



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 415/21

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday September 15, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Matt Inpanbutr

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on agenda.

ROLL CALL

091521.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle spoke in support of designation of Blackford Hall and Cassel Crag Apartments. He said both are a great addition to the neighborhood and exemplify unique character. He said Cassel Crag meets Criterion D and represents courtyard and Tudor Revival apartment buildings of the 1920s. Blackford Hall meets Criterion C and D and represents modernism in Seattle. He said the building was constructed as a nurses' home and helps convey nurses' story as well as women's history in Seattle. He said the elevations are intact.

091521.2 MEETING MINUTES

June 2, 2021

MM/SC/HW/DB 5:0:5 Minutes approved. Messrs. Macleod, Coney Norman, Mmes. Caton and McKinney abstained.

091521.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

091521.31

Jensen Block

601-611 Eastlake Avenue East

Proposed replacement of non-historic access stairs on rear elevation.

Pam Derry, SMR Architects provided photos of original deck structure. She provided context of the site, neighborhood and said the building was constructed in 1906. She proposed construction of rear stairs and balconies for exiting. She said the original stairs were replaced in 1997 and need to be replaced again as there is a lot of rot. She said all proposed work is on the rear of the building. She said originally there were three similar stairs going all the way up. Now they proposed a steel fire-rated stair, painted to match trim on building. She said the design is not the same as original, but it is close. She said a security structure around the stair opening is for safety/security; the barrier will not be climbable. She said there are only six locations where diagonal detail will be used to recall the original stair design.

Mr. Norman asked about the life span of the last stair.

Ms. Derry said it was installed in 1997 and needed repair in 2012. She said it was a significant maintenance issue. The steel stair should last a lot longer and won't rot.

Mr. Rodezno asked if grating below the railing would be replicated.

Ms. Derry said wherever there is a cross beam, there has to be grating behind it. She said it will match the green color on the building.

Mr. Coney said the interiors have changed for the better and asked if there are entrances/exits on Eastlake Avenue as well.

Ms. Derry said there are, but they are all commercial tenants.

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed this twice.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported the proposal and said it is needed for Code, and improved safety. She said the “X” diagonal design is cost prohibitive to keep but they have made a symbol of that in six locations to recognize the past. She said it is a good design and a better system. She said ARC asked about mesh guard and supported the project as shown.

Mr. Coney said he has been through the building and it is a mish mash of units. He said the 1997 stair lasted 20 years and is glad its replacement will be steel. He said it is code compliant, safe and secure.

Ms. McKinney supported the project. She wondered what the building meant to the various inhabitants over time and said that buildings have souls and tell stories.

Ms. Johnson said there is general agreement for the project.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for exterior alterations at the Jensen Block, 601-611 Eastlake Avenue East, as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118045, as the proposed work does not destroy historic building materials and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

091521.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

091521.41 La Quinta
1710 E Denny Way
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the building was recently sold and the new owner will continue the controls discussion. She requested an extension to October 20, 2021.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls & Incentives for the La Quinta, 1710 E. Denny Way until October 20, 2021.

MM/SC/ROC/HW 9:0:1 Motion carries. Mr. Norman abstained.

0901521.5 NOMINATIONS

091521.51 Blackford Hall
1200 Terry Avenue

David Peterson provided context of the site and neighborhood. He said the building was constructed in 1945 and designed by John Graham. He provided an overview of the development of First Hill after European arrival and noted it been a place for the wealthy and their mansions with great views. He said and early religious institutions included St. James Cathedral and First Baptist church among others. He said by 1910 apartment buildings began to replace the mansions and created apartment neighborhoods. He said First Hill is associated with healthcare including T. T. Minor Hospital in 1906, Swedish Hospital in 1911 and Virginia Mason in 1920. He said doctors James Tate Mason, John Blackford, and Maurice Dwyer tried to create a privately-owned hospital and on-site group practice of specialty-trained physicians patterned after the Mayo Clinic. He said the original hospital building was designed such that if the hospital didn't work out, the building could be turned into an apartment building. He said additions were made in 1928; nursing students lived there from 1922 – 1928. He said this building was constructed in 1945.

Mr. Peterson said the nursing profession was developed by Florence Nightingale in England who recognized the need for nurses in the Crimean and Civil wars. She developed a system where nurses live near the hospital and are overseen by their own staff. She said it was an internship program made up of unmarried young women who had a monastic devotion to their patients. He said the shifts were long with nurses doing cleaning and patient observation. He said students were used for labor and it was exploitive, but it was a popular program. He said as science technique developed instruction grew in importance and students paid tuition. He said the profession is tied to Victorian oversight of women. He said University of Washington nursing program started in 1917, Virginia Mason's started in 1922. He said the program at Harborview Hall was part of an integrated 4-year program.

He said by 1950s the vigorous oversight of young women went away, and the program turned into a regular educational program and students could live wherever they wanted. He provided examples of local nurses' housing such as Providence Hall, Harborview Hall, Francis Skinner Edris, and Eklind Hall which was built in the same period as the subject building. He said Blackford Hall was a nurses' home until 1956. He said the original building with courtyard was designed to serve as both dormitory and classroom. Teaching spaces were at basement level; first and second floors, accessed through the courtyard from Seneca Street housed the nurses' dormitory rooms. He said there were a total of 41 dorm rooms. He said the first floor served as an entry to residential levels and included a check-in office, reception room laundry room and small 'snack kitchen'. He said there was also the Nursing School Library and a living room / social lounged which featured a marble fireplace.

Mr. Peterson said in 1957 the space became occupied by Virginia Mason Research Center. In 1969 a hyperbaric chamber was installed in Blackford Hall as part of

research into physiology of deep-sea diving. At the time, it was the most advanced facility on the West Coast. In 1987 the MRI Building was constructed within 9' of Blackford Hall's exterior wall but they are not connected. He said the MRI building was sited at the location because it was the only space on the Virginia Mason campus available which adequately met the MRI equipment's unusual housing requirements: the huge, power magnet and shield required a separate building with 13' ceilings and a ground floor location was required to accommodate the tremendous weight of the equipment. He said the substantial mass of the building is designed to block interference from outside sources and to contain the magnetic field.

He said Blackford Hall is largely intact but the building's setting and relationship to its context was altered with the construction of the MRI Building in 1987. The MRI Building had specific needs which this site was able to meet. He said Blackford Hall's brick was painted and interior alterations including basement expansion and installation of drop ceiling impact its integrity.

He said that architect John Graham's career spanned 1900-1940s and he produced more city landmarks than any other architect. He said Blackford Hall was one of his last buildings. His firm was taken over by his son in 1946 and became more corporate, turning out work for mall design and construction, Virginia Mason Clinic, and the Space Needle.

Mr. Peterson said the building has lost integrity and noted the courtyard and the garden wall separating courtyard from sidewalk disappeared when the MRI Building was constructed. He said the interior space has changed; the double loaded corridor was changed, offices cut up and regular alterations were made to research lab. He said the building didn't meet any of the criteria for designation. He said it is not an exceptional work of modern design and that Eklind Hall was a better example. He said Blackford Hall was a transitional building. He said the building is associated with nursing program, but the residential component has been lost.

Ms. McKinney noted the importance of stories. She said with nursing, women were doing something they couldn't do before, particularly black women. She said her two great aunts were in a similar program in Alabama and noted the social and socio-economic context. She said the building integrity is not there so the right story wouldn't be told.

Mr. Norman asked if the brick is still there.

Mr. Peterson said it is, but it is painted beige.

Ms. Caton asked what the proposed use was.

Ms. Sodt explained that the focus is on the building and not potential uses.

Mr. Norman asked if the building could be restored.

Ms. Sodt said review of the building is on existing condition, not what it could be.

Mr. Barnes said it is an old building and reflects history as a nursing school, but the integrity has changed, and he did not support designation.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported nomination to learn more about the building's life as nurses' residence but said the building has lost integrity and has no resemblance to its former use. She noted the MRI Building changed the site.

Mr. Macleod said he supported designation on criteria C and D. He said the building is an interesting time capsule and Criterion C is most important with this building. He said it is amazing to think about how much the nursing profession has changed since the building was built. He noted a letter from Historic Seattle that said it was unfortunate that women have such strong history within historic preservation but so little representation; it was brought up when discussing a couple similarly used buildings nearby. He said it is important to pay attention to nursing as a woman's profession particularly in the post war years. In the bigger context of First Hill, an upper-class neighborhood story has been told, preserving this building tells another side. He said the building is not visually striking as Harborview Hall, but it embodies a distinctive early post war era. He said the building doesn't cleanly fit Art Deco or clean Modern, it is a messy style for the period. He said integrity is not just about how much has changed but whether integrity can show historic qualities and it does convey nurses' dormitory. He said it is a shame the MRI Building was added, and the interior has been changed but the form represents the building's typography.

Mr. Rodezno supported designation on Criterion E, John Graham. He said the building has lost integrity with many alterations, but they don't take away enough to not be a landmark.

Mr. Norman said he appreciated Mr. Macleod's comments but noted the building has lost integrity and said it is not a shining example. He did not support designation.

Ms. McKinney said she struggled and noted the loss of interior integrity, the brick is painted over. She said the shape is there, windows there, stories are there. She noted the importance of honoring the work of women in the building and she questioned how to honor in a place that is rapidly changing. She questioned if we should freeze a portion of history, or just let it all go. She said it barely embodies Criterion D. She said it is associated with Criterion C, the cultural significance of a movement in training of nurses which was a big deal where women left home. She noted her aunts in Tuskegee, Alabama. She supported designation.

Ms. Chang said regarding Criterion C, the building was a nurses' home and noted how that relates to the culture for women, where the profession was new. She said being a nurses' home is significant and this was specifically built for that purpose and this building was associated in a significant way with the community called 'pill hill'. She said the courtyard removal took a lot away of what it was, but it didn't take everything. She said she didn't see Criterion D although the building has

integrity in how it stands and how it looks. She said she supported designation and noted the importance of nursing students.

Mr. Coney said interiors are not typically designated so interior alterations have no impact on him. He supported inclusion of parts of the interior talked about at nomination: the entrance, and the fireplace. He said the building has integrity, it looks the same and paint can be reversed. He said the building has double significance of Criterion C; it was purpose-built as a nurses' dormitory, training center. He said the austere look is part of the story; it was built to house nurses, and it represents women starting careers. He said he supported designation.

Ms. Caton appreciated the presentation. She noted the importance of the courtyard and said the building was damaged because of that loss. She said the other two front facing facades are intact. She said the building was purpose-built and women's history is often overlooked. She supported designation on Criterion C.

Ms. Johnson said she was torn. She said women's history in the city should be honored. The building was purpose-built to house women in the war. She said it was an interesting time. She said the state of the building weighs heavily. She said it looks the same, but the paint really affects it. She said the courtyard infill is unfortunate. She said the building doesn't look residential although it was built as a residence. She said it is a nice modern building but that she would not support designation.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Blackford Hall at 1200 Terry Avenue, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building, including the original entry door; the interior living room fireplace; and excluding the MRI Building.

MM/SC/RUC/IM 5:5:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Johnson, McKinney, and Wasserman and Messrs. Barnes and Norman opposed.

091521.52 Cassel Crag Apartment Building
1218 Terry Avenue

David Peterson provided context of the site and neighborhood. He said that First Hill as the first apartment district in the city. He said the mansions were replaced by apartment building; the first apartment building in the city was the St. Paul apartments, built in 1901. He said taller apartment buildings were constructed in the 1920s-1930s. He said Virginia Mason purchased the Northcliff and Hudson Arms apartments in 1972 and Cassel Crag in 1971; in 2000 Virginia Mason purchased the Chasselton, Rhododendron, and Baroness apartments.

Mr. Peterson said that Angus Cassels worked as a shipping agent for the railway and had two side venture real estate investments – this building and the Brown Cassel

Apartments. He lived in the subject building from 1925-35 until he died; his wife remained there until she died in 1937. Their sons managed the building for ten years after. In 1946 the building was sold to Herman Conner who lived in the building and managed it until his death in 1971. Virginia Mason purchased the building from his estate and have used it as office space and some apartment use since. The structure is four stories of unreinforced masonry on a concrete foundation, with wood floor joists and wood frame interior partition walls, over a small partial basement. Street-facing facades feature heavily textured rug face brick in shades of dark browns, reds, and tans, with deeply raked mortar joints, typically laid in a running bond. The roof is flat with a high brick parapet; the parapet features decorative brickwork in a repeating diamond pattern on street facing facades. Common brick in pale reds and tans is used at the rear facades, laid in a running bond with thickly set flush mortar joints and lighter-colored header courses every fifth or sixth row, creating a modest decorative effect. Painted and unpainted cast stone is used as architectural ornament on the building, particularly on street facing facades. Horizontal bands wrap the building at the base of the parapet, at the first-floor windowsill level, and at the first-floor base. All windowsills are cast stone, as are quoins at the building corners at the first-floor level. The first-floor windows are further enhanced with a wrapping brick soldier course at the header level and centered cast stone keystones. Stacks of lancet windows centered on the west façades of the wings flanking the entry courtyard are edged with cast stone for a decorative quoining effect and topped with a cast stone panel at the parapet featuring Tudor Revival ornament. A similar stack of rectangular windows with quoins topped by a parapet panel is found on the north elevation, centered above a side building entry with Tudor-style arch, projecting drip cap, and a cast stone panel incised with the word "Cassel Crag" in Gothic lettering. At the northwest building corner is a small daylighted basement, exposed due to the grade, measuring approximately 20 by 40 feet in plan on the interior. The exterior at this location is scored concrete, finished with cementitious stucco painted white to match the building's cast stone trim. A recessed basement entry is visible on the west part of the north elevation. Windows on the building are a mix of the original single-hung wood sash, and vinyl replacements, which have been installed in recent decades. Typical original unit windows feature 10-over-1 clear leaded glass, or in a few locations, two ganged 6-over-1 clear leaded glass configurations. The main entry is accessed through the landscaped west side courtyard, which is raised above the sidewalk by three concrete steps. The entry is raised on two brick and concrete steps and features an elaborate cast-stone Tudor Revival surround, further emphasized by a full-height projecting bay rising above it. The bay features three ganged 12-lite clear leaded glass casement windows at each floor, diamond-shaped flush decorative brickwork between windows, and a large decorative panel featuring Tudor Revival details at the parapet. The glazed entry doors are original, with bronze hardware. There are original bronze light fixtures flanking the entry, and a non-original fabric canopy providing weather protection. Upon entry, three steps lead up to a central foyer with the main stair at the rear, and transverse double loaded corridors leading to residential units in the wings. There are original recessed fire doors in the archways leading to the north and south corridors. The lobby features marble wainscoting and steps, crown molding, and four corner square pilasters with Tudor-style capitals supporting arched concrete

beams. The main stair is original, and features turned balusters and an octagonal newel post. There is an elevator adjacent to the main lobby. Ceiling heights are 9 feet on all floors. Tax records indicate original interior finishes included fir and oak floors, tiled bathrooms, and plaster walls with fir trim. Most unit interiors and corridors have contemporary carpet over wood floors.

At present, the apartments are used as office space, but interiors largely retain original layout of living rooms, kitchens, bathrooms, etc., with little remodeling. Some interior doors have been removed for ease of access, and floors carpeted, but many original finishes remain intact. He said that 45% of the windows on the front are replacement vinyl with faux lights.

Mr. Peterson said comparable First Hill apartment buildings include the Arcadia, Maximilian, Lowell Emerson, Union Arms; apartment buildings with similar massing include John Alden Paul Review, and John Winthrop; apartment buildings in the Tudor Revival style include Biltmore, Phinney, Olympus Manor, Park Vista, Sheffield, Mallory among others.

He said during the design and construction of the subject building Architect Harry Hammond presumably encountered John Hudson and his brother Harry Hudson, if they did not know each other already. There is no indication that the Hudsons were involved in the development or construction of the Cassel Crag. John S. Hudson and his brother Henry "Harry" E. Hudson had a design and construction firm from 1908 to 1920, then after 1920 typically worked together on projects only occasionally. John Hudson usually entered brief partnerships with individual architects for specific projects. The number of Hudson apartment building projects during the 1920s on First Hill was remarkable. In 1926, John Hudson hired Harry Hammond to design yet another—the Miramar Apartments at 1108 9th Avenue, between Spring and Seneca Streets. The building was a three-story brick structure which featured 30 studio and one-bedroom units. The following year, Hammond and Hudson co-designed the Rhododendron Apartments (now the Inn at Virginia Mason), located at 1006 Spring Street. In 1930, the two men formed a partnership, Hudson & Hammond, perhaps to better seek work as the economic climate of the Depression worsened. The only project that could be identified was the Montrose (now Rosecrest) Apartments at 7914 Densmore Avenue N near Green Lake, a three-story 15-unit structure built in 1930. After two years, their partnership was dissolved.

Mr. Peterson said after 1932, Hammond operated as a sole proprietor. No projects could be identified between 1932 and 1936, but by the late 1930s, he appears to have had enough modest single-family house projects to remain in business. He also designed at least one store building during this period, the Columbian Furnace Company at 2510 N 45th Street. On more than one occasion, Hammond collaborated with Seattle architect Fred J. Rogers, who specialized in single family houses and multifamily buildings, including a design of six Mediterranean-style homes at 26th Avenue N and E Galer Street called Arboretum Park. No works after 1939 by Hammond could be identified. However, Hammond apparently never retired—he maintained a listing in city directories for a downtown Seattle architectural office until his death in 1959 at age 83.

Mr. Peterson said this building does not meet the threshold criteria and called it a typical building. He said in the period of the 1910s-1930s when the subject building was constructed, apartment buildings ranged from three story walk-ups to six or more stories with elevators. Buildings were typically rectangular in plan, with simple layouts that reflect cost-effective use of land and an efficient apartment arrangement. However, apartments also followed E-, H-, L-, or U-shaped plans to accommodate lightwells, entry courtyards, or rear courtyards. A main entry on the exterior front façade typically led to a lobby, and then to double-loaded corridors for access to individual unit entries.

He said cladding materials were generally brick and terra cotta for newer buildings, or wood for those constructed in the earlier part of the century. The buildings were often ornamented in varying degrees with architectural details following the eclectic styles of the early 20th century, especially the Colonial or Tudor Revival styles which were popular during the 1920s. He said that several the buildings looked the same and builders wanted as many units as possible. He said the Davenport Devonshire building is identical to the subject building except for the decorative elements. He said decorative elements used to embellish the building were average and commonly done. He said there must be something else to make it a landmark. He said the Biltmore has richer architectural detail with turrets, bay windows, recessed components. He noted the heavy timber pattern siding, circular stair tower, slanted roof at Anhalt apartment buildings.

He reiterated Cassel Crag does not meet the threshold criteria. He said in 2008 the Landmarks Board voted 11-0 against designation and that the building did not rise to the level of a landmark. He said members repeatedly said the building was not bad, but not exceptional. He said if the building were in a historic district, it would be a contributing building. He said the building does not meet Criterion F and while it meets Criterion D, it is not in an exceptional way.

Mr. Coney said Mr. Peterson made lots of comparisons to exceptional buildings and the board doesn't compare buildings. He asked why Criterion D requires a building be 'exceptional'.

Mr. Peterson said the threshold has to be met before we get the Criterion D. He said there are lots of nice buildings that are appropriate in a historic district but there has to be something else.

Ms. McKinney asked if Mahatma Gandhi stood in a hovel, would that hovel be designated? She said there are special people and special events that happen.

Mr. Peterson said it needs to be exceptional for landmark nomination. He said for association with a significant person, its not about the building's physical appearance. He cited the James Washington House as an example.

Ms. McKinney said it does not have to be architecturally exceptional if the person is significant.

Mr. Barnes asked about other designated apartments.

Mr. Peterson said the Highland Park, St. Remo, Roy Vue.

Mr. Barnes asked if other brick apartments landmarked.

Mr. Peterson said yes and named Canterbury Court, Anhalt buildings and noted they have different qualities.

Mr. Barnes asked about changes to building exterior.

Mr. Peterson said changes were made to windows only.

Mr. Norman asked how many units are in the building.

Mr. Peterson said the building originally had 42 units.

Mr. Norman asked if the building has been seismically upgraded.

Mr. Peterson said no and that it was on the city unreinforced masonry (URM) list.

Ms. Chang asked what drove Virginia Mason to purchase this building.

Mr. Peterson said the building became available.

Betsy Braun, Virginia Mason said the strategy wasn't known at the time but all major institutions landbank adjacent properties for future growth. Responding to questions, she said the Rhododendron is still being used as a hotel for patients.

Mr. Coney said each building is considered on its own and is not compared to others. He said the building is embellished and noted the diamond pattern brick, and terracotta. He said embellishments add to prominence and beauty and something like this will not likely be built again. He said with antiques, cars, and art, original and unrestored garner greater value and are prized. He said it is an original and unrestored building. He said like the Wayne Apartments in Belltown, the building was designated and then the owners said it was an economic liability. He said a light pressure wash and Cassel Crag would be beautiful. He said it is not unprecedented for a nomination to fail and come back years later; a new board may consider the building worthy. He said it doesn't have to be exceptional. He said it is a beautiful building and meets Criterion D "style OR method of construction....". He supported designation.

Ms. Chang said it was a revelation to discover the buildings are side by side and to see the different eras and characters. She said the building is more hidden and she noted its common use as apartment building. She said buildings shouldn't be compared. She said the brick is original and she noted the decorative cast stone.

She said she was bothered that a lot of windows had been changed. She was unsure of her decision and wanted to hear from others.

Ms. Wasserman said she agreed with Mr. Coney and noted the word 'exceptional' does not show up in criteria. She said it meets Criterion D and noted the style is distinctive enough. She said it is clearly the same building even without windows. She supported including interior.

Mr. Barnes said he was struggling with his decision. He said the building is intact and still has materials, terracotta and even the bathrooms. He said it has integrity but there are so many similar to it.

Mr. Macleod said he agreed with Mr. Coney and Ms. Wasserman and supported designation. He said language of Criterion D does not include the word 'exceptional' and doesn't make comparisons. He said that the building is original and unrestored is a compelling argument as the neighborhood rapidly changes. He said the building has remained untouched since it was built and he could overlook the window replacement. He said the bathrooms are still there. He said the building is part of the changing streetscape and would be a contributing building in a district. He noted the stock of these buildings diminishes. He said the building is a real gem that just needs polishing.

Mr. Rodezno supported designation on Criterion D. He said the building retains integrity and has had no major alterations. He said the building is part of the early development of First Hill. He said the building is not ordinary and the ornate style is no longer commonly found.

Ms. Caton agreed and said she supported designation. She said the building has integrity and except for the window hasn't changed a lot. She said the building embodies the style and meets Criterion D.

Mr. Norman supported designation on Criterion D and included B and F as well. He said the building is not painted, it has integrity, its aesthetics are nice, it is a corner location. He said he wishes it were an apartment building again.

Ms. McKinney supported designation and said the building is simple. She said buildings all over the Midwest look like this; she said they are still there. She said the building was built well and is original and unrestored. She said every brick has purpose and place and the building represents its style. She said the building will be here in 100 years.

Ms. Johnson noted the cultural history. She said there are so many buildings like this and it embraces its typology well. She questioned the notion that it is less valuable because it is similar to many others and noted you cannot build a building like this again; once gone you will never get it again. She supported designation.

Ms. Chang said she didn't want to compare the building to others. She said the building doesn't fit in the neighborhood anymore because it is so different from the

medical buildings but it is unique for that. She said as a standalone it carries its weight and embodies the style of the building. She said the building symbolizes older Seattle; it holds the character of its style and meets the standards. She supported designation.

Mr. Barnes said the building doesn't rise to 'distinctive' as there are so many like it. He said the building is original and D is the closest Criterion.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Cassel Crag at 1218 Terry Avenue 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 the site; the exterior of the building; and the interior entry lobby including from the front door up three marble steps to the area defined by four arches and pilasters, and the first flight of stairs to landing above.

MM/SC/RUS/HW 10:00 Motion carried.

Mr. Rodezno said he is not available for October 6 meeting.

Mr. Coney asked if there is a backlog of applications.

Ms. Doherty explained there are plenty coming, but more items are being reviewed administratively during the pandemic. She said scheduling Certificate of Approval applications are dependent on having a complete application. She said she has been scheduling nominations with one coming October 6.

Ms. Sodt said she has a couple in process including Freeway Park and the Panama Hotel in the International Special Review District which has national significance. She said the administrative review put in place during the pandemic is being considered to be made permanent so the board can focus on larger projects rather than small ones like signage or paint color. She said there are a few buildings in International Special Review District and Pioneer Square that are city landmarks as well as part of the historic district.

Mr. Coney said he heard a plaque was removed from Volunteer Park and asked for more information.

Ms. Doherty said she hadn't heard that but could ask Parks.

Mr. Coney said he would email her.

091521.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator