



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 327/21

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday July 7, 2021, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Matt Inpanbutr

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

John Rodezno

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:50 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

070721.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Colleen McAleer said she is a party of record to this site. She said the applicant talks in the statement of need. She said the Laurelhurst Community Club (LCC) supports their security measures and having someone on site has been great for observation. She said the fence was put up three days before the property was nominated and was never part of the architect's plan for the site. She said the applicant has put down criteria for when the fence would be removed. She said on page 3 of applicant comment it states, it would be when they "...secure a long-term tenant at market rate..." She said the LCC has always been supportive of any tenants there long term. She said the site conditions are horrendous and it looks like a fire hazard. She said photos were sent to the board by Spencer Howard and Katie Pratt. She said using the criteria 'market rate value' to continue to keep up the temporary fence should be struck from the criteria.

Spencer Howard said he spoke on behalf of the LCC and asked the board not to approve the application on the grounds the existing fence is not a design feature of the landscape; it was added just before the landmark nomination of the site. He said the landmark preservation ordinance does not provide a process specific to temporary installation. He said the fencing is a significant visual impact to the landmark without substantially differing it from the existing fencing that was installed just prior to the nomination hearing. He said the fencing is not compliant with Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (SOI) 2 or 9.

070721.2 MEETING MINUTES

May 19, 2021

MM/SC/MI/HW 5:0:0 Minutes approved

June 2, 2021

Tabled.

070721.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

070721.31 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Proposed perimeter fencing

Mr. Kiel recused himself; he remained in the audience to keep quorum.

Ms. Doherty said in September 2020, the Landmarks Board denied a retroactive Certificate of Approval application for additional perimeter fencing that was installed in November 2019. The owner/applicant filed an appeal to the Hearing Examiner and the case was heard in January 2021. The Hearing Examiner issued a decision in April 2021, upholding the requirement for a Certificate of Approval, and remanding the application to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to discuss alternatives that could potentially meet the needs of both the owner and the Board.

The ARC heard a briefing on the alternatives at their meeting of June 11, 2021. Five Board members were in attendance each of them concluded that Alternative #2

appeared to be a reasonable option. The owner/applicant submitted a Certificate of Approval application to reflect the scope of work shown in Alternative #2.

Nathan Rimmer, 4000 Property LLC said their intent is to keep the fence temporary in nature to protect the asset which is one of the SOI standards. He said it is a reasonable approach while the land use permitting process is ongoing. He said Quadrant Homes, who had an active application has exited the process. He said the ownership is now regrouping to determine next steps to come up with something to present to the board in the near term. He said they will be able to look at things differently than Quadrant did as an owner/operator. He said there is ongoing maintenance activity – trees have fallen, branches have broken off, stuff has died. He said since the basic operations ceased and the fence is up, that the site is in need of investment in a big way. He said they want to bring in market rate use as part of the re-investment process long term. He said in the interim, putting up a long-term protection structure made sense. He said Ms. Doherty has been aware of the number of vandalism activities over the last 18 months.

He said it is hard to put a timeline on it because of process landmarks and land use approvals. He said a timeline should be events based than an arbitrary timeline that actually may or may not make sense. He said ultimately the plan is not to have it as a permanent part of the site. He said it is pretty common with landmarks, to protect them and they are not considered permanent parts of the site. He said they are looking it is like other landmarks around the city. He said they understood where some of the concerns were visually on the site and that led them to study a few options and present to ARC. He said the first option is to relocate portions of the temporary fence; the second is to modify portions of previously existing fence and remove others, and third, move temporary fencing behind previously existing fencing. Focus seemed to be mostly on the south side which is the most prominent face of the site. He said the north side of the site is more tucked away and hidden from the public view.

