



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 617/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
City Hall – Bertha Knight Landes room  
Wednesday, October 7, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson  
Deb Barker  
Nick Carter  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Aaron Luoma  
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Mike Stanley

#### Staff

Sarah Sadt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Acting Chair Jeff Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

#### **100715.1 MEETING MINUTES**

August 19, 2015

MM/SC/DB/RK

8:0:2 Minutes approved. Mr. Murdock and Ms. Patterson abstained.

September 2, 2015

MM/SC/NC/RK

8:0:2 Minutes approved. Mmes. Barker and Patterson abstained.

#### **100715.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

100715.21

Pacific-Ford McKay Building

601 Westlake Avenue N.

Proposed business signage

Shawn Bowen, Tube Art, explained the proposed set of non-illuminated cut out letters with projecting cube above letters will be dark gray. He said the letters are 1” thick and 6” high on a course that connects all together and is pinned through grout joint. He said that the projecting cube will attach to metal studs behind terracotta; Pioneer Masonry removed the tile and left brackets for the sign. The tile will be preserved for when the sign is ever removed. An escutcheon plate painted to match the terracotta will cover the gap.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said the proposed cube is stark and glaring but said that the scale to building is relatively small. He said it is a good effort and the cube and letters are easily removable. He said that ARC was favorable.

Ms. Barker said that the coloring of the cube is not bright orange and noted that it is Option 3 on the drawings.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report, as the proposed signage is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features 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/NC/DB            10:0:0 Motion carried.

100715.22

The Theodora

6559 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Proposed building rehabilitation, addition, and site alterations

Detailed plans in DON file.

Eli Hardi, Clark Design, explained the plan to renovate existing building and construct additions at south end of east and west wings. He said they would improve accessibility and revitalize landscaping. He said the original use of the building was congregate housing and that the housing use will continue. He went through existing conditions interior and exterior. He said they worked to create unification of old and new and that they extended the concrete plinth of the garage, beneath the new addition. He said they added stair access for pedestrian entrance up to site from the

east. He said that existing access to the garage will be maintained; he said transparency throughout is proposed.

He said that they propose to create an enclosed elevator lobby beneath the east facing decks; they will infill the first level deck to create a leasing office. He said they worked to keep the enclosure as transparent as possible. He said they set back the enclosed portion so there is a small usable deck. He said that they will create a new main entry on the north and make it more pedestrian friendly. He said that they will cut two openings in the existing brick wall. He said they will add a subtly different pattern to distinguish new wall wings from the old perimeter wall. He said they will keep transparency at the new stair penthouses, and the bridge between the existing building wings and the new additions. He said proposed materials are bronze painted finishes and cementitious lap siding with smooth face finish; existing siding is wood tongue and groove. He brought material samples and said they will tie in with the deep rich brown. He said materials will modulate façade and give depth. He said they stepped back the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor to provide a little relief in the massing. He said the buildings face inward toward courtyard between wings.

Mr. Hardi said that trees are a big part of the site and they will maintain as many significant trees as possible and will unify the site. He said that the current landscape which is overgrown will be changed to lower shrubs, addition of color and greenery and allow light to come in. He said that hardscape will be unified and they will use a single style paver throughout the site, and have an asphalt driveway. He said that the south courtyard will provide pedestrian access on and off site. He said the landscape will buffer to provide thresholds and pavers will create paths into the space.

He said that designated interior spaces include the common kitchen, atrium space, and fireplace. He said that an intimate seating area was added around the fireplace and that the adjacent two new residential units are smaller. He said that signage will be period relevant block lettering for the main sign and smaller signs at pedestrian access points.

Mr. Luoma asked how the outdoor trellis and design relates to the architecture of the building.

Mr. Hardi said that there are existing courtyard throughout the site now – intimate but exposed with very little coverage/shelter. He said that an arbor or such would lend usability throughout the year and add some separation to the space. He said they are using wood – a heavy timber structure – that is simple and mirrors aspects of the building.

Ms. Doherty said that steel was shown at one time and ARC requested something more compatible with the existing architectural language.

Ms. Barker asked about internal access paths – how one would get from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the east wing to the fireplace area.

Mr. Hardi explained that there are 5' wide corridors between units and said one could go down and around the atrium space.

Mr. Murdock asked about the roof projection seen in the primary elevation.

Mr. Hardi said they are extending the existing stair above the roof to serve the top level of the additions. He said this is located in the middle of the roof depth.

Ms. Patterson asked what was being demolished per page 36.

Mr. Hardi said that existing columns will be within new units. He said that the existing “library” are plastic laminate bookcases – not an actual wall – and they propose to remove these.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said that ARC was comfortable with the modifications to create the new north entry, and that the two openings in the brick wall is an improvement. She said they changed windows of the leasing office addition at the eastern prow to be as transparent as possible but it still takes the balcony out of public realm. She said there is an excess of common space. She said that the addition of two units at the fireplace is tight and she noted view blockage. She said they are throwing in a lot of components.

Mr. Murdock said that the enclosure of the deck for the leasing office removes that floating character and that the two massive balconies are character defining features. He said that the new addition is flush with the end bay of the existing building and he said they it should have been consistent with the rhythm of the building and set the addition back further. He said the addition does not meet Secretary of Interior’s Standards.

Mr. Hardi said that the main body of new addition is set back from what you perceive as the front.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the loss of space in front of the fireplace.

Mr. Stanley said the south façade is blank and he asked if they looked at articulating it more.

Mr. Hardi said they did but decided against providing windows.

Ms. Barker said she could live with the leasing office and said it is the best spot for eyes on the site. She said she had concern for the space around the fireplace. She said that two units with one window is a disservice to all. She said she would prefer to eliminate these new units as a gesture to the communal area.

Mr. Carter said they have done the best they can with the new additions. He said it doesn’t follow the set back of main building but that it is separate from the main building and he is ok with it. He said he prefers the rooms be removed from around fireplace.

Ms. Anderson said she wouldn't put the project on hold but that she was disappointed with the loss of space around the fireplace. She said she appreciated the symmetry and that she would support the proposal.

Mr. Kiel agreed with other board member comments and said he wished some things were different. He said that they have enough of the big moves right, and there is not enough to say no to approving it.

Mr. Luoma said overall the concept is good. He said it keeps much of the historic fabric and style and said the addition is a good example. He said that it is complementary to existing but distinguishable. He said the stair is a nice demarcation between the two. He said the area around the fireplace is not a perfect solution but that he is sympathetic to knowing they are responding to a change in use. He said they are not destroying historic material and the additions are removable.

Mr. Sneddon said he supported the proposal. He said that the original intent of the Volunteers of America building shows in the design and he said concessions have to be made for its new life. He said that the outside spaces before were of a different mindset and the new will take it in a different direction. He said the interior spaces were a different type of communal space. He said the exterior is still intact and still conveys the architectural elements.

Ms. Patterson said she likes the character of the new addition. She said the siding pattern is good and the addition is set back and distinguishes itself as a new building. She said enclosure of the balcony is a significant issue. She said she wishes it were different – preserving the negative space and voids is important. She said that at the interior designated space – they are closing off half of it. She said moving the leasing office to the interior would be beneficial.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed 3-story additions at the south end of the building wings, minor exterior alterations, landscape improvements, and select interior alterations to The Theodora, 6559 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed 3-story additions, minor exterior alterations, landscape improvements, and select interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 596/14), as the proposed work 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/NC/AL            8:2:0    Motion carried. Mr. Murdock and Ms. Patterson opposed.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

**100715.4**

**CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

100715.41 E.C. Hughes School  
7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the E. C. Hughes School, 7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW for six months.

MM/SC/DB/NC 10:0:0 Motion carried.

100715.42 Magnolia School  
2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue W  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Magnolia School, 2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue W for six months.

MM/SC/RK/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

100715.43 Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building 601 Stewart Street until the second meeting in January 2016.

MM/SC/DB/NC 10:0:0 Motion carried.

100715.44 Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street

Ms. Sodt explained the request for extension and said that she has been working with DPD on compliance issues. She said the owner will make sure the contractor is securing the building in a way that does no damage to the building. She noted that no interiors are designated.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street until the second meeting in January 2016.

MM/SC/RK/DB 10:0:0 Motion carried.

100715.45 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant  
1120 John Street

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 John Street until the second meeting in January 2016.

MM/SC/RK/DB 10:0:0 Motion carried.

**100715.3            DESIGNATIONS**

100715.31            Gaslight Inn / Singerman House  
1727 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Owner Stephen Bennett said he and his partner purchased the house 40 years ago and worked to bring it back to its original character. He reported that in the 1980s Patty Murray held a fundraiser there for her first term in the Senate. He said that fundraisers have been held at the house for Norm Rice, Cal Anderson and Mayor Murray. He noted the house's connection to the gay community, and development of the City and the neighborhood.

Susan Boyle (BOLA) made the designation presentation (full report in DON file) and said the house embodies many layers of history. She provided context of the area, the 1890s development of the area, the addition of the trolley systems which supported growth of the city out from the center. She said that Capitol Hill is a long established urban neighborhood. She noted the larger parcels in the upper income area with housing type responding to larger parcels. She said the area had a variety of churches which indicates a great sense of tolerance and getting along. She said the Jewish community lived in Capitol Hill along Yesler and was connected to Temple de Hirsch.

She said that Paul Singerman owned Toklas and Singerman Department Store which was destroyed by the great fire. She said that they relocated the business and expanded it to take advantage of the Yukon gold rush; they built a new store in 1890. She said the store transformed into the McDougal and Southwick. She said that Singerman contributed to the rebuilding of the city following the fire. She said that Singerman built this house and per early newspaper article for \$7,000.00. She said it was a valuable property in an expensive part of the City. She said he sold the house within three years and said the construction of an apartment building across the street might have played a role.

She said that James Christensen bought the house in 1931 and divided it into apartments. She said the exterior remained unchanged. She said when Mr. Bennett purchased the property he removed the apartments piece by piece and restored the exterior and interior. She said he added a new kitchen and deck. She said he removed the deteriorating garage and added a swimming pool and arbor. He said the attic was converted to a guest room. She said the house has special architectural character in the Foursquare Style. She said there are similar large houses on large lots in the area. She said the house has a hip roof, window bays, porches, beautiful detailing and romantic Moorish and Spanish elements.

She said the house's story holds many layers – revival of Capitol Hill, gay and lesbian community, a refuge, poorer community – artists, marginalized citizens. She said the house and its revival represents another level of history – the renaissance of new residents. She went over wood trim detail, brick masonry fireplace, and said the windows were retained. She noted the oak wainscot trim on framing members and around entries. She said original gas light fixtures remain and she noted the spacious landing with panel doors.

John Fox said they learned about construction a room at a time and restoring the house was a labor of love for all.

Public Comment:

Jennifer Mortensen, Washington Trust, supported designation.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson disclosed she works for the Washington Trust.

Mr. Bennett said he had no problem with her participation.

Mr. Luoma said it was a privilege to tour the house and that he fully supported designation on criteria C and D. He said affection was used in the presentation which he said was a good word for it. He said it is visible there is sincere affection for physical attributes but also for the preservation of the cultural stories – of Singerman, the Jewish history and the more recent Capitol Hill history that makes it stand out even more. He said the stewardship of the house and the sincere dedication to the City and the community and he noted there is a bigger reason to preserve this than just the building.

Ms. Barker said she was glad she toured the building and said that it stands out. She said she saw what they started with – she peeked into the attic. She supported designation on criteria C and D. She said she appreciated the property's cultural, political, and economic associations. She said they have taken great care of the property.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on Criterion D. He didn't support Criterion C because he didn't see the significance of gay rights to the house.

Ms. Patterson said she supported designation on criteria C and D. She said that interior is important and noted the wood, fixtures and hardware.

Ms. Anderson supported designation and said she appreciated the care and attention that went in to the restoration.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C and D. He said there is a story for B too but that it could fold into C. He noted the foursquare proliferation on Capitol Hill and said it was an early architectural upper class taste. He noted the technologies and spatial relationships – chimney, fireplace, gas lights, and the relationship of parlors to kitchen.

Mr. Stanley supported designation and said it was good to hear about all the care and details. He said he supported Criterion D and was 'on the fence' on C.

Mr. Carter supported designation on criteria C and D and said it is a great example. He said the more recent history is almost as important as the old. He said D helps to define C as well. He said it is nice to see an owner bring in a nomination; he commended the owner.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C and D but that he would support B as well for Singerman, if he thought he would live there always, or if as a businessman he set the stage for all other department stores in the city. He said that regarding C it is part of the rebirth of the neighborhood and the LGBT community. He noted the association of the house with families who stayed there while attending memorials and funerals, during the AIDs epidemic.



Mr. Murdock supported designation and said the Foursquare is ubiquitous and the cultural history is compelling. He noted the rehabilitation and events that happened and the stories that are tied to it.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Gaslight Inn / Singerman House at 1727 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the house; and the following areas on the first floor interior: entry hall, main stair, living room, dining room, library, and parlor (former ballroom).

MM/SC/DB/NC 10:0:0 Motion carried.

100715.32

Wayne Apartments  
2224 2nd Avenue

Abigail DeWeese, attorney for the property owner, introduced David Peterson of NK Architects.

David Peterson (NKA) presented the nomination application (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and site and an overview of early settlers of Belltown. He said the site was part of the Bell family donation claim and he noted that they left for a long time. He said the area was covered with farmland and small houses. He said that by 1889 Austin Bell, Barnes and Hull buildings were there. He said there were efforts to create a commercial heart there post fire; he said they were trying to pull development north. He said that they started to regrade streets to get street cars and sewer systems around the city. He said the building was constructed between 1888 and 1893.

Mr. Peterson said the rowhouse was a specific building type with two party walls, front and back fenestration, point entry interior circulation on one side with a front parlor and a back parlor. He said there used to be a lot of them in Seattle. He noted that Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, mentioned Reuben McKnight's thesis about hybrid buildings. Between 1800s and 1950s commercial space was added to a house or building by addition of a floor or the front yard became the commercial space.

Mr. Peterson said that the Victorian Row apartments are the only pre-1900 rowhouses unaltered. He noted that the entries are perpendicular to the street. He said that townhouses are flexible and can be broken up to multiples in a variety of ways and that happened here. He said there were multiple people living here and the spaces were broken up to accommodate multiple families. He said from 1890-91 Lewis and Miranda Rowe lived on the subject property. He said that in 1908 the property was sold to Charles and Belle Schneider who had lived in an Alaskan mining camp. He said the Schneiders hired Charles Haynes to adapt the first floor commercial space; the building was lifted, moved to an adjacent lot, masonry commercial space was built and the 1890 portion was moved back on. He said that the building was adapted to become more apartments; hearths and fireplaces were removed. He said that the building quickly adapted to multi-family apartments. He said there are still shared bathrooms in the building.

He said that Haynes was a prominent architect in Seattle who designed lots of apartments – this is not his best work – as well as the Packard Auto Showroom. He said that early on in 1908 he worked on the Pacific Telephone building due to regrade impact. He said he added entablature to it similar to what was added here. He said that there were many alterations to this building: 1951 tile added, bulkheads changed, wood sash frame windows are aluminum now, some transoms remain, asbestos fake brick siding was added, furnace space was altered to a residential unit, and chain-link space was used by commercial space. He said that wood frame sash windows are mostly intact because they were covered with storm windows. He said that on the alley side are fin shaped courtyards, a light well with structure built over top. He said that the siding is coming apart and is in bad shape and he didn't know if the original wood siding still exists.

Mr. Peterson said that Lewis Rowe developed a commercial block known as “Rowe's Row”. He said he developed and owned other properties. He said he was successful in the grocery business and invested in real estate. He said Rowe had a carriage business from 1888-1900 but it is not listed in the Polk directory. He said that it might have been a repair or storage business. He provided information on Corliss Stone and said he found no significant relationship between him and Rowe.

Mr. Peterson responded to board question if this is the oldest residential building in Belltown. He said that there were not a lot of residential buildings in Belltown but he noted others nearby: Bell, Barnes, Hull buildings; 2231 Second Ave is from 1900 was a mixed use building and may have had upper floor residential; Virginia Inn Building built in 1901 is still intact and had a residential component; Livingston blocks, Leland Hotel and the Stewart Hotel in Pike Place Market which are both wood frame; the Belltown Cottages built in 1916 and New Pacific built in 1904 was a hospital until 1914 when it was residential, among others in the City. He said that this building has lost integrity: the entablature was removed, masonry covered with stucco, bulkhead changed, siding replaced, trim, brackets and gables are done. He said there is too much loss of integrity. He said that is all you need is the massing that is a low bar. He said there is no integrity and this building can't convey what it was. He said the building doesn't meet any of the criteria for designation.

Ms. DeWeese said she submitted a letter and a structural report to the Board last week (both in DON file). She said the building had no integrity and did not meet any of the criteria for designation. She said that building did not meet the double significance of criteria A or C and noted that its association with the regrade was indirect and not unique. She said the addition was a product of commercial development as much as a response to regrade. She said the building is not significantly associated with Rowe who may have lived there a year or so but it was just an investment property. She said that to meet Criterion D it must embody a style and this is not a best example; others have more integrity. She said it is similar to 1200 E. Pike which was not nominated because it had lost integrity. She said that a comment letter received from Steve Savage, a board member at the time, voted against it and advised the board to act consistently with the decision that was made then. She said that it is hard to read from the street and is obscured from the street by trees and light pole. She said that the board often doesn't often rely on this Criterion alone and when it does the building's connection to the neighborhood is obvious as is the Piers' connection to the waterfront neighborhood. This building doesn't rise to that same level. Regarding the Councilmembers letter she said it doesn't appear they

read the nomination report or visited the site or spoke to any expert historians to form their opinions so asked that the board not hold their comments in higher regard than any other comments that are made. She said regulating use or stopping development is not within the purview of the board.

Board Questions:

Mr. Barker asked for clarification on the area he looked at for the oldest buildings in Denny Regrade.

Mr. Peterson said he looked to Pike Pine on the south, along first along 1<sup>st</sup> Ave along the waterfront to Denny on the north and to Fairview on the east.

Ms. Barker asked if this is the oldest in the regrade and what are regrade boundaries.

Mr. Peterson said he was looking at Denny Fairview to Pike Pine.

Mr. Murdock said there were regrades all over Seattle but that Denny Hill was the largest in Seattle. He asked how this hybrid affects the idea of it being there and being altered to accommodate to the regrade.

Mr. Peterson said that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave image happened in 1902-10 or so but within the period of time; he pointed out this building at the far end of part of Denny Hill that was about to be regraded. He said one side of the street would have level sidewalk and across the street was a scraped hill. He said that because they were at the tail end it looks like it was graded 5' or 6' at front because stairs came down. He said the property owner was responsible for regrading his own property; but new utilities etc. came with the regrade. He said that many properties were demolished and some were moved around, or building was lifted and commercial built underneath. He said the neighborhood was becoming denser and moving from residential to commercial. He said that this is one of the few properties where this happened; the properties to either side of this one were developed in the 1920s.

Mr. Stanley asked if the work was driven by the regrade.

Mr. Peterson said it was going to have to be moved or demolished and said that they were able to make more money out of the building. He said the area behind the building is probably the same height it was before the Regrade but in front and sides are about 5' lower.

Mr. Stanley said that if it had to be moved or demolished it was clearly impacted by the regrade because it could not have stayed where it was.

Ms. DeWeese asked Mr. Peterson to go back to picture of building that showed it with 2<sup>nd</sup> in front of it. She said that him to explain how the street would have changed and how the slope down to the street would have affected the building.

Mr. Peterson went over photos of area before and after Regrade. Mr. Peterson said that it was a two-story building and there were probably steps up to the house. He said the street was being regraded and that utilities were being put in and there were lots of new things so it would have affected the building. He said there would have

been activity in front of the building; it had tenants in multiple apartments. He said it would have been a problem for tenants.

Ms. DeWeese said that they would have been able to access the street and said the building could still have been used the same way after the regrade.

Mr. Peterson said it could have been used residential or commercial.

Ms. DeWeese said that the grade change wasn't so significant that you couldn't access the building because of the grade of the street.

Mr. Peterson said this is a stairway going up to someone's house – a wooden stairway.

Mr. Kiel asked how many of the older buildings predate the Denny regrade and survived and how many of those have those been lowered again or had a story added.

Mr. Peterson said that the Hull, Barnes, and Austin Bell buildings are older but were not impacted by Regrade. He said that he can't say definitively that this is the only building to survive Regrade – some buildings may have been moved and we don't know where they are.

Mr. Sneddon said he was impressed by the thoroughness and professionalism of the report. He asked what Mr. Peterson thought when he first saw the building what architectural style he thought it was.

Mr. Peterson said it looked mysterious – he didn't realize the commercial level predated the 1950s. He said it has a rowhouse shape which caught his attention. He said it looked like a 19<sup>th</sup> Century building.

Mr. Luoma asked about photo that showed the Moore Theater and Josephinum buildings on top of Denny Regrade.

Mr. Peterson said that they were built in land that was cleared and by that time the streetcar tracks were laid. He said it was being developed.

Ms. DeWeese said that the Moore Building was built with certain specifications to respond to the different grade changes because they weren't sure where the grade would end up.

Public Comment:

Neil Kubath said the building embodies local and national criteria for designation – Criterion C. He said it survived the regrade and annexation. He said it has always housed fringe members of society, the unseen cogs of wheels on which the City churns, blue collar workers.

Miranda Stolei said it meets Criterion F. She said it is one of the last remaining hybrid architectural styles and very visible from the street. She said it is also one of the last example work built by Lewis Rowe who was a pioneer in Belltown. It is in

the heart and core of Belltown in cultural, historical, integrity and image. She noted City Council members joined her for a tour and support for designation.

Steve Hall said the building has integrity. He said in that in early drawings and photos you can see three gabled windows and today you can see the same three gabled windows.

Liz Campbell, past president Belltown Community Council, said there is support for designation. She said the structure does meet the threshold of connection to the culture of the current neighborhood. She said they are interested in exploring mechanisms and overlays to go from the 2300 block to the north of film row, through music row, all the way down to the Moore Theater. She said they see this building in context of neighborhood and that it does meet that threshold. She said that she is a community organizer and was invited in by this wonderful community to work with them. She said that Councilmember Bagshaw toured the building and Councilmembers were briefed before this.

Alison Ray said the building meets Criterion F. She said it stands out in Belltown as a long lived and well-loved structure that quirky as the block it stands on. She said it is worn but provides a unique Belltown experience. She would like to see it restored.

Robert Thompson said it is the last of its type in Belltown and the City. He said that the closest building from that era is four and a half blocks away making the Wayne Apartments very rare. He said we need to preserve buildings like this. He said it is over 100 years old and any wear and tear is expected for a building of its age. He said the architectural features that make it special and unique are still intact and it can still convey its significance.

Chuck Little said the Denny Regrade moved a mountain back in the day and now we can't build a tunnel.

Josh Sharp said it took four years for the City to honor Jimi Hendrix but just one month to name a street after a retired but living sports player. He said he supported designation and noted the value of arts in the city and specifically noted Nirvana, Pearl Jam, Kurt Cobain, coffee and grunge.

Matt Herron said he was opposed to designation and noted integrity issues. He said there is deep community support for the businesses and the people who live in the building but just because it is well loved doesn't mean it is worthy of nomination. He said the integrity is outstripped. He noted a building at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Stewart that didn't get designated and was much more deserving of it. He said that while interesting no one even knows who the original architect was.

John Breiner said he is a developer, landowner in Belltown. He said he loves the neighborhood but that the upstairs of this building is in bad shape. He said he would be careful as a member of the historic review side of every building that was moved to suddenly become a historic building and that he would hate to see that precedent take place. He said that compared to other historic building this building has been scabbed together for years.

Josh Burnham, PDA Lounge owner, said that thousands of tourists experience there what Seattle is supposed to be. He said it would be a shame for Belltown to turn into Capital Hill and he said not in a good way. He said that Capital Hill's culture is being destroyed and if Belltown's culture is destroyed too he didn't know where people will live next. He said as a music lover to lose these huge chunks of our culture every time someone with a big pocket book shows up would certainly be a shame and isn't reflective of the city he grew up in.

James Todd cited Criterion C and said the building has stood there for over 100 years. He noted the loss of the link to Seattle's past and those who built it. He said that London, Paris and New York embrace the past and the future. He said to save history and preserve honor.

Tiffany Jorgenson said that Rowe purchased five acres and there was a block known as the Rowe Block and that owner Rowe made \$700,000 in a gold mine. She said he didn't live in this building that long but that he is mentioned in many history books.

Persephone Cizek spoke in support of designation. She said it is not known the exact date when built but is estimated to be between 1888 and 1893. She said it is made of wood. She said that in 1889 the great fire destroyed downtown Seattle. After that a law was enacted that all buildings had to be built of stone or steel. She said that this could have survived that changed early Seattle. She said that the Denny Regrade should be considered – it began in 1888 because even at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Lenora it was 190' higher than Pioneer Square and carriages couldn't get up it. She said that 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue was even steeper than 1<sup>st</sup> and the Wayne Apartments survived this only a few blocks away from where work was being carried out.

Rebecca Prigot supported designation on criteria A and C. She said that the Regrade changed the geography and architecture and many of the buildings were razed. She said that the Wayne is not completely intact but should be preserved; she said it is a pre-Regrade hybrid building still being used for its original purpose.

Kim Spice, area business owner, supported designation on Criterion F. She said its gabled structure sets the block apart from the rest of the neighborhood.

Mark Taylor-Canfield said that the comment that the City Council 'did not read' the report was unsubstantiated. He said it is clear the building's architecture is unique and it was built before the Regrade; most have disappeared. He said the local businesses contribute to the culture and the building should be preserved.

Jennifer Mortenson, Washington Trust, supported designation on criteria C and D and noted the significant connection to the Regrade. She said that there is some loss of integrity but it retains enough to demonstrate significance for criteria C and D.

Patrick Worth said he lived in the building and supported Criterion F. He said the building draws in quality and identity of the neighborhood. He said he came from the east coast and these places are disappearing.

Graham Klym supported designation on the Regrade connection.

Keith Wolfe supported designation and said to preserve the culture and community.

Amy Penney supported designation on criteria C and D and said she lives in the building. She said the building is 120 years old and these places are being lost. She said this is what our City used to look like.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, supported designation on criteria C and D. She said the property has changed but can convey its significance. She noted the poor condition of the Japanese Language School and the Belltown Cottages when designated but since rehabilitated. She cited the book “Too High Too Steep” and puts into context of what the Wayne means. She said she talked to the author who said the Wayne is the only known extant pre-Regrade building.

Bill Bullock said the culture created here is a magnet that brings people to the city. When you take away those places away this will no longer be a magnet. This is what brings in more than money to the city.

Evan Clifthorne, aide to Tom Rasmussen, said he could not to allow the motives and qualifications of four Councilmembers who are employed by the entire City of Seattle to be misconstrued and impuned by a single attorney who is employed by one member among 600,000 who live in the City. He said these councilmembers who have served this city for a long time and are versed in this subject and wrote that letter with great forethought and with great input – he said he hoped board members would take that seriously.

Lillian Williams said she watched San Francisco become sterilized and it is not too late for Seattle.

Mr. Murdock thanked the public for their comments and for adhering to the criteria.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson recused herself.

Mr. Sneddon said that many comments have been received which are always helpful. He said he walked the block a couple times to understand it and have a sense of the neighborhood. He said he has been in Seattle a long time and he has some sense of the neighborhood but it is always good to get input from the people who live there, work there. He said that when we consider this building we are not considering what is happening in Belltown in general or other businesses on the street of what is going to happen to this building after this. He said the Board is about sitting here and judging this building on its own merits and whether it meets the criteria that are laid out in Seattle Municipal Code. He said that the building’s condition does not equate to its historical integrity. He said there are issues of integrity and its ability to convey its significance and noted to imagine a world heritage site there are ruins all over the place that are in terrible shape that are still considered world heritage sites. He said that integrity can also vary to some degree with the type of criterion that you are evaluating the building under. He said that if he is thinking about this building under C and D – which he said he is there can be building integrity that lets you understand its historical significance better than if you are trying to understand it as an architectural exemplary of a certain style where architectural features become a bit more important than if you are trying to consider it for its relationship to historical

events in the City. He said that it is very common to consider the additions separately. He said that Mr. Peterson noted this is one building but the board considers additions separately all the time. He said he would do that in his remarks as well between the 1910-11 and the 1890 building.

Mr. Sneddon said that he would support the designation under C, D, and F. He said this building represents something quite unique in Seattle's history – the early development of Belltown specifically first moving from single family residences to something with a higher density and second from residential to commercial and mixed use. He said the regrade completely reset Belltown development and it is one of the few buildings that can represent that pre-regrade period. He said that there has been some talk about other buildings in the area but if you look at its unique character it represents what pre-Belltown looked like before the regrade. He said that he believed that there was nothing like it in Seattle in the way that it can represent this 19<sup>th</sup> century rowhouse, Queen Anne style, pre-regrade in this hybrid form. He said that if you take all those together it represents something fairly historically significant. He said it also shows the transition between plan book designs and professional architectural designs. He said one of the reasons this Queen Anne style is so popular is because it is built often from plan books and you can see this proliferation in west coast cities especially San Francisco and the same thing in Seattle. He said that it is part of the national trend but reflected locally.

Mr. Sneddon said that under D, like Mr. Peterson, he didn't know what to make of this building when he first saw it but that he thought it was a 19<sup>th</sup> century building. He said that he has really enjoyed through this review process hearing the details about the history of the site. He said he thought that it had some integrity issues in terms of the decorative elements because in the Queen Anne style they like to use façade planes as place of expression. One of the primary forms in rowhouses is the projecting bay window with gables and this is an extremely good example of that type. He said that some of the stick elements are gone. He said there was question about what is underneath the siding; he said he read the structural assessment which noted – “it could be clapboard...we don't know”. He said that many of the alterations are reversible and there is still enough of the form to convey what he and Mr. Peterson thought of as a 19<sup>th</sup> Century building. He cited Criterion F and said that it doesn't have to be a prominent building it just has to “be prominent of spatial location or scale”. He said that for him there is nothing like it in this neighborhood and it has been there over 125 years; there is not a better example of this type structure in the Belltown neighborhood. He supported designation.

Mr. Luoma said board members wrestle with this decision and he has gone back and forth a thousand times. He said he thought it was an interesting statement about the decision the property owner had to make over 100 years ago whether to move or demolish. He said that at some point they decided to stay and adapt. He said that it is speculation to know exactly the reasoning for what they did but it appears that this building in its age and its proximity to the original Denney Hill and the regrading efforts does remain to be the only one to survive that effort based on its proximity, how close it was to the hill. He said the 1902 image is striking in how you envision looking south on 2<sup>nd</sup> street and how much they had to regrade and really all those buildings are no longer there except the ones looked at this evening. He said that it certainly has integrity issues and because of its style being of a rowhouse style with some Queen Anne ornamentation it relies more heavily on having such integrity. He



said that if it was a more modern style building that has typically less ornamentation then massing alone is usually sufficient. He said that he would not rely on Criterion D because for this style of building the mass alone may not be enough. He said that for Criterion F he agreed with the applicants that the board members typically don't rely on Criterion F alone. He said that he is often hesitant to reference that Criterion unless it is very obviously significant and prominent on what its scale and surroundings that stick out among topography e.g. Space Needle. He said that this does reference spatial location and scale and really the visual features of its neighborhood, meaning Belltown. He said that while he is very familiar with Belltown as a neighborhood he said it is good to rely on the public to give feedback on how significant they feel the building is in terms of Criterion F. He said that he has heard that tonight and he said he leaned to the public in that sense so he could see supporting Criterion F as well but certainly not by itself. He said that ultimately he said the stories of the Denny Regrade and the stories that the property owners had to face in moving, demolishing, or adapting are important enough that they surpass the conditions of the means that they uphold meaning the integrity of the building. He said that for the form that it is and how it is adapted to provide the mixed use facility he would support designation under Criterion C and less inclined to support it under D, but maybe a little bit under Criterion F. He said he would wait to hear what his colleagues say.

Mr. Kiel said this is a tricky one. He said he could walk through the ordinance because he was undecided. He said the building is 25 years old, it is connected to the regrade, it is a neat typology that was impacted by the regrade. He said that it is defined by a masonry commercial base with wood frame rowhouse on top. He said that because it has been covered by the fake brick and is only viewed from a distance is problematic in that the integrity of that significance you can't glance at the building and see what it is. He said that the forms are very clearly rowhouse forms. He said that Criterion A applies more strongly than C potentially and it was stated earlier that it was a Criterion that requires double significance – he said he disagreed with that in his reading of it. He said it states “location of, or is associated...” He said that there is no doubt that the Denney Regrade did have a significant effect on the City and this is in the location of that. He said that the way the Ordinance is written it was meant to be more about a specific place rather than a neighborhood but it is also the only remaining building that survived that event. He said that he didn't think Rowe was significant enough person to trigger Criterion B. He said that regarding D he said there has been a lot of talk about all the details that are missing and it is sad that those are gone but we can read beyond the architectural style and talk about characteristics of the period or a method of construction and that gets us back to rowhouses perched on top a commercial building and that building typology that is exceedingly rare today but was very common at the time. He said that it is not outstanding work of the designer or builder. He said that for F the turnout of the community has put doubt in his mind on this but he has lived in the area and walked his dog by there and didn't even notice the building until this came up. He said the Ordinance is really trying to say ‘easily identifiable visual feature’ as in you are giving directions to someone and use the building as wayfinding. He said this building is recessive in the built fabric of that block. He said that he was on the fence about integrity and criteria A.

Ms. Anderson said the building is significant to the Denney Regrade and it is most likely one of the only buildings left in the area that is associated with the significant event that impacted the community. She said that regarding D although the shape may not be alone enough to justify designation it has multiple layers within the building. She said that visibly it is a rowhouse and it has been changed to a mixed use building and through its historical context you can understand more about the building. She said that D paired with C it does seem to achieve designation. She said that she agreed that it definitely seems to contribute to a community. She said she was on the fence and wanted to hear other board comments.

Mr. Carter did not support designation. He said that it is associated with the Denney Regrade but that to him the association has to be more than 'you happened to be there'. He said that the Denney Regrade didn't happen because of this building; it happened and this building was moved or razed. He said that there are a lot of buildings in Seattle that were involved in the Denney Regrade at one time and have moved to different parts of the city. He said that it is the question of integrity and the ability to convey its significance. He said that when he looks at some of the buildings the board has looked at the past two years that he has been on the board – they have looked at buildings that have had minor changes from what they originally looked like and the board said 'no it can no longer convey what it is'. He said that this building that he sees now looks so different from what it used to look like. He said that he can't look at the building with the eyes that know what is underneath the asphalt shingles because that may never happen – we may never see what is underneath. He said that this building may transfer ownership and may stay like this forever. He said that he can't look at this building and say 'it could be returned to its form'. He said it comes down to walking past this building and looking at it now – does it have the integrity or the significance to convey significance; he said he didn't think it does. He said he would vote no.

Ms. Barker said she is a fan of the Denney Regrade. She noted a book – Madison House – a fictional story about the regrade. She said it was about people in a boarding house and the road was being shaved away and they never knew how they were going to get their house. She said she has those ideas of what people went through during the regrade. She noted the picture of the house with the regrade coming at it in the background and said she is drawn to it because of a book. She said she would support designation on Criterion C and said that the rowhouse was built to accommodate whatever was coming at it. She said it someone cared enough to not tear it down when they could have. She said that they still thought they would have a marketable property. She said the property is definitely regrade-associated. She said the alterations are reversible. She said the rowhouse, peaks, sawtooth, footprint all stand out in the maps that Mr. Peterson has shown; she said the building and its peaks can be seen in the 2002, 1937, and current photos. She said that under criterion F there is nothing like this building on the west side of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Stanley said he has been fascinated by this building for a long time. He thanked the public for all the interest in the building. He said that the board has to put all that aside and run through the criteria starting with the thresholds. He said the board looks at if the building meets the initial criteria he said that not on the cultural end but that there is enough interest that it does has historical interest and why he supported nomination because he felt that the building deserved the board to think hard about what the building means. He said that he also knew it has integrity issues; he thanked

the applicant for sending the inspection report. He said he is an engineer and it was informative to read it. He said it is important for this board because while they can't think about that outside tonight's context there is a real fear of designating buildings that would live in bottles and not be used. He said when you can't economically support a building it does handicap what the owner can do with it. He said that tonight is about looking at the criteria. He said that while he has questions on the integrity he believed that the building itself because of the very unique form of the 1911 addition and the retention of the gables by ever so small a margin does have the ability to convey that significance. He said that as you start to run down the rest of the criteria it is important that we understand A not being relevant to this as Mr. Kiel has mentioned. He said that this building was a reaction to the regrade and not necessarily the event that started it. He said that Thompson didn't meet in the living room of this place and decide to regrade. He said that is important distinction. He said that there were no significant occupants. He said that the entire designation hinges on Criterion C and the story of the regrade and to the extent this building responded to that. He said he was interested in asking Mr. Peterson whether or not the addition was a result of the regrade or was it done for other purposes. He said it is clear that it did impact it. He said the other question is the building moved and was moved back which is important as we measure whether or not the regrade story is germane to the building. He said that under Criterion C it does hold up.

Mr. Stanley said that he did not support Criterion D because it is difficult to support; he didn't think the building has any architectural integrity to convey. He did not support Criterion E. He said that he was open to discussion of Criterion F and said there are some elements and said that it is clear that its uses have stayed virtually the same - working class housing and tavern. He said that it is a fixture in terms of its use and the fact that it is largely been continuous in that form in the neighborhood perhaps there is an opportunity for Criterion F.

Mr. Ketcherside thanked the public for their comments and letters and said it has been helpful. He thanked Mr. Peterson for addressing questions that the board had from last meeting. He said it is important to the board when making a decision to identify all the criteria that it meets – not just one the board feels it most strongly meets. He said that this board will not exist beyond this year; membership changes and the further you go in time the less clear it is to board members what the intention was of the board initially. He said that the more strong statement the board can make about criteria the better chance that it helps them as stewards of the building. He said that is why they asked questions about A and B etc. He said that because the board does not remain the same it is impossible to act completely consistently. He said there are different opinions of the board members and noted that Steve (Savage) was usually on one extreme of opinions and informed the overall board opinion by giving his voice. He said that following the news of the time about 12<sup>th</sup> and Pike he said he believes he would have voted differently looking at the same material. He said that one reason is that because it is not just the members that change, it is the information that changes. He said that he didn't know in the report how well it described the 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Regrade because before he wrote about it he couldn't find anything written about it. He said that the fact that it was lifted you can visually have seen the 12<sup>th</sup> and Pike building was affected by the regrade but there wasn't information that could be accessed easily enough for the board to expect that a consultant to find that – you need to research to find that information. He said that the difference between the 12<sup>th</sup> and Pike building and this one in terms of regrades is that the 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue regrade

was a secondary / tertiary regrade. He said that most of the 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue regrade was fill taken from the dirt from the Denney Regrade. He said they were trying to get rid of the dirt and they dumped it in 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He said that gets to the point of the Denney Regrade as being the central story of re-architecting Seattle. He said the reason why this is a really strongly falls under C of the Denney Regrade is because of the economic aspect of it. He said that it is an economic aspect is the reason why the building is important to see. He said the reason a regrade was done was to increase land value. He said the idea was that by flattening out the street – remember this is before cars when they used horses – suddenly you can give access to a property that didn't have it before. He said by doing that suddenly there is all this extra value. He said the way you pay for a regrade is with local improvement districts the same thing that funded the majority of the streetcar in South Lake Union. He said that the land value increase due to the regrade and that increase the property owners were expected to pay that increased land value towards their share of the regrade expense. He said that a regrade is purely an economic activity. He said that there was discussion about timing of the building being moved and whether it really was spatially impacted by the height of the hill. He said that when the city contracted with an engineering company to cut the hill down they offered the adjacent property owners their cut rate digging price – that was one of the perks. He said that if you got in at the time of the regrade you could have the contractor remove the dirt from the site at the same rate the City paid. He said that if you wait – you would have to do it yourself. He said that there are plenty of properties around that are fully above street level in Seattle – those are all people who decided it wasn't worth paying to have the dirt removed from their property. He said that there is a really good example on Melrose between Pike and Pine across from Melrose Market – a house that is way up in the air. He said that everyone else in the area opted in and they opted out.

At the Wayne Apartments he said that they cut the street out from the front of it and now the property owners have the option of staying up there. He said that David Williams spent time looking up why the properties were left up there – perhaps they were absentee owners. He said that at the low end they had four choices: they could leave the building there; they could demolish it; they could move the building aside and move to a lower grade; or, they could slide it to the side, cut out the dirt, build something up and slide it back over. He said that is what they chose to do and if they chose any other option we wouldn't be talking about this building because it wouldn't represent the Denney Regrade. He said that it is only because they slid it aside and built something in its place that now suddenly the actual built form of the building reflects the fact that a regrade happened there. He said that not just a regrade, *the* regrade. He it is not just a building – it is the only one left. He said that this building clearly should be saved because of its connection to the Denney Regrade.

Mr. Ketcherside said that it is unfortunate that it wasn't caught at the nomination because there was a really great historic records for future properties like this the board should look at. He said that the engineering department has cross sections of every street that has ever been regraded. He said that it goes back to at least 1900 and covers this section. He said that he has looked at the Capital Hill cross section – he said they actually fold out. He said there are diagrams – beautiful visualizations of the information. He said the diagrams show both street size, corner to corner, the elevation before and after. He said that you could figure out where this property is at along that street front and then be able to see where the street edge was on the 2<sup>nd</sup>

Avenue and 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue sides. He said that it is a record that is available to try to guess topography on a granular level. He said that they are a beautiful record that would make a great coffee table book.

Mr. Ketcherside said he supported designation on Criterion C and would support D as well. He said that if we only support it under C then the shape of the building doesn't matter – it is its connection to the Denney Regrade. He said that in fact the shape caused by the Denney Regrade is what is important. He said that he would like to send a message to future board members when they are trying to make a decision about how to change this because this building will change – every building that comes before us changes in some way. He said that when we review the building for change the actual shape of it today matters. He said he wasn't sure if D would say that as a hybrid building or if it is sufficient to say simply that the exterior of the building is nominated. He said he would support F as well.

Mr. Murdock said he appreciated all the thoughtful comments by his colleagues and said that the regrade of Denney Hill was a monumental and catastrophic event. He said that what it took to do that most people – especially newcomers – don't even know what the regrade is and for that reason alone he believes that this building is the sole building that can really convey the story of the regrade and what happened after. He said it sort of stunted development instead of increasing property values. He said that a lot of buildings ended up being preserved like this one did for a long time until our recent history. He said he supported designation under standard C. He said that he thought it is important to include that this is a hybrid rowhouse over something that came later because that ties into the same story. He said that in terms of F the fact that it is an old building set back tells the story and spatially you wonder why that is happening. He said that in this case it is not how prominent it is it is more its contrast planning in terms of its context that makes it call out to this standard. He said that he also supported C, D and F. He said that the Moore Hotel and Josephinum while they were designed with the idea of the regrade going on they don't convey that story. He said you look at those buildings and you don't say 'that was designed with the regrade in mind' – he said he didn't find that to be compelling arguments that they can convey the significance of that event which was a huge impact in terms of the development of Seattle history. He said there was support for C, D and F and asked for a motion.

Mr. Sneddon said that in 1910 there was a massive 10-block fire in the area between Western and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Battery and Vine that destroyed 10 blocks and most of the buildings were one, two, and three story framed structure used as saloons, dwellings and lodging houses. He said that is why we don't see much on the other side of the street. He said that Mimi Sheridan 2007 context report for Belltown in residential building said that 'four groups of residential buildings will strongly convey Belltown's history, one of them is the Wayne Apartments with its three steep gables, unique hybrid example of the housing stock that once covered the slopes of Denney Hill'.

Mr. Stanley said he wouldn't mind hearing a little more information; he said a lot of folks didn't really comment on the integrity or the ability to convey piece and in this case it is extremely important. He said this is a big deal and he said he thought it did have the ability to convey but that he had severe questions about the integrity. He said in order to deliberate correctly the board needs to talk about that.

Mr. Murdock said that in the designation heard that building was a great example of a specific architectural style, the materials were there and completely conveyed its quality which was one of the best foursquares in Seattle. He said that this building conveys the story of the regrade so it is the form of the building that is conveying the significance rather than the materiality. He said that in this case he thought that take a shadow of this building and it will tell the story rather than looking at the windows themselves or the material quality.

Mr. Sneddon agreed and said when he looked at this building it read as a 19<sup>th</sup> century building. He said that he wasn't sure it said what was going on. He said that automatically puts it into a place in history – it is enough to tell it is a 19<sup>th</sup> century building. He said there is a window of about 10 – 15 years that it can convey and that is its historical marker. He said that some of the materials were still extant like the windows and some of the brackets and the slope of the roofs that you can tell roughly what period it is in.

Mr. Luoma said that the thresholds do specific integrity *OR* the ability to convey significance.

Mr. Stanley said that does play into a D discussion because that is more about the architecture than the form so he said if we are thinking about including D we need to be careful about how far we go.

Mr. Murdock said that we think of it as a hybrid as opposed to a style.

Ms. Barker agreed.

Mr. Stanley said we want to be careful about not going back to a Victorian style perhaps as we are for form.

Ms. Barker said she wanted to clarify that form includes not just the apartments but also includes the 1911 addition.

Mr. Luoma said he was also hesitant to include D because of that reason but he didn't know who said it but the point made being that if we must include D because it does reference the forms and the style and how it adapted to the regrade which is C.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Wayne Apartments at 2224 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/AL 6:2:1

There was a recount to clarify the vote.

MM/SC/DB/AL 6:3:1 Motion carried. Messrs. Carter, Kiel, and Stanley opposed. Ms. Patterson recused herself.

**100715.5      STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator