



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 414/21

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday September 1, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on agenda.

ROLL CALL

090121.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

090121.2 MEETING MINUTES

June 2, 2021
Tabled.

090121.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

090121.31 The Fairfax
1508 10th Avenue E
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to November 3, 2021. She said she has been working with the owners on a draft and additional time is needed.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of The Fairfax, 1508 10th Avenue E until November 3, 2021.

MM/SC/MI/DB 11:0:0 Motion carried.

090121.32 El Monterey
4204 11th Avenue NE

Ms. Doherty reviewed the signed agreement with the board. She said the language is common and noted that no Certificate of Approval would be needed for removal of trees, plantings, shrubs, perennials, except the significant trees per the list provided. She said administrative review is allowed for mechanical, electrical, and plumbing. She noted the awning cloth shades have been added and removed multiple times over the years and would be reviewed administratively as long as color is consistent, and all look similar.

Mr. Coney said it seems like the usual agreement. He said he was hoping to see incentives be provided to owners.

Ms. Doherty said they have been talking about the incentives.

Mr. Coney asked if TDR were available.

Ms. Doherty said that information had been relayed to owners as well. She said completing the Controls and Incentives is a required step to be able to use any financial incentives.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for The Monterey 4204 11th Avenue NE.

MM/SC/RUS/ROI 11:0:0 Motion carried.

090121.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090121.41

Original Van Asselt School

7201 Beacon Avenue S

Briefing on proposed addition to 1909 school building and site improvements

Mr. Inpanbutr and Ms. Caton recused themselves.

Ethan Bernau, Seattle Public Schools introduced the project and explained how it works on the Original Van Asselt (OVA) site. He said the school is an interim location for students when their school is undergoing renovation or being replaced. He said the school site serves a historically underserved population. He said the project will expand the capacity to upgrade the learning environment and will serve up to 1000 students. He said they will expose the character of the 1909 building and they will rehabilitate and occupy the historic building.

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects said seven options were developed for ARC and board review. He reviewed early site plan from original 1909 building and noted the right of way, and nearby community center and church.

Options explored.

- A. 3-stories behind the 1909 building, plus gym. *Overwhelmed the landmark and the remote gym was a safety issue.*
- B. 2-story academic wing on south side of landmark. *Too big.*
- C. 3-story addition with more space in front of 1909 building. *C-1 Preferred.*
- D. Move 1909 building; it would remain boarded up and unused. *Moves landmark from original location and sits as a shell, unused and unrepaired.*
- E. 1909 building untouched, unused, and unrepaired.
- E.1 1909 building untouched, unused, and unrepaired, new addition to south of landmark. *Blocks view of landmark.*
- E.2 1909 building untouched, unused, and unrepaired. Extension of 1950's building.

Mr. McConachie said the preferred option is C-1: rehabilitate and reuse the 1909 building, 2-story addition on south edge of property line, space in front of landmark, gaskets around building. He reviewed the rendering showing location of future portables pulled away from the 1909 building. He said the Controls and Incentives document shows the controlled area. He provided proposed interior and exterior scope of work to the 1909 building including: window restoration, patch and replacement of damaged wood siding, fascia boards, and wood trim with in-kind material; painting siding, fascia boards, and wood trim; paint concrete foundation walls; replace exterior doors to match original flush door and half-light with hardware per district standards; remove three exterior modern light fixtures from the face of the building; building will be illuminated with light posts; and preserve existing sign "Van Asselt Public School".

He said chalkboards will be retained in classrooms, a white board will be installed on top. He said ceiling tiles and plaster will be removed and replaced with new drywall and acoustic treatment. He said new light fixtures, power and data will be installed

throughout; some exposed wiring may be required. He said that minor seismic work and mechanical equipment will be done. He said doors will be replaced with fire rated doors. New plywood shear wall will be attached to existing studs and wallboard will have plaster veneer. He said a new mechanical soffit will be installed at west wall. He said most finishes will be maintained at the first-floor stairwell.

Mr. McConachie explained landscape design will honor original entry. Water retention is planned with species within bio-retention area selected for seasonal tolerance of both wet and dry conditions. He said exceptional trees will be retained and new Gingko trees added. He said paving will include some asphalt and some concrete with plaza and entry drive designed to accentuate the symmetry of the 1909 Building. He said benches and bike racks will be added. He provided comparison photos – original and existing - of the 1909 building. He said color palette will be neutral with stucco in dormer slightly darker as it was originally. He said wood siding and trim would be lighter. He said metal clad windows are proposed for new addition in darker beige tones, so the landmark stands out. He said color would break down the scale of the addition.

Ms. McKinney noted Gingko tree and asked if landscape plan considered heat levels / drought tolerance.

Mr. McConachie said Gingko tree is adaptive. He said planting areas are water retention sites and all suggest that planting is designed for its use.

Amanda Hoehn, Bassetti said drought tolerant and low maintenance native plants were incorporated into plant standard.

Ms. McKinney expressed concern about how the trees will survive. She said the Gingko seems good, but she was not sure about everything else.

Mr. Macleod said the project looks nice and has evolved well. He asked for clarification of the shear wall.

Mr. McConachie said it is a minor insertion, plywood cladding over existing studs. Responding to clarifying questions, he said parking will be added at the northwest corner of the site, not at the 1909 building.

Ms. Hoehn responded to question about the new addition and said there are a couple break out locations for outdoor learning with a good landscape buffer between school and adjacent residences. She said landscaping was enhanced for outdoor seating, roll up doors open the classroom to the outdoors.

Ms. Chang asked if there would be a full seismic upgrade on the 1909 building.

Mr. McConachie said seismic upgrade will be to Code.

Ms. Chang asked if the shear wall would connect to the exterior of the building.

Mr. McConachie said no, hold down connectors would be used at floor, roof and foundation.

Ms. Doherty said the structural drawings are included in the plan set and show the overall intent if that would be helpful.

Ms. Chang said she reviewed the. She appreciated that the project would extend the life of a building that sat unused for so long.

Mr. Norman asked if the gym would be connected to the 1909 building and to clarify the flow.

Mr. McConachie said the corridor serves as a gasket between the two buildings.

Mr. Bernau said some seismic improvements were made to the 1909 building in the 1990's which is why current seismic plans are limited.

Ms. Hoehn said the other gasket allows for exit to playfield.

Ms. Doherty said on sheet A3-21 the building section shows that the gasket is circulation between 1909 building and new addition.

Mr. Coney said this school is a temporary, interim location. He asked what is planned for the building after that.

Ms. Hoehn said the building will be an interim location for the next 50 years.

Mr. Coney said it is the only interim site in south Seattle.

Mr. Bernau said this school property has been an interim site for several years.

Mr. Macleod asked if there are plans for future additions and if there is capacity to expand.

Mr. Bernau said the advantage of this plan is that it allows for future changes elsewhere on the site though nothing is envisioned at this time.

Ms. Doherty said the Staff Report is written for a motion that reflects the factors in the Code.

Ms. Wasserman supported the project and said she has watched it from the beginning. She was adamant the 1909 building must be rehabilitated and reused. She suggested an interpretive plaque or signage. She said lots of thought has gone into this project and the team has been responsive to board comments.

Mr. Barnes supported the project. He said the 1909 building is not being used now and, agreeing with Ms. Wasserman, said the building should be occupied. He said you don't see many buildings like this in the South Seattle landscape.

Ms. Chang said she supported the project and appreciated Ms. Wasserman's comments about the 1909 building being used. She said it is shocking to see a significant building boarded up just sitting there. She said this is a great project.

Mr. Rodezno said the presentation was informative and that he supported the project. He said the 1909 building needs to be used. He said the school is unusable now, this project will give it new life.

Mr. Macleod said reuse of the 1909 building is a priority and he is glad it will not be relocated elsewhere on the property. He said it is an awkward site and the addition is sensitive and good architecture that respects the landmark. He said the project is permanent and non-transitory.

Mr. Coney said he did not support the project and noted the Secretary of Interior's Standards that state that alterations or additions to historic building are not recommended when needs could be met in other ways. He said the 1909 building is obscured. He didn't agree with the comment that options D or E would prevent restoration of the 1909 building. He said the site is landmarked so any building would have to be reviewed by the board. He said the new project – clad in metal-looks like a storage building or warehouse. He said the 1909 building won't survive another ten years. He said Seattle Public Schools is notorious for not maintaining their buildings. He preferred no addition to the 1909 building; there are other options. He cited other landmarked schools as better examples of use: John Hay School, John Allen, Latona, and Seward. He said the new addition surrounds the 1909 building; it's low-quality, and its metal cladding doesn't work for him.

Ms. McKinney said she agreed with the points made, and was confused that the elegance and simplicity of the 1909 building is not visible from all locations.

Mr. Lawrence appreciated Mr. Coney's comments. He said integration of old and new has to be possible from a practicality standpoint. He supported the project, noting otherwise the 1909 building would remain boarded up.

Ms. Johnson said she appreciated all comments. She said it is unusual that the 1909 landmark building and the 1950s building are both oriented to the street differently. She said the scale of the addition is big, but she noted the primacy of the 1909 building and the orientation of the drive/approach. She supported the project.

Mr. Macleod supported the project.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the exterior and interior rehabilitation, new building addition, and site/landscape alterations at the Original Van Asselt School, 7201 Beacon Avenue S, as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

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 Controls and Incentives Agreement (LPB 345/21).*
 - a. While the proposal includes a major addition on the west and south sides of the 1909 building, the height, scale, materials, and character of the addition are meant to be subservient to the historic building, and visually highlight its importance.
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 team presented informal design briefings to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and Landmarks Board (Board) throughout the development of the project's design, and received positive feedback from the majority of Board members present, including the following meetings:
 - 1) ARC – August 28, 2020
 - 2) Board – October 7, 2020
 - 3) ARC – November 11, 2020
 - 4) ARC – March 12, 2021
 - b. The applicant presented five massing options, including additions in different locations and some that were taller than the proposed addition. Two options did not touch the historic school and proposed no rehabilitation of the Landmark. One of the options proposed moving the school building out to the street. The majority of informal Board member feedback supported the shorter 2-story addition that engaged the building and supported rehabilitation and reuse of the landmark. The majority of Board feedback supported leaving the historic 1909 building in its original location, so that its relationship to the street and approach by students remained unchanged. The preferred option that emerged from the early briefings was refined through additional meeting briefings to become the proposed design in this application.
3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 E, *for Seattle School District property that is in use as a public school facility, educational specifications.*
 - a. The proposed classroom and gym addition are needed to accommodate the increased student population proposed for the property, and meet the criteria outlined in the Seattle Public Schools educational specifications. This campus will house students from numerous public schools that are being rehabilitated or replaced as part of the BEX V (5) Levy.
4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and D are not applicable.

5. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic 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/HW/ROI 7:2:2 Motion carried. Mr. Coney and Ms. McKinney opposed, Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr recused themselves.

090121.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator