



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 29/21

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday January 20, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

Matt Inpanbutr

Jordon Kiel

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kristen Johnson

Chair Jordan Kiel 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 below.

ROLL CALL

012021.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

Lorne McConachie spoke in support of designation of the Hahn Building. He said he struggled early on but said the building has the ability to convey its significance. He said on the land use sign the concept structure is a mid-rise tower on a base reminiscent of the Hahn Building. He said even the developer recognized and

replicated the form of this building. He said the building should be preserved and revitalized and owner should work with development team to ensure this quiet support building continues to play its role at the entrance to the Pike Place Market (Market).

Lisa Connelly spoke in support of designation of the Hahn Building. She said the building is at the crossroads at the entrance to the Market which is one of the best-known historic districts in the country. She noted the working-class history of those who built the City and Nation and said SROs like the Hahn Building housed these workers. She cited George Bailey in 'It's a Wonderful Life': "...that this rabble you're talking about, they do most of the working and paying and living and dying in this community. Well, is it too much to have them work and pay and live and die in a couple of decent rooms and a bath?" She said the Market was created when wealthy middlemen wanted to raise the costs too high. She said the Hahn Building was built before the Market. She said you feel different walking down the street from Target and know you have arrived.

Gabriel Brant spoke in opposition to designation of the Hahn Building and said he is a resident of the adjacent Newmark Building. He said the building has been reviewed twice before and failed both times. He said the building doesn't rise to standard of a landmark which should be a high standard. He said the building doesn't meet criteria and it doesn't relate to the Market, it is only across the street. He said with the new Waterfront, more diversity of architecture is beneficial.

Jean Sherrard, Pacific Northwest Columnist spoke in support of designation of the Hahn Building. He said the upper stories of the building were constructed after the Market came into being and before the Alaska Yukon Exposition (AYE). He said the modest size complements the Market. He said the three-story building is a mediation between and a transitional step down from the others that tower behind it. He noted the light and openness enhances the Market. He said the loss of the Hahn Building would unhinge that.

Barry Blanton spoke in opposition to the designation of the Hahn Building. He said nomination/designation was denied twice and nothing has changed since. He said changes made negatively impacted the architecture. He said in 1999, the board voted no, noting there was not enough to meet criteria D or F. He said in 2014 review the board denied nomination because of the 1980 remodel and said the Hahn is a background building only. He said the Staff Report recommends denying designation. He said the National Register deemed the building not critical.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle spoke in support of designation of the Hahn Building. She said the building meets criteria C and F. She said Criterion F is strong as the building is easily identifiable in the neighborhood. She noted the close proximity to the gateway of Market. She said 1st and Pike is one of the most iconic intersections in the City. She said the original 1970 National Register Nomination included the east side of 1st. She said that National Park Services' seven aspects of integrity uses the word "or" in determining the ability to convey significance. She said there is no faux historicism as the previous work done on the building is compatible.

Jim Graham, architect spoke in opposition to designation of the Hahn Building. Regarding Criterion F, he said the Hahn Building is just a background building and

doesn't rise to level of significance. He said the building blends in. He said that street activation is important and now the building is more of a liability than an asset to the Market. He said a new building will relate to the scale of the Market and the change in scale in area.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society said the Hahn Building is at the gateway of the Market, at the most used historic intersection in City. He said in Victor Steinbrueck's sketch, the Hahn Building sits at the gateway. The Hahn Building was constructed about the same time as the market and meets Criterion C. He said 14 years ago he learned the critical importance of buffer buildings on edge of high density. He said over time those buildings increase in importance because they provide a buffer. He said Queen Anne Historical Society supports designation.

Tiffany Jorgenson, Friends of Belltown spoke in support of designation of the Hahn Building. She said the building meets criteria C and F and is an identifiable feature of 1st Avenue. She said the pedestrian zones bring millions to the City. She said the building is associated with the economic boom after the Klondike Gold Rush. She said the Hahn Building was constructed in anticipation of the AYE when hotels looked like office buildings. She said the 1980 changes were funded by a grant from the City. The work matched the style and is complementary.

Claire Giordano opposed designation of the Hahn Building. She said the area is zone for 45' and landmarking should justify taking away the ability to add density. She said this building does not. She said the Newmark is 240' tall and some residents will lose views; views are not a right but a privilege that can be taken away. She said the building was denied landmark status twice before.

Sara Patton, Friends of the Market (FOM) spoke in support of designation of the Hahn Building and said FOM led the campaign to save the Market. She said the building has framed the Market since its beginning and retains integrity and character to convey its function. She said the building has sufficient integrity to convey significance. She said Criterion C is met because of the rich culture of commerce and community of this site as a gathering point; she noted it was a gathering point the day of the Great Fire of 1889. She said it meets Criterion F being at this intersection that has always been a place of special importance. She said the buildings on all corners shape the space of the intersection and entry to the Market.

Tommy Trause opposed designation of the Hahn Building. He said the corner should be activated; the current building does nothing to enlighten and lift up the neighborhood. He supported redevelopment of the site.

Maggie Haines supported designation of the Hahn Building. She said it is integral to the historic atmosphere at the intersection and said it is an anchor of the intersection. She said new development will interrupt pedestrian flow and will block light to the Market. She said it is an iconic intersection.

Maria Batayola spoke in support of the Considine House / Cohen House / Immaculate Conception Church Convent on criteria A and B. She said when she first came to this country in 1964 she attended Immaculate Conception High School. She read some excerpts of "Transitions of the Central District".

In 1906, through Holy Names, sisters from St. Rose Academy opened the parish school in makeshift classrooms in the basement. In 1910 Father Carroll built a brick building to accommodate 500 students; a high school was started the next year. In 1919 the parish purchased the convent at 16th and Columbia for nineteen sisters teaching at the high school. Back then the area was mostly white middle class families, but by 1950's there was a change to the racial composition of the area: many white families moved out, and black families moved in and were joined by Filipino and Japanese families. She said during this time the high school enrollment grew and it kept on until the school closed in 1971.

She said it is significant; the sisters who took a vow of poverty and provided significant high-quality level of education of a private school standard for poor children and children of color. She said the nuns educated the kids to prepare them for life and inoculate them against the social ills of racism, sexism, poverty, so they could be their very best and walk their lives as faith in action. She said that is true because of the alumna that came out of the school:

Dr. Millie Russell, the first medical technician who graduated from the University of Washington; she created a program to expedite the entrance of African American kids to college by preparing them; Dr. Dorothy Cordova; Frances Terry, first black nurse; Liz Thomas, longtime educator for Odessa Brown who was the first black nurse practitioner; Judge Judy Hightower; Judge Vivian Luna; Captain John Hayes; Peter Bocho; Sister Rita who started Holy Names College, which became the Forthright College in the Yakima Nation; and Sister Kay Burton who started programs in Jonestown, Mississippi.

Ms. Batayola said it is not just about the building, but about the 19 nuns living in poverty and providing the greatest civil rights service which is equal education.

Kris Snider, Hewitt opposed designation of the Hahn Building. He said he was excited about the proposed building and its ability to engage with pedestrians at street level. He said the building does not meet Criterion F and noted changes to the building. He said the proposed building will bring vitality back to neighborhood with wider sidewalks for more pedestrian activity. He said the high glass will be more transparent and will allow more inside-outside connection.

Jenny Chapman, Ankor Moisan, the architectural firm with the proposed design at the site opposed designation. She said the Market spirit is important, but the building isn't a visibly identifiable feature and may detract with its blank and opaque façade. She supported replacing the existing building with an interactive building and opening an interface between the building and the Market. She said the proposed building is site-sensitive and will support the neighborhood.

012021.2

MEETING MINUTES

December 16, 2020

MM/SC/DB/RCO 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

012021.3

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

012021.31

Northwest Rooms / Du Pen Fountain

302 Harrison Street

Proposed alterations to lower plaza and fountain, new site and building signage, and removal and planting of trees

Gareth Loveridge, The Swift Company explained the three DuPen sculptures were removed and restored and will return to the space. He provided context of the site and noted changes were made to breezeway access and the water feature area was reduced. He said the water element will be a jet spray rather than a pool to meet health codes. He said the site will be accessible and provide safe sightlines. He said the design allows the space to be used in a new way. The space has a calm ground plane with sandblasted finish and doesn't compete with the geometry at the edge. He said visitors can be part of the fountain and art, and remain dry and enjoy the quietness of the space. He said the sculptures are the key components. He said they will bring in stone using granite forms that sculptures will sit on; soft edges will be maintained. He said granite forms will have smoother top for seating. He said three trees that were removed will be replaced 2-1 in this area. He said a previous bollard location was moved to the inside face of the courtyard so there will be no bollard until one begins to move into the space. He went over the planned plant-scape and lighting and noted lighting level will be controllable.

Mr. Loveridge said if they were to keep the water feature as it was previously with the pool, guard rails would have been required. He said instead they created a dry zone and the opportunity to go through jet sprays if that is desired. He said a variance to the health code requiring water feature be 100' of restroom was requested. He said there is no way to accommodate that. He said they have a massive existing restroom that works, and the county has accepted that; additional signage will direct people to the restroom. He identified signage locations and said the signage will be in the character of the new Arena wayfinding, so a new style type will not be introduced. He said the small, thin signs will project no more than 3"; he said the font and symbol size could change a bit.

Julia Levitt, Seattle Center explained that artwork from the 1980s was removed, leaving a blank wall. She said they brought in a graphic design firm to design signage on wall. She said the painted wall is pitted and uneven and they may need to apply a skim coat to provide a smoother surface to create clean lines for the graphic. She said the finished design will have two colors either in Dibond or preferred paint. She said two blade signs will call out the alcove entrance; signs will be attached with hidden fasteners. She thanked the board for their collaboration and support for this project.

Mr. Coney asked if the large restroom graphic has been tested from a distance and if it is readable.

Ms. Levitt said the restrooms are used mostly by unsheltered people now. She said they will do a printout to test the final look. She said the spacing of the dots could be changed to make it legible if needed.

Mr. Barnes asked about drainage for the spray jets.

Mr. Loveridge said there is a drain right in the middle and the whole space will drain to it.

Ms. Chang asked about blue line shown on slide.

Mr. Loveridge said it represents blue glass aggregate worked into the concrete surface.

Ms. Chang said she agreed with Mr. Coney about checking readability of restroom graphic.

Ms. Wasserman said they have done the best they could. She suggested checking readability of restroom sign. She supported the proposal.

Mr. Coney said he was happy how it turned out and was pleased to see a quiet corner in the arena and that there would be no strobe light impact. He said he was glad the Du Pen family was involved in the new installation, and that he supported the accessibility of the sculptures. He said people can walk around them. He said he supported the exception for restroom access.

Mr. Inpanbutr said it will be a great space and described the modifications as nice. He appreciated the soft sides on the granite.

Mr. Barnes appreciated what was done to the sculpture area. He said it is interactive and available to people. He appreciated the seating area. He agreed with other comments about making sure the restroom graphic is readable.

Mr. Kiel appreciated the process and said it is nice and well thought out.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage and site alterations at the Northwest Rooms, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124584, 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/HW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

012021.32

Bon Marche Building
300 Pine Street
Proposed exterior alterations

Sarah Holstedt proposed alterations including re-demising the main level and creating a new mid-block front door on 4th Avenue. She said two types of demising walls will be constructed: one 2-hour fire rated wall that will go through the decorative coffers to structure; and one non-fire rated wall. She went through section

details and explained how the wall assembly fits in and how the coffers will be rebuilt.

Ron Wright said the coffers were a later creation and can easily be replicated and added back in. He said capitals are original and will be avoided as possible.

Ms. Holstedt explained two ceiling treatments are proposed: one is installed before the coffers which will be hidden above new ceiling; and the other is illumination between coffers. She shared detail showing how ceiling would be suspended with coffers remaining. She indicated illuminated ceiling around new opening to level 2. She said there is a relief trough area around the coffers where electrical will be run. At the mid-block entry on 4th Avenue, she proposed full height all glass doors with dark brass hardware and full height handle. She said the new hardware references brass at windows. She noted detail of the doors and canopy and indicated how door assembly meets the existing stone jamb.

Ms. Holstedt said the existing canopy is a metal panel on T-bar system and will be replaced with polycarbonate lens that will be backlit. She said this treatment will be at the main entry on 4th Avenue and at the venue entry off 3rd Avenue.

Jack McCullough noted consistence with other treatments under canopies.

Ms. Holstedt proposed four new blade signs replicating the 3rd and Pine Victrola sign. "Bon Marche logo" is used for now as placeholder; they will come back to board for actual content. She proposed a marquee sign for the venue tenant and to make this possible they proposed to remove and store two windows on level 2. She said they would build structure to interior and weatherproof. She said all elements can be added back in as desired.

Mr. McCullough said they would return to the board for review of actual marquee sign.

Ms. Holstedt said venue will require new service access point off Olive Way. She proposed reconfiguring the existing entry line. She said the same style door will be used, a medium style bronze that has a slightly different configuration. She said that tenant A will build an extensive mezzanine which will require removing decorative ceiling elements that will be built back when tenant leaves.

Mr. McCullough said they have had more tenant demand than space on the floor.

Ms. Holstedt said they will change egress pathway from stair 2. She said multiple occupants use the entry path; this will provide fire egress only. She said display window will have same cadence as other windows and will maintain same geometry. She said the window can be changed to operable, if desired. She said tenant C, the furthest west, has three entries with one pane being an exit door. She said tenant E at the northwest corner; she proposed re-opening a sealed entry. She said they will remove the metal panel and will reuse doors from 9.

Mr. Coney asked if there is more than one door color and asked about the mention of both bronze and brass.

Ms. Holstedt said this will be typical tenant and will match existing bronze finish. She said the mid-block entry is all glass and the hardware is brass finish to match display window frame.

Ms. Chang asked how many doors are renovated and stored.

Ms. Holstedt said perimeter doors in reconfigured areas will get new; that work has not been done yet and this will be the first. She said the entry was in prior phases. She said they will maintain and reuse doors.

Mr. McCullough said the doors around the perimeter are from the 1980s-90s.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if item 3, the portal door, are in the same plane.

Ms. Holstedt said they are.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked about jog in wall.

Ms. Holstedt said it is where the stone ends. She said their intention is to maintain the stone around the soffit and sides but where they have to attach doors to structure, they may have to saw cut stone. She said any sawcut would not be exposed.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked how the coffers are formed.

Mr. Wright said they are plaster creations formed over mesh on each side with a wave pattern. He said they are pretty stout and could be cut through with a blade.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if there is any way to achieve the two-hour rating without going through coffers.

Ms. Holstedt said they have to go through coffers to structure.

Mr. Kiel asked what on the interior is controlled.

Ms. Sodt said columns, elevator surround at level 1, capitals on columns, coffers, and stair handrails.

Mr. McCullough said the coffers can be reconstructed. He said non-rated walls won't impact coffers.

Mr. Coney asked if the marquee panels damaged at the loading dock will be repaired.

Mr. Wright said there is precedence the owner is strongly committed to fixing the building to make it right. He said he is reasonably certain it would be repaired.

Mr. McCullough said they will do a visual assessment around the perimeter.

Mr. Wright said there is a mixture of material, some brass coating but most is painted with multiple coats of paint.

Mr. Coney asked if the panels are pressed.

Mr. Wright said they are all stamped tin which is a common technique.

Ms. Wasserman said she was sorry to see Tenant A impacting the coffers but that she understood the need to get tenants.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he was concerned about that as well and he noted he was concerned about the signage piece. He said he understood the need to tenant the building.

Ms. Sodt said the board could add clarification to the motion that applicant will return with signage construction and copy detail at a later date. She said that administrative review is available for sign copy.

Mr. Kiel agreed and said it is tough to see historic materials go. He said it is an adaptive reuse project for an old department store. He said it is a thoughtful intervention on a historic building and the elements can be redone with the same methodology. He said a lot is reversible or is replacing non-original elements.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for interior and exterior alterations to the Bon Marche Building, 300 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal, with the blade copy coming back for administrative approval and the marquee coming back as a separate Certificate of Approval.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. 114772, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/ROI/MI 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. McCullough said they did an \$80 million on a seismic retrofit without touching controlled fabric.

012021.4 DESIGNATION

012021.41 Hahn Building/Hotel Elliot
103 Pike Street

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular stated at the last meeting, the city's preservation ordinance was cited to outline the standards for designation, and said she would explain how we believe the Hahn building meets the standards. Under the standards for designation, the ordinance states:

An object, site or improvement which is more than twenty-five (25) years old may be designated for preservation as a landmark site or

landmark if it has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation, if it has integrity or the ability to convey its significance, and if it falls into one (1) of the following categories: - which are criteria A-F.

She said the Hahn Building was built in 1897 as a one-story structure, and then a two-story addition and remodel occurred in 1908. She said the building has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation. She said it has the integrity or the ability to convey its significance and she would explain what integrity is, what aspects of integrity the Hahn building retains, and how - despite changes – it is still able to convey its significance.

She said the Hahn building falls into at least 2 of the 6 designation criteria: C and F.

- Criterion C – It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the community, City, state or nation. For the Hahn Building, this is its connection with early construction in the present-day downtown core. As well as its remodel and addition in 1908, demonstrating the continued growth of the central business district and the recent establishment of the Pike Place Public Market across 1st Avenue. Furthermore, it's use as an SRO connects in with the history of the city's working class population.
- Criterion F – Because of its prominence of spatial location, contrasts of siting, age, or scale, it is an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood or the City and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood or the City. For the Hahn Building, we believe part of its significance stems from its very location within the city at 1st and Pike. As you can see in historic photographs – or any time you visit that intersection currently – it is a prominent intersection within the city. Streetcar lines ran up and down First as well as Pike allowing passengers to disembark one line and hop on another to get all over the city from this one corner - making this intersection a key spot within the city with constant vehicle and pedestrian traffic. The Market is, and has been, one of the most visited locations in all of the city and the Hahn Building's location connects in with that larger setting, helping to tell the story of commerce and city living within Seattle.

Ms. Pratt said they have outlined the Hahn building's significance within the city's development – with its construction as the downtown area extended north from Pioneer Square and it's large scale remodel in 1908, shortly after the opening of the Pike Place Public Market just across the street. This remodel added two stories onto the one-story brick building, and those upper stories were utilized as a Single Room Occupancy or SRO hotel – and provided affordable lodging for residents as well as small businesses operating out of the hotel. It is unique in having the small upper story windows on the front facade communicating the location of former unit bathrooms.

She said the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Ordinance uses the term “integrity” but there is no definition for integrity contained within the ordinance. Within the historic preservation field, the National Register of Historic Places, maintained by the National Park Service and under the umbrella of the Secretary of the Interior, creates

the foundational terminology for much of this research. The definition of integrity provided by the Secretary of the Interior is: “the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period.” The National Register Bulletin, “How to Apply the National Register Criteria” further defines integrity as a combination of seven aspects or qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The seven aspects of integrity are not mutually exclusive but work together. Not all seven aspects need to be present for there to be integrity.

Ms. Pratt said the relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. In the case of the Hahn Building, it's location – in conjunction with its setting - is critical to understanding why it was constructed. The building is located at an intersection of two key commercial corridors in Seattle's central business district – First and Pike. This intersection was and is a prominent hub within downtown Seattle. To make downtown Seattle easier to navigate by foot, auto, and streetcar traffic, regrading efforts were undertaken to flatten portions of the hilly city, including the area around First Avenue and Pike Street. City of Seattle engineer R.H. Thompson led the efforts. The first project started in 1898 and was along First Avenue, from Pike Street to Denny Way. Commercial development followed along these newly flat streets and the recently completed single-story brick Hahn building at First and Pike was set up for success.

She said design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. A property's design reflects historic functions and technologies as well as aesthetics. It includes such considerations as the structural system; massing; arrangement of spaces; pattern of fenestration including the small bathroom windows; textures and colors of surface materials; and type, amount, and style of ornamental detailing. For the Hahn, it remains a 3-story building with its historic fenestration patterns – and even retains its mixed-use appearance with storefronts at street level with residential-type units above. Despite alterations including replacement windows, the texture of the brick, the use of quoins to mark the building's corners and projections, and the original terra cotta belt course, windowsills, and the brick jack arches with keystones over the windows remain. Windows are replacements and it appears the break mold has been removed.

She said where location refers to the specific place where a property was built or an event occurred, setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves how, not just where, the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space. Although there have been changes to downtown Seattle as the city has continued to grow, the Hahn Building's immediate setting retains key elements. The 1907 establishment of the Pike Place Public Market, Seattle's first public market, cemented First and Pike as a key downtown intersection. Streetcars brought easy access to the market's produce and food stalls as well as the surrounding buildings. The 1908 renovation of the Hahn Building, creating the upper two residential floors for the Hotel Elliott, capitalized on the establishment and growth of the Market, its prominent location at First and Pike, and Seattle's booming population.

She indicated on a map the Hahn and its relationship to both the current local Pike Place historic district boundaries and the original National Register of

Historic Places boundary for the Pike Place Historic District. The National Register district was nominated to the National Register in 1969; received by the National Park Service on February 10, 1970, following its approval by the Washington State Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and verified as a historic district by the Keeper of the National Register on March 13, 1970. The boundaries were subsequently reduced later that year and then have gone through a series of expansions over the years.

She said materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property. The choice and combination of materials reveal the preferences of those who created the property and indicate the availability of particular types of materials and technologies. Indigenous materials are often the focus of regional building traditions and thereby help define an area's sense of time and place. When we talk about “physical” integrity, it seems to be the materials aspect of integrity that are under discussion. The Hahn Building retains enough original materials to convey its significance as an SRO structure, constructed at one of the city’s most prominent intersections and added on to take advantage of the adjacent Pike Place Public Market. There are replacement materials on the building – most notably at the storefronts and the upper cornice, as well as the windows.

She provided a sequence of color-coded façades to show what remains intact on each elevation, compatible alterations, and alterations. The majority of each façade remains intact.

Ms. Pratt said at the last meeting the phrase “faux historicism” was used to discuss how the replacement cornice added in the 1980s is potentially inappropriate. She said that in thinking through whether a change is appropriate for a historic building I refer to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and associated Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Standards for Rehabilitation do not use the term “faux historicism” – but the standard that’s used for those types of discussion is standard 3. That standard states: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken. She said that the cornice is not a conjectural feature and that she would argue that Standard 9 of the Standards would apply when considering this new feature. Standard 9 states: 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. She said they do not have the original drawings for this building and the original balustrade was removed between 1931 and 1936, 45 years prior to the 1980s rehabilitation, and the cornice was removed some time after 1936 but before 1963. The cornice that was installed utilizes a new material, which is not distinguishable as incompatible with the building from street level, and its design is simple and Classical in nature – which is compatible with the building’s Classical Revival character. It is compatible with the extant remnant terra cotta frieze elements along the top of the wall and the terra cotta original belt course that transitions between the first and second stories.

She said when an entire historic feature is missing, the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings allows for its replacement. It may be an accurate restoration based on documentary historic documentation OR if none exists, a new design can be made for the missing feature which is compatible with the overall historic character of the building. A cornice was historically part of the building – it is a feature that existed with the remaining historic features on the building. Designing a new cornice compatible with the building does not diminish the building's integrity. Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory. Workmanship is important because it can furnish evidence of the technology of a craft, illustrate the aesthetic principles of a historic or prehistoric period, and reveal individual, local, regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles. Examples of workmanship in historic buildings include tooling, carving, painting, graining, turning, and joinery.

Ms. Pratt said on the Hahn Building, workmanship is evident in the building's brickwork – in particular the differences between the original brickwork on the alley facade and the brickwork for the 1908 upper stories. The historic features and materials that remain were all hand-built by builders and craftspeople so the terra cotta elements – like the belt course and key stones - contribute to workmanship.

She said feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character. For the Hahn Building, it retains its original location, setting and key elements of its original materials, workmanship, and design which distinguish it from more contemporary buildings within the surrounding neighborhood. The setting and context of the four corners at First and Pike work together with "feeling" to contribute to this sense of place.

She said association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. While we're not arguing that the Hahn is the place of a significant event, it retains enough integrity to convey its significance through its association with the commercial and SRO development in Seattle.

She said after the nomination meeting, they wanted to compare the Hahn with other landmarks that have had alterations prior to designation. One of the examples that came up at the last meeting with the Colonnade Hotel – which is a nicely rehabilitated building at 107 Pine Street. Other examples include the Avon-Capitol Crest Apartments, Frederick Boyd Co – or American Meter Co. building, the Schoenfeld Building, and the Joshua Green Building.

Ms. Pratt said Paul Groth's "Living Downtown: The History of Residential Hotels in the United States" and Dr. Marie Wong's "Building Tradition: Pan-Asian Seattle and Life in the Residential Hotels" establish the baseline for the typologies that helped us to understand how the Hahn building fit in and related to broader housing patterns within Seattle's central business district. The types and subtypes identified in the table stem from Paul Groth's work and City of Seattle building code definitions, as well as labels used on the 1884, 1888, 1893, and 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance

Company maps and 1905 and 1910 Seattle City Directories to identify different functions.

Ms. Pratt said as part of understanding how the Hahn building fit in and related to broader housing patterns within Seattle's central business district, she said they looked at the entire business district as it existed in 1905 just prior to the Hahn's 1908 two story addition and SRO use. She shared map showing original SROs and which remain relative to location of Hahn with a focus along 1st and Pike corridors. She identified lodging houses and apartments and tenements. She said they classified the Colonnade as a mid-priced hotel because it has a lobby which is not a feature of SROs. Notable examples of SROs in Seattle include New Latona, Scargo, Lewiston, and Strand buildings. Of the 16 hotels individually landmarked within the city, only three are SROs.

Owner's Presentation

Ian Morrison gave kudos to Ms. Pratt for her work on the nomination and said it is a unique and complex site. He said the board reviewed and denied landmark designation for this building twice. He said the building doesn't meet any criteria for designation; there have been significant alterations and the building lacks integrity and can't convey its significance.

Kathryn Merlino, UW professor of architecture and historic preservation said the building has eroded over the years; she provided photos of the building over the years. She noted the context has changed with buildings to the east becoming taller. She said there is no clear standard for integrity, it is an interpretation of a standard. She said a common theme in old buildings here is the loss of cornices and pediments in the 1949 earthquake. She said a 1990's renovation elongated use of the building.

She spoke to the Standards for Designation and noted that a building has to have integrity and meet criteria. She said Criterion C requires double significance and it has to convey both. She said there are only four landmarks designated on F only, most meet three or four criteria. She said there is debate about which are SROs and which are mid-priced hotels. She said the Colonnade has a lobby/waiting space which is a major distinction. She said the Latona, Eastern, Cadillac, and Lewiston are all URM buildings that were built as low-income or modest-price hotels for working men. She said the Colonnade storefronts are not original, but this was due to the regrade which itself was an historical moment in the City. She said the rehab kept the historic storefront feeling and porosity. She said the Guiry and other SROs in the city should be designated and are an important part of the City history.

Ms. Merlino said 12 out of 17 landmarked hotels are SRO's. She said integrity per the NPS Standards of Rehabilitation comes down to details that seem nitpicky but are important to think how these are accurately being represented. She said false historicism is not allowed and new additions should not destroy historic materials and should be differentiated from and compatible with the old.

She said the Hahn Building historical material that gives its feeling and association with its time period has been removed or significantly altered. She said the window profile is important. The cornice that caps building and gives it an identifiable feature has been replaced with faux replica. Italianate stone balustrade has been

removed. The triangle pediment above entry has been removed. The upper pediment identifying the entrance is gone and massive defining cornice is gone. The first-floor entries have been altered. There is very little original fabric left. Typically, a missing cornice is left as such or replaced identical to what had been there. She said what is seen here is a different profile in EIFS which covers the brick frieze. She said the extension of the cornice over the frieze is different. The cornice line follows the undulation of the façades; the new cornice gives a more flattened feeling.

Regarding Criterion F, she said the Hahn Building is included in the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places which she noted is not local and doesn't understand the context. She said the Hahn Building was not included in Seattle's Pike Place Market Historic District. She cited the Victor Steinbrueck boundary map which indicates no buildings on 1st are worthy of preservation. She said it is an important distinction even though it was included in the original National Register district. She said the Hahn Building was never proposed to be in the local historic district. She said the Market boundary is from the west side of 1st to the Waterfront; the rest is part of the growth of the commercial core.

She the intersection at which the Hahn Building sites is not the main entry to the Market anymore. She said things change, and it is a diverse market now that the viaduct down and with the new waterfront connection. She said the commercial core has grown and the association and context of the building has changed. She said from a pedestrian viewpoint and scale the clear path to the Market won't change; the height of a new building won't affect view of the Market nor will it affect light from the east. She said the Hahn Building is an interesting building but a new building there wouldn't change how we experience the Market.

Mr. Morrison said the building didn't meet any of the criteria for designation and said previous boards applied the same criteria and voted to deny designation; he said in 2014 the vote was 2 – 6. He said there is a bevy of designated SROs that are better able to convey significance. He said Criterion F has subjectivity and this site is unique. He said the board denied designation in 2014. He said the new project has been designed and permitted. He said the Hahn Building is a background building. He said there are 650,000 posts about the Pike Place Market on Instagram; not a single post includes even a sliver of the Hahn Building. He said the Hahn Building is not easily identifiable. He said the building doesn't meet criteria C or F.

Ms. Wasserman wanted to hear other board comments. She said she supported designation, but her feelings were not strong and that could change.

Mr. Inpanbutr said there have been great points and counterpoints and it has been an interesting discussion. He said he was leaning toward supporting designation but that he didn't feel strongly about it.

Mr. Barnes asked why designation wasn't successful the other times.

Ms. Sodt said she was not staff when it was nominated the first time but was in 2014 when board members denied designation based on the building not having integrity or ability to convey significance because many aspects of the building that have been changed. She said the last time the building wasn't nominated.

Mr. Barnes said the presentations were excellent and provided great information. He said that because there is so much new construction around, the historical look of the four-corner area is being lost. He noted the building at the northeast corner of the intersection is also one-two stories. He said the intersection represents old Seattle back in the early 1900s. He said it meets Criterion F and wondered if that was enough to overcome the changes over time. He agreed with Ms. Wasserman and Mr. Inpanbutr and said he wasn't clear yet.

Ms. Chang appreciated public comment and said it provides insight. She said this is more difficult because there is so much history and poignant points on both sides. She said from letters and public comment we can see there is a lot going on. She said the board focuses on the Code. She appreciated the additional information provided and that she found it helpful. She said she has done more research and reading and noted what caught her eye is the similarity in 'now and then' comparison photos. She said elements may have been removed following earthquakes in 1949 and 1965. She said that triangular pediments, cornice, and the parapets all can come down in earthquakes and cause safety issues. She said it makes sense why they were removed. She said things still look like it was intended to in the start. She said storefront changes can be restored. She said upper levels do retain original character. She supported designation.

Mr. Coney said a lot was stated about NPS standards for rehabilitation, but the building was not landmarked when the Bassetti rehabilitation was done so the restoration policies didn't apply. He said the work done was compatible and helps retain the design and style of the building. He appreciated the discussion on integrity and how to apply National Register Bulletin seven criteria. He said the building has integrity and conveys its significance. He said the first of the criteria sentence talks about design; the building still retains original style, but the design is still there. He said the setting speaks to character of place where property played its role. He said the main entrance is where it was and will always be. He said the intersection at 1st and Pike is the center point of Seattle, Washington State, the entire Pacific Northwest. He said the setting is important. He said workmanship is part of the Seven Aspects and the Bassetti rehabilitation was over 25 years ago and could be considered part of the workmanship of the building. Regarding materials, just about every brick is still there as are the openings. He said the Colonnade changed many times and went back to a more compatible storefront fenestration in the 1980s; the Hahn is similar. He said the building has integrity and can convey its significance. He said there is not a single cornice left in Seattle. He said this intersection is one of the two most important intersections in Seattle; the other is 1st and Yesler. He supported designation on criteria C and F.

Mr. Rodezno appreciated the presentations and said he agreed with other comments about supporting designation. He said that if the building had been included in Market boundaries it wouldn't be up for discussion now. He said the buildings shows 19th Century masonry workmanship, a type of construction no longer done. He said the SRO role in history is important. He said Kingsley and Bittman's involvement is important as is the building's role on the edge of the historic district. He said there are blight issues, but the building is 124 years old. He said this is at the entrance to the Pike Place Market and its role in history is defined.

Mr. Kiel said consideration was interesting and challenging as the building is right on the line of a number of things. He said the integrity argument is right on the line. He said it is interesting that past boards hung their hat on that. He said he doesn't buy Criterion F, being landmark-adjacent doesn't make you a landmark. He said this building is background in that way. He said there is no double significance. He said it is an incredibly old building and designation should have more than a nice old building. He said it leaves a lot to be desired. He said he is on the line but noted there is not a compelling argument for the criteria.

Mr. Barnes supported designation on criteria C and F. For C, he said the four corners are the main entry to the Market. Regarding F, he cited the age and identifiable features of the building and the brick work. He said the building supports the environment of the four-corner intersection. He said the building was within the original Market boundaries but was cut back for political reasons. He said the area was blighted in the 1970-80s and was cleaned up as part of the rejuvenation of the Market.

Ms. Wasserman supported designation on criteria C and F. She said she didn't want to lose the SRO connection, rooms with bathroom nor the intersection, location.

Mr. Rodezno supported designation and cited criteria C and F.

Mr. Inpanbutr said criterion F is barely over the line and he could understand why Mr. Kiel did not support designation. He said the corner could become a canjony and change the experience of going to the Market. He said the building spatially holds some prominence.

Ms. Chang said often church steeples are taken down after an earthquake. Regarding Criterion F, the intersection is the main entrance to the Market starting along that block. She said the spatial location matters, new building would be noticeable whether background or not. She said the building fits with character of what is across the street. She said as an SRO it was significant for its time but there is not as strong an argument for Criterion C as for F.

Mr. Coney noted Mr. Rodezno's comment that this workmanship won't be seen again. He said the building meets the 'feeling', aesthetic or sense of a time. It has stood in this location for a long time. It has integrity and location and setting. He said the case for Criterion F is stronger than for C. he said designation was denied twice. He said the owners were on notice but chose not to do anything. He said things change, circumstances change, and past decisions are not precedent. He said landmark status is an honor that conveys tax incentives and TDR benefits.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Hahn Building/Hotel Elliot at 103 Pike Street, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/RC/MI 6:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel opposed.

012021.5

NOMINATION

012021.51

Considine House / Cohen House / Immaculate Conception Convent
802 16th Avenue

Amy Hagopian, owner's daughter provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the house is included on the City's Historic Resources Survey. She said the house is two-stories with a third story attic. She noted the Neo-Classical style with full width porch, front columns, solarium on second floor, original front door, parlors on either side of entry, columns with Corinthian capitals. She said the south side is a pollinator pathway for bees and noted the original rectangular window, curved glass window. She said most exterior windows are original and noted a yellow slag window was removed when the house was vacant and recovered by owners in the 1970s. She said a separate gated entrance leads to slate tile patio and noted three entrances to lower rear apartment. She said the many entry for upstairs apartment is on the north façade. She noted original mail cubbies for nunnery.

She provided a virtual 'walk through' of the house via photos and noted the ornate hand carved railing at the main stair, ornate original radiators that have been restored and are still in use, original main fireplace with green glass tile, original fir floors, and ornamental plaster ceiling work. She said the church altar was transformed into an entry and the original priest entry to chapel now is a window with spiral staircase up to an art studio. She said stained-glass windows were created and installed by John Perry in the 1980s.

Ms. Hagopian explained the significance of the house in the context of the neighborhood, it changed drastically in 1919 when the Cohens sold their property to the Immaculate Conception Church to be used as a residence for the Sisters of the order who taught at the church's school nearby. The landmarked church stands at its original location at 820 18th Avenue, and still hosts services and community events. The Catholic Church's purchase of the house marked the beginning of the extensive remodel which resulted in the house's current footprint, and a building with approximately twice the usable square footage of the original dwelling. The original façade was not modified, but it was during this time that most of the lower rear apartment was constructed, and the solarium in the upper front apartment was closed in as an interior living space. In addition to providing kitchen, laundry, and sleeping facilities for the nuns, space was allocated for a chapel, community gathering space, and music classrooms. The decades that the Sisters resided at "The Convent" marked hugely significant changes to the neighborhood's demographics. When the nuns first moved in, most of the parishioners at the Immaculate Conception Church were wealthy and white. Then began a gradual influx of Irish and Italian immigrants, who altered the socioeconomic makeup of the community. The neighborhood was comprised largely of white, working-class families, who also made up the Immaculate Conception Congregation during the 1940s and 50s. In the 1950s African American, Japanese, and Filipino families began to move into the neighborhood, and the demographics of the congregation changed once again. By 1960 the neighborhood was 64% black, and by 1970 it was 79% black. Many of the white community members who had lived in the area for decades were growing old and dying. Fueled by racism, the majority of remaining white families relocated to the suburbs. The Sisters resided at 802 16 Avenue until 1972. According to Sister Kay Burton, who lived at the house during this period, the church intended to sell the

property and use the proceeds to preserve the Immaculate Conception Church. However, redlining in the Central District meant that no one could get a loan to purchase the property, and the house ended up sitting vacant, gradually falling into disrepair.

Ms. Hagopian said construction of the house began in 1900, when Thomas J. Considine, stage manager of the city's famous People's Theater, commissioned a home for his family from well-known architect Edwin W. Houghton. Completion was delayed because of conflicts between the builder and the Considine family, ending in a lawsuit and a change of contractors.

Once close friends, William L. Meredith, former Seattle police chief, and John Considine had a falling out when Meredith started work as a detective with the Seattle police department. When Meredith was made acting police chief in November 1900, he began targeting John Considine's businesses, enforcing laws (mostly about serving liquor and employing women) that were actively ignored by the police in other parts of the city. Before long, allegations of corruption were brought against Meredith, and Mayor Thomas Humes told Meredith to resign or he'd be fired. Meredith quit on June 22nd, 1901, believing vehemently that John Considine was to blame for his disgrace. On June 25th, 1901, Thomas and John Considine were confronted by Meredith, who had armed himself with a shotgun and a revolver. Meredith shot twice at John Considine but missed him. John ran at Meredith and attempted to subdue him, and Tom Considine managed to take Meredith's revolver from him. He began hitting Meredith over the head with the butt of the revolver, fracturing his skull. With Meredith incapacitated, John Considine drew his own revolver, and shot Meredith three times, killing him.

She reported that John and Tom Considine were both tried for 1st degree murder. Although both were famous and well-liked within the vaudeville circuit, many Seattle citizens did not look favorably on the brothers' professions and were opposed to their presence in the city after the incident with Meredith. John's trial lasted three weeks, at the end of which he was acquitted, and charges against Tom were dropped. Despite this outcome, the event did take a social and financial toll, and likely influenced Tom's sale of the subject property.

As mentioned in the January 1, 1904, *Seattle Times* Tom Considine had sold the property to A. L. Cohen, "the well-known cigar dealer of Seattle," for \$10,000. Cohen's purchase of the property marked the influx of a wealthy Jewish population into the neighborhood. The proximity of the house to Cohen's downtown cigar shops, as well as the local synagogue made it the perfect hub from which commute to his businesses and spend time with this family. She said Cohen was a two-time council member, a State Legislator, president of Seattle baseball club and a pioneer of the City. She said the Cohens lived at the house for 15 years.

She said although no one lived in "The Convent" between 1972 and 1978, it was rarely free of visitors. Ronnie Buford, son of famous jazz musician Vernon "Pops" Buford, liked to rollerblade through the big, empty rooms. Local bands used the house for practice space. It was rumored that Jimi Hendrix played there a time or two, as confirmed by Ronnetta Buford, granddaughter of Pops. The Bufords moved in 1946 to Seattle, where Pops - named for his take-charge manner, according to historian Paul de Barros - played all the old swing clubs, from Fort Lewis to Pioneer

Square. Pops died in 1994, a year after he was awarded a certificate of recognition in a Jazz Pioneers Reunion at the Museum of History and Industry. He is mentioned prominently in Paul de Barros' book "Jackson Street After Hours." And his first instrument was on view at Columbia Seafirst Tower. There was also some looting that occurred at the house during this period. One of the most notable elements that was removed was the yellow slag glass windows that were used in the chapel. When Pops' wife Lillian died in 2017, the Buford family lost the home to developers, who now have a permit to build four modern box structures on the site, obliterating the Buford family home and its history.

She said in the late 1970s the Seattle City Council finally took a stand against redlining, but it wasn't until 1978 that Anthony Ventura and his business partner, Norman Glassman, were able to secure a loan and purchase the house for \$30,000. Ventura and Glassman went to great lengths to restore the house in the vision of Considine and Cohen. They removed the buff-blend imitation brick that had been added to the entire exterior as insulation during the nuns' residence, revealing the original beveled cedar siding, which was still sporting its original coat of paint. They restored the claw-foot tub--which was being stored in the basement--to the front upstairs apartment, and, incredibly, were able to track down the original yellow slag glass windows that had been stolen from the house while it sat empty. The new owners preserved most features, except the interior of the fireplace itself, which was replaced. The building was converted to a four-unit multiplex, with the lower front section used as a counseling center, and the rest of the building used as living spaces for the owners and a series of tenants. At this time, the kitchen in the upper front apartment's solarium was added, and the main staircase for the building was reconfigured to remove the "Servant's Staircase" and close off the opening to the lower front apartment where there is now a kitchen. The original railings were preserved, though may have been shifted. This was also the period during which the original yellow slag windows were reclaimed and reinstalled in the South wall of the lower rear apartment's living room.

She said in 1988, the arrangement of owners sharing the building broke down, and the entire building was sold to the current owners, John and Sue Perry who made minor changes to the makeup of the four apartments between 1988 and 1990. Also, during this time, the spiral staircase in the lower rear apartment was added, and the painting studio it leads to was walled off from one of the upper apartments. The second-floor space currently used as a painting studio still contains built-in fir furniture which may have been used to store the priest's vestments. Sue Perry, the current owner of The Convent, is an accomplished oil painter. She spends much of her time pictorially documenting the demolition of the Central District's single-family homes and cultural landmarks. She and her late husband, John Oliver Perry, purchased the house from Ventura in 1988. They have gone to great lengths to preserve the historically significant elements of the house and are dedicated to maintaining its integrity for years to come. The Perrys made only minor changes to the makeup of the four apartments between 1988 and 1990. No significant changes occurred for the two front apartments constituted from the original Cohen spaces, and the rest of the former convent. Some interior traces remain of the presence of the nuns, most obviously the conversion of the chapel with a priest's entrance into a large living room with a main entry for the lower rear apartment, which is now occupied by owner Sue Perry.

Ms. Hagopian said prominent Seattle architect Edwin W. Houghton was commissioned by John Considine to design the house. Houghton was well known for designing homes, hotels and theaters, including the Moore and Majestic theaters and the Grand Opera House.

She said the house stands apart, and has evolved to reflect the diverse and changing neighborhood. She noted the current context of boxy condos.

Mr. Coney disclosed that Ms. Hagopian's son was a long-ago acquaintance of his and wanted to be up front about it.

Ms. Doherty said it did not sound like a financial concern.

Mr. Rodezno asked when the four separate apartments were constructed..

Ms. Hagopian said the four separate apartments were created during the Ventura / Glassman ownership in the 1980. She said the convent used the space like a dormitory.

Mr. Inpanbutr noted public comment by Maria Batayola.

Ms. Hagopian said she didn't have the names of these individuals.

Ms. Doherty said they were alums from Immaculate Conception, and would ask Ms. Batayola so share the written history she was reading from.

Ms. Hagopian said the nuns were teachers.

Mr. Barnes asked about areas to include in landmark.

Ms. Hagopian said exterior is important.

Mr. Kiel said the board often sticks to exterior unless there is a compelling reason to go inside.

Mr. Barnes noted the decorative plaster work on the ceiling and the wood etching.

Ms. Wasserman thought the exterior and site were adequate.

Sarah Greiner, co-author of nomination report said they want to keep the house intact in its prominent place and remain a fixture in the area. She said whatever the Board thinks is best to include is agreeable to them.

Ms. Wasserman commended the owner on fabulous work of house documentation.

Messrs. Kiel and Barnes concurred.

Mr. Barnes said the house is special in the neighborhood. He supported nomination including exterior and site.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination ‘absolutely’ and commented it is a wonderful house. She supported including exterior and site.

Mr. Rodezno supported nomination of the exterior. He didn’t support nomination of interior although there is lots of beautiful craftsmanship.

Mr. Inpanbutr commended applicant on the great job on report. He supported nomination and wanted to hear more about people, including public comment by Maria Batayola.

Ms. Chang supported nomination and asked if that included the stained glass windows.

Ms. Doherty said if the stained glass was added, it could be seen as an art installation. But if they have been made integral to the windows, then they could be considered as the “windows” which are art of the “exterior”.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the story about recovering and reinstalling the old yellow window.

Ms. Chang supported nomination of exterior and site and would like more information on whether the exterior windows and doors are original.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and said unfortunately landmarking a property is not a panacea as many have been lost including the Sullivan House and the Galbraith Mansion. He supported including exterior and site.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and said it is nice when the owner drives the effort, especially on a residence.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of 802 16th Avenue 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 exterior of the house; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for March 17, 2021; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/MI 7:0:0 Motion carried.

012021.6 **STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator