



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 643/14

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, November 5, 2014 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Linda Amato

Deb Barker

Nick Carter

Robert Ketcherside

Aaron Luoma

Marie Strong

Alison Walker Brems, Chair

Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sordt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair

Matthew Sneddon

Sarah Shadid

Valerie Porter

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

110514.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 15, 2014

MM/SC/DB/MS

7:0:1

Minutes approved. Ms. Amato abstained.

110514.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

110514.21 Rohrer House

122 37th Avenue East

Ms. Doherty passed out photos and went over improvements. She said that \$96,805.82 was submitted and is eligible. She said improvements include new master bathroom, landscaping, regrading, grubbing, replanting and shrubs. She said that some windows were reviewed administratively and other items were maintenance and in-kind repair.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Rohrer House, 122 37th Avenue East, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/RK/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110514.22 Anhalt Apartments
1600 East John Street

Ms. Doherty passed out photos and said submitted costs were only for the rehabilitation portion of the project and met the criteria. She said they cleaned masonry, leaded windows were restored, they rehabilitated the entire building for new apartments, and there were some site improvements.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Anhalt Apartments, 1600 East John Street, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/NC/MS 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110514.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110514.31 Fasica Building (Columbia City Landmark District)
3808 S. Edmunds Street
Proposed exterior alterations and signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed storefront remodel and exterior alterations, including installation of a new aluminum storefront system and sectional garage door, structured canopy, lighting fixtures, roof-mounted flag pole, skylight and revisions to the alley façade, as well as new paint colors. She noted the proposed installation of a wall sign to be located above

the canopy on the south façade and a 2-sided blade sign attached the underside of the canopy. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and plans. She reported that the Fasica Building was constructed in 1924. It is an historic, non-contributing vernacular building within the Columbia City National Register District. Architect: J.L. McCauley.

Ms. Frestedt said that on June 6, 2014, the Columbia City Review Committee received a briefing on proposed alterations. The Committee voiced support for the addition of a canopy and recommended maintaining transparency within the garage door. The briefing included discussion of masonry restoration and paint removal and the addition of 1-2 floors to the building. The Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the current application on October 7, 2014. The Committee considered an alternate design for the garage door that included a continuation of the green panels along the bottom of the center bay. Committee members were split in their opinion about the design of the garage door. One member was interested in seeing an alternative without divided lights. Another member recommended replacing the paneling with a neutral color or glazing, which was supported by all CCRC members. The Committee also requested additional details about the placement and color of the seismic braces. The Committee recommended approval for the proposal, conditional upon revising the design of the lower level of the garage door. The final proposal includes responses to the CCRC's feedback.

Steve Sutherland, Johnson Southerland, said the building has been altered a lot; he said the original brick under the windows has been removed in a couple places and replaced with wood spandrel panels, the scooped cornice has been removed and the parapet is flat. He said that existing fabric canopies will be removed and a steel framed canopy installed. He said they will install new storefronts. He said that they will install an overhead garage door, new entry door, flag pole, a large sign above and a blade sign in middle above door, goose neck lamps across the top and where the sign will be. He said that there will be a row of frosted glazing in the lower panes of the garage door. Responding to a clarifying question, he explained that the proposed storefront system will be a standard dark bronze. He said that the window division is applied, not true divided light.

Mr. Southerland went over changes to the back of the building and said they would replace the existing stairs along the alley and restore with a wood frame stair that will be widened to serve as a loading dock. He said they propose to take out a window opening and replace it with overhead door. He said the back of the building is brick and it will remain unpainted. He said that they will take off the metal grating and remove plywood to expose original multi-pane windows.

Ms. Wine asked if there are other infill storefront systems in the district.

Ms. Frestedt said that there are and this is a non-contributing building which allows greater flexibility.

Ms. Wine asked about signage size.

Mr. Sutherland said the wall sign is 10' x 3'.

Ms. Frestedt said the CCRC had no objections to the proposed sign.

Ms. Walker Brems suggested elimination of the simulated divided light.

Ms. Frestedt said CCRC discussed the alternatives, including a two-paned option, but ultimately didn't object to the applicant's proposal.

Public Comment:

Rob Mohn, community member, supported the project.

Mr. Luoma said that this is almost like a new building because it is so far removed from the historic building it was.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approval a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and signage located at 3808 S. Edmunds St.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations and signage meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant Columbia City Landmark District Design Guidelines

Guidelines/Specific

2. Building Materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide.

4. Storefront. Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e., windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

5. Transparency. To provide street-level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street-level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall

not be significantly obscured by security bars or gates, frosting, etching, painting, extensive signage, window darkening film or mirrored film, window treatments, or other means. The intent is to encourage pedestrians to focus on the products or services offered, rather than the signage.

10. Awnings/Canopies/Marquees. Marquees, awnings, and canopies will be encouraged at street level. Shiny, high-gloss materials are not appropriate. Distinctive architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure. Awnings may be installed on upper levels where appropriate.

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.
- b. **Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards

#3. Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken.

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

MM/SC/EW/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110514.32 Medical-Dental Building
509 Olive Way
Proposed business signage

Hunter Brooks, Evergreens Salad, explained the three proposed signs: a smaller blade sign, round sign in window and the main sign above the storefront. Responding to ARC request he provided mock up in relation to Jimmy Johns and contextual photos of adjacent storefront.

Ms. Sodt said that what was proposed is in conformance with the sign plan.

Ms. Wine said there was some concern at ARC about the round sign and elevation and the applicant provided what ARC asked for.

Mr. Luoma said that Cherry Street Coffee also has a round sign.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. 122316, 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/MS/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110514.33 Hull Building
2401-2405 First Avenue
Proposed storefront paint colors and lighting

Michelle Dirkse, explained the proposal to paint the front of the building eliminating the light green and keeping the dark green and orange. She said that her space will be dark green only. She said she would install a light fixture in existing light location next to her entrance and recessed back a bit. She said that she proposes white vinyl decal at the bottom of all window "Michelle Dirkse Interior Design"; website and telephone will be included. She said that the front window will be bordered with color and her logo and will look better when the storefront is all green.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine said that ARC was in support of the paint and light fixture and thought the signage was minimal with no negative impacts.

Board members discussed the paint colors and proposed location of each color with some expressing concern about the context of the storefront and uniformity of color pulling building together. There was support for consistency of color across three spaces.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations Option B, forest green paint on door and signage already in place at the Hull Building, 2401-2405 1st Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alternations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. 108518, 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/RK/MS 8:00 Motion carried.

110514.34

Seattle Tower
1212 Third Avenue
Proposed business signage

Bart Dellinger, National Sign, said he made modifications that ARC asked for. He said that Steinway is moving in and will collaborate with the philharmonic. He said that signage will be hung from inside. He said he reduced the size of the interior lit cabinet signs. He said that signage will include the Steinway name and then signs for two piano lines.

Ms. Sodt said that no signs will be mounted to the exterior of the building.

Responding to questions Mr. Dellinger explained that the translucent vinyl letters will show light through. Steinway will be in gold.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said the font size is good but the scale is wrong and she said that the blue and red signs should be away from the Steinway sign.

Ms. Wine said that typically she would not support a sign in every window but noted there is no exterior signage. She said ARC asked the applicant to minimize the field and pull the signs up and this has successfully been tackled. She said that the blue and red competed visually in the window space. She said she ARC was ok with the amount of signage for Steinway just didn't want the view into space obscured. She said it is important to have signage for the other brands.

Mr. Dellinger said he liked the stacking of Boston and Essex signs on University Street and noted he was trying for more symmetry.

Ms. Wine said they were trying to get a lot of signage in.

Ms. Walker Brems said that the red back lit sign was at eye level.

Mr. Ketcherside said that on the University Street side there is visibility through the window and noted the grade change.

Board member discussed options such as putting red sign on one side and blue on the other, smaller signs, use higher panel, font only backlit, staff review of final.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Seattle Tower, 1212 Third Avenue, with elimination of one of the two smaller signs – Boston or Essex – hanging below Steinway on the Third Avenue elevation; verify eye level view into space possible, and only letters are back lit and pending Staff approval.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage 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, 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/EW/MS 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110514.35 Sand Point Naval Air Station – Building 11
7777 62nd Avenue NE
Proposed exterior alterations

Kevin Bergsrud, DOPAR, said that they propose alterations to six elements.

1. Replace three large utility doors; install overhead garage doors for better security;
2. Construct new man-door opening with transom window above – similar to existing;
3. Lower window sashes on north façade lower and add another sash at the top of existing openings;
4. Five new LED lights to match existing - install same height as others installed along east façade and one on north façade;
5. Install dryer vent; and
6. Add concrete accessible ramps at the northwest corner of the building (City requirement for ADA compliance).

Mr. Bergsrud said that wood doors will be painted Navy Blue per the SPNAS Guidelines.

Responding to questions he said that the residential garage door option is their preferred. He said that the square panels with no divided lites is closer to what exists there now.

Ms. Wine said the originals door had a recessed (square edged panel) not raised panel, and this has a different feel to it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine said that ARC thought the proposed alterations were reasonable and had no issues with the north wall with proposed windows or the ADA ramp. She said ARC asked for clarification on the panels on the doors.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at Building 11, 7777 62nd Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal with staff approval of profile of overhead door panels.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations for select windows, a new man door, lighting, ventilation and ramps at Building 11 do 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*.
2. The proposed replacement of the large service doors will adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation. However, the need for replacement has been documented. The proposed "replacement elements shall not alter the essential form and detailing of the feature; and every effort should be made to insure that the feature continues to convey the same visual appearance," per the *Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines for Architectural Features and Details*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110514.36 The Fionia Apartments
109 John Street
Proposed site improvements and exterior alterations.

Withdrawn, following denial of designation. Agenda was reviewed out of order.

110514.4 DESIGNATION

101514.41 The Fionia Apartments
109 John Street

Sonja Molchany, BOLA, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood. She noted the development of the trolley line, the population growth, and apartment development boom in anticipation of AYP and in 1920s. She said that there are three commercial buildings on the tax parcel circa 1920-22. She said that the original owner was Ideal Investments and was likely a speculative investment. She said that W. S. Dahl was an early owner; the current owner has owned since 1976. She said that the central windows over the entry bay have been replaced.

She said that the units are studios, one and two bedrooms and a 1922 advertisement describes the apartments as 'ultra-modern' at a 'convenient location'. She said that residents were middle class workers – teachers, waiters, sales clerks etc.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, said the building is comparable with others in the neighborhood.

Ms. Molchany said the five-story L-shape building is clad in textured dark red brick, with modest terracotta detail and banding above the 2nd floor and below the parapet. She said that wood windows have been replaced with aluminum. She said the south façade is utilitarian with painted brick. She said the alley is utilitarian and clad in common brick. She said there is an exit onto the alley from the back stair. She said that the north façade finish wraps around the first bay into the alley. She noted the soldier headers and brick sills. She noted the deep recessed main entry with oak doors and the building name in terracotta above the entry. She said there are 59 apartments with units averaging 514 square feet. She said there are double loaded corridors. She said there is no lobby – just an open vestibule at the stair's mid-landing. She said that there is terrazzo flooring with carpet runners, original wood floor and trim, original breakfast nooks.

Ms. Boyle provided comparisons to other apartment buildings in the area including Strathmore, Avalon, Arkona, Centerview, Pittsburgh, Queens Court, Delmasso, Inn at Queen Anne, Leonard, Del Roy, Olympic Arms, Olympus, and La Charme among others. She said that there are a variety of apartment buildings and styles in the area.

She said that architect William Aitken was a sole practitioner but worked as a designer with other architects including Ellsworth Green. She said Mr. Aitken designed the Quinault and Harvard Crest apartment buildings on Capitol Hill and the Black Diamond Coal building which is a King County landmark. She said he designed retail shops, the Lincoln Theater, and Sick's Stadium. She said he was a member of the Yesler Terrace design team as a construction supervisor.

Ms. Molchany said the building did not meet A, B or C and noted that its association with the decade of population growth and apartment development is general rather than significant.

Ms. Boyle said the building did not meet D, E, or F and noted that there are other similar examples nearby. She said that Aitken had many projects and a long career and this is not an outstanding example of this work. She said that the building is surrounded by other similar examples and it doesn't stand out.

Ms. Wine asked if the north facing brick had been altered or cleaned.

Ms. Molchany said that part has been repointed.

Ms. Boyle said the south wall had been treated to cover graffiti and leak problems.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation on criterion D. He said he was concerned with preservation of the neighborhood character and this building contributes to the kinds of buildings that marked the neighborhood in the 1920s. He said not to use the term 'middle class' because these were blue collar people who had jobs downtown, bartenders etc. He said that the building meets D and F. He said it adds to the distinctive blue collar dwellings of the 1920s.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Amato said she struggled with her decision and said that the building is intact, clean and solid. She said that it is representative of Queen Ann as a whole but wasn't sure which criterion, but said she would support designation on criterion D.

Ms. Barker said she struggled with her decision and said that the building embodies its period – that of a working person – and is intact even with the window changes. She said she would support designation on criteria D and F.

Mr. Carter said it is a nice building and is reminiscent of all that was built in that time. He said that while it does contribute to Queen Anne neighborhood it isn't a landmark; he didn't support designation.

Mr. Ketcherside said he struggled, and said that if he could be convinced he would support criteria D.

Mr. Luoma said it is a close call, but supported designation. He said that although one could say it is just a representation and that there are other examples, he said that there are variations of era buildings; he said that this building has integrity. He said that it is on the lower end of the style and significance but it is still worthy for criterion D.

Ms. Strong said it is a nice building but not a landmark. She noted the change in windows and change above the entry door. She said the owners have been good stewards.

Ms. Wine said that the façade is simplistic, and with the loss of majority of windows degrades it and makes it difficult to determine its age. She said that the changes to the center windows are significant. She said that she thought the alley was more interesting. She did not support designation. Ms. Wine appreciated the additional research by BOLA of other neighboring apartment buildings.

Ms. Walker Brems said she was struck by the building, as a representation of working class character in Queen Anne. She noted the changed windows were problematic and said she would not support designation.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Fionia Apartments at 109 John Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: a portion of the site including the existing footprint of the apartment building and the area 20' to the west of the building face; and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/AL 3:5:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Carter and Ketcherside and Mmes. Wine, Strong, and Walker Brems opposed.

110514.5 NOMINATION

110514.51 Standard Furniture / The Broadacres Building 1601 Second Avenue

Jack McCullough said that while they have no plans to do anything to this building they have plans to develop on adjacent site. He said he didn't think the building was worthy of landmark status.

David Peterson, NK Architects, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the neighborhood and site and provided an overview of the development of the area with the north end expansion. He said that the area was regraded and development started in response to the great fire and Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition. He reported that the University of Washington moved to its present location allowing for the Metropolitan Tract development and movement of retail northward. He said that the 1907 -08 Standard Furniture building was the first major retail business to be built on 2nd Avenue.

Mr. Peterson said that architect A. W. Gould moved to Seattle in 1903 and was knowledgeable of east coast building techniques that brought tall buildings, invention of the elevator, steel frame structural system, reinforced concrete and fire proofing. He said that Gould was caught up in the 1912 Bogue Plan scandal; his partnership with Champney ended and he was kicked out of the AIA. Gould continued to work building the Arctic Building and New Richmond Hotel; he worked until 1920 and died in 1922 at age 50.

He said that the style was informed by the French Beaux Arts department store. He said that the building had chamfered corner, large windows at the ground floor, steel and reinforced concrete system, clad in terracotta on reinforced concrete base, and constructed with base, middle and top. He noted the white and cream terracotta and corner entry. He said that the first remodel was in 1930 and moved toward a modern aesthetic and more use of artificial light. He said that the corner entry was moved to the Pine Street side and a showroom created. He said that boxed in ground floor windows blocked light. He said that a marquis was added and the lower three levels were changed. He said that the dark band display area was changed to match the windows above it. He said that the mezzanine windows were altered with bronze grille.

Mr. Peterson said that in 1950s the Schoenfeld family sold the store which merged with another; later both were absorbed by Bon Marche. He said that in 1955-56 changes were made to elevator bank, upper levels changed to offices and substantial changes were made to the building. He said that an elevator lobby was added using a window bay and the side entry was moved to the corner. He said that all windows were replaced with modern sash and all upper level cornices were removed. He said that terracotta piers were encased in aluminum sheet metal. He said that terracotta spandrels are intact except where the cornice was removed. He said that one fire stair was installed, windows filled in and ceramic tile installed.

Mr. Peterson said that Arnold Gangnes designed the 1950s changes; he was known for small 1950s residences, Mental Retardation Child Development Center, and Shurgard addition and had a severe modern aesthetic. He said that the building still has components of the 1950s renovation but that various tenants since have made alterations. He said that the building is a hodge podge of some original features, with 1937 and 1950s renovations.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine said she concurred with Mr. Peterson's assessment that the building is too altered and has lost integrity. She said that it was interesting to see the 1950s and 1960s alterations.

Ms. Strong agreed with Ms. Wine and said that there have been too many changes.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination and said that the building had been heavily modernized and looks as if it could have been built today. He said that the structural significance in how it was designed was lost because historic fabric was lost.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination. He said that the report was great. He said that it is too bad because it is such an early commercial building in prominent spot and has not been maintained. He said that the building is appealing enough for re-use. He said that it was interesting to see what Gangnes wanted to do.

Mr. Carter recused himself.

Ms. Barker said it is a weird building that looks incomplete. She did not support nomination.

Ms. Amato did not support nomination.

Ms. Walker Brems did not support nomination but would have supported the original building.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Standard Furniture Building at 1601 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance as required by SMC 25.12. 350.

MM/SC/MS/AL 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Carter abstained.

110514.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator