



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 103/21

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday March 3, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Matt Inpanbutr

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

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

## ROLL CALL

### 030321.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

**030321.2 MEETING MINUTES**  
February 3, 2021 Tabled.

**030321.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

030321.31 Gas Works Park  
1901 N Northlake Way  
Proposed site improvements, and proposed demolition and replacement  
of comfort station

Jay Rood, SPAR introduced the project and team. He explained the project will address ADA citations, resolve CPTED issues, and provide new comfort station.

Rhoda Lawrence, BOLA said Rich Haag, the landscape architect of this park won design awards for it. She said the bathroom was designed in the same era by local architect Gordon Walker. She said ARC has reviewed the project four times, and she consulted with Mr. Haag before he passed away. She said Mr. Haag agreed the changes are appropriate and sympathetic to his design. She said the bathroom is not a significant character defining feature of the park. She said options were considered and in 2018 ARC indicated the design direction appeared compatible.

Christopher Patano, Patano Studio Architecture said the east entry and comfort station are the focus of the project and he noted there have been lots of Department of Justice citations. He said with relocation of the comfort station north there is opportunity to open up the picnic area which will be a big safety improvement. He said that structural, mechanical, and electrical elements on the existing station are at the end of their useful lives and are not salvageable. He provided comparison photos of other city comfort stations built at the same time, and visibility studies. He said the new comfort station site will provide new accessible routes, open visibility, seating, and navigating railroad tracks at east entry will meet accessibility standards. He said the roof height will be similar to existing but a little smaller, and four individual stalls of universal design are included.

Mr. Patano went over proposed materials and design of the comfort station noting the roof geometry, exposed framing, roof pitch, and interior features. He said the roof floats above and provides natural ventilation. He said a palette of gray colors were selected to fit in with the environment and noted the corrugated roof, and parge coat wall finish. He said materials are durable and maintainable.

Mr. Barnes asked if there will be bike racks near the comfort station.

Mike Eliason said there will be. He said they are opposite the walkway and close to the trestles, 50' away at most.

Mr. Rood said there are bike racks in the new play area as well.

Ms. Chang asked about user analyses, if the four stalls are sufficient, and if there are any lessons learned from Covid.

Redi Karameto, SPAR said the current comfort station has seven non-accessible stalls. He said with the number reduced to four accessible stalls, the turnover will be faster, lines will be same for all genders. He said this is based on general use of the park and estimated numbers from parking lot, bikes and numbers provided by maintenance team. He said July 4<sup>th</sup> sees a higher demand and they supplement with portables. He said with regard to Covid lessons, they have minimized need to touch surfaces, stations are separate with queuing outside, space has natural ventilation which helps to move the air faster.

Mr. Eliason said additional mechanical ventilation will continue to be used as well.

Mr. Kiel said ARC reviewed the project which was well-received because the design is playing off cues of the existing historic buildings.

Ms. Johnson said the team went through a lot of work to show why the comfort station could and should be removed. She said it was a long exercise to prove that it is reasonable. She said she likes that the big gesture of the roof relates to other buildings at the park.

Ms. Doherty said the design team went through rigorous exercise to try to convert the existing building and showed that it could not be adapted as needed.

Mr. Barnes said that as a biker it is nice to have racks near the station. He said the access and comfort station are more inviting.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated incorporation of changes mentioned in ARC. She said they team went through a lot of hurdles and that she supports the plan.

Mr. Rodezno said the plan is wonderful. He said a lot of thought and attention went to layout and design, materials and palette. He said the design is considerate to uses at the park and is not taking away from what the park is.

Ms. Chang appreciated the detail included. She said she goes there a lot and never knew there was a north lawn behind the restrooms.

Mr. Coney said he has seen all the presentations at ARC and the design has evolved nicely. He said the team went through the exercise if the current building could be re-used; there wasn't anything to save. He said the comfort station is subtle, serves its purpose, is current, and blends in. He supported the proposal.

Mr. Kiel supported the proposal.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site improvements, and demolition and replacement of the comfort station at Gas Works Park, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121043, as the proposed new structure is in the same location and is compatible with the size and scale of the landmarked Park, 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/JR/HW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

030321.32

Northwest Rooms

302 Harrison Street

Proposed new sign, select door replacement, security cameras, and relocation of sign and donor panels

Rischel Granquist, KEXP Director of Facilities explained they moved into the space in 2015 and what they are presenting was part of their original design. She said the ticker sign will provide activation of corner above the window to the station's working space. She said the ticker will invite neighbors and visitors to participate in events.

Russell Blazier, SKB Architects provided context of the site and noted that updates to the courtyard and public plaza will be part of a separate project. He showed rendering of north elevation in context to size of ticker sign; he said it is discrete tucked up under the eave yet easily seen. He went over security cameras proposed and said there is one already in place and noted where additional cameras will be installed. He proposed replacing two service doors at the breezeway and painting them to match existing. He said they are the same size and color but with glass panel for security. He proposed relocation of donor tiles to proposed addition and art installation. He said the KEXP sign will moved west on the south end, so as not to be hidden by the new tree.

Ms. Granquist said they will also patch ad repair where tiles had been. She said tiles will be replaced and extended onto new addition around corner. She said she had a conversation with Climate Pledge Arena and Seattle Center, and they have no issue with that.

Mr. Kiel said this change to the application could be approved with administrative review.

Ms. Doherty said she will mark it up in the drawings.

Mr. Coney asked why the donor tiles are outside and not inside, in their space.

Ms. Granquist said the tiles are outside, so they are viewable when they are not open. She said the existing exterior donor tiles were removed for construction but will be put back up. This proposal is to expand the total area.

Mr. Blazier said they have a provision for an expansion joint.

Ms. Doherty clarified the expansion of tiles. She said there are donor tiles on the west side now which will be reinstalled, and they will add more to the addition. There will be no tiles on the existing south wall because it is covered by the addition. She said the tiles would now expand along the additions west face and wrap the corner, extending to the new doors.

Mr. Coney asked the number of tiles and the material.

Ms. Granquist said they are engraved metal plaques. A portion of tiles were on south side of building; they are putting those back up in the new area on the addition.

Mr. Barnes asked if the security camera is enough to cover 90° on either side. He wants to make sure they have sufficient coverage.

Ms. Granquist said at 1<sup>st</sup> and Republican it is not a full 270° but it is wide enough.

Ms. Johnson asked if the ticker sign had been approved as part of original KEXP design.

Mr. Blazier said it had been part of their original design intent, but not part of what the Landmarks Board approved in 2014.

Ms. Granquist responded to question and said the tiles are \$500, \$1000, and \$5000.

Mr. Barnes said it looks nice and it is a nice addition to the corner. He said it will provide good eyes on the street and will be a nice attraction.

Ms. Wasserman agreed with Mr. Barnes and said it looks good. She said the design goes along with the history and feel. She said she doesn't like tickers but this one is tucked in nicely.

Mr. Rodezno agreed and said it makes sense and improves safety.

Ms. Johnson said she has no issue. She said there are tickers elsewhere and this one is tucked up; she noted the adjacent arena. She said she would feel differently about the donor tiles if this was a corporate building, but it is KEXP and there is a community aspect to it.

Ms. Chang said there are good reasons for what is proposed with security being the main factor. She said she had no problem with last minute change in donor tiles. She said it will all tie together, and she supported the proposal.

Mr. Coney said he had no issue with security camera or doors. He said it makes sense to have glass panel in door. He said he didn't appreciate donor tiles especially on public buildings. He preferred donor tiles be installed in KEXP lobby. He said he wouldn't support the proposal with the donor tiles which is a way for affluent, privileged people to pay to put their name on the building. He said he was not okay with the expansion of donor tiles.

Mr. Rodezno said he supported the proposal overall and that it is in keeping with previous approvals and aesthetics. He said he while he understands Mr. Coney's concern, he didn't share it. He noted the proposed work fits in with established design vocabulary.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage and alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124584, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/KJ                      6:1:0      Motion carried. Mr. Coney opposed.

**030321.4                      CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

030321.41                      Georgetown Steam Plant Pump Station  
7551 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue S  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said the agreement had been signed by Sarah Sodt, City Historic Preservation Officer and transmitted to Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPAR) for their Superintendent's signature. She said it has not been signed by Parks yet and suggested a one- or two-month extension; if signed earlier she would bring to board.

Mr. Barnes asked for some background on the landmark.

Ms. Doherty provided a summary of the designation of the site south of Georgetown. She said it is a city landmark and a National Historic landmark as well. She said the pump station is related to when the Duwamish River was rerouted 100 years ago, the steam plant needed to build the pump station to pump water from the re-channelized waterway to the steam plant. She said its significance relates to

the Steam Plant itself, the re-channelization of the Duwamish River, and marks the loss of the indigenous community to industry.

Action: I move to extend consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Georgetown Steam Plant Pump Station at 7551 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue S for two months.

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

**030321.5 NOMINATION**

030321.51 El Monterey  
4204 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Historian David Peterson prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood. He said the El Monterey is a three-story 20-unit apartment building, organized into three building masses which each measure approximately 57 by 51 feet and are connected on the exterior but not on the interior. The masses form a loose L-shaped footprint on the site, and are located approximately at the northwest, southwest, and southeast property corners. Each of the three building masses typically have two units per floor, and each have separate front and back stairways. Each front stairway has a main entry on the sidewalk. Within each unit is a door to the back stairwell which provides access to the rear landscaped courtyard.

He said the buildings are wood frame and hollow tile construction over concrete stem walls and are clad in brick and stucco employed for picturesque effect. Roofs are flat at the center but are wrapped and hidden by pitched or hipped red tile roofs at the building perimeter. The red tiles are barrel in profile, and are replacements dating to sometime after 1975 to the original red barrel tiles.

He said exterior stucco is textured and typically used at the second and third floors. Brick is typically used at the first floor but extends to the second floor in a few locations. Bricks used are in a variety of red hues, painted white, or brushed lightly with white lime wash. Bricks are a mix of “new” crisp-edged bricks and old or tumbled bricks. At least three different sizes of bricks are used. Masonry is typically laid in a running bond and one-third running bond. Bricks often project slightly or are laid askew, for a decorative effect.

Mr. Peterson said windows are typically outlined by soldier course headers and soldier course jambs, often using the “new” crisp-edged bricks. There is a brick arched entry on the south elevation, and a few windows feature brick arch headers. The masonry is enhanced with colorful glazed tiles possibly 1920s Malibu Pottery tiles, or the like which are used as accents around the doors or windows at the first floor. Windows throughout the building appear to be the original steel sash, typically casements or fixed. Windowsills at brick locations feature brick sills; at stucco locations, sills are slate or cast stone. At each of the three main building entries, there is a small three lite window with clear and colored glass divided by lead canes in an octagon-and-diamond pattern. He said other notable building

features are in keeping with the Spanish Eclectic style, including carved, projecting floor beams visible on street-facing facades; decorative wrought-iron window grilles at the first floor; and custom exterior light fixtures and door hardware at entries. A prominent feature are the six heavy timber projecting bracketed balconies at the third floor on both street elevations, which support red tile shed roofs. Their current railings appear to be replacements of the balustrades visible in the 1937 tax assessor photos, although then as now, balustrades vary across the building, with shaped or simple pickets.

He said the El Monterey's rear courtyard follows an irregular footprint, formed by a series of wide, connected lightwells and walkways that are landscaped and open to each other. Providing a focus near the center of one of the wider parts of the courtyard is a concrete and glazed tile fountain, which does not appear on architectural drawings but is presumably original (a similar fountain is located near the northwest property corner, in the setback at the building's west facade; period news accounts mention more than one fountain installed on the site).

Mr. Peterson said access into the El Monterey from one of the three 11th Avenue or 42nd Street sidewalk entries leads directly to its associated stairwell. Each stairway features risers accented with colorful glazed tiles, similar to those found on the building exterior. Stairs have ornate, wrought iron balustrades, and are lit with custom light fixtures. Stairwells have textured walls and red quarry tile floors, and windows at landings. Each landing serves two-unit entries. He said that King County Tax Assessor historic records indicate that building ceiling heights are 8 feet at all floors. Tax records further state that original interior finishes include painted "jazz plaster" walls; fir, oak, and linoleum floors; tile floors at kitchens and bathrooms; and electric fireplaces with tile hearths. While there is base floor trim, no door or window trim was originally installed, in accordance with the Spanish Eclectic style. While some units have been remodeled over time (typically in a sensitive manner), all retain their original character, many with original finishes and fixtures.

El Monterey units range in size from approximately 400 to approximately 1,100 square feet; four units were inspected for this report. The most common unit is one bedroom, which features a large living room, kitchen, bath, dining room, and a separate breakfast room. Units were typically fitted with bed closets adjacent to the living room for hide-away Murphy beds on vertical pivots, especially for the few studio apartments; these beds are presumably no longer intact. The large living room features hand-adzed ceiling beams, and a large, prominent fireplace. Fireplace designs vary, and hearths feature glazed art tiles. He said floor levels vary—two steps down to the living room from the kitchen or bedroom hallway are highlighted by more decorative glazed tiles. Interiors typically feature custom period light fixtures and hardware, arched openings, wall niches, and built-in cabinets. A separate door off the bedroom hallway leads to a secondary stairway which provides access to the rear courtyard. The secondary stairways are more simply finished, with wood stairs, brick landings, and a simpler balustrade with vertical pickets.

Mr. Peterson said in 1890, James Moore purchased area property, including part of the original settlers' farm, and began to subdivide it into building parcels. The new neighborhood was called "Brooklyn" in Moore's promotional advertisements. In 1891, this Brooklyn neighborhood was annexed into the Seattle city limits, as were other north-of-town neighborhoods, including Green Lake, Wallingford, Phinney Ridge, Montlake, and Magnolia. Many of Moore's street names were changed after annexation, to match Seattle's numbered street system. Seattle's population at this time was about 42,000 people.

He said a nationwide financial crash in 1893 slowed development of the new neighborhood for a few initial years. The most significant event for the young neighborhood of Brooklyn was the decision in 1891 to relocate the University of Washington to this area from downtown Seattle, where physical growth for the institution had been limited. The university regents retained the original campus downtown for future development and began building in 1895 the new campus on the considerable acreage east of 15th Avenue NE and south of NE 45th Street, to the waterfront of Union Bay and Lake Union. The development of the university spurred significant growth in the neighborhood. In addition to hundreds of students who attended the university, the non-student population quickly grew, so that by the first decade of the 1900s a complete community had developed, with apartment and single-family housing, shops, churches, schools, and civic buildings. By this time, the neighborhood was popularly called the "University District" rather than Brooklyn. From 1900 to 1910, Seattle continued to grow due to population increase and through major annexations that took place in 1907. In 1900 the population was about 80,700; by 1910 it had nearly tripled to over 237,000. In 1909, the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition was held on the University of Washington campus, a significant event which improved the university with permanent buildings and landscaping and spurred further growth in the area. University Way, which included a trolley route along it as early as 1892, had developed by this time into the primary north-south and commercial spine of the neighborhood. A 1907 trolley line from Wallingford along NE 45th Street established that route as the primary east-west spine through the neighborhood.

Mr. Peterson said the overall population of Seattle in 1920 was 315,000, which continued to grow moderately through the 1920s and 1930s but leveled off to 366,000 in 1940. By the mid-1940s, the wartime economy drew new residents to the Seattle area, and to the neighborhood. After World War II, the University of Washington's enrollment almost tripled, as veterans took advantage of the G.I. Bill.

He said beginning in the late 1940s, parking congestion had become a noticeable problem in the University District and parking lots began to replace old houses and underperforming commercial buildings. In 1947, a new state law enabled the university to acquire property by condemnation. A new campus plan in 1948 proposed expansion westward beyond its traditional boundaries, into the University District neighborhood. In the 1950s the ever-larger university began a controversial, decades-long program of purchasing homes, apartment buildings, and commercial structures west of 15th Avenue NE and south of NE 41st Street in order to redevelop more university buildings.

Mr. Peterson said in 1929 or early 1930, Everett J. Beardsley, the owner, developer, architect, and builder of the subject building, had purchased three lots. In early 1930, he received a permit to demolish the existing frame buildings on site.

The El Monterey was originally configured with eighteen apartments: five 2-room, one 3-room, and twelve 4-room units. There were also two “bachelor rooms,” which appear on the original drawings as two large bedrooms with a shared bath but no kitchen or closet on the first floor directly accessed from the sidewalk through the arched doorway on the south elevation. He said drawings show two small maids’ rooms with a shared bath located on the courtyard side of the first floor.

He said in 1978, the El Monterey’s ownership structure was converted from apartments to a condominium and remains so today.

Mr. Peterson said Beardsley’s background is not well known. He was born in Woodbine, Iowa, in 1890, and attended Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Indiana, although it is not clear if he received any architectural training. In the mid-1910s, he was living in Billings, Montana, with his wife Irene, and was listed in city directories as a building contractor. In late 1917, Everett and Irene moved to Seattle and by 1920 he was listed in Seattle directories as a building contractor. Beardsley was primarily associated with elegant, mid-sized apartment buildings design in the Spanish Eclectic mode. Besides the subject building he designed the Morris Apartments, Hacienda Court Apartments, Villa Costella, El Cerrito among others. That Beardsley fulfilled the multiple roles of designer, builder, developer, and owner was not unusual in Seattle in the 1920s. Others—such as Frederick Anhalt, John S. Hudson, or Henry “Harry” E. Hudson—were well-known and prolific designer-builders active during the same period, and all specialized in multifamily structures.

He said the El Monterey was designed as an apartment building in the Spanish Eclectic style and constructed in 1930. The style derives from the Spanish Colonial Revival style which developed as an extension of the earlier Mission Revival style. Mission Revival developed in the 1880s in California, after several architects there sought inspiration in the colonial history of the western United States as the basis for architectural design, rather than continuing to “import” and use the seemingly out-of-place English Colonial Revival style which dominated the taste of the eastern United States. Influences on Mission Style included a broad range of buildings, from the occasionally ornate 18<sup>th</sup> century Spanish Franciscan order mission churches which were derived from earlier Spanish baroque and renaissance architecture in Europe to the modest adobe dwellings of the Southwest.

Mr. Peterson said the first widespread notice of the Mission Revival style was with the construction of the California State Building at the Chicago Columbian Exposition in 1893. In the Pacific Northwest, the style was particularly popularized by its widespread use in the 1905 Lewis & Clark Centennial Exposition buildings in Portland, Oregon. Mission Style buildings typically include the following features: arched openings, either round or segmented; low-pitched hipped or gable tile roofs and pent-roofs with exposed rafters and deep overhangs; and scalloped or

curvilinear shaped parapets. Exteriors are generally stucco, but examples in brick, wood, and stone can be found.

He said the Mission Style quickly became popular in the western states but could be found nationwide. It was used in a variety of building types, including churches, train stations, club buildings, commercial buildings, apartment buildings, and single-family houses. In Seattle, it was popular from about 1900 to 1920; excellent examples are the LaCrosse Apartments (1907) at 302 Malden Avenue E, and the L'Amourita Apartments (1909) at 2901 Franklin Avenue E, a designated Seattle landmark.

Mr. Peterson said early on, the style sometimes began to merge with Arts & Crafts movement, resulting in an emphasis on simple forms, quality of materials, and little decoration. In rare instances, highly simplified applications of the Mission Style appear as a kind of stark, stripped-down pre-Modernism.

He said at the other extreme, some builders and architects chose to focus on the ornamental possibilities of the Spanish Colonial architectural inheritance in the west. In 1915, the buildings of the Panama-California Exposition in San Diego were designed in a highly elaborate mode, tapping the Spanish architectural baroque Plateresque and Churrigueresque styles; as well as Spanish Gothic, Moorish, and Spanish Renaissance elements found in both Spain and its colonies. In Seattle, the Spanish Colonial Revival style was somewhat popular but usually employed less extravagantly than can be found in California. Instead, designers in Seattle generally employed a freer, "Spanish Eclectic" style reflecting a looser use of Spanish-Colonial-derived ornamental details to create a pleasing façade.

Mr. Coney wondered if any original owners from 1978 condominium conversion are still there. He said it is a beautiful building and noted the warmth and detail are timeless. He said the money was spent wisely.

Mr. Peterson said two original owners remain from the 1978 condo conversion.

Mr. Barnes asked if there had been any external changes.

Mr. Peterson said very little. He said the roof was replaced with non-original materials. He said other changes include the third-floor balcony railings, El Monterey sign, and removal of garage doors for recycling and garbage. He said the brick is the same although it was originally painted white. He said currently the same paint is there and some lime Washington. He said there have been no significant alterations.

Mr. Barnes questioned if the only the original exterior decorative tile work should be included or if interior elements should be included as well.

Mr. Peterson said the ownership had discussions and do not want to include unit interior as it would be onerous over time. So far, all units have been lovingly cared for. He said they would like to include exterior, site, garage, and stairways.

Ms. Wasserman said it is a lovely building. She wanted to include the tile on the stairways and railings and beams.

Mr. Rodezno agreed. He said the tile on the stairway is pretty unique and contributes to the landmark and is a semi-public/private pathway. He supported exclusion of the actual unit interiors.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and that Criterion D was clear and Criterion E makes sense. She said the building doesn't typify and is a remarkably intact building with all the details. She didn't oppose inclusion of stairway tiles because there is no lobby here and the tiles are special.

Ms. Chang asked about a steel pole in the courtyard.

Mr. Peterson said it is a metal pole that goes across, maybe a brace wall or some type of preventative measure. He said there is no information on why it was installed but it is from the past 50 years.

Ms. Chang asked if wood frame with hollow clay tile is an odd combination. She asked if the hollow clay tile is part of party walls, or a finish.

Mr. Peterson said he found that information on the tax records. He said it may be in the partition walls, but he wasn't sure.

Ms. Chang said it looks like the fabric awnings have been up for a long time and wondered if they are original.

Mr. Peterson said he didn't know but they show up in the 1975 in 1937 photos. He said he imagines people used them because stylistically they match and that he didn't think they were original. He noted that a round glazed window and semi-circular patio were not built.

Mr. Kiel said he supported nomination but noted he had to leave the meeting.

*Mr. Kiel left the meeting at 5:30pm.*

Mr. Coney asked if any significant people lived there.

Mr. Peterson said Beardsley lived there for a time and writer David Gutersona. He said that research of Polk Directories is not possible due to the current pandemic. But he was able to search newspapers that were searchable online.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and inclusion of primary main stairways.

Board members agreed to include the stairwells with tiles and hoped that no one would mess with beams or tiles inside.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of El Monterey at 4204 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site, the exterior of the building, the exterior of the garage building, and the six main front stair towers; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 7, 2021; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RUS/DB          6:0:0    Motion carried.

**030321.6          STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator