



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 19/22

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, January 19, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Genna Nashem

Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Russell Coney

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson 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

**011922.1 PUBLIC COMMENT**  
*There was no public comment.*

**011922.2 MEETING MINUTES**  
December 1, 2021  
MM/SC/DB/HW 8:0:2 Minutes approved. Mss. McKinney and Chang abstained.

**011922.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

011922.31 1027 Summit Ave E / Harvard-Belmont Landmark District  
Demolition of garage (retroactive) and proposed new addition

Ms. Nashem introduced the project and explained the house was built in 1925 at the same time the neighboring Hacienda Apartments were built, both using the Spanish Style. The house is a Category 1 building - 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. On December 10, 2021 the Architectural Review Committee reviewed the briefing and recommended approval of an option that rebuilt the garage in-kind and the addition design with French doors with shutters on the front façade.

Amy Vanderger explained the intention to re-do the garage and the discovery of rot and water damage which now necessitates reconstruction of the garage. She said with the need to reconstruct the garage they also sought approval to add a bedroom over the new garage.

Brandon Keller explained the house was built in 1925 and designed by Everett Beardsley. He noted the quality and integrity have held up well but said the garage was in poor condition. He said they have taken advice given at two ARC meetings and made changes to the design. He said the upper floor was stepped back 3'; they achieved a parapet wall with railing to replicated what was there. He said classic style wood French door with mullions and with shutters are the street facing façade and additional windows with shutters were added on the side. He said stucco material will be similar to existing stucco. He proposed Spanish style tile roofing to match existing style and color. He said he felt like they have met the Guidelines.

Ms. Vanderger said the space will be used as a bedroom. She said they plan to stay in the house and want a good addition that is good for the neighborhood and their family.

Austin Vanderger said they will have the utility of a new room and the preservation of the existing structure.

Mr. Barnes asked about public comment from the neighborhood who said the addition is too close to his bedroom and is over the property line.

Ms. Vandergen said there used to be a roof top deck there which was next to their windows. She said bedroom use will offer better privacy for the neighbors.

Mr. Vandergen said the neighbor's house is built on the property line and in some cases over the property line. He said garage location is the existing foot print. He said Ms. Vandergen addressed the privacy concerns. He explained the intent to add some styling to the side surface of the structure. He said they value the opinions of the historic committee.

Mr. Keller explained that they started working with SDCI, unaware of landmark requirements and met all zoning requirements. He said the existing garage footprint will be replaced like for like. He said they are barely encroaching on the 5' setback – maybe 6' and asked to continue that non-conformity. He said the neighbor's house sits right on the property line with some encroachment. He said from a legal standpoint it meets the requirements. He said they didn't plaster that side of the addition with windows and the windows that will be there are small 2' square windows placed high. He noted neighbor concern with view blockage.

Mr. Barnes asked about neighbor's view over the garage.

Mr. Keller said the neighbor's previous view was onto the rooftop deck.

Mr. Barnes asked if this was discussed at ARC.

Ms. Wasserman said the letter from the neighbor hadn't been received at that point. She said ARC members were not aware the neighbor's house was right up to property line; but she understood that this was historically condition and that it is in a very urban area where things will be close. She said it is not to the point of hardship.

Ms. Chang asked the timeline of events from purchase of house to demolition etc.

Mr. Keller said the house was purchased in 2019. SDCI issued permit to fix roof January 11, 2021; permit was applied for December 2020. When contractor worked on roof, he discovered rot and began to tear garage down. He said he was hired in February 2021 and in May they applied for a permit. He said they first received correction letter which informed them of the need for a Certificate of Approval in Summer 2021.

Ms. Chang asked about change of contractor and scope change.

Mr. Vandergen said the original contractor was hired to do the minimal repair work and their plan was to do addition later. He said the contractor demolished more of the garage as more rot was discovered. He said the contractor provided bad advice and is gone. He regretted not having gone through the appropriate process.

Ms. Chang asked to hear ARC member comments.

Ms. Wasserman said other options were provided and considered; ARC agreed on the presented option.

Ms. Vandergen said the original designs had the new bedroom flush with the front elevation. ARC recommended the 3' setback with balcony and bringing other existing design elements to the addition.

Mr. Vandergen said the constructability of an addition affected the construction of the new garage. They had always planned to build garage with addition capability but now it makes sense to get approval for everything.

Ms. Doherty said alternatives had projecting dormer. She said ARC talked about rotating it so roof was more in line with the house so there is a forward facing gable rather than side gable.

Mr. Macleod asked how they would match up the roof material.

Mr. Keller said he wasn't sure of the age of the roof tiles but noted the contractor specified barrel style roofing to match the existing texture, style and color of existing.

Mr. Vandergen said only the front section of the roof is tile and they hope to retain the 100-year-old tile. He said the rest of the pitched roof is shingled as is a flat portion in the back. He said color match will be a challenge but hoped that cleaning existing roof tiles will help with a match. He said they will look to salvaged tile to match.

Mr. Norman asked how the garage was in such poor shape.

Mr. Vandergen said former owners had focused on interior details rather than exterior. He said the garage roof had a concrete roof, a deck, more concrete and another deck with no waterproofing.

Ms. Vandergen noted tree at garage corner where dirt level was above garage foundation and water had infiltrated causing visible damage. She said the later added bump out window impacted draining.

Mr. Vandergen said the glass bump out window was installed in the 1990s. The original window looked like other windows on the house.

Mr. Rodezno asked if they would retain the garage's concrete stem wall.

Mr. Vandergen said it will remain.

Mr. Keller said all landscape features remain as is. He said they will reinforce and pour new foundation walls to take the weight of the new structure.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the new garage door will match.

Mr. Keller said the opening will be smaller width than existing to account for lateral load. He said the new wood garage door will the same height, just a bit narrower.

Ms. Wasserman said the applicant responded well to ARC. She noted the lovely presentation and options provided and said it will be an improvement.

Mr. Barnes said he agreed with Ms. Wasserman and that he supported the application.

Mr. Norman concurred and said it is strange not to have known about the historic district.

Mr. Vandergen said it was mentioned when they purchased the house, but he didn't find anything when he looked it up later. He said they regret the error; he tried and failed.

Ms. Johnson said it is unfortunate that it is after the fact, but it meets the Guidelines.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for demolition of garage (retroactive) and proposed rebuilding the garage and new second story addition above the garage, as proposed.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Harvard Belmont Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Guidelines/Specific**

**C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS**

**1. Additions or renovations**

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

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 the Interior Standards**

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.

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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/HW/MI 10:00 Motion carried.

011922.32 Japanese Language School / Japanese Cultural & Community Center  
1414 S Weller Street  
Proposed mural at building exterior

Erin Shigaki said she and Kenji Hamai Stoll are the project artists. She said at the start of the project there was a lot of anti-Asian xenophobia. She wants to lift up and tell the story in a fresh way. She said the Central District was a redlined neighborhood in which communities of color existed for a long time. She noted the diminished Japantown that never came back after WWII. She said it is the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of incarceration and it is important to be storytellers for the community. She said her family was a typical working-class family. One of her great grandfathers helped build this building and the family lived here when they came back from the Idaho concentration camp.

She provided examples of other murals they have done and proposed the mural to be applied to two-story blank wall that is highly visible from Rainier Avenue. She showed the proposed layout of two pieces, two long scrolls or banners in Japanese style. She said installation will be simple and would not impact historic siding; she said it will be easily removable in the future. She said the mural is under design right now.

Mr. Norman said it looks exciting and asked about attachment to building.

Ms. Shigaki said an elegant floating bracket is spec'd so it appears to be off the siding. She said she wants to get other installation quotes. She said the piece will be fabricated in studio and will be installed on to building.

Mr. Norman said it looks interesting and it is good to tell the story.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and said she was excited to see the mural on the wall. She asked if the board would see a sample of the design and how approval would work.

Ms. Doherty said that sometimes the board does see the proposed art, and other times they see representative images. She said approval could be conditioned upon administrative review of the final version if the Board would like to do that. She said the content of the art is not under the board's purview.

Ms. Wasserman said she doesn't want to become an art critic but that it would be nice to see it when it is complete. She said it won't damage the structure and is easily reversible if needed.

Ms. Caton appreciated the work and said the applicant is being thoughtful about the building and attachment.

Mr. Barnes appreciated seeing what would be done and the process. He said he was OK with approving as is.

Mr. Macleod concurred.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the exterior mural on Building #1 of the former Japanese Language School / Japanese Cultural & Community Center, 1414 S Weller Street, as per the attached submittal.

#### **EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS**

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 125743.*
  - a. The proposed mural is applied on top of the exterior siding, and no original siding will be removed or significantly altered.
  - b. The proposed mural is large, but it is proportional to the blank wall on which it will be installed.
  - c. It is an assembly of multiple panels which helps mitigate its overall scale.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
  - a. The location is highly visible but is located on a secondary façade near the rear of the building, mitigating its view from the primary entries and fronts of Buildings #1 and 2.

- b. Visibility of the mural is desirable to highlight “*We the Ancestors*”, and to honor the legacy and stories of Washington’s Japanese American community.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.
4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #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.*

*Standard #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/DB/IM 10:0:0 Motion carried.

#### **011922.4 DESIGNATION**

011922.41 Panama Hotel and Hashidate Yu Bathhouse  
605 S Main Street

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular said the Panama Hotel is in Seattle’s historic Japantown in the Chinatown-International District and contributing to the City of Seattle International Special Review District and the Seattle Chinatown Historic District National Register historic district. The hotel is individually designated a National Historic Landmark due to its nationally significant association with the immigration of Japanese to the United States and as the location of one of only two surviving Japanese public bathhouses in the United States.

The five story building faces north overlooking S Main Street. The south facade abuts the historic 1914 Northern Pacific Hotel. Original features characteristic of the building exterior is the Common bonded brick masonry, buff brick accents, wood windows, and steel fire escapes. Interior spatial organization remains uniquely intact conveying the historic bathhouse and SRO function, and professional offices. The main entry stairs remain intact and extend from the entrance on S Main Street up to the fifth floor and remain the central vertical circulation feature for the entire building. The floor remains intact and occupies only the western half of the building and contains the building’s former professional office spaces, since converted to hotel rooms.

Mr. Howard said the second-floor rooms and corridors remain intact, including leather flooring, chair rail, picture molding, window and door casings, wood baseboard, and plaster walls and ceilings. The third-floor rooms and corridors

remain intact, including the original hotel reception area shown in green and an associated guest lobby. The light well, spatial layout, as well as interior finishes remain intact. The main stair ascends through the building.

He said both the fourth and fifth floors continue the same pattern of intact spatial layout providing the extraordinarily rare experience of being able to walk through and stay at an original SRO hotel. The corridor and guest rooms retain intact finishes, including wood flooring, baseboard and chair rail, door and window casings, and plaster walls and ceiling finishes. The basement contains the Hashidate Yu bathhouse in the western third with the original commercial laundry space directly below. The main central volume of the basement provides the artifact storage area. He showed images of bathhouse signage, the seats and heating element within the raised bath basin, and an example of some of the artifacts remaining within the storage area.

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular said the Chinatown International District was primarily developed between 1907 and 1927. Although originally referred to as Chinatown, the neighborhood became home to many different ethnic groups with sub-communities formed within the neighborhood. Asian immigrants – first Chinese, followed by Japanese and Filipino, began arriving in Seattle in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The first Japanese began to arrive in Seattle in 1879, reflecting the second wave of Asian immigration to the United States. Japantown was established in the area bounded by Yesler Way, 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue S, S Dearborn Street, and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue S. The business core was located primarily along S Main Street and the north side of S Jackson Street.

She said Japanese living in communities throughout the Puget Sound region would make special trips into Seattle to frequent the Japanese businesses and use the bathhouses. While public bathhouses were critical for SRO residents in the early 1900s, in Japantown, these bathhouses were also a social and cultural gathering place for Japanese living and visiting in the city.

Ms. Pratt said Japanese in Seattle faced racial discrimination, which only intensified following Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942. The executive order's implementation had life-altering effects for the Japanese population through military orders in proscribed military zones, curfew, voluntary relocation, temporary assembly and, ultimately, forced relocation and incarceration of all people of Japanese ancestry. Within weeks of evacuation orders, all of the Japanese in Western Washington, Western Oregon, and California were required to gather at assembly centers—Seattle area residents were gathered at the Puyallup Fairgrounds. They could only bring what they could carry to the relocation centers, so some Japanese stored their belongings where they could, including the basement of the Panama Hotel.

She said the Panama Hotel's role as a Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotel is significant, particularly with its location and historic ownership/management. In 1908, Japanese operated fifty hotels and SROs in Seattle and by 1920, hotel and

apartment operation comprised 26% of the jobs held by Japanese in the city. These business owners formed a business association, the Seattle Japanese Hotel and Apartment Association (SJHAA) and began meeting in January 1910. The SJHAA ceased operating between 1942 and 1949 but resumed business in 1949 with only eight fewer hotels than before the war.

She said the Panama Hotel building, designed by Sabro Ozasa, was constructed in 1910, opening in mid-January 1911. When it opened, it had six storefronts available for retail businesses, basement retail spaces (the exact number of which are unknown), a basement bathhouse, a floor for professional office spaces, and three floors of hotel rooms. The original owner of the property was the West Coast Building Company, but F. Fujii was the Japanese hotel proprietor. This type of ownership was not uncommon due to alien land ownership laws in Washington State – bicultural umbrella companies were established to allow Japanese into the real estate market. The original proprietor of the bathhouse was T. Ohme, followed by the Sano family. The Panama Hotel's six storefronts housed a number of businesses over the years. These included Pacific Print Co., Japanese-owned restaurants, a barbershop, billiards room, grocery stores, a Japanese Morning Daily newspaper, the Taisho-Do Bookstore, and Tokuda Drugs.

Ms. Pratt said Takashi Hori and his father, Sanjiro, purchased the Panama Hotel and took over its operation in 1938. In the midst of their early ownership of the Panama Hotel, the world was at war. The forced relocation of all people of Japanese ancestry as result of Executive Order 9066 included the Hori family and their neighbors and friends. The Hori family allowed members of the Japanese community to store their belongings in the Panama Hotel's basement prior to relocation.

She said while some Japanese, like the Horis, returned to Seattle's Japantown after the war, many others did not. The businesses that resumed in Japantown provided familiar goods and services to returning Japanese families, but the number of businesses dwindled as the area's demographics shifted. Takashi took over ownership of the building from his father and continued to own and manage the hotel, alongside his own family until 1985.

She said a key component of Japantown was the presence of public bath facilities, which served Japanese SRO hotel residents as well as the larger Japanese community. The Panama Hotel's bathhouse was called Hashidate Yu. It operated as both a bathhouse and a laundry facility. In 1914, the Hashidate Yu was one of 10 bathhouses south of Yesler Way, by 1936, it was one of only three still in operation. And it was the only bathhouse to reopen following the end of World War II. It continued in operation until the mid-1960s.

Ms. Pratt said when the bathhouse closed it was the last *senjo* operating in Seattle and may have been one of the last public bathhouses in the western United States. There were once hundreds of Japanese-style bathhouses throughout the western United States, but now only two are known to remain: the Hashidate Yu in the Panama Hotel and one in Walnut Grove, California. The Walnut Grove example is listed in the National Register and is a contributing property within the Walnut Grove Historic District. However, it is an example of a small public bathhouse in a small community rather than a large *senjo* like the one in the Panama Hotel. A shed that used to house a Japanese-style soaking tub (or *furo*), rather than a public

bathhouse (*sentō*), has been restored and is located at the Neely Mansion in Auburn, a King County landmark.

She said the Panama Hotel building was designed by Saburo Ozasa. He immigrated to the U.S. from Japan in 1893. Ozasa's Japanese birth name was Kosasa Saburo. He attended the University of Oregon and graduated in 1908 with a degree in Mining Engineering. Ozasa arrived in Seattle in 1908 and began to practice architecture—the first Japanese (and Asian) individual to do so in Seattle. Very little is known about Ozasa's personal life. His wife was named Shizu and they had a son named Yonao (born ca. 1909). The Panama Hotel is the largest of Ozasa's designs remaining in the United States, as he moved back to Japan and died in Tokyo in 1915.

She said the Hori family sold the Panama Hotel building and hotel business to Jan Johnson in 1985. Johnson has taken her role as steward of the building and its important story seriously; she continues to operate the Panama Hotel on the upper floors of the building and has renovated three of the six storefronts.

She said several significant themes the Panama Hotel conveys about the Japanese story in Seattle:

- It represents the limited work of Saburo Ozasa, the first Japanese architect to practice in Seattle.
- It is located within Seattle's Nihonmachi or Japantown
- It contains the Hasidate-Yu, the last known traditional bathhouse or *sentō* in Seattle and one of only two known to remain on the West Coast.
- It reflects the establishment and growth of the Seattle Japanese Hotel and Apartment Association (SJHAA)
- It reflects the trauma inflicted upon the Japanese during the forced relocation during World War II
- And finally, it represents the enduring stewardship by the Hori family, who returned to their business after the war and continued to operate the SRO even when residential hotels were a challenge to run and maintain in the city.

We agree with staff's recommendation included in their report at the nomination hearing, that the Panama Hotel eligible for landmark designation under four designation standards:

- A. It is the location of, or is associated in a significant way with, a historic event with a significant effect upon the community, City, state, or nation.
- C. It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the community, City, state or nation.
- D. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or a method of construction.
- E. It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder.

She said they'd like to see the exterior designated as well as the entire interior but understand if the Board wants to follow staff's recommendation. We'd like the

original walk-in cooler added and to clarify the bathhouse includes the laundry and associated spaces.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle thanked Mr. Howard and Ms. Pratt for the report and the National Trust for helping fund the nomination. She thanked the board for the unanimous support at the nomination meeting. She said the building is special and has high integrity. She thanked owner Jan Johnson for her stewardship, and the Hori family's stewardship before that and Karen Yoshitomi.

Jan Johnson said she wanted to save the building from Day 1 and here it is, 40 years later. She said she wants a museum at the building. She said she looks forward to working more with Historic Seattle.

Miyu Yoshida thanked the board.

Ms. McKinney asked if the Hori family was associated with the cucumber farm.

Ms. Johnson said the family was in real estate and did no farming that she knew of.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the excellent presentation and asked for clarity on the Staff Recommendation

Ms. Sodt said a couple things were not included in the Staff Report and she drafted a modified motion or description including the refrigerator and clarifying bathhouse and associated areas. She said if the board includes the entire interior, it does make sense for this significant of a resource, including the first floor.

Ms. Wasserman said in this case especially since the owner suggested it. She supported inclusion of entire interior and for details to be worked out in controls and incentives.

Ms. Chang asked about building structure where damage had occurred.

Mr. Howard said in the historic structure report there has been no structural analysis but as-builts were included. He said there are no plans for structural assessment. He said it will likely be part of the long-term building life along with seismic upgrade. He said he didn't see any structural report.

Ms. Woo said structural engineers have gone through the building.

Ms. Johnson said a structural assessment is being worked on. She said she was told structural improvements would require taking out coved plaster on third floor and she said 'no'. She said she was then told they could pin every two feet without touching the coved ceilings and plaster.

Ms. Woo said if interior is designated, it doesn't mean change can't happen just that it would need board review.

Mr. Macleod said he supported designation and inclusion of the entire interior after seeing there is so much intact; he said it is amazing. He said he wished he could convey the experience that was magical. He noted the walk-in cooler that exists and is still in use. He said it is the perfect example of a landmark and it is already a National Landmark. He said including the entire interior is very important. He said it is entirely intact and additions and modifications over time adds to the history. He thanked the owner for her stewardship.

Mr. Barnes concurred. He supported designated based on the four criteria cited in the Staff Report and he supported inclusion of entire interior. He said they can always come to board for review. He noted the preservation of the history and the interior and commented on the original and working interior remains.

Mr. Macleod said the building shows how much care the owner has taken to preserve it, as in the story about seismic issues and interior plaster.

Mr. Norman said he is shocked it isn't already a landmark. He said he was honored to support designation and said the building meets all the criteria.

Mr. Rodezno supported designation and echoed his colleagues' comments. He said the building meets the criteria in the Staff Report. He thanked the owner for her stewardship.

Ms. Caton said the tour was fantastic and the building is a rare gem. She said the owner's stewardship enabled landmark review.

Ms. Chang appreciated the thorough presentation, photos, plans. She thanked the owner for her stewardship and care in preservation of all features. She looked forward to it becoming a museum. She supported designation.

Ms. Wasserman supported designation based on all criteria listed in Staff Report. She said her book club met there to discuss "Hotel on the Corner of Bitter and Sweet". She supported inclusion of entire interior.

Ms. McKinney echoed her colleagues' comments and supported designation on all criteria.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported designation and said the owner is a good steward.

Ms. Johnson supported designation and said it is one of the easiest designations. She said it is a remarkable building with continued use as a hotel. She noted the owner's stewardship. She supported the Staff Report with inclusion of entire interior with details worked out at Controls and Incentives.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Panama Hotel and Hashidate Yu Bathhouse, at 605 South Main Street, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards A, C, D, and E; that the features and characteristics of the

property identified for preservation include: The interior and exterior of the building.

MM/SC/IM/DB

10:0:0 Motion carried.

**011922.5**

**STAFF REPORT**