He said through ARC he felt that Alternative 2, modifying 4' fence to a 6' fence was something everyone thought that was better than the truly temporary style with non-permanent footings. He said fencing is common with landmarked sites or redevelopment sites in the city or sites that are in transition. He said they understood the concern and thought that augmenting the existing fence would be a good compromise between aesthetics and security concerns to keep casual trespassers from coming into the site. He said you will never keep everybody out, but you do your best with what you've got. He said there is not on-site security per se, there is some on-site staff but calling them 'security' would be misleading. The staff are not trained in security, so they are cognizant of their safety and try to not put them into confrontational situations. They are there to keep eyes on the site. He said there has been vandalism: breaking of windows, graffiti, camping out in buildings. There are at least eyes on the site daily to report those things, so they don't go totally unchecked.

He said to focus on Alternative 2 which they honed in on with ARC, he indicated on Exhibit A2, page 8 of the PDF file, most of the site is surrounded by vegetation so it

is not all that necessary for large portions of the site. He said it is a large site – 18 acres and there are lots of open areas. He indicated yellow line on drawing shows where they will delete that temporary style fencing up along the north and the northwest of the site. He said the blue lines on the south side indicate where existing 4' fencing and gate would be augmented to 6' using an off-the-shelf post riser system. He said the off-the-shelf black chain link mesh will go across that and will provide that next level security to deter the next level of determined trespassers. He said they easily scaled the 4' fence, just hopped over.

He provided a photo of fencing at north property edge, the buildings at the north and the footing system of the existing fencing, which is temporary, at grade, not permanently affixed.

Ms. Doherty identified the exhibits as B and C.

Mr. Barnes asked for clarification on which side exhibits B and C are on.

Mr. Rimmer said yes, the fencing shown is it same as on the south.

Ms. Doherty clarified that what was proposed to stay on north and west side and is shown as the yellow line on exhibits B and C identified as A2.

Mr. Rimmer said that is correct. He said Exhibit D was just Google search of temporary fencing. He noted photos of common style fencing, industry standard. He said there was a lot of discussion about 'what is temporary'? He said they looked at options to making things look aesthetically better. He said he didn't think that anyone thought that vinyl screening slats looked good. He said Exhibit F shows the style of what they are proposing in Alternative 2. He said rather than putting in new posts there are simple extensions to augment things. He said Exhibit F shows a 6' fence in relation to a 4' fence and you get that added level of protection. He said you get the security of a construction style fence but with a more aesthetically pleasing look to it.

He said Exhibit G shows 'as is' on NE 41st Street on the south side. He said this is where they propose to take the old existing 4' black fencing and augment it. He said the photo shows the galvanized face which would be replaced by a smoother, uniform, 6' in place of the black 4' behind it. He provided photos showing northwest side where fencing is hidden by vegetation; he said it is a commercial corner adjacent to a parking lot and it not very visible from the outside or the more public views. He said along 38th it will remain as is.

He asked for questions or comments.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary said Ms. Doherty did a really good job of summarizing what the Hearing Examiner's ruling was regarding the appeal. She said the Hearing Examiner directed the applicant to put together options about the fence and for the board to consider them. She said factors to be considered by the board related to Certificates of Approval and one of the main criteria for a

Certificate of Approval is the reasonableness or the lack thereof, of the fence in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant. She said Mr. Rimmer has talked about what their objective is which is to secure the property in the most effective way. She said a fence is the first line of defense. She said contrary to what you heard in public comment earlier, there is a Secretary of Interior guideline directly on point and that is "building site". She said a recommended thing to do on a historic property is to protect the landscape features against arson and vandalism before rehabilitation begins i.e., erecting protective fencing and installing alarm systems connected to local protective agencies. She said there is a Secretary of Interior guideline on point with the exact situation. She said we would ask the board to consider alternatives put together by Mr. Rimmer and work toward approval today.

Mr. Barnes asked for a report from ARC about why Alternative 2 was chosen.

Ms. Wasserman said Ms. Doherty did a great job putting it into the staff report. Ms. Wasserman said it is a compromise, as no construction type fence is going to be gorgeous. She said that almost nothing is going to be totally protective. There are compromises no matter what you do. She said the ARC didn't want the ugly temporary galvanized fence where visible along blue line shown on map where people really do see it. She said the black vinyl is taller and a real compromise, but it would work. It would give them the 6' that are needed to be somewhat protected and it looks a million times better than galvanized. She said there was agreement to do nothing in the yellow area because nobody sees it and it is not hurting anybody. She said that cost, aesthetics, and security were considerations and Option 2 was the best fit. She said there was no big discussion after that proposal; it is an adequate and good option.

Mr. Barnes said at one time ARC felt that no fence was needed because there was a security guard on staff. He said it now sounds like that is not the case anymore.

Ms. Wasserman said there is not a full-time security guard there is on-site staff, one person. She said with 18 acres of land, she didn't think it could be secured with one staff. She said she is not a security expert, but a fence is part of a security package; even a fence is not a total wall. She said it is helpful and necessary and she noted concern about properties that are empty and left to crumble and the board doesn't want that to happen here. She said this cost is nothing compared to vandalism and people taking over. She said the fence is necessary and Option 2 is acceptable to her.

Mr. Barnes asked how long "temporary" would be.

Ms. Doherty said when the board previously considered this, some board members asked the applicant to define temporary. She said from the applicant's perspective, temporary can't be defined here as it is tied to how the property may be redeveloped in the future or what tenants may or may not be there. She said it is important to remember this will be there as long as they think it is necessary. She said the Staff Report has no condition for the length of time it will be there.

Mr. Rimmer said any long term tenant will require for aesthetics reasons for it to be removed. He said it also works when the site is re-tenanted, there will be more eyes on the property and will eliminate the need for this. He said when that happens, they are fully prepared for this fence to be removed.

Mr. Barnes said he assumed the fence reduces neighborhood interaction with the property which had been thought of as a neighborhood park.

Mr. Rimmer it is private property and not open at this time regardless of whether there is a fence. It was a privilege that was revoked years ago.

Ms. Doherty said it is a private piece of property.

Ms. Wasserman said there was lots of discussion about that whether it was a meeting about the fence or something else, but at that time it wasn't a park or public walkway. She said it is private, a future development site of some sort. She said the owner has a right and need to secure it and that is to all our advantage if we want to preserve it.

Mr. Rimmer said their vision long term would be to reopen and reestablish, reallocate that neighborhood use of the site but until there is the ability to invest in the site with a viable long-term plan, that can't happen.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he had no questions.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Barnes if he was comfortable with the Option 2 ARC selected.

Mr. Barnes said he was, and that he wasn't at the ARC and wanted to understand the rationale. He said as a board member he trusts ARC judgment.

Ms. Doherty asked that the full text of Staff Report be read.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the alterations to the proposed perimeter fencing identified as Alternative #2, at the Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41st 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 the Report on Designation (LPB 742/13).*

- a. While the modified fencing on the south and east sides of the property remains visible, the black finish makes the fence less visually obtrusive.
 - b. While the bare galvanized fencing at the north and west sides of the property is visually prominent, this part of the designated site is more hidden from the public's view.
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 owner/applicant showed the ARC alternatives to relocate the bare galvanized chain-link fencing on the south side of the property, but these solutions did not mitigate their impact on the appearance of the designated site.
 - b. Increasing the height of the existing black fence on the south and east sides of the property appears to be a reasonable means of improving security, in lieu of installing additional lines of fencing at the same portion of the site.
 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.

5. The removal of the 6' tall bare galvanized chain-link fencing and gates on the south and east sides of the property, shall be completed within 45 days of the issuance of the Certificate of Approval.

MM/SC/HW/MI 4:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

070721.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

070721.41 El Monterey
4204 11th Avenue NE
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said they are actively negotiating and have requested an extension to the September 1, 2021, meeting to allow the HOA members to review.

Messrs. Inpanbutr and Kiel said it was reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the El Monterey, 4204 11th Avenue NE, until September 1, 2021.

MM/SC/MI/HW 5:0:0 Motion carried.

070721.42 Cayton-Revels House
518 14th Avenue E

Ms. Doherty went over the signed agreement and noted some language that is different from other agreements. She said that no Certificate of Approval is needed to remove or repair garage/shed and administrative approval would be required for possible backyard accessory dwelling unit.

Ms. Wasserman said it is reasonable and she was glad the process moved so quickly. She said it must have been nice to work with such agreeable people.

Ms. Johnson concurred.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Cayton-Revels House, 518 14th Avenue E.

MM/SC/KJ/MI 5:0:0 Motion carried.

070721.43 Wagner Floating Home
2700 Westlake Avenue N, Unit 10

Ms. Doherty said the estate / Wagner sons are going to sell the house. She said administrative approval language is common but noted specific language about the logs / float system.

Mr. Kiel said it was reasonable.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Wagner Floating Home, 2700 Westlake Avenue N., Unit 10.

MM/SC/KJ/HW 5:0:0 Motion carried.

070721.5 DESIGNATION

070721.51 University National Bank
4502 University Way NE

Nominator's Presentation:

Larry Johnson said he initiated research on this building at least five years ago. He believes that this terra cotta bank building, with the former Meany Tower and the Neptune Theater, are the three most historically important commercial buildings in the University District, although there are numerous other buildings that deserve recognition. He said he has always been curious why a nomination has not previously been prepared for the bank. The subject building lies in the heart of the University District on the northeastern corner of its most important intersection, University Way NE, and NE 45th Street. The building takes up most of lots 16 and 17 of the University Heights Addition.

He provided a virtual walk around the building via photos. He noted two pilasters that original stopped at the bottom of the spandrel to allow two storefront entries. He noted the high-quality workmanship on the building's pilasters, capitals, spandrels, and cornice. The southwestern corner of the building was the original entry to the bank, it now houses an ATM. The clock is original. The entry near the eastern end originally led up to an auditorium that at the time was a popular student dance venue. The alley façade is non-primary and non-significant. The National Park Service Bulletin 15 defines how the integrity of a property can convey its historic significance. Integrity is the authenticity of a historic resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics existing during the resource's period of significance and is recognized by five qualifiers: Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, and Association. The building has had so many interior alterations over the years that very little of the original fabric remains. The exterior was remodeled in 1926 to shift the entry to the western façade and eliminate the storefronts. However, the exterior retains sufficient physical integrity in design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association to qualify for designation.

Mr. Johnson said Criterion A deals with significant events. Although the bank may have been robbed a few times and perhaps several people met their future significant others at a dance on the second floor, he didn't think that this building is associated with a particularly significant event.

He said Criterion B deals with an association with the life of a person or persons that would be considered historically important. He said that there is only one person that is a candidate for such a distinction, and that would be Harry Lear. A native of Pittsburgh who attended the Scarritt Military College where he roomed with actor and humorist, Will Rogers. Lear entered the banking business in 1900 and settled in Seattle in 1906. He was one of the founders of the University State Bank. He served as one of the bank's first presidents and after the bank merged with Pacific National Bank, became chairman of the board. Lear retired in 1965. He said he didn't believe that this association warrants nomination under Criterion B.

Mr. Johnson said the building meets Criterion C, even considering its double significance threshold. The University District was originally the little frontier town of Brooklyn but was annexed into the City of Seattle in 1891, in anticipation of the relocation of the University of Washington from downtown Seattle to the district. David Denny ran a streetcar line across the Lake Union at Latona stimulating development in the area. The University of Washington was officially relocated to

the area in 1894 with the laying of the cornerstone of what would become Denny Hall in 1894. As students and faculty arrived, they need housing and a supporting commercial district that could deliver basic necessities such as food and clothing. Merchants, faculty, and students had no local access to banking, forcing them to travel via streetcar to downtown Seattle to deposit money and complete other banking activities. By 1900 the new university had 1,200 students and around 100 faculty and non-academic employees. In 1906 a meeting was held to address the banking problem. Although money was still tight following the 1893 financial crisis, \$25,000 was raised to establish a bank, mainly with relatively small subscriptions of a few hundred dollars. In 1909 the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific (AYP) Exhibition was held on the University of Washington campus encouraging additional community growth. With the growth of the University and the neighboring commercial district, the optimistic bank management constructed a relatively large terra cotta faced building at the northeastern corner of NE 14th Avenue, later University Avenue NE, and NE 45th Street. The bank interior, originally limited to the southern side of the building, was finished with mahogany and "old Mexican onyx." The corner entrance was fitted with iron doors and marble wainscoting. Two storefronts were located on the northern side of the ground floor. Office rooms and a ballroom were located on the second floor. The ballroom was a popular venue for university-related dances including those held by the fraternity Sigma Chi, The Town and Gown Club, and others. By the mid-1920s the University District was a thriving commercial center. The bank was granted a National Charter in 1922, becoming University National Bank. The bank issued over two and a half million dollars in currency between 1922 and 1933, when in the midst of the great Depression Congress passed the Emergency Banking Relied Act. The bank to expanded into nearly the entire lower floor and basement in 1926 with a major remodel and another remodel in 1940 that eliminated the northernmost storefront. University National Bank merged with Pacific National Bank in 1955, and in 1966 became a unit of Wells Fargo. The subject building is significantly associated with both the University of Washington and the growth of the University Commercial District. He said the building meets Criterion C.

Regarding Criterion D, he said the building was designed in the Classical Revival style. Dentils and a nearly symmetrical composition are indicators of the style. The stylistic choice may have been influenced by the 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, which emulated the "White City" of Chicago's 1893 Columbian Exposition. The design of federal buildings was especially influenced by Neoclassical Revival architecture due to the passage of the Tarnsey Act of 1893, which allowed private firms to design federal buildings. Neoclassical Revival style tends to include the features of classical symmetry, full height trabeated (post and lintel) form of Greek temples, and various classical ornament such as dentil cornices, entablatures, and triangular pediments. The arrangement of windows and doors is formal and symmetrical, with the front door often flanked by pilasters or side lights and capped with a flat entablature, broken pediment, or rounded fanlight. Historically, American architects often favored Classical prototypes for bank buildings. Architect Henry Latrobe's 1798 Bank of Pennsylvania is just but one example. Classical architecture displayed traditional values and security. Later examples include State Savings Bank (1900, McKim, Mead & White) in Detroit; McKim, Mead & White's Bowery Savings Bank (1895) in New York; the New First National Bank (1906) in Champaign, Illinois;

and the Citizen's National Bank (1908) in Frederick, Maryland. Bank interiors during that time were typically sumptuous. Marble, ornate polished hardwood, and wrought metal were combined to evoke solidity and wealth. He said another example, Citizen's National Bank in Maryland could almost be the prototype for the subject building completed 14 years later. He said it is interesting to note that in the mid-1930s the University would dictate that all campus architecture should be designed in the Collegiate Gothic style, and that the neighboring commercial development be encouraged to do so as well. After World War II, the United States government and banking institutions embraced modernism, especially in neighborhood branch banks, which became less institutional and welcoming. The subject building definitely meets this criterion; it is a fine example of a Classical Revival bank building rendered in white terra cotta. It is a product of its time when banks wanted their buildings to convey a sense of traditional solidity.

Mr. Johnson said Criterion E was not as clear. He noted an article from the Seattle Post Intelligencer published on March 21, 1912, which shows a rendering of the proposed bank attributed to the Seattle architectural firm of the Beezer Brothers. After this date the firm appears to no longer be involved. A Seattle Times article published on August 5, 1912, states that George Hughes had secured the construction contract and a building permit for the structure. In the nomination package is a set of construction drawings signed by George Hughes "Architect." Hughes was a building contractor, and this is the sole incident where he calls himself an architect. He said it may be conjecture, but the only reasonable answer is that the bank was still short on funds and hired Hughes to take Beezer Brothers schematic drawings and work them up to a reasonable permit set. Since he appears not to have been formally trained as an architect, it is also reasonable that the firm that supplied the terra cotta for the building also worked up the finished elevations drawings. So even though the Beezer Brothers never included the building in their portfolio of projects, he said he would still award the attribution to them. Louis and Michael J. Beezer were identical twin brothers born on July 6, 1889, in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. After studying architecture in Pittsburgh, they practiced architecture first in Altoona, Pennsylvania, and then in Pittsburgh. Around 1907 the brothers relocated to Seattle. The brothers' practice was regional, completing projects in Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Mr. Johnson said in Seattle the brothers completed several significant commissions, including the English Tudor Oliver D. Fisher Residence on Capitol Hill, the Gothic Revival Blessed Sacrament Church, and the Bishop O'Dea School. The brothers' portfolio is vast and represents high-quality design. In 1926, the subject building was entirely gutted. The floor structure was replaced, and the interior was completely redone. Alterations to the exterior included elimination of the corner entrance and a new western entry. The design architect was the Seattle architecture firm of Doyle and Merriam. Although the short-lived firm completed a few significant projects in Seattle, including the Doyle Building, he said nearly all of their interior work has been altered and only their western entrance remains. He George Hughes was an accomplished contractor who constructed several beautiful homes through Seattle. He said that due to the confusing design history of the subject building, that

although it is a beautiful and significant building within its neighborhood, that it does not meet this criterion.

Regarding Criterion F, Mr. Johnson said the building is located on the most significant intersection in the University District, NE 4th Street and University Way. It is a significant visual landmark visible from multiple locations in the district. Its ability to anchor its corner representing a significant element of the history of the University District is perhaps the reason I chose to prepare this nomination.

Owner's Presentation:

Stephen Day presented on behalf of the ownership and said he appreciated Mr. Johnson's good presentation and report. He noted his focus would be on the interior, specifically its current condition. He said that beginning in 1920s, virtually all original design attributed to the Beezer Brothers and others was removed. He provided a virtual walk through the building using photos, noting current conditions and the few original elements that remain. He said the basement vault/safe remains in altered condition and some components remain in the manager office, secondary entry from NE 45th. He indicated where construction is underway to install an elevator. He explained they have opened up the volume of the ballroom space and will try to retain mezzanine level. He said that while the exterior remains remarkably intact, the interiors are heavily altered.

Mr. Inpanbutr thanked both presenters and said he supported designation based on the Staff Report, criteria D, E, and F and noted there are compelling arguments for them.

Ms. Johnson supported designation and said it is a really nice building that looks remarkably similar to its original condition. She said she agreed with the Staff Report, Criterion D was easy, F was appropriate, and she supported E as well. She thanked both presenters.

Ms. Wasserman thanked both presenters and said she loves the building. She said she supported designation based on Staff Report, D, E and especially F because the building is noticeable.

Mr. Barnes supported designation and said the building is an outstanding feature of the district and it is unique to have it there. He said the building is reflective of the architecture of the time.

Mr. Kiel supported designation based on the Staff Report criteria D, E, and F. He said the building embodies its time, period, and style.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the University National Bank at 4500-4502 University Way NE as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/HW/DB 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Johnson said he has worked in preservation for 45 years and this would be his last nomination/designation. He wanted to say good-bye to the board and thank staff and board for their work. He noted Earl Layman, Jon Chaney, Karen Gordon, Beth Chave, Sarah Sodt, Erin Doherty, and Melinda Bloom.

070721.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator