



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 243/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday April 17, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Garrett Hodgins
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Steven Treffers

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

041719.1 MEETING MINUTES

January 2, 2019

MM/SC/DB/KJ

6:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Durham and Mr. Hodgins abstained.

January 16, 2019

MM/SC/DB/RC

8:0:0 Minutes approved.

February 6, 2019
MM/SC/DB/KJ

6:0:2 Minutes approved. Mr. Hodgins and Mr. Coney

abstained.

Mr. Guo arrived at 3:35 pm.

041719.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041719.21

Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

Rainier Chapter House

800 E Roy St

Installation of National Register of Historic Places plaque

Diana Prigger proposed installation of National Register of Historic Places plaque and said they will use ‘built’ instead of ‘established’ in the wording in the plaque and they will use the national DAR insignia.

Ms. Prigger said the plaque will be installed between window and door towards the left end of the building, into wood material.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for installation of a National Register plaque at 800 East Roy as presented.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented April 17, 2019 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

Building Categories

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed.

Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

The buildings within the District are categorized as follows:

Category 1: Buildings and significant landscape elements with an identifiable architectural or historic significance in satisfaction of the appropriate criteria of the Seattle Landmark Ordinance (SMC 25.12) These buildings characterize a distinctive architectural style, or contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship

which are characteristic of an architectural period. The preservation of these elements is of primary importance to the District. May also include historic sites.

D. SIGNS

Guideline: Keep signs relatively small and subordinate to the building. Signs that flash, blink, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion, or signs that vary in intensity shall not be permitted.

Sign lighting should be subdued, incandescent and front-lit from the exterior rather than back-lit of the fluorescent type. Signs shall be designed to minimize glare on existing buildings.

Secretary of Interior Standards

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

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

MM/SC/RF/KJ 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041719.22

Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

Merrill House – Carriage House facing Boylston Ave E

919 Harvard Ave E

Alterations and repairs to the carriage façade

Ms. Nashem explained that the Harvard-Belmont ARC met on site to review the proposal. It was noted that the far-right window above the garage doors appears to be in far worse condition than when documented in the photos provided and will need to be replaced in-kind. ARC thought that the plans were as recommended by the Secretary of Interior Standards. This building is Category 1 and also individually listed on the National Register.

Applicant Comment:

Steven Sullivan proposed restoration of trellis to original condition; remove paint, restore parge coat finish; restore windows and doors to original look.

Mr. Kiel asked if they had done a condition assessment.

Mr. Sullivan said he submitted it to Ms. Nashem. He said some windows are rotted and must be rebuilt; they will use existing windows as models and will use the same materials and glass. He said it is a true restoration.

Mr. Coney asked about storm windows visible in the photos.

Mr. Sullivan said it was a plexiglass protective covering from when a basketball hoop had been installed. He said the garage doors are from the 1960's. He said they will put in replica of existing original doors.

Mr. Freitas asked about the rafter tails.

Mr. Sullivan said the cantilevered ends were cut off 15 years ago.

Ms. Nashem noted the work meets SOI standards. She said there is no record of approval for painting the exterior or removing the rafter tails. She said they propose to remove paint and return to the original surface.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it is lovely to see a genuine and appropriate restoration.

Mr. Coney said it is commendable to see in kind replacement and suggested saving and reinstalling the glass in the arched window that needs to be rebuilt.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for alterations and repair including replacing non original garage doors, Repair doors, repair/replace windows, reconstruct concrete lintels, repair concrete wall and parge coat, remove paint, rebuild pergola roof of the Carriage house facing Boylston at 919 Harvard Ave E as presented.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented April 17, 2019 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

The Development and Design Review Guidelines identify the unique values of the district and are consistent with the purposes of the district and other criteria of SMC 25.22 which created the Landmark District. The guidelines identify design characteristics which have either a positive or negative effect upon the unique values of the district and specify design related considerations which will be allowed, encouraged, limited or excluded from the District when Certificate of Approval applications are reviewed.

Within the District, a Certificate of Approval, issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board, is required prior to the issuance of any city building, demolition, street use, or other permits for proposed work which work is within or visible from a public street, alley or way, and, which involves:

The demolition of, exterior alterations or additions to any building or structure,

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

Building Categories

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed.

Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

The buildings within the District are categorized as follows:

Category 1: Buildings and significant landscape elements with an identifiable architectural or historic significance in satisfaction of the appropriate criteria of the Seattle Landmark Ordinance (SMC 25.12) These buildings characterize a distinctive architectural style, or contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which are characteristic of an architectural period. The preservation of these elements is of primary importance to the District. May also include historic sites.

C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

1. Additions or renovations

Guideline: Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.

Guideline: Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.

Guideline: The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

Secretary of Interior Standards

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

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

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

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/6-dangers-abrasive-cleaning.htm>

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/15-concrete.htm>

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/22-stucco.htm>

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

041719.23

Lake Union Steam Plant
1201 Eastlake Avenue East
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt passed out materials and said the applicant proposes to replace Zymogenetics name painted on stacks with Fred Hutch Cancer Research Center Steam Plant. When Zymogenetics got approval they also had a logo approved but it was never applied.

Katie Kendall, McCullough Leary Hill, explained that Fred Hutch has a ten-year lease and will use the building for continued research use. She said the existing sign was applied in 1993; they are doing in-kind replacement with the same size letters. She noted a shoreline variance approval and said the sign will not detract from historic features. She said the stacks are the only place for signage. She said it meets SOI standards 9 and 10.

Taka Soga said it meets SOI standards 9 and 10 and the new paint will have the same tonal value as existing. He provided Fred Hutch colors, and branding, and said the signs will be applied to north and south sides of the stacks as is existing. He said the logo is the same scale as the Zymogenetics logo. He said paint is reversible.

Mr. Freitas asked if the original letters are vinyl film applied to stack.

Ms. Kendall said it is paint. She said when the building was rehabbed, they put up new stacks and all were painted the same color.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Kiel said it is reasonable and reversible.

Ms. Johnson concurred.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 117251, as the proposed exterior alterations and interior alterations are 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/GH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041719.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

041719.31 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

1015 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt went through the signed agreement and noted it was pretty standard. She said if replacement of non-historic windows does not meet SOI Standards, review would come to board. She said windows are non-original.

Jack McCullough said they are replacing with match to originals.

Ms. Barker asked about the sculptures.

Ms. Sodt said some had been installed without approval.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said the sculpture was temporarily stored there and is gone now. He said they will be thoughtful about putting things into administrative review.

Mr. Kiel said public art is great as is the flexibility of art moving through.

Action: move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041719.32

E.C. Hughes School
7740 34th Avenue SW
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said the staff had drafted a master C&I template for schools and has given it to the School District.

Mr. Kiel disclosed that the school district is an active client for his firm but not on this property.

Mr. Coney said Mr. Kiel should recuse himself.

Ms. Doherty said it is common for Board members to disclose a professional (financial) relationship, but if the proposal is not related to their work, they are not required to recuse.

Mr. Coney said even the appearance is enough.

Ms. Johnson said it would be helpful if Mr. Kiel could participate in reviewing school projects at ARC meetings.

Mr. Kiel said he would recuse himself today.

Ms. Sodt said that staff will follow up with the Ethics department.

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

MM/SC/GH/KJ 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

041719.33 Loyal Heights School
2501 NW 80th Street
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Loyal Heights School, 2501 NW 80th Street, for six months.

MM/SC/GH/KJ 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Ms. Barker left at 4:20 pm.

041719.4 DESIGNATION

041719.41 Knights of Columbus
700-722 East Union Street

Full report in DON file.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture, provided context of the site and neighborhood; she noted it is a prominent site on a corner location. She noted the change in grid at this location. She said surrounding buildings were residential, commercial and public. This area was the first to get street cars and development followed in a linear fashion. She said there was a concentration of Catholic institutions in the area and that probably gave rise to the interest in the location, but the property was given to them by Elizabeth Foss. Foss came to Seattle in the 1870s. No relation to Foss Marine, she was the widow of a real estate financier. She was philanthropic and gave to many schools. She was featured in the brochure when this building was opened.

She reported that the Knights of Columbus started in the east by Catholic priests. She noted the need for solidarity for Irish Catholics who came as uneducated and were discriminated against. She said KOC served its members and took on social programs, provided social center for soldiers. In contrast to YMCA which served only Protestants, KOC served everyone. KOC took on social justice issues opposed by some Protestant groups, especially the KKK who saw the KOC as a threat. She said the KKK went after parochial schools and in 1920 tried to pass legislation against them.

She said the basement housed a swimming pool, gym with running track, and mechanical space. She said the pool was infilled, changes were made to locker room and recessed entry was filled in. She said the 1st floor and Mezzanine were member entry and check in; a stairway led up to private members only lodge room, lobby space, large ballroom space, kitchen and stairway. She said the Mezzanine was members only space and housed billiards, lounging rooms, and library. She said the stairway remains. She said the top floor includes the lodge room, class room and office space. She noted arched windows over rectangular windows. She said the mezzanine level was infilled on the east side. She said there was a major ornamental marquee over the public entry. She said in 1915 changes were proposed to the first-floor ballroom for gallery space; it was never done. She noted the clinker brick, stone trim, arched head windows, and rectangular windows. She said the north

façade is primary and she noted the well-developed east façade. She said the back side has no windows at the property line.

Ms. Boyle said other historic social halls in Seattle include Knights of Columbus at the AYPE, Egyptian Theater, Oddfellows Hall, Scottish Rite Temple. She said all look back to classic and medieval times in terms of symbols. She said the window placement indicates an inward-focused building. She said architect F. M. Bohn was from Kentucky. She said he understood institutional architecture having designed libraries, cemeteries, churches in Kentucky. She said he travelled in elite circles.

She said the clinker brick is solid but with an informality in how it is made. The drawings called out cast concrete for stone elements, but sandstone was used at cornice band and raised parapets. She said the painted signage on un-fenestrated ends has been there a long time. She said the east façade had a marquee and the entry used to be recessed with more elaborate doors. She said the north façade sets back above the base level. She said the south and east entries were modernized in the 1960s with removal of doors, transoms, and marquee. She said on the south is a deep light well. She said the single lane bowling alley with sky light over is now a store room. She said the building is used by members, and students of O’Dea High School use it as a gym. She said the first-floor musicians’ balcony has been filled in and fan shaped openings have been removed. She said the lobby has all new materials and suspended ceilings but noted the egg and dart plaster decoration remains. She said the entry to the ballroom has 1960s door assembly.

At the nomination meeting, board members asked about African American membership. Ms. Boyle said she found no information on this.

Ms. Boyle said that the club had difficulty maintaining the building; the third floor was rehabbed with office systems furniture to be used as tenant space. She noted associated rooms still have doors and lights.

Andy Luce, SRM Development / building owner, reported they voluntarily nominated the building for designation. He said there are challenges with what they can do with the building and the Knights of Columbus had similar challenges with their attempted adaptive reuses. He proposed adaptive reuse – not residential – of the building with residential construction on adjacent parking lots. He said there have been so many interior changes and asked the board not to include interior to allow them flexibility for adaptive reuse. He said the dramatic part of the stairwell will be retained and restored. He reiterated the need for flexibility.

Ms. Boyle said a National Register nomination has been done and the owner is seeking certified rehabilitation status; DAHP and NPS review will also be required.

Mr. Freitas asked if there are other KOC groups in Seattle.

Ms. Boyle said there are other organizations, and most are associated with parishes; she didn’t know of other purpose-built halls.

Mr. Freitas asked about iconography on the building.

Ms. Boyle said the stained-glass window between women's lounge and regular lounge is not trimmed out.

Ms. Sodt said it did not look old and that it looked more 'crafty'.

Ms. Boyle said at the top of the building there are dates.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Durham said she went on the tour and noted there is lots of exterior integrity and they had done a good job on the storefront. She noted interior volumes and trim were remarkable, but the rest of the building was chopped up. She said the gym was original.

Ms. Sodt said she was surprised that a lot was altered except for the three volumes. She said the main stairwell is intact but does not appear significant or unique. She said she limited recommended designation to three volumes, finishes and detail.

Mr. Hodgins asked about the little offices.

Ms. Durham noted the original molding and trim was intact; she noted the capital detail and ornate decoration.

Mr. Chalana asked about inclusion of gym.

Ms. Durham wasn't sure that it was appropriate to designate it.

Ms. Sodt said she included the gym because is a historically intact interior space.

Mr. Hodgins asked about acoustic ceiling and stage.

Ms. Sodt said in the main ballroom the acoustic ceiling is not noticeable.

Mr. Hodgins said the exterior is amazing and it is a great example of a hall building. He supported designation of the exterior per the Staff Report but was unsure of interior. He said there is no guarantee of public access. He said the gym is cool but what would it be saved for. He said the lodge room is awkwardly renovated.

Ms. Durham supported designation based on the Staff Report, criteria C, D, E, and F. She said all the new elements in the lodge room could be knocked down; the interior spaces were important to the function of the building, as KOC building. She said she enjoyed the gym but didn't feel it was feasible to include as there is not public access. She said the building detailing is really important and noted the shields and carving in capital. She noted the plaster ceiling would be revealed if the acoustic tile was removed.

Mr. Chalana supported designation of the exterior and items noted on Staff Report for interior – the ballroom, lodge room, and gym; he noted he didn't go on tour.

Ms. Sodt said she wanted to be clear to list all remaining original features given the whole interior was nominated.

Mr. Chalana liked that spaces be preserved and noted the importance of the volume. He said the fir flooring could be re-used; he noted the tin ceiling and the elevated track.

Mr. Freitas supported designation. He said the building is very handsome and is of its time. He said the interior distinguishes its use; he noted the volume of the ballroom and said the meeting room is salvageable. He said the volumes speak to the significance of use more than the exterior does. He said a better context of social and fraternal halls is needed and he wondered where this one stands in the pantheon of others in Seattle. He supported criteria C, D, F, exterior and interior but no gym.

Mr. Guo supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F and said he agreed with the Staff Report. He said the interior – the ballroom, lodge room, gym, feel essential to what KOC is. He said to include the gym and not the track.

Mr. Coney supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F. He noted the specific logos, and emblems are an asset of the building. He noted the large volumes. He supported inclusion of exterior and interior spaces including the ball room and lodge room. He said the track is interesting but excluded it. He said to repurpose the building like the IOOF Hall. He noted the large open spaces.

Mr. Kiel didn't support inclusion of the gym. He said the building interior conveys the internally focused organization. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F, but not F.

Board members decided not to include the gym.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Knights of Columbus building at 700-722 E. Union Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: The exterior of the building and the following portions of the interior: the Ballroom (the volume of the space and original decorative details including the trim, moldings, wrapped beams, frieze band, plasterwork, interior transom, and gallery/balcony), the Lodge room (the volume of the space and the original decorative details including the trim, moldings, wrapped beams, frieze band, plasterwork, and original light fixtures).

MM/SC/RC/GH 7:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Johnson recused herself

041719.5

NOMINATION

041719.51

Queen Anne Masonic Temple / Sunset Telephone & Telegraph Garfield Exchange
1608 4th Avenue W

Richard Rogers said he owns the building with his father.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, explained the building has a layered history. It started as the first telephone exchange on Queen Anne and operated until they moved to the nearby Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building. When they moved out, the Masons took over. She provided context of the area and neighborhood. She said by 1912 Queen Anne was a residential neighborhood. She went over details on Baist and Nyberg-Steinbrueck maps.

She said the building was built in 1905 for Pacific Telephone & Telegraph (PT&T). She said PT&T wanted to be in the neighborhood and noted they had exchanges in other neighborhoods. She said that common brick masonry was proposed but after comments by neighbors, the front was clad with an exterior plaster parge coating over brick with rusticated treatment. She said it is a URM building with large cornice in front, trim band, head treatment above the windows and projected canopy at entry. She said the grade slopes from the front down to the back and the basement is actually a crawl space. She said the telephone exchange provided career opportunities for women. The early ones were staffed by teenage boys who were unruly, hence the changes to women, the “hello girls”. She said they were closely monitored and had dress codes.

She said the buildings were very solid with masonry outside and concrete, high strength floor system, and introverted windows for illumination. She said there was lounge space for women and long linear banks of equipment. She said the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph building was built for them in 1923 when they moved out of this building. She said the local masonic chapter purchase the building in 1924 for \$6500. She said alterations in 1957 were done by the Masons themselves; they took out center stair and inserted it into the southwest corner and took out columns and inserted extensions. She said they upstairs space was used as the lodge and for public events. She said the Masons were housed in lots of building types; other examples in Seattle include the Egyptian Theater, and halls in Ballard and Auburn.

Ms. Boyle said there are similar scale buildings adjacent; the building is mid-block with setback similar to the neighboring buildings. She said the 60' x 120' lot aligns with adjacent buildings. She said that some windows have been infilled, some have had alterations to sash and frame. She noted the deep reveals, humble side and rear walls. She noted the original masonry walls on interior; upper floor lodge room, vestibule, door hardware with insignia, and raised platform in lodge room. She reported that the interior is earlier than the one at Garfield PT&T by almost two decades. She said the building represents the ascendance of local industry; this building was the first.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported nomination and said the telephone exchange is historic and the building's years as a Masonic lodge is important. She said it is a wonderful early example of adaptive reuse. She looked forward to another example of adaptive reuse. She said the building meets Criterion F; she said it is directly across the street from the library and locally it meets F. She didn't support inclusion of an interior elements and noted it is very altered.

Nicole Demers Changelo, supported designation on criteria C and D. She said the value is the connection to the exchange and the telephone industry. She said the Masonic use provided no value. She said the interiors are not worthy.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Hodgins agreed with public comment and said the significance is about the telephone exchange and less about the Masons. He said the neighbors' input made a nicer-looking building. He said the siting is interesting and relationship to other exchange is important and indicative of standard 'F'. He said it was a start-up concept in the neighborhood with progressively better real estate as it grew. He supported nomination of exterior only.

Mr. Coney supported nomination of the exterior only for its link to early telephone exchange. He said it is interesting it is in a single-family zone. He said 'F' is relevant.

Mr. Guo supported nomination based on significance of telephone history. He noted that it should be only the building exterior. He asked if it was the first exchange building.

Ms. Boyle said it was the first on Queen Anne.

Mr. Freitas supported nomination and noted his focus is the significance of the telephone history, but not sure this building represented something the Garfield exchange did not. He said that it is a mid-block building seems surprising and important. He said it is across from the library and he wondered if there was a relationship between the two.

Ms. Durham supported nomination of the exterior only and noted the significance lies on the telephone relationship. She said this was the first exchange building on Queen Anne. She said the employment for women is significant. She didn't see significance of Masons' use.

Ms. Johnson left at 5:15 pm.

Mr. Chalana said he was struggling with this one, due to some of the alterations. He said there is a rich women's history associated with the telephone business; it should be celebrated, and he wanted it more fleshed-out. He noted the interesting ways women carved out paid employment. He supported nomination for the exterior only.

Mr. Kiel said it is an oddball building. He said the goal to build a commercial infill building in the neighborhood is odd and its character is unusual. He said the building meets F. He said the Masons' tenancy was not significant.

Ms. Durham asked if there was anything of note associated with the building.

Mr. Hodgins asked if any of the Masons have stories to tell.

Ms. Boyle said they didn't find anything of note. She said that the Masons organized much earlier and elsewhere before moving into this building.

Mr. Freitas said it would be interesting to know of their work in the Queen Anne neighborhood.

Mr. Kiel asked for more information about the telephone and telegraph exchange context, the time period, and how it unfolded in the city.

Mr. Hodgins asked if there were other buildings of this era in other neighborhoods.

Mr. Freitas noted the East Pine Station.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Queen Anne Masonic Temple / Sunset Telephone & Telegraph Garfield Exchange at 1608 4th Avenue West 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; and the interior of the second floor lodge room; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 5, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MC/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041719.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator