



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 148/17

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, March 1, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Kathleen Durham

Garrett Hodgins

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair

Kristen Johnson

Matthew Sneddon

Steven Treffers

Emily Vyhnanek

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Genna Nashem

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Julianne Patterson

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

### **030117.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

January 4, 2017

MM/SC/DB/MSN

5:0:5 Minutes approved. Mmes. Durham, Vyhnanek, Messrs. Treffers, Hodgins, Coney abstained.

January 18, 2017  
MM/SC/RK/KJ

6:0:4 Minutes approved. Mmes. Barker, Messrs. Coney,  
Hodgins, Kiel abstained.

**030117.2 BOARD BUSINESS**

030117.21 Columbia City Review Committee Appointment  
Confirmation of appointment of Brooks Kolb

Ms. Frestedt reported that the Columbia City Business Association forwarded an appointment for one of three positions on the Columbia City Review Committee to fill a vacant seat. She said that the CCBA nominated Brooks Kolb, a landscape architect and Columbia City resident.

Action: I move to appoint Brooks Kolb to the Columbia City Review Committee for a 2-year term ending February 28, 2019.

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

**030117.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

030117.31 Harvard Belmont  
Belmont Ave E between Bellevue Pl E and Summit Ave E  
Construction of ADA ramps and sidewalks including removal  
of granite curbs

Ms. Nashem explained the application for alteration to sidewalks including removal of granite curbs, and planting strips to install ADA curb ramps.

Jinnie Green, SDOT, explained they were doing resurfacing work and any time work is through an intersection they have to update ramps or install new ones. She said they will use yellow detectable curb ramps. She said that the sidewalks will be replaced and will have a gradual transition to ramps. She said that planting strip will be impacted and where needed they will spread grass seed. She said they will remove shrubs in a couple places and have given adjacent property owners notice in case they want to transplant the shrubs. She said that the granite will be left undisturbed where possible but where necessary they will replace curbs with standard concrete. She said depending on weather the project should take 2-3 weeks.

Ms. Nashem said the review committee met on site. They found that granite is mostly only on corners and they will minimize removal of granite as much as possible. She said it is historical material, but the committee thought it was not character defining. She said that they considered that ADA upgrades are necessary and the landscape is not significant.

Mr. Sneddon asked when the granite curbs date to.

Ms. Green thought they dated to the 1920s.

Mr. Ketcherside asked where the granite will go.

Ms. Green said it will be stockpiled and reused by Parks.

Ms. Barker asked of the number of linear feet there how much is being removed.

Ms. Green said about half; about 87' is being removed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said it is reasonable.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is a terrible and unsafe street and needs the update. He said that in other places he would push to retain the granite but this area is already compromised.

Ms. Barker said it is a shame ADA requirements were not figured out a long time ago as the granite was elegant and beautiful.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for alterations to the sidewalk, curbs and planting strips per the submittal

This action is based on the following:

25.12.750- Factors to be considered by Board or Hearing Examiner.

C. The extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance;

The proposed changes are addressed on the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

#### I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

##### Purpose and Goals

The purpose and goals of the Harvard-Belmont District are:

A. To preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate those elements of the District's cultural, social, economic, architectural, and historic heritage;

B. To foster community and civic pride in the significance and accomplishments of the past;

C. To stabilize or improve the historic authenticity, economic vitality, and aesthetic value of the district;

D. To promote and encourage continued private ownership and use of buildings and other structures;

E. To encourage continued City interest and support in the District; and to recognize and promote the local identity of the area.

##### Guidelines

#### 3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is

encouraged. Existing street trees are important and pruning should be done only in a professional manner to maintain the trees health and to retain the natural form.

Guideline: Maintain a clear separation between sidewalk and street and between sidewalk and site.

Guideline: Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

MM/SC/ST/EV            10:0:0 Motion carried.

030117.32

Eitel Building

1501 Second Avenue  
Proposed rehabilitation

Matt Aalfs provide historical information on the 1904 building and said they are working on an adaptive reuse; it will be a hotel and they will add a top floor penthouse. He said they must meet the high-rise code and add mechanical, life-safety, and infrastructure. He said the building was originally constructed as 6-story as a medical office building; Bartell occupied the corner retail space. He said the building was damaged in the Nisqually quake and tension cables hold walls in place. He said they will do a seismic retrofit. He said the front entrance will be at the historic portico. He said the first floor will house a restaurant and building services. He said that basement level will house services and infrastructure - generator, transformer, etc. He said that floors two through seven will be typical guest rooms. He said the new penthouse will set back and will have eight guestrooms and elevator. Elevator overrun and mechanical equipment will be on the rooftop.

Mr. Aalfs said that street level facades are original; some column pilasters are wood and some are terracotta – all will be preserved. He said they will raise the transom level to add retractable canopy; it will be kept shallow so as not to cover too much glass. He said there will be new storefront infill. He said the sheet metal sign band is not original. He said they will clean and stabilize the building and add aluminum clad wood windows. He said they will add projecting weather protection on the west; they propose steel frame, glass panel so that portico element remains prominent. He guided board member through materials and colors – painted steel, black ceramic tile, black awning, ephus system on west façade, Pella system windows, and light fixtures.

He said they propose a sign “The State Hotel”; the style will reference early Bartell’s sign. Incandescent bulbs set in 3-D pan will set in larger aluminum box. He said

there will be a blade sign at the corner for the restaurant. He said there will be a sign at the top of the building looking west.

Mr. Treffers asked about controls on the building.

Ms. Sodt said the entire exterior is controlled; they anticipated the need to use the lightwell in a different way.

Mr. Treffers said the entry vestibule to the right looks original.

Mr. Aalfs said it was modified in the 1920s.

Mr. Treffers asked under what designation criteria the building was designated.

Ms. Sodt said she thought it was C, D, and E.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the original design was planned for an addition.

Mr. Aalfs said no, that the cornice is prominent and he thought the addition was an after the fact addition. He explained the structural system is steel with timber with unreinforced masonry.

Mr. Coney said the cornice looks altered.

Mr. Treffers asked about the materials proposed for the west elevation.

Mr. Aalfs they will use ephus in the lightwell infill, the rest will be brick.

Mr. Treffers asked about ARC thoughts on storefront materials.

Ms. Barker said it shows diversity over time and what is proposed felt of the spirit.

Mr. Kiel said the capitals / tops are different and noted it is part of the record keeping of the building.

Ms. Sodt noted that a different transom was proposed and has been modified to ARC comments.

Mr. Coney asked how they are treating the corner.

Mr. Aalfs said the column will remain and they will recess the vestibule so entry can be accessed from 2<sup>nd</sup> or Pike.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said that applicant was respondent to ARC comments.

Ms. Barker said each time he responded to ARC comments and it made it better.

Mr. Kiel said the glass canopy is an elegant solution.

Ms. Johnson appreciated the awnings.

Mr. Treffers said a rooftop addition is hard to do and this one succeeds. He said the entrance canopy is differentiated as is the lightwell.

Mr. Sneddon said it is great the building is being used. He said that the ending of the mezzanine level and changes to windows are a big sacrifice.

Mr. Ketcherside said the building has sat empty; this project will reinvigorate the area.

Ms. Vyhnanek appreciated the homage to the Bartell sign.

Ms. Barker said she hopes they will put historic Bartell photos up.

Ms. Sodt said the building has been partially empty since the 1970s.

Mr. Coney asked about windows.

Mr. Aalfs said all had been replaced.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Eitel Building, 1501 Second Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. **123534** as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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/DB/KJ            10:0:0 Motion carried.

#### **030117.4            NOMINATIONS**

030117.41            Row House Café  
1170 Republican Street

Jack McCullough said the structures were originally three separate houses and now they are joined together forming one structure. He said their goal is that it not be nominated.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the neighborhood and site in the Cascade neighborhood. She guided board members through photos of the three houses and the

changes made to them over time. She noted the dormer detail, gabled ends, and said windows have been moved around. She said that some are new vinyl and some are salvaged. She said salvaged materials from the Re-store were used on exterior and interior.

She said that an engineering firm occupied the space and demolished fireplaces, porches were enclosed, with little of the original floor plan evident. She said that the porches, windows, bargeboards were all altered and there have been several alterations over time. She said that the charming atmosphere is not accurate or significantly reconstructed; she said no attempt to reconstruct had been made. She said that all that is left is the roofline which is not enough to nominate.

Ms. Mirro said the buildings do not meet any of the criteria for nomination. She said that while it is associated with the development of South Lake Union but not in a significant way. She said before the regrade the area was populated by small scale residences. She said there are a few wood frame buildings in the neighborhood but not many. She said the area was also home to many laundry buildings. She said before remodeling, the houses were vernacular worker housing. She said they were built in bungalow form with likely no plans; she compared them to Belltown Cottages. She said the buildings can't convey the principals of Arts and Crafts and the details of worker housing have been stripped away. She said the houses were built by the McFarland family for themselves; they were brick layers and carpenters. She said that the building is not highly visible. She said there is not sufficient integrity for nomination.

Mr. McCullough agreed with Ms. Mirro's assessment and said that they are interesting buildings until Neurendorf's alterations in the 1990s and more alterations as a retail café. He said there was no effort to be faithful to rebuild into a new context. He said that café owner Erin Maher created a pastiche and said to look past the sentimental comments.

Ms. Barker said she was aware of laundries, churches, and Firestone Building and asked about other landmarks in the area.

Ms. Sodt noted the Jensen Block.

Ms. Mirro said it is all commercial now.

Mr. Treffers asked if survey findings were reviewed.

Ms. Mirro said she reviews them.

Mr. Treffers said that in 2004 review the property met the criteria and the photos with the survey show the property as connected and still identified it as eligible.

Mr. McCullough said the author thought that but the board can exercise discretion.

Mr. Kiel asked how the reports were generated.

Ms. Sodt said that in 2004 Karin Link, an architectural historian who is now deceased, did it as part of the City database.

Mr. Treffers said that Historic Seattle has the 1970s survey and it was identified there as well and included in City database.

Mr. Kiel said it was working class housing and asked about kitchen.

Mr. Mirro said that tenants included elevator operator at Smith Tower, paint spray operator at Ford, working class people. She said that kitchen space was elsewhere.

Ms. Barker said that like laundry they may have had a lean-to in the back.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the siding.

Ms. Mirro said it is wood lap siding with different exposures.

Mr. Kiel asked if the garage addition is attached.

Ms. Mirro said it is not.

Ms. Durham asked when the porch was enclosed if they removed the façade.

Café owner Erin Maher said the front porches were pushed out and covered. She said she created the new wall on first two cottages. She said the place was gutted and the floors are materials from the 1980s. She said that Neurendorf's built-ins are still there. She said she had to make it ADA compliant and put in larger doors and brought it up to code. She said she took siding from the back and put it on the front, built porches. She said the original walls on the back were constructed out of doors. She said the place was in terrible shape and the whole front is new and there are just two original walls. She said the workforce housing and vernacular story is a fake; she built her brand around it and it is all fake.

Ms. Mirro said that the roofing was redone and only the dormer form is there.

Mr. Treffers asked why '1172' was removed from the site plan.

Ms. Mirro said the building is gone.

Mr. Treffers said that the plan said 'former building' and now it is removed.

Mr. McCullough said it was a garage structure.

Ms. Mirro said it is not structurally attached.

Ms. Maher said that it is very close. She said that it is all one property owner, same parcel, and one tax lot.

Mr. Sneddon asked why, when citing the SOI that rehabilitation – put to new use - was used instead of reconstruction.

Ms. Mirro said it is not the same material and everything was rebuilt.



Mr. Sneddon said that it is standard when using for new use to use rehabilitation; it is misleading to suggest standards apply to this case.

Mr. Coney said that on page 4 of the nomination report it says that it was reconstructed based on historic photos and lumber salvaged from the site.

Ms. Maher said that it was based on she didn't know what it looked like and wanted to get it done as fast and inexpensively as possible.

Ms. Mirro said that sentence was based on information from Ms. Maher.

Ms. Maher said that she just did what she needed to do.

Mr. Coney asked how she knew where to put the porch.

Mr. Maher said they just took to the lot line.

Ms. Mirro said it had the original roof to point to original envelope.

Ms. Maher said the architect made the decision.

Mr. Kiel said SOI rehabilitate means to alter to meet new uses and reconstruct is to recreate vanished element.

Public Comment:

Jennifer Mortenson, Historic Seattle, supported the nomination. She said that significance goes beyond specific material components. She said the siting and massing can convey the significance in current form. She said that it meets Criterion C and represents the cultural movement of workers. She said the owner said she made up things but worker housing is conveyed here. She said that this is the last craftsman of working class community that made up the Cascade neighborhood. She said there is enough integrity. She noted the material changes at the Wayne Apartments but it retains its form and massing as this does. She said it is interesting methodology that more recent changes have been with salvaged materials which is the very same method used to construct the buildings in the first place. She said that changes have been made but to nominate it and designate it.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, supported nomination cited the 1970s Steinbrueck and Nyberg survey and said that 40 years later it is used as a resource. She said it explained why these worker houses are important. She said the 2004 survey confirmed that; the surveys were done by professionals. She said there used to be six Belltown Cottages and now there are just three; they weren't in good condition like they are now. She said these vernacular craftsman are not high style or well built. She said that vernacular can be historic and significant. She urged the board to support nomination and noted the houses retain enough and convey their significance; the form is there. She said it tells the story of worker history in Cascade neighborhood; it embodies the property type and method of construction.

Ms. Maher said she was struggling for 7 – 8 years. She said she is on the South Lake Community Council and wants what is right for the neighborhood. She said there are

public health issues – vagrants – fire hazards – and said that will happen to these stupid little shacks; she said it is a public hazard.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside said he wanted to support nomination but he can't see the form to hang stories on. He said there is not much left in the neighborhood. He said he would vote for it to avoid being the tipping vote.

Mr. Treffers cited integrity as described in Secretary of Interior Standards, National Parks Bulletin 15, seven aspects: He said that rarity of a resource it is permissible for greater degree of alteration. He said there are two other examples of single family housing in South Lake Union; this is the last iteration of that. He said the two context statements discuss property type and rarity; others of this type have all been demolished. He said this is the last iteration of something that can communicate a story; it is rare and can convey that. He said it is altered but he agrees with public comment and said that the roof form, arrangement of houses is still there. He said to look at the survey statements. He said the building has significance. He said that vernacular doesn't mean 'plenty' – it is an everyday style. He said that 'jerry-rigged' and doors used for walls is a statement for use of this type of building. He appreciated the trials of cleaning it up, drug issues but noted those are not the purview of the board and not what is being looked at. He said the board looks at integrity which they may or may not have, or the ability to convey which they do. He said F applies because of the age and scale it can convey significance. He supported nomination. He also cited criteria D as relevant.

Ms. Durham said form and scale of building and although modified still has the essential form and physical relationships of worker housing. She said it is very rare and you can't brush that aside because it has already been mucked around which she said reflects the way it was built to begin with. She said it is vernacular where one can understand history of the common man, not those who can pay for fancy architecture. She supported nomination on criteria D and F.

Ms. Johnson did not support nomination and while an important part of the neighborhood she said that there has been so much change and all that is left is three buildings and a roof.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination. And said that he had some trouble with Criterion D although there were still many elements there. He said it is low style craftsman with changes in design and materials – brackets, windows, door; he said the roofline is the same and the porches are there. He said the building can convey its significance. He said that the building meets Criterion C. He said that at the time when built, who built it and who lived there was represented in the houses. He said it was a boom stage and tenants included a brick layer, who was employed building buildings; an elevator operator who worked in Smith Tower; a paint sprayer who worked in the new auto industry; and a book keeper and clerk who evidenced the new single, professional worker. He noted the labor strikes and said there is a direct association with the cultural, political, and economic heritage of the city. He said there are few representations of this type housing outside Belltown Cottages. He agreed with Mr. Treffers' comments and said that it contrasts in age and size and would meet Criterion F.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination and noted the association with the development of Seattle. She noted the parallel history of now and then - that vernacular style houses that were built out of what they had. She said the South Lake Union is fast and different and this is rare and spatially different.

Mr. Hodgins said he was leaning toward no and said the building has been cobbled and recobbled and the character has been lost. He said it is historically non-significant.

Mr. Coney supported nomination on Criterion F. He noted that the surveys were conducted by professional historians. He said the buildings do convey their significance and noted the roof forms, rafter tails. He said an architect was involved in remodeling and noted the two western most porches were moved back to their original locations. He said he would like more information regarding Criterion C and how the buildings fit into the broader context in the City. He said that he said it meets Criterion F because it is a noticeable property.

Ms. Barker said she remembers when Belltown Cottages were in horrible condition before they were landmarked. She noted the Wayne Apartments that went through the regrade and the roof form remains; she said you can see the roof form here. She said the scale is shown in the roof form and you can still see the side of the building – the spacing from residence to residence is still there today. She noted the scale, grouping, setback of the buildings. She supported criteria D and F.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination and said he couldn't see at a future ARC meeting what they would be protecting. He said you would be nominating the roofline only and that is an incomplete picture. He said the Wayne Apartments is different because it is the last of its kind; the original mass and form are there although detail has been stripped off. He said these don't have that. He said there are no original walls and this meets no criteria.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the criteria of scarcity of resources. He noted the condition of Belltown Cottages when landmarked and the Wayne Apartments.

*Ms. Johnson left at 5:45 pm.*

Mr. Kiel said this is not a board of collectors and scarcity is interesting but said the building does not stand on its own merits.

Mr. Treffers commented there was some misleading information in the report; it was based on original photos not what was replaced. He said that the dormer parts are original. He requested a fully flushed out alteration history.

Ms. Barker said the interior should not be included in nomination.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is not deep history. He said the architecture is vernacular and there are materials to support. He commented on people having different means and the cobbled together houses tell that story. He wanted to know how it fits in the story and is this the last in the neighborhood.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Row House Café Buildings at 1170 Republican Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal

description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the buildings; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 5, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ST/DB 7:2:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Kiel and Hodgins opposed.

030117.42

Bleitz Funeral Home  
316 Florentia Street

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Coney disclosed that he has previously met owner Bill Pollard but has no business ties to him.

There were no objections to his participation by the Board or the applicants.

Bill Pollard, one of the owners, said they want to do adaptive reuse of the building and are supportive of designation of the building which he said is wonderful. He said they want develop the western portion of the site and retain building exterior.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the building which was built in 1921 as a family owned and operated funeral parlor for Jacob J. Bleitz. She provided aerial view of Fremont and Queen Anne indicating the residential neighborhoods and commercial on the canal. She said "Parlor" was changed to "Home" on the sign. She said that in 1990 it was sold to a corporation. She said that funeral businesses typically worked near residences, close to roads, and built their own buildings. She said by mid-century this area was industrialized, with service stations resulting from the rise in auto use.

She said with the tall massing, formality, and light color it is highly visible. She said it went through many construction phases which she said are distinguishable and documented by drawings. She said changes were responsive to change in business. She said the entry marquee was added in the 1960's. She said changes to the entry were made including the awning and coloration. She shared historic photo albums provided by Michael Emmick whose father was employed there; she said interior views are provided which provide insights to the original building interior.

She said the 1960's marquee was put in to modernize the building. She said the one story multistory garage was constructed along with one story office addition in 1988-89. She said early photos show an interesting mix of forms – concrete stucco, half timbering in gable dormer exhibiting Craftsman style; and the Mission Revival front. She noted the effort to stylize the buildings in classic forms or homey forms. She said they were symbolic buildings. She guided board members through interior photos. She said that in 1960's they modernized including adding a new marquee and altering the opening shape at the entry, adding another flue to the outboard chimney, painted the building white which obscures the brick work, and added a garage. She said the 1988-89 addition is a postmodern adaptation of the original façade. She provided photos of the current condition of the building.

Ms. Boyle said that in 1988-89 project they returned the entry to its original form and the roof was redone in aqua color. She noted the nice landscape aspect of the east side garden. She said that the north shows the retort addition, flues, and access for vehicles. She said the portal entry is on the west addition. She said a juliet balcony was originally an exit stair that was removed to make room for vehicle access. She said the original Bleitz sign was removed. She said the doors are original or at least have been there a long time. She said that in the chapel the organ is gone. She said there is sky lit space in the lobby addition.

She reported that Bleitz came to Seattle in 1924; he was associated with other undertakers including Butterworth who opened the first funeral home around 1900. She said that Bleitz worked with Rafferty who promoted affordable services. They were associated with the People's Memorial Collaborative, a burial co-op that pre-negotiated arrangements with other homes. She said that Bleitz was associated with the industry but only representationally. She said that the building did not meet standards A, B, C, or E but does meet criteria D – excluding the 1988-89 building, and F.

Mr. McCullough said the 1921 building only is a landmark.

Mr. Treffers asked about windows.

Ms. Boyle said they are original.

Mr. Hodgins asked about the interior of the addition.

Ms. Boyle indicated on photos the newer elements.

Mr. Treffers asked where the reconstructed entrance starts and stops.

Ms. Boyle indicated on photos and said the plane was still there, it had just been squared off but later the arch was put back in.

Ms. Barker asked if there were any 1921 building permits or records.

Ms. Doherty said she obtained them from SDCI but they are completely illegible; she shared the documents with board members.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the building was non-denominational.

Ms. Boyle said it was a commercial building with no religious affiliation.

Mr. Ketcherside said the site was likely chosen because Nickerson and Fremont was the busiest intersection in the City.

Mr. Kiel said that stylistically it is a weird collection of styles – gabled and Mission style.

Ms. Boyle said the front was intended to carry the whole message and noted it was a hybrid building.

Ms. Barker asked where Bleitz was from.

Mr. Boyle said he was from the Midwest; funeral home was a family business and a respected profession.

Mike Emmick said his father worked there for 25 years. He said he supported the nomination and that too many have been lost. He said it is a significant part of history. He said that Bleitz was seen as a black sheep communist because he offered low cost burial. He said that the building has a fascinating history and stories. He said the stained-glass doors are not original; they were handmade in Italy in the 1940's and shipped over. He said the urn with floral treatment above the front doors is still there.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported nomination and said it is important to Queen Anne and Fremont. She said it is a heavily travelled corridor. She said this is the centennial of the ship canal. She supported nomination of the building and the site being cognizant of the site to the east and north east and the juxtaposition to the bridge. She noted the nearby original Interurban shelter was restored.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked Ms. Boyle for the report. She said the building is a visual landmark and meets Criterion F. She said the original building meets Criterion D. She said that regarding Criterion C the building represents the business of the funeral home. She said to look at the entire legal parcel and the entire building but noted the addition is not significant. She thanked the owner and appreciated the proposed adaptive reuse.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney supported nomination of the entire structure on Criterion F and said the building is a fixture there.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination of the entire building and site on criteria D and F and maybe C for its association with the industry.

Ms. Durham supported nomination for the entire envelope on criteria D and F.

Ms. Barker supported nomination including the site on criteria C, D, and F.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and noted the transition from 'parlor' to 'home'. He noted the homelike building in an urban center with church function – and compared it to 'one-stop shopping'. He noted the casket industry in Seattle when caskets were made of wood; they were later made of steel. He said it is a weird style – not that of a professional architect or builder.

Ms. Vyhvanek supported nomination and cited Criterion C; she noted connection to the LGBTQ community history, and affordability.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination of site and exterior of building. He was interested in learning more about how they arrived at the style.

Mr. Ketcherside asked for more information on AIDS related events and to pursue more stories. He suggested contacting the owner of the Gaslight Inn and noted they may have information.

Ms. Boyle said she thought there is a LBGTQ map of Seattle.

Mr. Treffers commented that in Los Angeles and West Hollywood there are historical context statements.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and suggested a tour.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Bleitz Funeral Home at 316 Florentia Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 19, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MS/EV 9:0:0 Motion carried.

## **030117.5 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

030117.51 Franklin Apartments  
2302 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough explained the request for extension to the second meeting in June. He said they will attend ARC in June to discuss scale and tower formation. He said they will report about fire damage.

Ms. Barker said she had no problem with the extension. She expressed concern about the fire, graffiti, and vacancy of the building. She encouraged ownership to go within and beyond to secure the building so there is no repeat of Seattle Times Building here.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Franklin Apartments, 2302 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, until the second meeting in June 2017.

MM/SC/DB/RK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

## **030117.6 BOARD BUSINESS**

Landmarks Board Elections

Jordan Kiel was elected Chair. Deb Barker was elected Vice Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator