

## **SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Dept. Contact:</b>	<b>CBO Contact:</b>
Neighborhoods	Erin Doherty/206-684-0380	Nick Tucker/206-684-5847

### **1. BILL SUMMARY**

**Legislation Title:**

AN ORDINANCE relating to historic preservation; imposing controls upon the Stewart House, a landmark designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board under Chapter 25.12 of the Seattle Municipal Code, and adding it to the Table of Historical Landmarks contained in Chapter 25.32 of the Seattle Municipal Code.

**Summary and Background of the Legislation:**

The attached legislation acknowledges the designation of the Stewart House as a historic landmark by the Landmarks Preservation Board, imposes controls, grants incentives, and adds the Stewart House to the Table of Historical Landmarks contained in SMC Chapter 25.32. The legislation does not have a financial impact.

The Stewart House was built in 1931. It is located in the Endolyne/Arroyo Heights neighborhood of West Seattle, on the shore of Puget Sound. A Controls and Incentives Agreement has been signed by the owner and has been approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board. The controls in the agreement apply to the site, the exteriors of the house and apartment/garage, and portions of the house interior, but do not apply to any in-kind maintenance or repairs of the designated features.

### **2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Does this legislation have financial impacts to the City? ☐ Yes ☒ No

### **4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

- a. Please describe how this legislation may affect any departments besides the originating department.

No adverse effects anticipated.

- b. Does this legislation affect a piece of property? If yes, please attach a map and explain any impacts on the property. Please attach any Environmental Impact Statements, Determinations of Non-Significance, or other reports generated for this property.**

Yes, see attached map in Exhibit A. This legislation imposes controls upon the property, as outlined in the proposed landmark designation ordinance.

- c. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative.**

- i. How does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? How did you arrive at this conclusion? In your response please consider impacts within City government (employees, internal programs) as well as in the broader community.**

There are no known negative impacts on vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities.

- ii. Please attach any Racial Equity Toolkits or other racial equity analyses in the development and/or assessment of the legislation.**

This legislation is to codify the Controls & Incentives Agreement between the City Historic Preservation Officer and the owner of this Landmark property. There was no formal equity analysis undertaken for this property related to the language in the agreement, although we work with each property owner to strike a balance between preservation goals and continued operation of a property. Early in the landmarks process, separate from the negotiation of controls, DON Historic Preservation program staff review each landmark nomination application for completeness and provide detailed guidance to the author, to increase representation and accuracy of untold or misrepresented history.

- iii. What is the Language Access Plan for any communications to the public?**

A language access plan is not anticipated.

- d. Climate Change Implications**

- i. Emissions: How is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way? Please attach any studies or other materials that were used to inform this response.**

This legislation supports the sustainable practice of preserving historic buildings and their embodied energy. Reuse and restoration of a building or structure reduces the consumption of new natural resources, and the carbon emissions associated with new construction. Preservation also avoids contributing to the ever-growing landfills.

- ii. **Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle’s resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.**

Many historic buildings possess materials and craftsmanship that cannot be duplicated today. When properly maintained and improved, they will benefit future generations, and surpass the longevity of most of today’s new construction. They can also support upgraded systems for better energy performance, and these investments typically support local or regional suppliers, and labor industries.

- e. **If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program’s desired goal(s)? What mechanisms will be used to measure progress towards meeting those goals?**

No new initiative or programmatic expansion.

## 5. CHECKLIST

Please click the appropriate box if any of these questions apply to this legislation.

- ☐ **Is a public hearing required?**
- ☐ **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required?**
- ☐ **If this legislation changes spending and/or revenues for a fund, have you reviewed the relevant fund policies and determined that this legislation complies?**
- ☐ **Does this legislation create a non-utility CIP project that involves a shared financial commitment with a non-City partner agency or organization?**  
If yes, please review requirements in Resolution 31203 for applicability and complete and attach “Additional risk analysis and fiscal analysis for non-utility partner projects” form.

## 6. ATTACHMENTS

### Summary Attachments:

Summary Exhibit A – Vicinity Map of Stewart House