



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 166/22

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, May 4, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Taber Caton

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

**050422.1 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Judy Smith spoke in support of nomination of the Steinhart Theriault Anderson Office Building. She said the building stands out and is on an irregular lot which likely couldn't have been used for a standard building. She said the building is eye-popping and was like a live billboard. She said it resembles Paul Hayden Kirk's Blair House. She said to keep alive this important architectural period.

Ms. Johnson said much public comment had been received via email.

**050422.2 MEETING MINUTES**

March 16, 2022  
Tabled.

**050422.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

050422.31 John Stanford International School / Latona Elementary School  
401 NE 42nd Street  
Proposed mural

Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself.

Colleen Weinstein, Seattle Public Schools explained the project was initiated by an on-site provider. Mural will be painted this summer by students either onto the wall or plywood sheets. She said there is no color palette yet, but colors will likely be bright.

Mr. Norman said it looks good.

Ms. Johnson said the mural will go on the addition and not the historic building. She had no preference of painting on the wall versus plywood sheets.

Ms. McKinney said it will be an improvement. She said John Stanford was a family friend and she went to his funeral which had a horse-drawn carriage and trumpet salute. She said it is a very human and humane memory for a general. She said it makes her happy.

Mr. Barnes asked if a graffiti coating will be applied.

Ms. Weinstein said it will, as it is a requirement.

Ms. Wasserman supported the application and said it is a nice memory. She said it looks good and she had no preference on wall versus plywood application.

Mr. Macleod supported the project and said he loved it. He said either surface application was OK; he suggested plywood as it could be relocated if need be.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed mural at the John Stanford International School / former Latona Elementary School, 401 NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed mural does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, and in compliance with SMC 25.12.750.A.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/LN 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself.

050422.41 University of Washington Faculty Club  
4020 E Stevens Way  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained she is actively negotiating with the UW representative, Julie Blakeslee. She said they are making minor changes to the landscape language. She said the site plan in the nomination is not appropriate to use as an exhibit and she is helping them make a different site plan exhibit. She said a three-month extension is requested.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the University of Washington Faculty Club, 4020 E. Stevens Way for three months.

MM/SC/IM/DB 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself.

050422.42 Evans Pool  
7201-7359 E Green Lake Drive N  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained she prepared a draft and submitted it to Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPAR). She noted that David Graves from Parks said they are now reconsidering what to do with the property now that a portion of the building is a landmark. She said SPAR is planning to do feasibility studies and re-work of design. She said SPAR doesn't have funds at this time and needs additional time to do that work. SPAR will come back and provide design briefings. She requested three months and said more will likely be needed.

Mr. Barnes suggested making the extension longer.

Mr. Inpanbutr said a six-month extension seems reasonable.

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

MM/SC/MI/IM 9:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Chang abstained.

Ms. Johnson left the meeting at 4:00pm; Mr. Inpanbutr took over as Chair.

**050422.5 NOMINATION**

050422.51 Steinhart Theriault Anderson Office Building  
1264 Eastlake Avenue E

Ms. Doherty said the building was nominated by an outside party and the owner Robert Breskovich would provide comments following the nominators' presentation.

Eugenia Woo, DoCoMoMoWeWa said it is one of her favorite buildings in Seattle and it has been on the Eastlake Modernism tour. She thanked the current owners for being great stewards. She said she wants to see the building preserved for the future and noted they also nominated the Pacific Architect and Builder, and Shannon & Wilson buildings as landmarks.

*Full report in DON file.*

Susan Boyle provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the building represents mid-1950s construction and has been noted by Nyberg Steinbrueck, city historic resources survey, and DAHP. She said the building has been featured on the Eastlake Modernism Tour with a number of other special low-rise modernist buildings and is one of many professional design offices.

She said the building has a concrete foundation, rubble stone, wide flange edge beams, glu-lam roof, redwood screens and post and beam. She said the building is of simple construction but is inventive and innovative. She noted the mahogany panels inside, wood trim and diffusing ceiling. She said several drawings were signed by Steinhart, Theriault, and Anderson and noted the simple abstract design translated with Pacific Northwest material. She noted the greater transparency from east to west. She said mudslides were common during the construction of I-5; because of the siting and design this building had no problem. She said there has been much new construction in Eastlake and this building contrasts with other buildings.

She said Steinhart and Theriault were previously involved with other firms before forming their architectural partnership. Anderson joined the firm and became a partner four years after graduation. She said open space was designed for collaborative work the redwood screened the west sun. She said the building is intact and she recognized the good stewardship of owners and occupants over the years. She said the landscape is now more rugged and of a northwest quality; not as pruned as it had once been. She said stones embedded in paving of parking lot provide extra naturalism. Off the entry is a screened deck. She noted the simple tube steel railings and said the original courtyard had been filled infilled. She noted the redwood strip screening.

Ms. Boyle said other work by this firm includes multiple schools including Highline, Mercer, and Shoreline, West Seattle dental office, The Swedish Club, St. Paul Episcopal Church, Rainier Golf and Country Club, and churches. She said comparable Modern Style buildings include Shannon & Wilson, Labor Union Building, Control Building and University of Washington Faculty Club. Comparable buildings in Eastlake include the Egan House, Kirk Apartment Building, Kirk's office, El-Mec Building, Pacific Architect and Builder building.

Ms. Boyle said the nomination was written by volunteers including the Eastlake council and community. She said the owner has been gracious and has been a fabulous steward.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the outstanding presentation. He said the building seems not to have changed much and asked about any modifications.

Ms. Boyle said there has been some adjustment to the courtyard space but nothing else.

Mr. Macleod said he appreciated the photos. He asked who did the original landscape.

Ms. Boyle said there is no indication of a landscape architect. She said it was a simple design with materials typical of northwest and evergreen.

Ms. Chang said the building is unique and noted there is lots of space around it with little encroachment. She noted new construction across the street and asked if there were impacts to the building during drilling etc.

Ms. Boyle said the building to the east was demolished at some point. She said she didn't know of any impacts from vibration or construction.

Mr. Norman said it is a beautiful building and one of his favorite styles of Seattle architecture.

#### Owner Comments

Bob Breskovich said he purchased the building in 2009. He said while he appreciated why the building should be designated, he didn't agree. He said if designated, it is not fair without compensation to the property owner for the public good. He said the public should compensate owner for the loss in value. He said an addition off the parking lot was done in the 1980s; that was probably the courtyard. He said to the west Alex Real Estate built a parking lot with no impact to the building. He said over the last six months there has been problem with homeless camps under the freeway and the building has been broken into twice. He said the tenants are good but if he can't solve this problem, they probably won't renew their lease.

Mr. Norman asked if it is commercial.

Mr. Breskovich said it is an office building. He said he purchased it as an investment. He said it is worth \$5 million today and \$1 million tomorrow.

Ms. McKinney expressed concern about break ins and adjacent camping area and asked how the owner is protecting the building.

Mr. Breskovich said they are thinking of putting up a security gate, but it would cost \$10,000 which is too much so he wasn't sure. He noted people have camped beneath the deck.

Ms. McKinney said the building could retain its value.

Mr. Breskovich noted recent police activity and someone with a gun at the adjacent homeless camp.

Mr. Norman said designation could help value. He noted that a developer couldn't knock it down to achieve maximum value. He said designation wouldn't preclude some development and there are ways to work with a designated property.

Mr. Breskovich said they are not developers.

*Ms. Johnson returned to meeting at 4:41 pm.*

John Hempelmann, Cairncross & Hempelmann, the owner's attorney said he appreciated the landmarks board and city staff efforts. He appreciates Seattle's history and has seen the city grow and change. He said he represents Mr. Breskovich and he represented Mr. Breskovich's parents. He said that Mr. Breskovich is a great steward of the building. He said there is no immediate risk of development of that site so there is no rush. He said he has worked with a lot of developers and architects that have addressed landmarked buildings. He said this site is not big enough for that to happen. He said today 70-75 units of housing could be built on this site. He said the value is not in preservation or designation of the building but in tenants / buyers who recognize its value. He said designation reduces the pool of potential buyers and value. He said historic preservation is important but one of few areas of American jurisprudence where public good is laid on private owners without compensation. He said everyone needs to come together to take aggressive action to compensate property owners; in this condition mom and pop owners of this building. He said it is a burden on owners who are concerned about retirement nest egg. He said it is unfortunate that Eastlake is not a sending area for TDR. He appreciated Eugenia Woo's discussion with OPCD about potential incentives. He said historic preservation leadership and advocacy with other sister departments in the city to at least create a TDR sending option for every building in the city nominated and designated as a landmark. He said this owner, especially in Eastlake, should be a designated sending area. He said to be creative and think of other ways to compensate owners. He thanked Ms. Doherty. He said the owner needs help if designated to minimize controls and maximize incentives although there is not too much there. He said Ms. Doherty said she would work with the owner to negotiate the controls. He said the Breskovichs need the board's help and understanding.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the presentation and the fantastic stewardship of the building by the owners. He said it is good to hear from owners and he thanked the owner for

being present. He said he understands concerns and challenges of maintaining a building especially outside pressures of unwanted visitors and how to keep an investment property working. He noted the need to balance private enterprise with public good. He said he supported nomination and that this building 'checks all the boxes' and is a landmark in the most literal sense. He said it is the northwest equivalent of Philip Johnson Glass House, it jumps out as passing it. He said it is representative of architectural diversity in this small narrow neighborhood. He said the building is remarkably intact and would meet criteria D, E and F. He said he was not familiar with Steinhart Theriault & Anderson. He asked how secure the building is and noted there were security issues in his own office. He said the board is accommodating and likes to work with property owners. He noted the net value benefit of preserving the building.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the presentation and said it was well done. She said there was lots of discussion about needed action on issues, but the board's purview is the building and whether it qualifies and a landmark. She said she loves the building and that she agrees with staff report; she supported nomination and said it meets the requirements. She said to landmark the building while bringing up owner comments and requested actions.

Mr. Inpanbutr agreed and said that he appreciated the owner's perspective and that it is good to share. He said he was sympathetic of the pickle the owner was in but that it was not the board's place to weigh in. He said the board's purview is the building. He said the building embodies its style. He supported nomination. He said he wished there were a way to make everyone happy; designation should be celebrated, not a penalty.

Mr. Norman supported nomination and noted the horizontal slats and glass. He said it is a cool building. He said he remembers walking the neighborhood in his childhood. He said he is a property owner and landlord and is open to changes and preservation of the building's integrity. He said he wants designation to be prestigious, not a punishment and better education is needed. He said designation is not an obstacle.

Mr. Barnes concurred with his colleagues. He appreciated the unique style and said it isn't seen much. He said new buildings look like boxes.

Ms. McKinney concurred with her colleagues. She said the building is unique and the style is not seen much. She said it is reminiscent of her childhood as well. She said she wanted to make certain that the building is protected. She said it is lovely in a simple and strange way and she noted how it just floats there. She said it is an interesting, lovely, simple Seattle building.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and the owner's comments. She said it is impactful to understand the scenarios behind each project even though outside of their purview. She said some projects are the focus of politics and campaigns with landmarking as a last stand against development. She said that is not the role being taken here. She said she is neither an architect nor historian but follows the Code. She said she wants to learn more and supported the nomination. She said it fits the criteria and she wants to hear more dialog amongst the board members.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and said it will be interesting to hear the deliberations at the designation meeting. He said he wants to learn more. He said he has been by the property many times. He agreed with the owner statement and that leadership is needed in securing favorable outcomes. He said TDR is only available in some areas of the city which is odd because it could alleviate potential burden. He said TDR should be citywide. He said designation should be seen as an honor. He said there are many other avenues of recourse.

Mr. Schmitt supported nomination and called the building an 'eye-stopper'. He said the building is Modernist but with Pacific Northwest spin / take. He said the slats are catching and he noted the simplicity and quality of the design. He recognized the building's public benefit.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and said it is hard to make a simple building. She noted the building is modest but amazing with slats and cantilevers and meets Criterion D. She said the board has to follow Code and said the building meets architectural criteria. She said the board tends to be pragmatic about changes. She agreed that citywide TDR would be a huge benefit and it is good that advocacy groups are working on it. She wished for real incentives for property owners.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Steinhart Theriault & Anderson Office Building at 1264 Eastlake Avenue E for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site, and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 15, 2022; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/IM/HW 10:0:0 Motion carried.

Eugenia Woo asked board members what additional information they wanted.

Mr. Coney said he wants to further review the landmark application and hear board discussion / comment.

Ms. Chang concurred.

Ms. Boyle suggested the board discuss TDR.

Ms. Doherty asked to leave that discussion for another time. She said the TDR process is out of the Board's hands, but that she can continue to help address the owner's questions.

Mr. Barnes asked for more information about any modifications that have been done to the building. He asked for more information about the uniqueness of the style from a historical perspective.

On a separate matter, Ms. Sodt reported that the Governor was planning to lift the proclamation regarding the Open Public Meetings Act and meetings would go to a hybrid format starting in June. She said meetings will be staffed in a physical location with a virtual option. She said the Boards and Commission room has been equipped with technology for Webex hybrid meetings. She said staff have started testing.

Mr. Macleod said meeting virtually is helpful.

Ms. Sodt said the board can attend virtually.

Mr. Barnes said he attended just one meeting before lockdown.

Ms. Sodt said they are working on ways to try to make it easy for everyone to access and participate and to minimize background noise. She said setting parameters such as identifying oneself when speaking will be more important in a hybrid meeting. Staff will poll board members on meeting preference – in person or virtual. Proof of vaccination and submission of an attestation form is required in advance of attendance.

Meeting adjourned at 5:23 pm.