



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 461/22

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, November 16, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Taber Caton

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Genna Nashem

Absent

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

111622.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Heuser spoke in support of nomination of 229-235 Broadway Ave E. He said that there is sufficient integrity through retention of many original windows, rounded bay windows with Corinthian heavy cornice bracket. He said it has the

ability to convey significance through its significant association with the life of a person important to the history of the City and State. He said the original owner, William Wilshire was a state senator whose districts included Capitol Hill. He said Wilshire lived within walking distance of the building and owned it until his death. He said these are indicators of long-term interest and investment in the building itself and the community in which he lived. He said the building has an extensive and significant history as a home for institutions dedicated to women’s health and deserves recognition for this through its physical integrity. He said the building embodies the distinctive characteristics of its early 20th century architectural period so meets criterion D. He said given its location on a corner parcel and its 1903 construction, size relative to many of the surrounding buildings, its contrast of age and scale it meets criterion F as it is an easily identifiable feature that contributes to the distinctive quality and identity of the neighborhood. He said to set aside any concerns about affordable housing because future use is not a criterion for judging landmark status and because housing and preservation goals are not opposed.

Lana Blinderman agreed with what had already been noted about the building’s history and its architect and original ownership, and said it contributes a great deal to the appeal of the area. She said Broadway doesn’t have many buildings of that age, condition, left unchecked – barely any – and the building contributes significantly visually in terms of the spirit of the neighborhood. Ms. Blinderman noted that affordable housing and preservation do not have to conflict with each other, and it a false contradiction. She noted there are plenty of plots in the neighborhood that can and should be developed into affordable housing, that do not require taking out one of the few remaining historical buildings.

Mr. Macleod arrived at 3:35pm.

111622.2

MEETING MINUTES

August 17, 2022

MM/SC/IM/MI

6:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Norman and Slattery abstained.

Ms. Wasserman arrived at 3:38pm.

September 7, 2022

MM/SC/MI/IM

5:0:4 Minutes approved. Dr. McKinney and Ms. Caton abstained. Messrs. Schmitt and Slattery abstained.

111622.3

SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

111622.31

Seattle Quilt Building

316 1st Ave S

Ms. Nashem explained the Special Tax Valuation program. She said submitted and eligible rehabilitation costs were \$6,037,177. She said that all work was interior and seismic and do not affect the exterior of the building so work did not require a

Certificate of Approval. She said the application was approved this morning by the full Pioneer Square Preservation Board.

Ms. Johnson said it looks nice.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Seattle Quilt Building, 316 1st Ave S, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

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

111622.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

111622.41 14TH Avenue W House Group
2000 14th Avenue W
Retroactive proposal for garage expansion

Ms. Doherty provided context of the site and noted the delineated property line and location of where the work was done. She noted the application is retroactive and said the property has a preservation easement with Historic Seattle who does annual site visits. She said the work was noticed during annual site visit by Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle. She said it is essentially a little flat roofed building and all the siding is still intact, as is the window and the door. She said the roof tucks under the eave and gutter line. She said that it is connected to the house but the exterior side of the house is left intact.

Ms. Johnson asked if this house is part of a group designation.

Ms. Doherty said it is, there are five houses, but it just looks like four because one is essentially hidden behind another. She said they are all of a similar era; two look very similar to one another. She said this house doesn't look like any of the other houses but is of the same era. She said the garage is at the rear of the house on the existing driveway.

Mr. Norman asked if other houses have garages.

Ms. Doherty said no, because they don't have the street access this one has. This house already has a garage and the property is on the corner while the others are together in a row. She said the owner has just extended the existing garage form further out behind the house.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked a procedural question, what would happen if the board didn't approve a retroactive approval.

Ms. Doherty said the owner would have the opportunity to appeal to the Hearing Examiner. If the board's decision was upheld, the owner would be directed to remove the garage addition. She said alternative motions were provided in the Staff Report. She said the owner told her he has classic cars that he wants to keep inside to be protected. She said he has been trying unsuccessfully to lease or rent space for his cars. She said she doesn't believe there is a design alternative for another location due to the house and its relationship to the street and adjacent properties.

Ms. Johnson asked if this was a miscommunication with the owners about what is acceptable and what is not.

Ms. Doherty said the owner said he did understand that there was a preservation easement and that he knows the house is a landmark. She said she thought he has owned it for 40+ years. The owner said he did not think what he was doing was problematic because it was behind the house, and he thought he was doing things the right way by tucking it beneath the roof and leaving the exterior wall intact. But he didn't seek approval either the Landmarks Board or from Historic Seattle, hence the retroactive application.

Mr. Macleod looked at photographs detailing the work and noted the door, window and siding are still intact, and the work is reversible.

Mr. Inpanbutr noted the original garage door opening is still there as well.

Ms. Doherty noted that the pre-existing garage was not original to the house. She said the garage is still there, it has just been extended toward the street with this addition.

Ms. Johnson said it is unfortunate that it is after the fact review. She said it could be better, but it could be worse. She said it is still set back from the main side façade. She said had the board seen this earlier, we would have been curious if the peaked roof could have been extended but it looks like that would probably affect the main roof. She didn't think it was worth removing the garage addition and asked other board members' input.

Mr. Inpanbutr said that it seems to be about the lightest touch you could have. If that peak roof came forward it seems like there would be some draining complications. He said it is as removable as it could be and the timing was unfortunate but it doesn't give him a lot of heartburn. He said it is not visible from Google Street view and he was OK with it.

Mr. Norman said he was OK with it as well and hoped the owner is aware of need for review in future.

Mr. Macleod concurred and said it doesn't bother him too much. It is potentially reversible and had the board reviewed it prior to being built, board likely would have approved it with a few tweaks.

Ms. Caton concurred. She suggested some education outreach to homeowners.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the retroactive application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the garage addition at 2000 14th Avenue W, as per the attached submittal.

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 108211.*
 - a. The addition changes the massing of the house. But due to the setback, height, and flat roof, it does not detract from the overall form and character of the house.
 - b. The location of the garage wall and roof do not alter the existing door and windows on the east façade of the house.
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. No alternatives were presented to the Landmarks Board. But due to the location of the driveway and configuration of the site, it appears to be the only reasonable location for a proposed expansion of the existing garage.
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/LE/IM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

111622.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

111622.51 West Seattle High School
4075 SW Stevens Street

Ms. Doherty explained the agreement with the school district and read specific details from the signed agreement.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the Controls and Incentives agreement for West Seattle High School at 471 Southwest Steven Street.

MM/SC/IM/HW 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused. Ms. Caton was not available to vote.

111622.52 Caroline Horton House
627 14th Avenue E
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three-month extension. She said she is actively working on an agreement and sharing drafts with the property owner.

Ms. Johnson said it is a reasonable request.

Action: I moved to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Caroline Horton House, 627 14th Avenue E for three months.

MM/SC/IM/MI 8:0:0 Motion carried. Ms. Caton was not available to vote.

Ms. Caton noted that her technical issue was resolved.

111622.6 NOMINATION

111622.61 229-235 Broadway E

Ellen Mirro and Katie Jaeger, Studio TJP prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file).

Ms. Mirro provided context of the site and noted it is two separate parcels.

The building has a wood structure with a brick veneer. The exterior partial brick facade is a veneer and the load bearing structure consist of a wood frame wall and wood post and beam at the interior. The sidewalk tile address numbers were part of an improvement project in 1981 and illustrate that the storefront entries have changed locations since these address numbers were installed. The storefront entries have changed since 1981 and are not original. She said the stucco bulkheads are not original or even historical. She noted the northern entry to the subject building and that it shares the entry stairs with the building next door. She said they are two separate buildings and noted how the roofline steps down and the jog in the building at the property line. She said some of the windows on the north have been blocked in. She said there are no original finishes intact.

Continuing her virtual 'walk around' the building she noted the upper floor hallway, which has been remodeled and the northern entries stair. She said sites must retain the ability to convey whatever significance they have in order to qualify as a landmark. The earliest photo of the building, the tax photo from 1937 exhibits the tile storefront, bulkheads, and the large transom windows. She noted how much the configuration of the entries to the storefront have changed. She noted the corner window detail on that corner storefront there at drugstore. She noted the entry to the sanitarium on the other side. She pointed out the historic storefronts with the tile bulkheads and the glass corner, but in 1975, those transom windows had been removed.

Ms. Mirro provided a timeline of the main floor tenants. The corner space had the longest-term use as a series of pharmacies for 60 years, and then restaurants for 40 years. The southern spaces operated as a single usable space. The middle of retail space had a series of grocery stores for 13 years succeeded by a series of hair salons for 30 years. Other notable uses were an 11-year stint in the southern space for a health food store followed by a 21 year as a bead store. She said for about 50 years there were a series of maternity care clinics in the space. In 1955, a remodel broke up the space for professional suites.

She provided a photo with highlighted areas of the building showing what has changed since 1937 and noted the changes to the storefront, the highlighted stone finials in the photograph and you can clearly read the name of the building in the pediment here, all the roof ornaments, chimneys and the building name are gone.

Ms. Jaeger went over criteria. Regarding Criterion A, there is no event associated with the building that had a significant effect on the community. Regarding Criterion B, the building is associated mostly by name with William Wilshire the developer and original owner of the building. Wilshire was a lawyer and over the course of his career, he served as deputy county prosecutor, and also served as a state senator representing the Capitol Hill area.

In addition to the subject building Wilshire also developed his family home at 302 Harvard Avenue immediately northwest. Wilshire doesn't seem to have developed any additional buildings in the city, but he bought and sold real estate in the first few decades of the 20th century. According to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Preservation, persons associated with the property must be individually significant within a historic context or within that professional field. The historic record does not indicate that Wilshire had exceptional significance as a lawyer, a deputy prosecutor, or a state senator. There is little to no evidence that he affected the course of history in his legislative or legal roles. As a white moneyed man, he had automatic status, but the power of privilege doesn't automatically equal historic importance.

She said before occupation by white settlers, the land commonly known today as Capitol Hill was home to the Coast Salish people. Following colonization, Capitol Hill was one of the earliest neighborhoods to be developed after the downtown core; she provided photos of the area showing development up to present day.

Immediately east of the civic building the area now known as Cal Anderson Park has long been a core element of the neighborhood serving as a city reservoir, playfield, a recreational and gathering space, and a site of protest most recently with the occupied protest of 2020. Capitol Hill has long been associated with the community, since at least the 1950s. In addition to being home to clubs, community resources, and once the future affordable housing Broadway was and is again the site of the annual gay pride parade, which started in 1977. She noted area landmarks including Cal Anderson Park and the Pantages house.

For half the subject building's existence the upper floor contained a business, or a series of businesses associated with women's healthcare for nearly five decades of that time. This took the form of a maternity home. Although throughout the twentieth century, the term maternity home shifted, in terms of who was being served and what services were provided. Studio TJP's report contains a detailed statement on larger national and regional trends in maternity care and childbirth practices across race and ethnicities.

She provided a graph which shows the percentage of hospital births in the 20th century and the near total shift from 1900 when most babies were born at home to around the 1960s when nearly all were born in a hospital setting. She said the businesses being looked at today bridge that period between giving birth at home, and giving a large hospital setting the clientele of the subject buildings. Businesses served mostly white, middle class women. And until the 1945 iteration of the business, were probably also married women.

She said the first three decades of the century saw the proliferation of the private maternity hospital. These institutions were often owned and run by women who might have had nursing or medical training or might have had a few extra rooms in their house. There was also a proliferation of somewhat larger businesses, advertising, registered nurses on staff doctors on call and they might offer a package deal of 35 dollars for a 10-day stay.

She said around the start of the 1940s, there was a pretty dramatic shift in the target patient from usually married middle class mothers to the euphemistic 'girls in trouble', which was always shorthand for unmarried, pregnant women and girls. Hand ringing about the unwed mother was nothing new. The Florence Crittenton Home was established in Seattle in 1899. It was a nationwide concern with thousands of outposts. Seattle also had the Lebanon Home founded in 1908 and affiliated with the Free Methodist Church.

She said in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, a particular breed of maternity home emerged that has since gained notoriety as using a culture of shame to often coerce young mothers to give up their babies for adoption. She said there is no evidence that the subject buildings or named maternity home was using these shady practices. However, it was advertised similarly to two proven so called 'baby farms'. And then in the 1950s nationwide, one sees the beginning of legal family planning options for married women specifically. At this point Planned Parenthood had a clinic outpost in the subject building. The group had begun in Seattle in 1940, with

an office just three blocks north of subject building, before moving the headquarters downtown.

Planned Parenthood which moved its headquarters to First hill in 1960. In 1955 the upstairs was converted to office suites and was no longer occupied by a single clinic or provider. Pregnancy Aid was a tenant for two years in the 1970s. In distinction to a medical clinic, Pregnancy aid was a nonprofit social services provider of the movement that was coming to be known as pro-life, or right to life. She said this was two years after Roe v. Wade had passed, and 5 years after Washington state had legalized abortion.

She said elsewhere in the region there was a rise in different community-centered care and comprehensive childbirth, and birth control services, which often included abortion. These include Aradia Women's Health Center, small scale birthing centers, and the Carolyn Downs Family Medical Clinic which grew out of the Black Panther Party's community health. She said each iteration of maternity facility that we see in the subject building is a really typical example of its genre and its historic context. The Findley facilities fit in with the proliferation of small, private perinatal care facilities. The unnamed home of the 1940s, also fits into the pattern of similar businesses at the time with an emphasis on secrecy and girls in trouble in the 1950s with the planned parenthood outposts. We see women having more choices and options around pregnancy and family planning again typical of local and national trends. And in the 1970 s, shortly after abortion was legalized, Pregnancy Aid part of a developing prolife movement started. None of the businesses had greater obvious fame or infamy than equivalent service providers. At the time with Planned Parenthood and Pregnancy Aid were short term branches, branch officers of a larger organization. It would be hard to say that any of these businesses had a significant effect on the history of birth practices in the region.

Ms. Mirro said regarding criterion D, the style or period the city of Seattle historic site survey indicates for the building style is of neoclassical type building. She said they didn't find much on the building itself to relate it to the architectural style beyond the bay windows, which provides some of the three-dimensionality. The style is known for the sense of classical order, and decoration is missing. The arch windows and brick masonry, brick masonry relate the building in an adjacent way to the Romanesque Revival, which was probably one of the most popular styles of the time period. The building is missing the hallmarks of that style, like a rusticated base and a sense of mass. A Romanesque Revival building would have a thick masonry wall, and this building's masonry veneer fails to impart a sense of mass of a Romanesque building. She said there are excellent examples of this style in Pioneer Square, and the former Broadway High School also shares characteristics of the style.

Another style that featured arched openings where the Spanish Revival Style; with stucco cladding and clay tile roofs as hallmarks of the style. The style was popular starting in 1893 with the Columbia Exhibition in Chicago. And there are examples of both commercial and residential Spanish Revival style buildings in Seattle. The subject building again only seems to share those arched window openings with the

style. All of these styles were popular at the turn of the 20th Century, but there were some prominent buildings in the development of Capitol Hill on Broadway, reminiscent of the Spanish Revival. She didn't think this building embodies any particular style and said that although the character of the building is typical of the period it will be up to the board to determine if the building can clear the bar for embodying the characteristics of the period, especially given the changes that building has undergone.

Regarding Criterion E, she said it made her wonder what do we do with the art of terrible people? This question peppers our cultural legacy as no artist is a perfect person; however, some are worse than others. Architect Henry Dozier was born in Mississippi and then he moved to St. Louis. His education consisted of an apprenticeship with the St. Louis architect Eugene Greenleaf and a course of mathematics at the old Falun Polytechnic School. He worked with other St. Louis architects, and spent much of his productive career in Colorado. He worked in Seattle for eight years between 1901 and 1909 with a list of about 23 projects.

She provided images showing the design fees of his most well-known Seattle projects and a letter to the editor that shows some of his opinions at the time he lived in Seattle, and some of which included poems and thoughts on topics such as effort of evolution to create the highest type of man, and the dangers of the Japanese American community in Seattle. She said she found irony in the contrast between his creation of the style for the design of the Dearborn House and Dozier's opinions regarding Seattle's Japanese populations.

The story of his character starts here with his marriage to Pauline, in 1879 with whom he went on to have 9 children. Pauline was committed to an asylum in 1896 and Dozier abandoned his family, all 9 children. He was arrested for failing to support his family and several of Dozier's children ended up in orphanages, while others were literally farmed out to other families. Pauline actually gave birth to Dozier's youngest child while she was incarcerated in the asylum. By 1898 Dozier was on his way to Alaska as a 2nd class passenger on a steamer, leaving his children, including the baby with no resources. And here again, we see Dozier's most significant work in Seattle, the Dearborn Mansion, now the home of Historic Seattle. His other most prominent design that is still standing is the Pacific Hospital Building on 1st Avenue in Belltown. By 1910, Dozier had moved to Tacoma and was working as a draftsman for City Light and Water. After a short residency in Tacoma, Dozier moved to Pennsylvania where he died in 1914. His wife, Pauline lived her life in and out of institutions until her death.

Ms. Jaeger said the building did not meet Criterion F and provided various views of the building to support that opinion.

Ms. Mirro said staff has recommended considering this building under criterion C and D, and when we think about it under criteria B, Wilshire may have had status, but he may not have reached the individual importance in his profession that's required. She said the building seems to be a normal part of the development of

Broadway's commercial strip and also provided space for a type of maternal care that bridged the period between typical home birth and typical hospital birth. In that context, among the many other maternal care options under criteria D, the building illustrates the period, but it's up to the board whether the building actually rises to the extra level of embodying the period under criteria.

She said the building is one of a number of Dozier's extent designs but again it's up to the board to decide what we value in our cultural heritage. And who we elevate under this ordinance. Under criterion F, corner buildings do not automatically meet this criterion, and the Board will have to decide if it is distinctive for the neighborhood.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary said they are in permitting now (referred through the Appendix A process) with a proposal to build over 100 affordable housing units on this site. He doesn't think they should uncouple this process from that larger process of the entitlements here. He encouraged the Board to think about their criteria, and he acknowledged that affordable housing is not a factor of that criteria, but it is part of this entire process. And asked the Board to look hard at, and as Ellen said to think about, do we do we want to celebrate and separate the architecture of odious architects. Mr. Dozier's reputation and xenophobia is well documented. Mr. Morrison said that is part of the reason that under criteria D - about the embodying distinctive visible characteristics of the architecture - this structure has significant alterations to the character defining features that challenge its ability to convey its significance. Under criterion E, and the architecture of Mr. Dozier, Mr. Morrison questions whether it is worthy of continued celebration in the city. He said some of Mr. Dozier's other work are landmarks, which he thought were more significant to his body of work - setting aside his personal opinions.

Mr. Morrison said that outposts of maternal health care in this building's history do not rise to the level of Criterion C. He said under Criterion F - while the owner acknowledges that this is a corner building - he said it is not a sufficient condition to rise to that level of prominence, and then easily identifiable visual feature. He said this building is commonly known as Jai Thai throughout the neighborhood, and Jai Thai as has closed and moved to other locations. He said public comment talked about how this building is identifiable in scale. And thinks that when you look north on Broadway, it is clear that there's an existing datum - where this is arguably a background building, and that as you look at it, as you look West on Thomas, especially with the historicist addition of the 1980s - it again blends in and does not rise to the level of an easily identifiable visual feature of the neighborhood. For all those reasons, the owner would respectfully request that the board decline to nominate this building.

Mr. Slattery asked if the client is a non-profit.

Mr. Morrison said the client is an affordable housing provider that partners with non-profits.

Mr. Slattery asked how they will guarantee that this will actually be affordable housing development on this site, and that plans won't switch down the road.

Mr. Morrison said as their land use attorney, the applicant for this project has disclosed as they're going through the Master Use Permit that this is affordable housing. They are in conversations with the Seattle Office of Housing for potential office of housing funds, should they get a Master Use Permit for this. Their business model and their development is pursuing 100% affordable housing on this site. The intent of this project, should it go forward is to develop a 100% affordable housing that hopefully will secure office of housing city funds to develop the project. Those will be covenant restricted affordable housing units. There will be deed restrictions and funding restrictions that those units would need to be affordable for the life of the project, or typically, depending on the funding stack, either 99 years or the life of the project, at 60 or below or area median income.

Mr. Slattery said he is a hardcore historic preservationist but noted he did not support this nomination.

Mr. Macleod said as he was looking through the public comment it was mentioned that Historic Seattle brought up when the board looked at the Capital Crest building. It was mentioned that this could possibly be one of the oldest mixed-use buildings on Capitol Hill. He asked if there was any research into that.

Ms. Mirro said that as to where that fits in with the history of Broadway and mixed-use buildings - it is one of the oldest buildings on Broadway. It's two years younger than the Avon Capital Crest.

Mr. Macleod said he will probably be going against the staff report and supporting nomination of this building under criteria C and D. Obviously, the personal history of the architect is deeply troubling, but that's not necessarily what he would nominate this building under. He said that this being an early mixed-use building on Broadway many of which are rapidly disappearing - that itself warrants merit for this building. When you look at a buildings like this, he said it's easy to talk about integrity issues, and how storefronts have evolved over their lifetime. He said this is similar to his comments during review of the Avon - Capitol Crest building. That it'd be great if it was intact the way it was when it was built. He said he lives in the Columbia City Landmark District, and there are a few buildings that really retain that early appearance. But I think this building you could overlook the aluminum storefront assembly and see that the core of the building is really intact, particularly those arched windows, that peaked element in the roof that is front and center. There have been minor details that just happen over the course of a life, and you can take that in the context of the size of the building. He said that the maternity ward aspect of the history is really interesting, and really unique in an area that is really dominated by retail and retail history. He said the board has looked at a few other buildings, like the genesis of the music school down the street. He said that's a really unique and compelling bit of history there. He supported nomination. He said it's also important to remember that the Landmarks Board is not approving or disapproving a proposed project, but rather looking at the historic site itself.

Ms. Wasserman said Mr. Macleod pretty much said what she would say. She said she had to be careful not to look at future use. She said it is impossible though, for me to look at that area of Broadway and not think about the setting. The whole street has become a canyon of modern buildings. This is a chance to preserve the exterior of one of the old ones. She was not ready to select criteria but supported nominating the building and moving forward with the process. She said when looking at the building - the top floor, the windows, the peak on the roof is still there though, not quite as pretty as it once was. She said the board has approved other buildings where the storefronts have been changed. In fact, most of the buildings that have storefronts, they've been drastically changed. She supported nominating this to move forward with the process.

Mr. Macleod said he really wished that there was a Broadway historic district. It would make looking at these buildings a little easier. But agreeing with Ms. Wasserman, he said the old buildings on Broadway are rapidly disappearing and so this is a real great opportunity to hang on to one.

Mr. Norman did not support the nomination noting it doesn't meet any of the criteria. He said this building feels too far gone. He appreciated the presentation and said it was really illuminating. He said it provided a lot of good history. He said it was good to hear that this was an outpost for Planned Parenthood. He noted all the other tenants that have been in the building, and that hopefully some of that could be encapsulated somewhere in a new building in this at the site.

Mr. Schmitt said he agreed with Mr. Norman. He also said if the building were part of a Broadway historic district as Mr. Macleod said, then he would feel differently. But he noted the building in and of itself doesn't meet criteria C or D, or any of the others that have been discussed. But if it was a part of a historic district that encompassed all Broadway then that would be different, because there are some elements of like the roof and the 2nd floor and those arched windows that do kind of contribute to a historic feeling around Broadway. He said this building alone isn't historically significant. It's kind of stuck in that in-between area where it doesn't meet the standards on its own. But it could, if it was preserved as part of a larger part of the larger neighborhood. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Caton said she appreciated all of the comments, and said she feels torn on this building, in terms of its history as a center of maternal care and all of its iteration, and thinks that is something especially relevant in these times. She said she knows the building really well and it is a visual landmark on Broadway, and agrees that it is very much contributing to the neighborhood overall, but maybe not necessarily as an individual landmarked building.

Dr. McKinney said she agreed with Mr. Norman's comments and did not have anything to add.

Mr. Slattery said he personally likes the building and all of the bones are there. He said it has been modified over the years but the bones are undeniably right there.

But when considering this site, the city needs affordable housing right now and not this mediocre historic architecture.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he was torn and that he could look past the changing storefronts, as the rest of the building does have some integrity. But there is compelling enough argument for it as a mixed use building that it was definitely significant, I guess, to meet criteria C. And though it does have some visual characters for criteria D, I'm not sure it embodies those visible characteristics. He was leaning towards not nominating but could be convinced otherwise.

Ms. Johnson said she thought she was of the same mindset. She said the presentation was really interesting and the history of maternal care, and a building like this is something she had never considered before reading the nomination. She said architecturally, this is one of those buildings that has lost some of the really interesting specific details. She said storefronts change all the time and we're used to seeing storefronts change. She said there is certainly a sense of what the building looked like historically still there, though painted and with the changes it has. She said she was having trouble that there isn't some other element pushing it towards the nomination. She said that it is one of the oldest buildings still there, and given the new construction does really stand out. But thinks she is someone in the camp that is on the fence, and leaning towards not nominating. She said there are two strong supporters, four 'no' votes, and Mr. Inpanbutr, Ms. Tabor and herself noted as in the middle. She said five votes are needed to nominate or not.

Ms. Caton said that while she would like the history of maternal care to rise to that occasion she didn't know how that could be preserved.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he wished the building could be contributory to a neighborhood, but he didn't know that it's significant enough on its own.

Ms. Johnson said she leaned towards not supporting nomination.

Mr. Macleod said we often deal with superlatives in historic buildings and this being one of if not the oldest building of its type in mixed use residential and commercial building makes it particularly important. He said it would be a tremendous loss to Broadway to lose such an old original building like this. He noted the maternity ward aspect of the history and said it is really fascinating. He said he read through the report and tried to research further on it independently and said it is not an insignificant part of the building's history for fifty-plus years. He noted it is a good chunk of its existence on the site but it was mentioned in the presentation the history of Capitol Hill, and this doesn't necessarily factor into that. He thinks it has a parallel narrative in terms of women's history, women's health history and particularly marginalized women because these places became a place of last resort for 'troubled women'. He said it is a really important historical aspect to consider of this building and he would like to hear more about it.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of 229-235 Broadway E for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination

Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the building exterior; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for January 4, 2023; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.”

MM/SC/HW/IM 2:7:0 Motion failed. Dr. McKinney, Mmes. Caton and Johnson, and Messrs. Inpanbutr, Norman, Schmitt, and Slattery opposed.

111622.7 BOARD BUSINESS