



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 166/24

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall, Room L2-80

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, June 26, 2024 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Taber Caton

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod, Chair

Lawrence Norman

Katie Randall

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Michael de Lange

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang, Vice-Chair

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Padraic Slattery

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

ROLL CALL

062624.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Janice Sutter expressed concern about the Controls and Incentives extension request for Battelle Talaris. She said vandals broke windows. She urged ownership to come up with a plan before the whole site is ruined.

Colleen McAleer expressed concern about the Battelle extension request and the lack of security at the site. She noted vandalism and trespassing, boarded windows, downed trees, damage at Building G. She said their proposed plan for the site doesn't meet any of the Secretary of Interior Standards. She said the site continues to deteriorate. She asked for a plan for preservation and repair.

062624.2 MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2024

Deferred.

062624.3 BRIEFING

062624.31 Disability Activism Historic Context Survey
Briefing on project

He said that out of the first 400 landmarks in the city, none for disability history. He hopes to create a model for other cities and national work. He said that disability activism puts focus on community's agency to affect change. Written report providing narrative history provides context for analysis of significance for NRHP criteria and Landmarks standards. Does not designate any given properties.

Mr. de Lange provided the board with an overview of his ongoing research to represent the history of disability in the built environment. He said historic preservation has a mandate to designate, preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate significant elements of the city's heritage. He said it is broadly written, a One Seattle approach that implies a mandate that we should be including everyone and as many stories as we can - significant stories and perpetuate that heritage. As historic preservation practitioners, there is a sense that there are gaps in our work. It's obvious to most people working doing the work whether volunteer or professional. He noted the assistance provided by 4Culture's Beyond Integrity project has been going on for about ten years. Beyond Integrity has been looking at the landmarks and historic preservation programs of King County and the city, and it did the work of providing us specific language and amounts of the gaps in our work, so that we can start to take steps to sort of fill in those and meet that mandate. We have many underrepresented communities including the disability communities, which are perhaps totally unrepresented for the most part. The work that Beyond Integrity provided didn't even identify disability as missing

part of our history, but Mr. de Lange noted that the Beyond Integrity input was still very helpful. They are really the instigators of this project. He said he noted that to show how far that disconnect is between disability history and practitioners, people who are specifically thinking about underrepresented communities forgot about them and they rectified that. So, as part of our commitment to making sure we have as many communities represented as possible, we decided to pursue a grant to do some work in disability history. We chose the certified local government grant, which in part because of your existence as a board where a certified local government has identified by DAHP and the park service and that means we have an ordinance and we do certain activities, like have a survey, but it also means we have access to not very big set up grants that are given on a yearly basis. He said they thought it would be a good idea to use this money to do this project and this work, because they are so accessible. He said they hope to create a model for other local governments by choosing this accessible grant as opposed to a big funder like Getty, where we're showing that this is something that all sizes of communities can do.

Mr. de Lange said there are 400 plus city landmarks, none are specifically for disability history. There are roughly as many national register sites, a couple of those have disability as a sub type, subheading of, of their significance, but they're mostly places that were nominated because of their architecture and places that people were sent away to. He said they wanted to create a model for other cities to do this work, but also help national work that's going along. The park service is like our national preservation agency. They are early in the process of creating a context study related disability here. We hope that this work could be a steppingstone for that. We chose activism specifically because we needed to narrow the topic because there are so many communities within this larger subheading of disability. We also wanted to, center community's agency to affect change.

He said the historic context study is a written report that provides a narrative history and context for the analysis of natural register criteria or landmarks criteria. It sort of helps give you the language or the foundation or fills in some of the puzzle pieces for why a place may or may not be significant by giving you that broader history. It doesn't designate any given properties, and it doesn't even really evaluate those properties.

Mr. de Lange said they have hired two historians to take this on. Dr. Gail Dubrow who's a professor at the University of Minnesota, but has a long history in Seattle. She was with the University of Washington's historic preservation program and may have been a professor of several people in this meeting. She has been working for decades and has often been at the forefront of putting inclusion into historic preservation efforts, working with

communities of color, Pacific and Asian Pacific Islanders specifically. She wrote Sento at 6th and Main, partially based here and worked with queer communities. She has had a long, storied history working in preservation, and was one of the only people currently working, with disability history and historic preservation in part, inspired by her own experiences with disability and realizing that there was this gap. Laura Leppink is also with the University of Minnesota and her career has been at this intersection of place based public history and disability history. She's an expert in the first licensed deaf architect in his work and how his experiences as a deaf person appear in his architecture. They have been hard at work the last few months doing archival research mostly and they have sort of some early themes, so these will probably pop up in the written context study.

Mr. de Lange said of early institutions a lot is a negative history or could be seen as that, not all of it though. He said that some of the schools are more positive and have socially conscious history, but soldiers' homes for veterans, schools, asylums were the beginnings of people and disability communities being put proximity to one another either for services or for treatment. He said that is the beginning of folks getting together and having common experiences.

Mr. de Lange said the next piece is forming advocacy around specific communities which takes a lot of the 20th century. He noted the Puget Sound Association of the Deaf which was founded in 1900. Olof Hanson was involved with that, their advocacy group. The Lighthouse for the Blind also still exists. They are an organization that among many other things has worked on job access for folks with low vision and who are blind. He explained the beginning of combining forces of various communities for civil rights equality and said the Center Park housing development was an example of this.

Section 504 is a part of a federal law that required federal properties to provide equal access to people with accessibility needs. There were nationwide protests that were critical components in creating a nationwide accessibility and equality movement. He said the movie Crip Camp talked about the gathering and organizing. He said it sort of laid the groundwork for the ADA advocacy later. Here specifically in Seattle there are lots of protests with Metro about equal access to transportation opportunities and that as a right.

Mr. de Lange said Olof Hanson was the first deaf licensed architect in America. He started his career in Minnesota but moved out to Seattle and had a had a long career in Seattle. His home in the University District was an organizing space, but also an important social space for the deaf community.

He said there were weddings and lectures, card games and other get togethers there. He and his wife Agatha advocated for accessibility laws also in Washington DC where he was at Gallaudet University of the Deaf University, and in Washington state. He was the architect for the School of Deaf here in Washington and several other prominent buildings. He said Puget Sound Association of the Deaf was founded at the turn of the century focused on health, wealth, and well-being of the community, longstanding storied organization. He provided images of Hanson's work and noted Center Park, a Brutalist apartment building in south Seattle. He indicated a newspaper clipping that shows the apartment building, a rendering of it, and "apartments for the handicapped". It's the culmination of the internationally recognized activist, Ida Daly's work to provide accessible housing for folks with disabilities. According to the news coverage at the time, it was the first public housing project in America designed specifically for people with disabilities, it's right across the street from Lighthouse for the Blind. He said having those two organizations that people knew would be accessible next to each other was, according to some of the interviews that we've done, a natural meeting place for the community for both organization and just for social needs. He said it was designed by Paul Kirk who himself was disabled. He said it was an example of a disabled community organizing together and choosing a disabled architect to design a place for disabled peoples to live and is fairly significant.

Mr. de Lange said the first draft will be a very early draft of the report and will be available in early July and will be made available to the board. He invited comments from the board. He said they are in the research process and will lean on community interviews, oral history and story sharing. He said they try not just to say 'oral history' since that can be exclusive. He said that both the historians and DON communications team will be speaking to people in community and capturing their stories. We have a community-based storytelling project that isn't strictly history tied, but it's kind of experiential that our communications division is running also. The report will be complete in October, and soon after in November, they will have a couple of events at MOHAI, both to share the research and the project with people and also the stories that we've collected along the way, both from the historical research and from that community-based storytelling project. He said they will have an online story map indicating places related to Seattle's disability history with plans to include a list of properties related to disability history. He said it won't be a survey per se, but it will be a start. He said he hopes that the various disability communities organize around disabilities - the history and historic preservation so that we can start having conversations about what the right tools and approaches are to perpetuate that history as we were required to.

Ms. Caton asked if in some of the research they are taking into account kind of more of neuro-divergent disabilities that we see so much of today and if it might be a way of engaging younger kids who are at a higher rate of experiencing that right now.

Mr. de Lange said that he was sensitive to this as a neuro-divergent person. He said it is something they, as historians, agreed should be there. He said it is hard to talk about going far into the past because the language and describing the experiences is difficult. But in the later portions, both parent-based advocacy, which is going to be a really important subheading under that civil rights access and equality heading, and also about organizations and like school programming based on that will be included.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said this was fantastic and she was really looking forward to seeing what you guys find out and present.

Mr. Inpanbutr echoed Ms. Pheasant-Reis' comments and said he appreciated the impressive mach speed summary, and noted there is obviously a lot of work going into this. He said there are not many people telling stories like this, so this is awesome.

Mr. Norman appreciated the report and said he was familiar with the Center Park neighborhood.

Ms. Randall appreciated hearing these stories being told.

Mr. Macleod said he wasn't familiar with how Center Park came to be. He said he was excited to see this develop further. He asked Mr. de Lange if there was specific feedback they needed from the board.

Mr. de Lange said there isn't anything specific yet, but he noted they are having difficulty finding information about local protests around Section 504.

062624.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

062624.41 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty stated that the Controls and Incentives document is still in draft form. She reminded board members that the action on the agenda is to extend negotiations of the Controls and Incentives Agreement, and is not about the Certificate of Approval for the owner's proposed project.

Nathan Rimmer, 4000 Property LLC requested a four-month extension as they work through the process for the agreement.

For clarification, Ms. Doherty said the initial timelines are dictated in the code for staff's steps. But there is nothing for the completion of the Certificate of Approval application by an owner.

Mr. Macleod asked if there were any further details.

Mr. Rimmer said they have nothing to show about their separate project, since the last presentation four months ago.

Ms. Doherty said the July 3, 2024, meeting was moved to June 26, 2024. She suggested noting the extension to November 6, 2024.

Mr. Rimmer agreed.

Ms. Doherty said if it is signed sooner, it can be brought to the board.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41st Street to November 6, 2024.

MM/SC/KR/MS

6:0:2

Motion carried. Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr recused.

062624.5 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

062624.51 Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District - Building 11

7861 62nd Avenue NE

Proposed wall-mounted mechanical equipment, louvers, and replacement of non-historic overhead door

Ms. Doherty said the SPARC had two members present, Tom Ansart and Christine Howard; both were OK with the new panel door with the glazing to be more similar to the newer Sand Point doors that are further to the north. "Sail Sand Point" is on them. The new door is going to be metal, rather the wood at the other doors, but they said that they didn't have a concern about that because of the separation of them and that it's, this is not a historic door that's being replaced. Whereas the other ones were historic doors being replaced. In the past, and as Ellen said related to the colors, Tom was not

concerned about the color. He thought the options were fine. Christine preferred the white because of its relationship of this language of the white within the brick but she also understood that the blue was the branding for Sail Sand Point, and it would be a signal to people that this was a Sail Sand Point space, just like the other three doors. Ms. Doherty said related to the HVAC, Tom thought the, proposal was reasonable and Christine said that she would prefer to see it on the roof, which would be a normal convention, but she understood the factors and the feedback from DAHP. She said it was unfortunate to have to attach through the historic metal siding, but understood that they were minimizing the impact and doing the best they could with the requirements imposed by DAHP.

Mr. Macleod asked about the vent/grill that was called out.

Ms. Mirro said they thought the vent/grille could be reused at first but plans changed.

Ms. Doherty said vent/grill will be installed within existing opening and will be painted a custom color to match.

Ms. Randall appreciated the options explored with the HVAC. Given the feedback from other regulatory agencies it does seem like this is the best option available. It's always a tough line to balance being very clear meaning the Secretary of the Interior Standards that whatever you're putting in new is not actually historic while also making it look cohesive. She supported the blue color on the new door. It does help emphasize that it's a newer door while maintaining that visual cohesion. She supported the project as proposed.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked about the refrigerant line routing to the outdoor units.

Jon Bunnell, B+E Consulting said it will be routed through the interior of the building, which is the shortest path they can take.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations at Sand Point Building 11, 7861 62nd Avenue 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 124850.

- a. The existing overhead door is not historic, and the general character of its replacement is consistent with other nearby doors in the building.
 - b. The custom-colored louvers to match the siding will have little visual impact on the back of the building.
 - c. Wall-mounted mechanical equipment is not preferred, but it is located on the back of the building with little visibility, and the applicant said that roof-mounted and ground-mounted equipment were not viable due to tenant and site constraints.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alteration in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
 - a. No alternatives were provided, and the committee did not request any.
 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 will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

062624.52 Gas Works Park
1901 N Northlake Way
Proposed removal of access ladder and frame

David Graves, Seattle Parks & Recreation proposed removal of an access ladder and cage as it is a safety hazard.

Mr. Macleod said ARC reviewed the proposal and felt that it was an unfortunate necessity.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said unfortunately it came down first, but the board likely would have approved it. She said it is not a significant impact to the entire range of the structure. She said there is no need for further documentation.

Ms. Doherty provided a view of the cracking tower assemblage to give the ladder scale in context.

Mr. Macleod said the ladder is a smaller component of a richly textured site. Removing the ladder for safety is reasonable.

Mr. Graves said they have done a comprehensive cleanup pulling vines off, but they are still slowly hauling debris away.

Ms. Doherty said the proposal is to provide clear access and minimize safety issues for the maintenance staff.

Ms. Caton asked if there is a long-term plan to preserve the park.

Mr. Graves said Rich Haag's vision was that the towers be accessible. He said it is an operational nightmare due to liability. He said they spent \$250,000 on fencing. He said the soil in this area has not been remediated. He said items have been stripped of climbability elements. He said they will eventually strip off the soil and put down gravel. Responding to questions he said the towers are graffitied repeatedly.

Ms. Doherty said the existing soil comes right up to the steel and leads to rust.

Mr. Inpanbutr said the steel will continue to deteriorate over time and he understands the need to remove elements.

Mr. Macleod asked if there are other elements like this ladder.

Mr. Graves said yes and where parts and pieces touch the ground. He said they have caged off areas to make them less climbable.

Mr. Norman asked if they had considered security cameras.

Mr. Graves said lighting elements are being considered. Cameras are a challenge. He said that SPU uses cameras that triggers a voice warning.

Ms. Randall said she had no concerns and that there were no negative impacts.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board retroactively approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for demolition of a ladder and platform at the central cracking towers at Gas Works Park, 1901 N Northlake Way, 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 121043.
 - a. Demolition of the ladder and platform removes historic material from the structure, but the intervention is small in scale compared to the overall tower assemblage, and other access ladders and walkways remain intact.
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 owner's structural assessment indicates the ladder structure is in very poor condition. They do not propose to repair it due to safety concerns.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/KR/TC

8:0:0

Motion carried.

062624.53 William Grose Center / former Fire Station 6
101 23rd Avenue S
Proposed exterior alterations

Ms. Doherty said ARC had reviewed the application.

Robert Drucker provided images of the building which showed existing conditions of the building. He said that the roof was in poor condition and needed replacement. He shared a hand drawn detail is the condition of

existing flashing and installation as measured on site. He said there's going to be a TPO membrane, and they have a product that will enable them to chemically seal the roof to the back side of the parapet. It preserves the crenelated appearance of the front of the parapet, so no component of this roofing will be visible from the street. It allows for a lot more insulation up top and we will be able to achieve the code required insulation. He said they are withdrawing requests for relief from the energy code for this portion of the project.

He said because the handball court is not currently conditioned space, and SDCI is requiring that they replace the six non-original windows which are no longer energy code compliant. He shared images of the product that most resembles the condition of the existing 1931 windows. He noted a beveled muntin which most closely approximates the glazing putty that was originally used to install glass in the steel sash. He showed new version of window details and said the original detail to scale, which was the vertical meeting mullion of the, of the original push out casement windows. The new windows are not paired. It's a single casement, new profile that we've picked out, which is two and three eighths overall width is close approximation of that original vertical center.

Mr. Drucker said the apparatus bay doors are not original to 1931 and were built in approximately 1986. They were designed to be remarkably similar; he proposed retaining them and requested relief from the energy code requirement to provide new doors. He said the only difference was the 1931 doors had four large knuckle hinges per leaf and in 1986, and in 1986 they substituted a piano hinge, but otherwise they are a remarkable facsimile. He said the lightning bolt transom window is the only remaining steel sash behind, those lightning bolts, which are, which are a modern reproduction of the original lightning bolt. He proposed to retain that which means requesting relief from the energy code requirement to provide a lower U-value product. He said on the west side there is a ramp that was constructed in phase one, previously approved. He said unfortunately the ramp was built incorrectly and is too steep. He said it must be demolished and rebuilt to provide access to the lower level. He said the steel rail will be painted firehouse red to match the existing wall mounted ladder and other steel components. He said they will attach 4" square ADA buttons to trigger power door operators both in the front of the building and down on the parking lot side of the building. He said mechanical equipment will be replaced and the new will be minimally visible.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said regarding the window extrusion the proportions looked more like wood than metal, so ARC asked for updates. She said the window proportions are more akin to the original metal. The windows have

actual muntins and not etched glass pattern in the 1980s windows. She said the version selected is nice.

Mr. Macleod said he looked at detailing and that replicating historic proportions is worthwhile.

Ms. Doherty said Mr. Drucker outlined items requiring exceptions such as apparatus door and lightning bolt. She said the roof insulation exception is no longer needed and what is being installed will comply with the code and qualify as maintenance.

Ms. Wasserman said it is all reasonable. She said the project was carefully planned out and the building well preserved. She said the changes are minor and reversible.

Mr. Schmitt said it looks good.

Mr. Macleod said the applicant did a great job to meet energy code and maintain historic fabric. He said the window choice was good. He supported exemptions and noted the doors and transom windows.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the ADA push pad was centered.

Mr. Drucker said it was mounted away from strike space and door. It is in the second panel between the concrete reveals. He provided dimensions to precisely locate it.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations at former Fire Station 6, 101 23rd Avenue S, 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 122462.
 - a. The windows proposed for replacement are non-historic sashes within original openings, and the new windows are more visually compatible with the original character of the building.
 - b. The building and site alterations are relatively minor and are reversible.

- c. The proposed rooftop equipment is larger than existing and therefore more visible, but are sized to meet the building’s heating and cooling needs.
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 explored design alternatives for the replacement windows to be responsive to Board and staff feedback.
 3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 C, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance.
 - a. The proposed exterior ramp, and door operators are to address accessibility code requirements.
 4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 D and E are not applicable.
 5. 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 will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/MS/TC

8:0:0

Motion carried.

062624.54

Beacon Hill Garden House

2336 15th Avenue S

Proposed alterations at site, exterior lighting, and interior stair

Matt Purvis, Rolluda Architects provided context of the building and site. He provided examples of various uses. He proposed adding a concrete sidewalk

on the south side. He proposed adding brick border to existing paved pathway to expand surface about 8" and to tie into other brick paving. He said 4' tall visually unobtrusive fences will be installed to control access related to event planning needs. He proposed anti-slip – high traction ramp at south elevation at south porch to bridge existing porch landing platform. He said the wood picket with banister rail will match the style on the north side of the building. He said there are two steps down to porch level. He said the exterior light fixture is non-original and will be replaced with one in similar style. He said the interior banister is less than 30" high and does not meet code. He proposed to add a rail to the interior wall, painted white. Brass standoff pins are shown but white are preferred. A 42" high frameless glass guard rail will be added at the second-floor landing.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if the glass would have any color.

Mr. Purvis said it will be clear.

Ms. Randall asked about guard rail options explored.

Mr. Purvis said many were explored.

Mr. Schmitt supported the application.

Ms. Wasserman said she was happy to see it progress, and the facility being used.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the attention to detail.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior and interior alterations at the Beacon Hill Garden House, 2336 15th Avenue S, 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 the Report on Designation (LPB 185/19).
 - a. The alterations are relatively minor and are reversible.
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 explored design alternatives for the ramp and interior stair guardrail to be responsive to Board and staff feedback.
- 3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 C, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance.
 - a. The proposed exterior ramp, and interior stair alterations are to address safety and accessibility code requirements.
- 4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 D and E are not applicable.
- 5. 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 will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/KR/HW

8:0:0

Motion carried.

062624.55

La Quinta Apartments

1710 E Denny Way

Proposed stormwater utility line for adjacent property development

Michael Pollard, Pollard Development proposed installing stormwater drainage utility line through the basement and site of La Quinta. He said the exterior of the building is controlled. He proposed to trench under the building and showed proposed route. He said all would be replaced when work is completed. He proposed to sawcut the sidewalk and trench under the wood frame staircase which would be supported during construction and replaced and repaired when complete. He said the utility line will support adjacent project to build affordable housing. He showed the rainwater route and how it is directed to the retention pipe to public storm system. He said he talked to Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) and other options are too expensive

for him. He said they have no firm numbers due to the old neighborhood, poor soil conditions, etc.

Mr. Pollard said they are proposing to route the utility under the building through the courtyard and through a portion of the basement. There would be some trenching associated with it. The trenching is going to be about 5 ft deep, a couple of feet wide. It is outside the root system of the Deodar Cedar, on site at central for the courtyard. He presented to the ARC board and they had some questions about impacting the tree. They had an arborist review it, and confirmed it is about 18 ft away from the tree would, and would have no appreciable impact to the stability or to the health of the tree. He said the landscaping is going to be restored to existing condition or better, including lawn and any shrubs they need to remove. At ARC they discussed the need to pour new concrete where we would impact the existing walkway. In lieu of this, they propose to sawcut the existing expansion joints, remove the panel temporarily and replace it in the same location. On the north side of the building, the pipe would exit under a wood frame staircase that provides access to the caretaker unit. They believe that that staircase can be supported and stay active during the construction.

He explained the proposed adjacent apartment building, with 84 units of housing, 22 proposed to be affordable. ARC asked about the detention system is, how the storm water works. He explained all of the water that will be captured on the new apartment site. He said the new line will be a 5 ft diameter corrugated metal pipe, 92 ft long. The capacity is sized for a 50- or 100-year storm. Along with capturing the water they need to control flow from the site. He explained the different components. Outside of the building is typically a civil engineer's purview that's administered by SDCI drainage in concert with Seattle Public Utilities. When the pipe goes inside the building, it becomes the plumbing purview of King County Public Health. The interior pipe will be ductile iron instead of plastic. The visible line can be monitored. He said the pipe is not pressurized and it is a closed loop system. He said Ms. Doherty suggested they provide leak detection as part of the proposal. He said they will use a system that is hard wired and will have an audible alarm if there is a leak.

Mr. Pollard said they discussed route alternatives with SPU and the only option is to do a utility main extension. He said that it is more costly than they have planned for in their project. He said the proposed new development will help subsidize the housing cost for La Quinta and together they work as a financially viable package.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said she asked for a cost estimate at ARC and asked if that was provided.

Mr. Pollard said he worked with some contractors over the past week. One estimate was \$60,000 - \$75,000. Another was around \$128,000 which he thought was very high. He said they also confirmed the alternative option of main extension was a minimum of \$500,000. He said there may be many unknown conditions to address in the street when installing a main extension.

Ms. Wasserman said she appreciated the effort to try to get some estimates. She said the board doesn't usually get into comparing with costs of different options so much, but in this case where that's being used as the main reason or is one of the main reasons for the proposed option, she wished there was better information.

Ms. Randall asked what is driving the cost of the pipe extension because is it still the same length of pipe.

Mr. Pollard said it is a number of factors. To design a pipe out in the right-of-way puts you into the SDOT SIMP or street improvement permit. It's a very lengthy process. It's got a lot of requirements that come with it.

Ms. Randall asked if there is no stormline extension, is there no SIMP, and no need to open up 17th Avenue E at all?

Mr. Pollard said they will have a SIMP Lite, and that is because ADA sidewalk improvements are required at the street corner.

Ms. Randall said she understands the project perspective, it is just odd to see a storm line running through the basement of a building. She said she didn't have a good frame of reference for how that impacts the landmark, not just in the present but also for risk in the future. Who else at the city reviews plans to run storm lines through the basements of buildings?

Mr. Pollard said it is a whole game. He said he has done many projects in Seattle. He has only run a storm line under a building one other time. He reiterated the jurisdiction of other City Departments and King County.

Ms. Wasserman said obviously a lot of agencies and a lot of departments involved in this project. She said she wanted to make sure that she is seeing facts and that this drainage and solution is for the proposed new building next door to the north and not for the landmarked La Quinta building. Is that correct?

Mr. Pollard said that is correct. Although they've considered tying rainwater collection from La Quinta roof into this line. He said it currently seeps into the ground.

Ms. Wasserman said she doesn't do the legal documents, but she understands the comment about underground utilities being exempt for some of the process is intended for La Quinta utilities. This is different where you are proposing to merge a new development with the landmark property. She said it is complicated.

Mr. Pollard concurred and said it's not their first choice, but the only viable option they think they have.

Ms. Randall said her concern is mostly about long term risk to the landmark if there is a backup or an issue in the storm line.

Mr. Macleod asked if this drain is required because of the size of the new construction. He said that this routing would only be possible because they merged the sites into one parcel. He asked if the new proposed building was on its own, not connected to the tax parcel that La Quinta sits on would this have been required.

Mr. Pollard said the main extension would certainly be required if the development was independent from the landmark parcel. He said they would have proposed much smaller development like townhomes.

Mr. Macleod said the only other property similar to this I can think of with a new development, kind of built around a historic property was Canterbury Court up in the U-district. He did not recall how that worked.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked how does the \$400,000 delta compares to the relative cost of the project?

Mr. Pollard reiterated the utility bids he received. He did not provide the whole project cost.

Mr. Inpanbutr said the high costs doesn't necessarily make the project unviable. He understands that there's a major difference but doesn't mean it's completely out of the question.

Mr. Pollard said the \$500,000 utility main extension cost will kill the proposed building project. He said it provides a long-term income stream that helps La Quinta.

Mr. Inpanbutr said there is an element of risk. He said he realized they are mitigating it by putting up more sturdy cast iron piping through the basement portion but this still does represent an element of risk to the landmark building. He said he is concerned about it.

Mr. Pollard said the Romans have been putting pipes under buildings for thousands of years and La Quinta has many pipes that run under it. He said that if the worst-case scenario happened and there was a leak, this would be occurring in a concrete basement, and there would be leak detection and an alarm to go off.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said there was public comment about La Quinta being in a fragile state. She was wondering about potential construction impacts.

Mr. Pollard said he read the comments and thought some of it was embellished. He said there is a lot of deferred maintenance or a lack of maintenance since this this new owner took over two or three years ago. He said they are planning some maintenance for the building. He had a structural engineer assess the concrete and they did provide a certification that the concrete is sound and there are no challenges or any risk to the building by running the pipe through the walls of the basement.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked and the other elements of the building as well?

Mr. Pollard said he didn't think large and heavy equipment was necessary for the trenching. He doesn't think the building is so fragile. He said cosmetically the building is not looking too hot right now and it does need to be cleaned up. He didn't think we were looking at a house of cards that was going to fall over.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked Mr. Pollard to clarify if that was his opinion, or that of a consultant.

Mr. Pollard said a structural engineer looked at the concrete and the foundation, but did not ask the consultants if the building would fall over if we ran a pipe through the courtyard.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about potential damage, not falling over, just to clarify the extent of concern.

Mr. Pollard thinks it is a standard utility installation aside from the basement work. He said they could have inadvertent damage but will repair it. He did not expect cracking windows or falling items.

Ms. Wasserman said there are a lot of uncertainties and remains concerned. She appreciates new affordable housing, but said the Landmarks Board needs to focus on protecting the Landmark. She said the alternative utility routing is a crazy high cost, but hears Ms. Pheasant-Reis's concerns and agrees that unexpected bad things can happen. The fact that this utility is not to serve La Quinta makes it unusual.

Mr. Schmitt shared the concerns that Ms. Wasserman voiced. He asked about the incentives that are part of the landmarks process. He asked if there was a way to avoid impacts.

Mr. Pollard asked if there's some sort of third-party monitor or inspector type person that they could propose to oversee things beyond just the crew manager. He did not explain what Landmark incentive he had been referencing.

Ms. Doherty agreed that having a third-party observe construction would be helpful.

Mr. Schmitt said it was not as much concern about the initial work being done, but the long-term risk about having that in a historic building. He said ideas to reduce or alleviate the risk in some way.

Ms. Randall said leak detection is a great tool already and has been proposed. She said having a provision for required additional third-party oversight during installation to make sure there are no issues with the install with the installed piping. She said would like someone to confirm that the other public entities that have oversight over this will also have inspections before the line is put into service. There is a fair amount of oversight that comes with utilities, even private utilities that are being constructed for large scale buildings. She thought that leak detection is good, and knowing the pipe is not pressurized. She wondered if there was anything that could be designed downstream as sort of a flow protection in case there's some sort of backup in in the main to prevent undue amounts of water backing up into the system.

Mr. Pollard said it's important to note the storm water is just fresh clean water, there are no solids in it. The point of the pump on the high side of the system is that everything from the pump can flow downwards through gravity.

Mr. Macleod said his concerns really echo some of Ms. Wasserman's concerns. He understands there are multiple layers of regulatory agencies that are reviewing this for technical issues, but is still concerned with the

myriad risk both in construction and potentially in the future. Also, as Ms. Wasserman this is shortcutting through the landmarked property without directly benefiting it. This is not proposed as part of an adaptive reuse or rehabilitation of the historic apartment building itself. This is for a new building that may potentially subsidize the Landmark financially, but the idea of tunneling through the building for another building is uncomfortable. He was undecided on the proposal.

Ms. Wasserman said she wouldn't be able to support the proposal.

Mr. Pollard said the gutters on La Quinta are in rough shape and asked if it would help if the owner were to update the gutters on and tie them into the storm line so that the storm line serves both La Quinta and the new building to the north.

Mr. Macleod said it would not hurt, but said the board would need to see an updated proposal. He said his concerns are bigger picture on how to treat a historic property, more than the nuts and bolts of where the water goes.

Mr. Schmitt said he would be in favor of improving La Quinta and incorporating that into this proposal, and would like to see the documents updated.

Ms. Randall said she understands the financial issue and recognizes this is now a combined site with the existing building and new one proposed, and that having a private stormwater system that serves the whole property may be reasonable.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis agreed with some of Ms. Randall's comments. But she was still concerned that this landmark was purchased in order to combine parcels and use it for a new building, rather than thinking about how to improve the landmark through upgrades and repairs. She is interested in seeing renovation or restoration of La Quinta. Saying that that new construction is going to help benefit the landmark in the future gives no guarantee that it will actually happen. She said the property could be sold and no work done on the landmark. So, the landmarks takes all of the risk. It is receiving no current benefit, while providing financial benefit to the other building.

Ms. Wasserman said she was not in favor of this proposal as laid out and agreed with Ms. Pheasant-Reis. She said she would need to see real details and real in-depth work if they proposed improvements to La Quinta. She said she didn't think it's something that can be modified in the proposal on the fly at least to her satisfaction.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis concurred with Ms. Wasserman and said it is common for the Board to see a balance of changes where one thing may be lost something else is improved.

Ms. Wasserman agreed that there are trade-offs by their nature and it is not a bad thing, it just needs to be carefully done.

Mr. Schmitt agreed and said he would like to see a different approach as is current thinking was leaning towards saying no.

Ms. Caton said a proposal that provides more benefit to the historic structure is good, including potentially the tying in of the gutters. But she would need to better understand that proposal in more detail, including how that new trenching would impact the existing paving and tree roots, because that would be trenching in a lot more locations.

Mr. Macleod agreed with Ms. Pheasant-Reis that he would like to see how this works with improvements for the Landmark. He said he understood Ms. Randall's perspective as well that on the flip side, this is now one parcel, it's functionally one site. It is common to share utilities but conversely, they're functionally two buildings at this point and perhaps a different proposal might persuade him otherwise, but this one doesn't yet.

Mr. Norman said he was recusing.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he is with the group that is not in favor of approval. He would like to see a more complete conditions assessment of the Landmark for what need to be addressed, rather than saying simply replacing the gutters and tying the downspouts to the storm line.

Mr. Macleod said he heard more people disapproving than approving, and thought it might better to table the application and give the applicant an opportunity to prepare more information.

Ms. Doherty said she has been listening carefully to everyone's thoughts and agreed with Mr. Macleod's assessment. She summarized the various requests she heard from the Board members. She asked Mr. Pollard if he would like to table the application and return with additional information to be responsive to the Board.

Mr. Pollard said that was the preferable option. He said he heard concerns and will come back with additional information.

Ms. Doherty said she is hearing a formal request to table the application. She said she will change the status of the record in the portal and put it back into correction so that Mr. Pollard can upload revised documents when he is ready, or request a briefing.

Mr. Pollard confirmed the request to table the application.

Tabled.

062624.6 BOARD BUSINESS