



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 344/23

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall, Room L2-80

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, October 4, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Katie Randall

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Marc Schmitt

Acting Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

## **ROLL CALL**

**100423.1**

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Commander Robert Kettle gave public comment in person and spoke in support of designation of the Memorial Wall only. He said the wall is in terrible condition but is

worthy of landmark designation. He cited General Order #11 and the intent to honor departed comrades.

Katherine Cheng, Vice President, Mariners spoke against designation of Memorial Stadium and said it is unsafe and uncomfortable. She wanted a state-of-the-art facility for kids.

Mari Horita from Seattle Kraken supported redevelopment of the site and opposed designation of Memorial Stadium. She supported designation of the Memorial Wall which is dedicated to 762 Seattle students killed in WWII.

John Savo did not support designation of Memorial Stadium, but did support designation of the Memorial Wall.

Johannes Thiessen, Ballard High School opposed designation of Memorial Stadium. He said it is not accessible and should be rebuilt.

Julian Swift, Ballard High School Marching Band said they practice at Memorial Stadium. He said the space brings people together, but it is not accessible and is a poor facility. He supported rebuilding it.

Jacob Chen, Ballard High School Marching Band did not support designation of Memorial Stadium. He said it is more about memories and experiences and not the physical environment.

Patrick McCarthy supported the designation of the Memorial Wall only. He said the wall honors vets and should be preserved.

*Mr. Norman joined the meeting.*

Ruth Danner supported designation and said Seattle Public Schools should preserve as much as possible.

Todd Leber, former Seattle Center board member opposed designation of Memorial Stadium, but supported designation of the Memorial Wall.

Felix Banel supported designation of the Memorial Stadium and Wall. He said it has been targeted for removal by political and other pressures. He disagreed with the Staff Report. He said thousands gathered at the site for a memorial for Martin Luther King Jr. and the local alums who died in WWII.

Alyson Teeter supported designation of the Memorial Wall only in memory of the sacrifices of city youth. She said it is an undignified location that has been neglected and disrespected and should be restored to a place of honor that it deserves.

Sharon Lee spoke on behalf of neighbors of the Bullitt property which she said is an important element of the neighborhood. She requested that ownership adhere to

Guidelines and Harvard Belmont rules; no landscape changes approved until there is an approved management plan; a maintenance plan and CPTED analysis; and a comprehensive analysis of security and safety measures.

Matt Hanna, Cairn Cross, opposed designation of the stadium and site. He said there are seismic issues and no accessibility. He said the stadium lacks the ability to run safely and should be redeveloped. He supported designation of the Memorial Wall.

Lorne McConachie supported designation of the Memorial Wall, but not the stadium or field. He said it is not a cultural landscape and does not meet the criteria for designation. He said it is a site of memories – a few long-forgotten concerts, speeches and personal nostalgia.

Koichi Kobayashi, Seattle Center supported designation of the Memorial Wall. She said that many Japanese Americans perished in the war.

Kristine Wilson, Perkins Coie said she submitted written comment (in DON file). She supported designation of the Memorial Wall only.

Christina Scheppelmann, Director of Seattle Opera supported designation of the Memorial Wall, but not the Memorial Stadium.

June Fox supported designation of the Memorial Wall but not the Memorial Stadium.

Shawn Murphy supported designation of Memorial Stadium and Memorial Wall. He said the stadium was built as a living memorial and should not go away. He said Seattle Public Schools let everyone down by letting it fall into disrepair and not taking into consideration what it was built for and named for.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary was opposed to designation of the Memorial Stadium, but supported designation of the Memorial Wall. He said the stadium doesn't meet any of the criteria for designation.

Marshall Foster, Director of Seattle Center opposed designation of the Memorial Stadium, but supported designation of the Memorial Wall.

Tom Albro, Seattle Monorail spoke in opposition to designation of Memorial Stadium, but supported designation of the Memorial Wall.

**100423.2**

**MEETING MINUTES**

August 16, 2023

MM/SC/HW/MI

9:0:2 Minutes approved. Mmes. Caton and Chang abstained.

**100423.3      CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

100423.31      Bullitt House  
1125 Harvard Ave E  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a six-month extension. She said negotiations have started. She supported the request.

Mr. Macleod said it is reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Bullitt House, 1125 Harvard Avenue E for six months.

MM/SC/MI/DB      11:0:0

100423.32      E.C. Hughes Elementary School  
7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said more time is needed; she is working on all school agreements and said the list has been re-prioritized as needs change. She requested a six-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the E. C. Hughes Elementary School, 7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW for six months.

MM/SC/RC/MI      10:0:1    Motion carried. Ms. Caton abstained.

100422.33      Daniel Webster Elementary School  
3014 NW 67<sup>th</sup> Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty requested a six-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for Daniel Webster Elementary School, 3014 NW 67 Street for six months.

MM/SC/RC/MI      9:0:1    Motion carried. Ms. Caton abstained.

100422.34      Lincoln High School  
4400 Interlake Avenue N  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty requested a six-month extension. She said Phase II of the rehabilitation is finished.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis disclosed worked schools in past, but no association now. It was more than two years ago.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for Lincoln High School, 4400 Interlake Avenue N. for six months.

MM/SC/RC/DB 10:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Caton abstained.

**100423.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

100423.41 Seattle Times Office Building  
1120 John Street  
Proposed seismic joint

Andy Clinch, Perkins + Will provided context of the site. He explained some additional seismic joints were needed; the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) was supportive. He provided background on the landmarked buildings and site and noted the buildings were demolished as part of an emergency order with façades retained.

Michael O’Keefe, Glotman Simpson said the current façade is a stiffer frame than the new construction and not reinforced to carry loads. He said the joint would be attached to building perpendicular to the wall so it can’t fail. He said it is an L-shaped wall and room is needed at corner where two axis meet, to move.

Mr. Clinch indicated the east elevation along Fairview and said a 3” seismic joint is needed; it will be painted to match granite. The east façade was selected over the south façade as it can be better disguised. He provided photo examples of integration done on other projects.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said at ARC the applicant explained all options explore and why this one was chosen. She said it is important to protect the façade.

Ms. Wasserman said the applicant answered all ARC questions and have done the best possible.

Ms. Chang supported the proposed work and appreciated the separation of new from old.

Mr. Macleod said it makes sense.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis suggested having the color approved administratively.

Ms. Sodt said she would be happy to do that if the board were to delegate that to her.

Board members unanimously delegated color option review to staff.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Seattle Times Building, 1120 John Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118046 as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KR/TC 11:0:0 Motion carried.

**100423.5 DESIGNATION**

100423.51 Memorial Stadium  
401 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N

Mr. Macleod explained that the board will be voting on one site and the scope of the landmark.

Ms. Doherty advised the board that during deliberations they will to decide if they want to include the entire property or in part. She indicated there were a couple board disclosures.

Ms. Caton disclosed her firm currently has work with Seattle Public Schools. She said she was comfortable voting if others are.

Mr. Inpanbutr said his firm is at the tail end of a project. He said he has not been actively working on the project.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr's participation and noted they are not working on this site.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

Mr. Macleod said it was reasonable.

Ms. Doherty asked if Seattle Public Schools was comfortable with the Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr's participation.

Jessie Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary spoke on behalf of her client and said they would not be opposed.

David Peterson said at the nomination meeting his presentation set up the historic context, existing site conditions; he said supplementary information was provided to the board to answer questions board members had at that meeting. He said at the nomination meeting he presented the historical context, how the space was used earlier, how it turned into a civic auditorium, civic field and the civic center buildings that developed. He noted the wooden stands and the site's inadequacy as a playfield. He said the initial design did not incorporate a memorial wall. He said during his earlier presentation he talked about the structure, the giant box beam and how the structure is on top of the roof as designed by George Stoddard.

Mr. Peterson provided examples of stadium types in Seattle and Washington, and the evolution of the memorial wall design and how it came to be. He said the stadium type selected was dependent more on funding. Many open stadiums from the early twentieth century were built with concrete often into a natural hillside bowl where the concrete grandstand served as a foundation and retaining structure. Others were built with circular bowls above grade such as the original Husky Stadium of 1920; the period of 1900 to 1940s is known as the rise of the modern stadium. He said there are no other local examples of concrete construction with rib structure on the top side of the roof. He said these systems may have been seen as not a good idea as drains eventually were blocked causing drainage issues. He said this roof was modified in 1999 with over-framing and a membrane roof for better resistance to rain. He said thin shell concrete would have allowed a smooth look functionally and would have been structurally stable. He said the technology was available in the 1930's but was difficult and didn't start to be seen locally until Jack Christiansen's work in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

Mr. Peterson provided an overview of events at the stadium including Harry Truman's speech on reclamation in 1948, and the Progressive party's Henry Wallace's campaign speech in 1948. Dwight Eisenhower made a speech at next door's Mercer Ice Arena with overflow crowds accommodated at Memorial Stadium; Bumbershoot, from 1971-2019, 2023; independent concerts of prominent musicians; church service and activities use, and Billy Graham revivals in 1951. He said that most concerts were associated with Bumbershoot but there were many independent concerts as well. He noted Elvis, Janis Joplin, Jimi Hendrix, Steve Miller among others played there. He said the stadium and playfield was used for torchlights parades and the floats would end there. The stadium was a gathering and prep space or ending location for some public marches including a memorial march for Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr in 1968. Some national and minor league soccer teams played in the stadium including the Sounders and the OL Reign. The stadium has been used as an assembly place and end point for some marathons and their awards ceremonies. He said the stadium was used during the Century 21 Exposition.

Mr. Peterson went over criteria for designation for the two separate components - the Memorial Stadium and the Memorial Wall, and criteria A, B and F were not met for either. He said the stadium was built for use as a football stadium in 1947 and was used as a leased venue for many major events, concerts, marches, marathons but the primary use was for Seattle Public Schools. He said the stadium has a

general association to Criterion C but that the Memorial Wall meets Criterion C. He said the stadium was an adapted pre-existing facility to be used for the six months of the 1962 World's Fair. He said it was not purpose-built but rather part of publicly owned property and this association doesn't meet Criterion C. He said the Memorial Wall meets criteria C, D, and E and the Stadium, none. He said the Memorial Wall is strongly associated with World War II, its aftermath and impact on Seattle residents. Regarding Criterion D, the wall

Jessie Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary represented Seattle Public Schools who supported designation of the Memorial Wall but not the Memorial Stadium or the open playfield. She said the stadium is not an outstanding work of George Stoddard and not even his best stadium work. She said the only interesting thing is the smooth underside of the roof with the beam system on the top which turns out is really a design flaw that captures bird droppings, dirt, moss and water and turns it into a maintenance nightmare. She said the stadium is not a significant concert venue, no musicians have spoken up for it, unlike The Showbox designation for which multiple musicians including Death Cab for Cutie, Pearl Jam and Macklemore rallied for it. She said most public comment received was in opposition to designation. The playfield was replaced with rubber field in 2013 which doesn't meet the 25-year threshold. She noted other local playfields – Hiawatha and Bobby Morris – that were designated and were associated with the Olmsted design.

Dr. McKinney appreciated the presentation and agreed that the wall was important. She said she understood the dangerous conditions and challenges of the stadium. She said a civil rights march started here and her father, Rev. Dr. McKinney led it; that alone should qualify for landmark status. She noted the special history of Jimi Hendrix.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and asked the definition of 'living memorial' at the time the wall was constructed and has that changed.

Mr. Peterson said the living memorial movement began after WWII to remember the war dead in a more positive way. He said there have been many examples over the years such as trees at the entrance to University of Washington and along the Des Moines Memorial Drive as well as museums, pools, and sports facilities. He said the living memorial movement came and went; it was more philosophical unlike an old-fashioned monument as a place to remember things. He said Seattle Public Schools, after discussions throughout the city determined where to put a monument to all who died. A giant obelisk was proposed after grieving mothers said they wanted a place to grieve, not go to a football game. He said the wall was designed by a high school student in a school district competition and was added in 1951.

Mr. Slattery asked why the stadium could not be retrofitted.

Ms. Clawson said studies have been done looking at options. She said the stadium is difficult to renovate due to accessibility issues and seismic needs. She said the addition of seismic beams would seriously change the look.

Mr. Macleod asked about the staff report.

Ms. Doherty said multiple motions were offered and went over details of each and how board members could contemplate what to include.

Ms. Wasserman said the word site seems to be just a word that's from the day. We have a dozen different, probably legal descriptions of what site means. She said to her it did not mean the term or the grass, or the weeds, or the plants. She said she was thinking of here like Ms. Doherty was thinking of the actual place. She said she was really concerned and bothered by the various legal comments offered today saying the landmark rules don't allow for a site to have any improvements on it. She said it is weird because there is ground there, and the improvements are on it. And she didn't know if that really takes that out of board ability to discuss or not. She said she didn't want to designate the buildings, the stadium part. She said she thought the concrete structure itself is dead and what was unique about it didn't work. She didn't see any point in memorializing forever something that failed, and so did not support designating the buildings. She wanted to landmark the wall, and to include the playfield site, the ground.

Ms. Doherty said 'outdoor space' fits within the landmark's parameters, that is why 'site' and 'building' are included collectively or individually in designated features.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported the first part of the Staff Report and said she would like to include the field and wall but not the buildings.

Ms. Randall appreciated the conversation and noted the recognition of something cared about that is not embodied in the built environment. She said the Memorial Wall meets Criterion A for its connection to WWII but the stadium did not. She said the wall meets Criterion C as a significant gathering in the city and one of the oldest gathering places in the city. She said the wall meets Criterion E.

Mr. Inpanbutr concurred and said he supported designation for both the wall and the site.

Mr. Barnes supported designation of the Memorial Wall but not the stadium or the stands. He said Ms. Doherty described well the designation of 'place' but he struggled with designation of it. He said the land has changed in uses over the years and wondered if a plaque might be more appropriate.

Ms. Chang said the roof structure is the most unique piece of the stadium, but it is not visible to appreciate because it is only seen from above. She supported designation of the Memorial Wall and said it meets the criteria and can convey its significance. She said it meets Criterion C and she said she wouldn't oppose other criteria based on what other board members want. She did not support inclusion of the stadium or site.

Ms. Caton noted the history and significance of the space as a gathering place and said there are better mechanisms to preserve that history. She said continuing the use will enhance the story. She said the Memorial Wall should be brought to a prominent position; the parking lot is distracting. She supported designation of the Memorial Wall but not the stadium or site.

Mr. Norman supported designation of the Memorial Wall and said its current state is deplorable – it desperately needs to be refreshed to honor its history. He did not support designation of the stadium or site.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said the site is a stadium and is required to function as a stadium not another use. She expressed concern about interpretation of criteria to avoid designation of the stadium – that it sets a poor precedence for landmarking future buildings. She said significant cultural heritage was presented for the site and said that how people experience a place and events meets double significance standards. It is a unique stadium. She said significant history happened there but she didn't see how it can convey that. She supported designation of the Memorial Wall. She said she hoped that people with a negative view of the stadium take a more caring view of history of the site as a community gathering space.

Dr. McKinney agreed with Ms. Pheasant-Reis. She supported designation of the Memorial Wall and said it needs to be cleaned up and respected by how the land around it is used. Regarding the site, it is important to have some kind of memorial that tells a story of what happened there in ways that people can learn and understand. She said it is important to tell the stories because the stories are being lost.

Mr. Slattery said he still misses the Kingdome. He said he has heard a mountain of opinions from commenters that seemingly have little to do with the stadium and everything to do with the appeal of a new stadium. He said while he understands that, future use cannot be considered. He said restoration of the stadium should be explored and he had not seen substantive information that it cannot be retrofitted, only the words, 'can't'. He noted the important cultural history – civil rights marches, music, graduations that took place there. He supported designation and said criteria A, B, and C are relevant.

Mr. Macleod supported designation of the Memorial Wall and noted there was a lot of public support for it. He said he struggled coming to a decision on the site and the stadium. He said he appreciated staff clarification and motion options. He said he supported designation of the site and said it is memorializing a place – a historical place and there is room to consider cultural heritage. He noted the exhaustive list provided by Felix Banel and said the site rises to double significance of Criterion C but the stadium does not. He said it is a unique building and he was marginally in favor of Criterion D. He said he wasn't sure how intricately linked the stadium structure is to the gathering space memory, but that he did support designation of wall and site and cited criteria A, C, D, and E. He said it is unfortunate the stadium is in a state of disrepair and renovation was not explored.

Ms. Wasserman said she wanted to designate the wall and site but without the buildings. She said she would approve a motion that didn't include the site.

Mr. Barnes and Ms. Randall concurred.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis concurred and asked what the hope was for designating the site and how that would work. She asked what it is about the site that is significant.

Dr. McKinney said civil rights marches started and ended there. She said some of Bumbershoot is significant to city history. She said the stadium building is in disrepair and while the architecture is interesting, it is not as interesting as others. She said the configuration is important and noted that Berkeley had a free speech park where people could speak their minds. She said the subject space has history as a gathering place, where civic discussions were held and a variety of things happened. She said it wouldn't be hard to figure out how to use the site and there are a number of ways people could be guided through how they think about the space.

Ms. Wasserman concurred. She said it is important for the board not to define future use of the site. While the board has purview over physical changes, the board does not keep uses from happening. She cited the Climate Pledge Arena project as an example of board input and involvement.

Ms. Doherty suggested a straw poll. While a couple board members supported designation of the stadium, most did not. A straw poll would clarify board member positions on what to include in designation.

A straw poll was conducted to assess board feelings on inclusion of site/open space with designation of the wall. A majority of board members did support designation of the site, but enough for designation vote to be carried. Further discussion led to decision to designate the wall only, with 20' perimeter around it. There was unanimous approval.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of select features of the Memorial Stadium property at 401 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards A, C, D, and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the memorial wall with associated steps, fountains and other integral features, all of the structural wall(s) and foundation(s) that physically support the memorial in situ, and the site area on which the memorial resides and relies upon for structural support, including 20' of space on all sides of the wall. The remainder of the site and stadium structure are excluded.

MM/SC/DB/LN            10:1:0 Motion carried.