, which captures a period of development in early Seattle that has changed quite a bit. Supported including the exterior, and interior stairwells and demising wall.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the 1411 Boylston Ave for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building, the site, and the two interior stairwells and demising wall from the first to the second floor; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for February 19, 2024; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/HW/DB

8:0:0

Nomination approved. Board members Barnes, Caton, Chang, McKinney, Norman, Randall, Pheasant-Reis, and Wasserman voted in favor.

## **011525.5 BRIEFING**

### **011525.51 Memorial Wall**

401 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N

Briefing on rehabilitation and improvements

AP Gareth Loveridge, Swift Company presented their proposal for Memorial Wall (details in DON file). The intent of the proposal is to protect everything in place during construction of new stadium. Intent is to retain all stone features and restore anything that is damaged. The stonework is all in reasonable condition. Water features will be repaired to get the water going again. Intent is to replace the light fixtures in-kind, keeping them in essentially the same location. Remove the planting out in front for visibility and ease of cleaning. Repair the drains and raise the floor in the trough. Still uncertain if the pipes, spouts, etc. can be retained or returned to working order. Text on the memorial panels is still quite legible; damage is relatively limited.

The overall intent is preserving and protecting and honoring the memorial wall. Creating a spatial buffer between the wall and the parking area. Bringing back a usefulness to the memorial. Current intent is to bring the function of the water back with a new more complex system.

The memorial will become a feature of the new development that can be viewed from the east parking lot. The parking lot slopes to the east – not an accessible cross slope, so grading will be necessary and the memorial will be made accessible off the parking lot. New pavement is proposed that would bury the first stair/tread slope up to the wall. Mesh fence on either side of the memorial is also proposed.

Intent is to keep the stone features of the Memorial Wall intact, they are going to try to be sensible about intervention of the water feature – add two drains. Exploratory work will need to be done to determine what is possible. Carving out portion of the bowl may be necessary and recreate a new and shallower dish – water would spray in and splash the surface with a small amount of

water to collect and slowly drain. Goal is to find the central pipe and reconnect it. Goal is to have two water features on each end.

Board member questions and comments:

BM McKinney said the presentation answered all her questions.

Vice-Chair Chang appreciated the presentation.

BM Barnes wondered if they had a comparison image of what is proposed next to one showing existing elevations. AP Loveridge explained that there are concrete walls that abut the memorial – those would be removed. A transparent steel and mesh fence will flank the Memorial Wall. The entrance to the actual stadium will be closer to the Wall but not immediately adjacent – entrance on either side but not symmetrical.

BM Randall asked if they are asking for specific feedback from the Board? AP Loveridge said two questions: any concerns about adding low profile six mini jets in the lower water features/bowls; and if there is any concern about covering the stair for improved accessibility.

BM Pheasant-Reis had no concern about work on the water features and the stair. More people will be able to access and appreciate the historic asset.

BM Randall does not have a concern about the alterations to the step or the fountains. Both will improve the landmark's ability to shine. Essence of the experience of the landmark will remain.

Vice-Chair Chang asked about the 20 foot buffer zone – does the plan shown show what has changed within the buffer zone? What are the existing conditions where the Wall connects to the new stadium? Will any changes need to be made to the Wall due to the removal of the abutting concrete walls?

AP Loveridge explained that the wall abutting is proposed to get saw cut down and a cap or a treatment will be needed to cover the saw cut area. New piece of concrete cast over that the new fence could be attached to – like a buttress. No detail yet.

Vice-Chair Chang said that they have no issue with alterations to the step and the water feature. Accessibility is a big goal and this is a clean solution that highlights the wall. They supported the changes.

BM Pheasant-Reis asked about the planting area that is proposed to be infilled. Is there any concern about people getting closer to the memorial wall and potential damage to might be caused by allowing people to get closer to the wall. Was there ever pigment in the lettering?

AP Loveridge said that they have been considering the benefit of getting people closer to the memorial vs. the potential damage that might be caused. The condition might influence the decision to keep people back from the wall. Skateboarding is a concern, so we may want to put in a low amount of planting. Did not find any evidence of pigmentation historically added to make it more legible.

BM Wasserman is happy with the proposal so far, and is eager to see more.

BM Norman said they were comfortable with what is shown and happy with the direction it is going.

Vice-Chair Chang thanked the Board and the presenters. They asked, regarding next steps, where the presenters are in the design process. AP Loveridge said they are pretty far along, but need to get more precise about the grading, bench location, planting design, and the construction details. The water

features system – intent for a reserve tank and a control vault outside of the Wall. Overall layout is set.

SM Doherty asked about the cavity behind the wall – there is more to this and what happens at the back of the wall will need to be addressed. Structural improvement will be happening where that cavity is now. The Board will need to see all the details that will be happening in that 20-foot designated zone around the memorial wall. Is the back of the wall blank, or is something happening there?

AP Loveridge explained that the back of the wall is under review as a feature wall for use by Seattle Public Schools. SM Doherty stated that the Board will need to be briefed on all those elements too.

AP Loveridge said that they will bring existing photos next time they brief the Board.

**011525.6 BOARD BUSINESS**