



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 224/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4080
Wednesday, April 15, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Marie Strong
Tom Veith
Mollie Tremaine
Meredith Wirsching
Christine Howard
Stephen Lee, Chair
Sean Peterfreund
Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Karen Gordon
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Steve Savage
Alyce Conti

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

041509.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of March 18, 2009
MM/SC/MT/MW

6:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Hannum abstained.

041509.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041509.21 1065 Summit Ave. E
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Final design for proposed renovation and additions, including details and associated landscaping, and including demolition of existing garage

Ms. Chave introduced the proposal and said the house is a Category 1 house in the District. She said the proposed renovation received a Certificate of Approval for

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Preliminary Design in January 2007 and has since been reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and the Harvard Belmont (HB) District Committee. She introduced owners Jerry Tone and Martha Wycoff, architects Renee Roman, and David Leavengood and Tom Higgins.

Ms. Wycoff explained they have presented the project to the ARC. She said they (owners) are committed to embracing the requirements of the Historic District while creating a home to live in. She said she believes the proposed improvements are a significant upgrade for their property and to the neighborhood.

Mr. Abelsen arrived at 4:40 p.m.

Ms. Wycoff explained many letters in support of this project had been sent to the Board. She stated they plan to undo damage from previous owners' changes and are restoring architectural details to the house. She said they are adding "green" elements – green roof, water catchments and solar energy design – as well as a beautiful garden.

Project architect Renee Roman explained the house was built in 1909 and provided current and c. 1930 photos and noted there have been a number of remodels. She said in the 1950s the attached garage was added and the north wing constructed. She said in early 2000 windows were replaced, dormers were added to south and east sides, new roofing, gutters and siding were replaced; she said no original exterior fabric (skin) is left. She said they have little historical information and are using the 1930s photo to replicate what has been removed during the other remodels. She said they propose to remove the attached garage and there will be a reduction of 514 square feet in the overall footprint. She said a landscaped area between the house and garage will be added. She provided detail on tree heights and species and reviewed massing perspectives from street level and aerial view.

Ms. Roman said the north wing and attached garage are differentiated from the original foursquare style house and are different in height, massing and location. She explained the changes clearly read as non-original fabric yet the details are compatible. She reviewed the materials and said they will use custom wood windows and doors, 2 ½" exposed bevel wood siding, cementitious faux stone base; the garage is proposed to be a masonry structure and the roofing will be the same rubber roofing as approved for the 1073 house. She pointed out solar panels, green roof and the green wall on the south face of the garage. She went on to provide an overview of paving palettes and proposed lighting, in response to requests by the Harvard Belmont Committee. She said the exterior paint colors are not part of this application and will be submitted at a later date for review.

Mr. Veith arrived at 3:45 p.m.

Ms. Roman walked the Board through the drawings and said they would reduce the total building from 9500 square feet to 4500 square feet; they would reduce the mass and make it compatible with a foursquare. She explained 10,000 square feet is allowed in the zoning envelope but they have not chosen that direction and said the home brings back the charm of the foursquare. Referencing the packets she provided an overview of the fencing, masonry base with metal pickets, piers and pier foundation.

Ms. Chave explained the issue of different siding considered on the addition to differentiate it from the original. She said the Harvard Belmont Committee preferred to have the siding the same; the Committee said that the addition is distinct enough. She said the City Arborist has approved the removal of trees and the plan for new trees meets the City Arborist's approval.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked if there were other solar panels in the District.

Ms. Chave replied that to her knowledge there were one, but stated that possibly they could be on an elevation not visible from the street; the Board has jurisdiction over what is visible from the public way.

Ms. Roman said they new roofing will be installed and then explained that a unistrut system attaches to the roof; the solar panels attach to that. In response to a clarifying question she said the new garage footprint will be 22'7" x 20'.

Ms. Chave noted that the applicants are not proposing paint colors at this time but will do that under a separate application.

Public Comment:

Ms. Chave noted that several letters were sent to the Board on this project. (Letters in Board packages and on file).

Andrea Umbauch, neighbor. Said she has been a District resident for 16 years. She expressed concern about the design proposal and said she sent letters to the Board via Ms. Chave. She said it is great the house is being improved – it needs it – but said that the north addition did not follow the Harvard Belmont design guidelines or the original intent of the Ordinance. She said she was more concerned than supportive.

Byron Coney, neighbor said he submitted a letter this afternoon. He said he has lived in the Fisher House in the District for 42 years; his house was built in 1909. He said the 1065 Summit property has been troubled for years and had different owners and even after the Harvard-Belmont District was adopted, owners made changes without permits or review by this Board. He said other properties in the neighborhood have gone through the Board review process. He was concerned the strict guidelines were being watered down – views would be obstructed and he said that preliminary approval doesn't give authorization to do the work. He said he was concerned about the proposed north addition. He said the neighborhood should be preserved in an historic fashion; "a little here and there" will take more and more.

Mr. Lee cited a letter of support from former Board member and former Harvard Belmont Committee member Henry Matthews.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Chave clarified that a Certificate of Approval was approved for the demolition of the 1956 north addition - an application separate from this one. She said to her

knowledge no non-approved work has been by the current owner. The former owner did work without approval, but not this owner.

Ms. Strong said she reviewed the house a couple times (HB Committee meetings) and said with regard to views, what is being proposed is an improvement. She said precedent is not being set, the footprint is not any larger and she supported the application.

Mr. Hannum said he was not comfortable with the proposed solar panels.

Ms. Chave said the ARC and HB Committees were concerned about the appearance of solar panels and the subsequently the project architects provided a lot of information as to placement. She said the panels are reversible and could be removed without damage. She said that the panels will be visible. She said there was quite a bit of discussion about this item at ARC.

Mr. Veith noted it looked like the area had been redesigned and simplified per ARC comments.

Mr. Lee stated it was an improvement to what is there and they received good input at ARC; he supported the application.

Mr. Abelsen said the building, as it is, obstructs views and that the improvements being made provide better views and the improvements are compatible. He said he fully supported the application.

Mr. Veith saw no difference in the view from either a pedestrian or driving perspective with the exception of the 2nd story portion of the addition that takes out a piece of the sky. He said the new space occupies the same space as the existing west end of the prior addition; the Guidelines don't ask to open views that don't already exist. He said the new garage is smaller than the existing one and allows better views of the foursquare structure. He expressed discomfort with the 2nd story addition but thought it a reasonable trade for getting greater appreciation of the existing house. He said the siding would be no less compatible than existing; he explained the siding discussion at the on-site HB meeting. He said the viewer would know an addition has been made so no differentiation in siding was necessary. He said the solar panels were reorganized into a more elegant arrangement and are only on the side elevation. He said in general, we are losing very little and gaining much. He said you can debate whether such a large house is "green", but that the Landmarks Board was not here to enforce what is "green", but rather to enforce the Harvard Belmont District guidelines. He supported the application based on the guidelines.

Ms. Wirsching said the application appears to meet the Guidelines and the addition is compatible with the existing building. She agreed with Mr. Veith – the views are already obstructed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Final Design for alterations to the existing house, including window replacement, re-roofing, and installation of solar panels; the demolition of the 1956 garage addition and replacement with new garage; proposed addition to the house, and proposed landscaping including new fence and gate. This includes all

construction drawings, finishes and details, excluding paint colors, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations and additions meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

B. 1. General

Guideline: The height of new buildings and additions should be similar to the heights of adjacent properties so that the relationship of building heights and the land contour remains the same.

B. 2. The Block

Guideline: Maintain yard space especially that of front and side yards visible from the street. Front yards should not be used for parking areas. Protect or add trees and landscaping to help reinforce yard edges.

Guideline: Maintain the pattern of primary building entrances facing the street. Renovations should preserve the original building entrances facing the street. New construction should locate the primary entrance facing the street.

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: The imitation of historic styles is strongly discouraged, new buildings should be compatible with older structures, especially in terms of other guideline criteria. But they should also be a true product of the present, not a false product of the past.

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.

2. Building Components

Guideline: Building components should be similar in size and shape to those already in use along the street.

Guideline: The use of wood, brick and stucco is strongly encouraged in new construction. If brick is used consider creating contemporary interpretations of patterned brick. When brick facades are renovated, do not cover up existing patterns, and do not paint over them unless absolutely necessary.

4. Fences and Walls:

Guideline: If fencing is required, low fences are encouraged especially in front yards to maintain the existing openness of the district.

Guideline: Fencing and wall materials shall be consistent with the district.

Guideline: Planting is encouraged to soften the visual appearance of fencing and walls.

The proposal meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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 the environment.

MM/SC/MH/MT

9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.22

Sigma Kappa House

4510 22nd Ave NE

Proposed window replacement

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, explained the requested window replacement and provided an overview of the history of the house. She said the north and south “connectors” were built in 1961. She said the project was divided into three parts, each in three phases. Phase 1 would entail the replacement of all the windows in the east wing which was found not to be a significant part of the building during landmarking. She said the replacement windows would be fiberglass in the original configuration. The French doors that opened to a deck that has been removed will be replaced with windows. Phase 2 involves replacing windows in the west wing; she said the windows are currently aluminum and they propose to replace them with fiberglass clad window. She said some of the proportions are slightly bigger than the original. Phase 3 involves window replacement at the north and south connector. The windows will have the same muntin division as originally drawn. One phase will be done each summer. In response to a Board member question she explained a Certificate of Approval lasts for 18 months so they will have to get a renewal. In Phase 1 the driveway will also be repaired; they will rebuild the retaining wall and widen the driveway to make room for another trash receptacle.

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, said when the nomination was approved the 1961 addition was designated along with the original building to be able to control both buildings. The original 1961 drawings show all windows were set up with upper transom lights but they were built upside down in response to safety concerns.

Mr. Abelsen explained the ARC saw this application and the work is reasonable and appropriate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee and Ms. Howard were satisfied with the application.

Mr. Abelsen said it would be an improvement.

Mr. Veith noted they are not replacing any historic windows.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the following, as per the applicant's submittal:

- Replace all windows in East Wing
- Replace all third floor aluminum windows and one second floor aluminum window in the West Wing
- Re-pave existing driveway
- Re-build existing retaining wall adjacent to driveway

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 122469 as the proposed work meets the following Standard of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: Standard # 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.*

The applicant has provided a complete window survey and analysis on the existing windows proposed for replacement. The design of the replacement windows is compatible with the landmark building and closely matches the design of the original windows.

In addition, the significance of the windows in the East Wing (the 1962 addition) was addressed in the Controls and Incentives agreement and in Ordinance #122469.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MT/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.3 DESIGNATION

041509.31 Egan House
1500 Lakeview Boulevard East

Mark Blatter, Historic Seattle, spoke as the owner's representative and said they support designation.

Susan Boyle, representing the nominators DOCOMOMO-WeWa, provided site and urban context of the house which was built in 1959. She said the neighborhood used to continue to Eastlake (before the freeway went in). She said the site is isolated due to the steep topography. She pointed out the varied window sizes and noted that the windows were designed from the outside in terms of view; one can see out only if seated. She said a deck was added on the north side in 1988 and another was added

on the south side later. She said the original cladding is a grooved 5” x 9”, painted dark. She noted the stripe pattern rolled roofing.

Ms. Boyle said the house is entered at grade level; the next level up is the kitchen, bath and bedroom; and, the top level is the living room. She said the house sits on a greenbelt, on land owned by Seattle Parks and Recreation, the structure itself is owned by Historic Seattle. She said Historic Seattle acquired the house and then restored it; the restoration was completed in 2002. She explained that much of the cladding had deteriorated as well as the decking. She said the original GE modular kitchen has been preserved. She said the stairs have open marble treads with no riser and plywood was used with the marble; Ms. Boyle stated that ordinary materials were used in extraordinary ways.

Ms. Boyle showed photos of other houses designed by architect Robert Reichert. She said Reichert also taught at the University of Washington. She called attention to how his work was different from the work of other Mid-Century Modernists and said he was well recognized for his skills. She noted that his work was much more personal than that of other residential practitioners of his time.

Board Questions:

There was Board discussion about whether or not the windows had been replaced or if the house was built with aluminum windows. One Board member noted that the hinges looked to be of an earlier era and another member noted that aluminum windows were available in the 1950s.

Mr. Veith noted that the landing or deck had been planned at that location in case someone wants to reconstruct – there is justification.

Public Comment:

Larry Johnson said the windows were aluminum when he visited the house in 1975.

Rick Sever, Chair of Historic Seattle, thanked Docomomo and said Historic Seattle supported the designation.

Ms. Boyle corrected an earlier draft of the nomination report and stated the Parks Department was neutral on designation.

Ms. Chave noted that the Parks Department owns the land and just the house was nominated by the Board.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Howard supported designation based on the Staff Recommendation of D, E and F including the exterior, the interior excluding the bathroom, and the office/bedroom. She said it was an outstanding work of Reichert and had a sense of drama to it.

Ms. Wirsching supported designation based on D, E, and F. She said three exterior elements – the deck, column supporting the cantilever, roofing – are not original but do not detract from the house.

Mr. Peterfreund supported designation based on D, E, and F and said it is a unique structure. He agreed with Ms. Wirsching's comments.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on D, E, and F. Because of its location it stands out against the ravine it is dramatic and well known.

Ms. Tremaine supported designation based on D, E, and F and said the house should be a landmark – it is unique. She said the house is well known.

Mr. Abelsen called the house “remarkable” and supported designation based on D, E, and F. He said the house had a distinctive architectural style and noted the placement of the windows to control the interior environment.

Mr. Hannum supported designation based on D, E, and F. He said it was important to look at buildings from this era as there are very few outstanding examples.

Mr. Veith supported designation based on D, E, and F. He said that D and E were straightforward and clear. He said the house was very formal and romantic in design and embodies two main thrusts of Modernism. He said it is the most identifiable work by this designer. He noted the giant treads up to St. Mark's and the human scale treads that run up the side of the building. He said the diagonal ceiling siding was perhaps custom; it is put up at an angle to both walls and appears to “twist”. He said the windows could have been placed by formal calculations but he thought the architect knew he had some freedom with how he dealt with them and was intentional in forcing people to take his view of the world. With regard to Criterion F he said the iconic character of the house was so strong that even if not visible, one knows it is there. He noted the distinctive placement on the site. He said changes made have not damaged the character of the house. He supported including the interior excluding the bathroom and the office and the exterior.

Mr. Lee supported designation based on D, E, and F and said it was a fantastic building. He said he was glad to have the support of the owner.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Egan House at 1500 Lakeview Boulevard East a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the nomination report; 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, and the interior of the building excluding both bathrooms and excluding the office/bedroom on the lower (entry) level.

MM/SC/MW/VA

9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.4 NOMINATION

041509.41 Two Bells Building
2315-2325 4th Avenue

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination report (full report in file). She provided context of the site in Belltown and said most of the block was small buildings. She said the building was built in 1923 for John H. Scott by George W. Stoddard. She noted the building was done in an early period of his eclectic work and is the only one like it with Tudor Revival elements. She said the other period of his most notable designs was Art Moderne and Art Deco; after the war he was well known for his commercial buildings. She explained the building was notable for its details and throughout the City there are only a few buildings like this with identifiable style. She said the building was entirely intact which is apparent in drawings and early photos.

Ms. Sheridan reviewed Tudor Revival elements and noted the three doorways with brick coining and the elegance of the entries. She said the building was built to house a grocery store and there was an apartment at the rear. She pointed out its U-shape and 14 garage stalls in the back. She said the building has been called Two Bells since 1948. She went over the key features: the gabled parapets with shield designs, the intact windows, decorative brickwork that continues down to bulkhead, and the embodiment of Tudor Revival to a relatively simple strip building. She said she didn't know of any buildings like this one.

Ms. Sheridan said the building stands out – it is unique in Seattle and has integrity. She noted that 80% of the buildings this size and have been quite altered. She noted the strong design and said it is an excellent example of this type of design applied to this small type of building.

Board questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked if this is one of the oldest taverns in the City and if the garage is unique in downtown.

Ms. Sheridan said she has not studied all the taverns and doesn't view that as a reason for significance – it was just part of the history. She said the tavern probably dates back to the prohibition but that is not a basis for nomination. Parking in the area is unusual and was likely provided for nearby apartments.

Mr. Veith asked about the uses before 1937.

Ms. Sheridan said there was a grocery store and café, and that there was probably always a café there.

Owner Comment:

John Teutsch, friend of the owner, said the building is taken care of and it doesn't meet the criteria. He said it is a modest building but there are more significant structures around and this is a cute eclectic amalgam of many styles – not exemplary of any. He said it is not an outstanding work of Stoddard. He said the north and

south facades are cinderblocks and he recommended denial of the nomination. He said to nominate would be a dilution of the whole process.

Tina Lee, owner, spoke against nomination and said the building was not significant. She said designation would create a hardship for them because they bought the building as an investment. She said they have maintained the building well and like it. She noted that no style was offered except “eclectic” and only to the façade. She said she was confused and the nomination terms were encompassing and the process was bewildering. She named other buildings in the City she thought were significant and stated this one was not. She said the sale of the building will give them financial footing for their future. She said that Karen Gordon and Sarah Sordt were courteous and helpful in explaining everything and that Ms. Gordon provided an “Urban Planning 101”. She said a person who was interested in purchasing their property told her there would be no interest in buying a landmark and she hasn’t had anyone say a designation wouldn’t significantly depreciate the value of their property. She said an attorney offered pro bono advice to her but that she and her family shouldn’t have to sacrifice financial security because it appeals to a group of people or the general public who have all the power and nothing to lose. She asked the Board to vote “no”. She said they love the building.

Public Comment:

Rick Sever, speaking as a private citizens and not representing Historic Seattle, said this was a great example for the need of TDRs in the City; they could sell air rights and they wouldn’t be out their money. He said TDRs can be transferred and spread across the City.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said it was not an outstanding work of the architect. He said the building had a lot of character and he liked it but none of the criteria applied. He said some details were fascinating but he did not support nomination.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination and said he would like to study it further. He said it did not meet Criteria D and E but he thought it met F. He said there are few buildings like this in downtown core and he thought it should be preserved.

Mr. Abelsen said it was a nice structure more as a study or sketch of architecture. He said it was not an outstanding work of Stoddard but it showed a contrast in scale in the neighborhood. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Tremaine did not support nomination. She said it had a folk art look to it and was cute but nothing at the level of the William Tell. She said it did not rise to the level of significance.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination but said it was a unique type in Belltown that is disappearing but it wasn’t distinctive.

Mr. Peterfreund did not support nomination and said the building itself is eclectic but does not rise to the level of significance.

Ms. Wirsching said it was a cute building and expressed concern that it would be torn down. She said it had a presence in the neighborhood and a level of integrity architecturally but it did not rise to the level of significance on any criteria. It could potentially fit in Criterion D but it doesn't rise to the level.

Ms. Howard said the modest character of the building should not disqualify it from being a landmark. She said it was close but it didn't make it. She did not support nomination.

Mr. Lee said the building was not significant enough to be a landmark and did not support nomination.

Action: I move to not approve nomination of the Two Bells Building at 2315-2325 4th Avenue because the building does not meet any of the criteria for designation.

MM/SC/TV/MW

8:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Hannum opposed.

Tina Lee asked the Board how to protect the façade if they choose to and asked if the Design Review process would play a part. A board member replied "only if it is a City landmark".

Ms. Chave said there is another process through the Department of Planning and Development if a large project is being done; it is a separate process apart from the Landmarks process.

041509.5

CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

041509.51

Securities Building
1904 Third Ave.

Ms. Gordon reported the Controls and Incentives for the Securities Building had been signed by the President and CEO of Clise Properties. She said the features for Certificate of Approval are the exterior of the building and the interior of the 3rd Avenue and Stewart Street lobbies but excluding the post-1947 non-historic building additions which were not designated to the north elevation, the connect to the adjacent garage. She said it follows the designation with administrative review for ductwork etc. and alterations to portions of the lobby that were constructed after 1947.

Jack McCullough, attorney for the owner, stated they would be back for (C of A) review of the canopy change. He stated the company thought this was a good process.

Action: I move to approve the signed Controls and Incentives agreement for the Securities Building.

MM/SC/VA/MH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.52 Seattle Labor Temple
2800 First Ave.

Ms. Gordon explained the Controls and Incentives document which covered exactly what was designated which was the exterior of the building and the two interior lobby spaces and the site. She said a Certificate of Approval is required for changes to those features with the exception of the Administrative Review for the interior lobby spaces and the sign faces for the existing internal-lit sign cabinet on the south elevation of the building.

Action: I move to approve the signed Controls and Incentives Agreement for the Seattle Labor Temple at 2800 First Avenue as provided by the Staff Report.

MM/SC/MW/CH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.53 Terry Avenue Building
320 Terry Ave.
Request for extension

Ms. Chave explained the owner's request for a three month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Terry Avenue Building at 320 Terry Avenue for a period of three months.

MM/SC/TV/MH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.53 Eitel Building
1501 Second Ave.

Ms. Gordon explained the request for an extension of 90 days ending July 15. She said they have indicated in their letter they are providing consultant studies which Staff has not yet received.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Eitel Building at 1501 Second Avenue for a period of three months.

MM/SC/TV/VA 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.54 Sorrento Hotel
900 Madison St.

Ms. Chave explained the owner's request for a sixty-day extension. She said they are actively working on an agreement ; a lot of details are being reviewed.

Action: I move to grant an extension of Controls and Incentives for the Sorrento Hotel for a period of sixty days.

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

041509.55 Washington Hall
153 14th Ave.

Ms. Chave explained the owner's request for a sixty day deferral.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Washington Hal
at 153 14th Avenue for a period of sixty days.

MM/SC/TV/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.6 BOARD BUSINESS

041509.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator