

1
2
3
4
5
6 BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
7 FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

8 In the Matter of Appeal by

9 SAVE THE MARKET ENTRANCE.ORG and
10 THE NEWMARK BUILDING OWNERS
11 ASSOCIATION

12 of a Decision by the Director of the Seattle
13 Department of Construction and Inspections

Hearing Examiner File:
MUP-20-003, 004 (S, SE, V, W) &
S-20-002

DECLARATION OF SARAH SODT

14
15 I, Sarah Sodt, declare as follows:

16 1. I am the City of Seattle ("City's") Historic Preservation Officer with the
17 Department of Neighborhoods ("Department" or "DON"). I make this declaration based on my
18 personal knowledge.

19 2. As the City's Historic Preservation Officer, I am responsible for the
20 managing the City's historic preservation programs, including the Landmarks Preservation
21 Board ("Board"). I am also responsible for staffing the Board with regard to landmark
22 nominations for structures in Downtown. I have worked in the Department of Neighborhoods in
23 preservation planning for approximately 17 years. I have a Master's degree in Urban Planning
24 and Design with a historic preservation certificate and a Bachelor of Arts in Art History with a
25 concentration in architectural history, both degrees from the University of Washington.
26
27

28 DECLARATION OF SARAH SODT - 1

Peter S. Holmes
Seattle City Attorney
701 Fifth Ave., Suite 2050
Seattle, WA 98104-7097
(206) 684-8200

1 3. I am familiar with Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.12 (“Landmarks
2 Preservation Ordinance” or “Ordinance”), which governs the procedures for nominating and
3 designating City landmarks. The Ordinance also governs the process by which landmarks can
4 obtain approval for alterations after obtaining a Certificate of Approval from the Board.
5

6 4. The Landmarks Preservation Ordinance also provides procedures for the
7 negotiating controls and incentives for designated landmarks with the property owner.

8 5. “Controls” are defined as “specific restrictions as may be imposed by a
9 designating ordinance, upon the alteration or the making of significant changes of specific
10 features or characteristics of a landmark site or landmark that are designated for preservation by
11 such designating ordinance.” SMC 25.12.090. Controls are specifically negotiated for each
12 landmark based on its unique considerations and designated features. Typically, a Certificate of
13 Approval by the Board is required before changes to a controlled feature may be approved.
14

15 6. Once a site or structure is designated as a landmark by the Board, the next step is
16 for Board staff to engage with the owner regarding the negotiation of controls and incentives to
17 the site or structure. If the Board staff and owner reach a written agreement about the scope of
18 controls and incentives, the Board staff shall submit the written agreement to the Board for
19 approval. If the Board approves the agreement, the controls and incentives agreement is
20 transmitted to City Council for final action to designate the site or structure as a landmark by
21 ordinance. *See* SMC 25-12.490 - .510.
22

23 7. However, the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance also provides: “In no event
24 shall...any proceeding or application of this chapter deprive any owner of a site, improvement or
25 object of a reasonable economic use of such site, improvement or object.” SMC 25.12.580. The
26
27

1 Code provides five criteria to be considered when evaluating the reasonable economic use of a
2 designated site or structure. SMC 25.12.590.

3 8. Applying the Landmark Preservation Ordinance’s reasonable economic use
4 provisions can result in a “no controls” agreement for a designated structure or site, which would
5 allow for legally demolishing the structure without the need to obtain a Certificate of Approval.
6 Thus, the processes described herein can result either in approval of a controls and incentives
7 agreement, or in approval of a “no controls” agreement.
8

9 9. If the Board staff and owner cannot reach agreement on controls and incentives,
10 or the Board disapproves the agreement reached by the Board staff and owner, the Board files its
11 own recommendations on controls and incentives with the City’s Hearing Examiner. In addition,
12 any interested party, including the owner, may appeal the Board’s recommendation on controls
13 and incentives to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner will hold a hearing to make
14 recommendations on the proposed controls and incentives. SMC 25.12.530 - .570. The
15 Landmarks Preservation Ordinance prohibits the Hearing Examiner from making any
16 recommendations on controls that would “prevent the owner from realizing a reasonable return
17 on the site, improvement or object.” *Id.* The Hearing Examiner’s recommendations are
18 transmitted to the City Council.
19

20 10. Upon transmitting the Hearing Examiner’s recommendation to City Council, there
21 is a further appeal opportunity before the City Council. SMC 25.12.620 - .640. The City
22 Council’s decision must be supported by the applicable law—including protecting the owner’s
23 reasonable economic use of the site—and substantial evidence. SMC 25.12.630.C. The City
24 Council may either: (a) affirm the Hearing Examiner’s recommendations and adopt an ordinance
25
26
27

1 implementing those controls and incentives for the landmark; (b) modify the proposed controls
2 and incentives and adopt an ordinance implementing the modified controls and incentives
3 provisions for the landmark; or (c) reject the Board's or Hearing Examiner's recommendations
4 on controls and incentives and adopt an ordinance without controls and incentives. SMC
5 25.12.640. Under the third City Council scenario, demolishing a structure would be allowed
6 without a Certificate of Approval.
7

8 11. On January 20, 2021, the Board designated the Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building at 103
9 Pike Street in Seattle, Washington ("Hahn Building") as a landmark by vote of 6 to 1. The
10 Board's designation is limited to the exterior of the Hahn Building; no interior features were
11 designated. I was present for the Board's vote on designating the Hahn Building. Upon the
12 Board's nomination, before the owner may make alterations or significant changes to the Hahn
13 Building's exterior features, a Certificate of Approval is now required, and remains required as
14 long as proceedings for a designation are pending or if a designating ordinance so requires in the
15 future. SMC 25.12.390. A true and correct copy of the Board's designation report is attached as
16 Exhibit A to this Declaration.
17
18

19 12. On February 2, 2021, I sent a copy of the Board's designation report and request
20 to participate in controls and incentives negotiations to the Hahn Building's owners ("Controls &
21 Incentives Negotiation Request"). A true and correct copy of the Controls & Incentives
22 Agreement Request is attached as Exhibit B to this Declaration.
23

24 13. On February 9, 2021, the Hahn Building owners' attorney confirmed the
25 ownerships' intention to participate in the controls and incentives negotiation. A true and correct
26
27
28

1 copy of the letter on behalf of the Hahn Building owners is attached as Exhibit C to this
2 Declaration.

3 14. The Board staff and Hahn Building ownership will now proceed with negotiations
4 on potential controls and incentives for the Hahn Building. These negotiations are ongoing; it is
5 impossible to predict the outcome at this early stage. Consistent with the Landmarks
6 Preservation Ordinance, the potential outcomes vary. The Hahn Building owners may contend
7 that landmark designation deprives ownership of reasonable economic use of the Hahn Building,
8 and depending on its consideration of the criteria set forth in SMC 25.12.590, the Board staff
9 may agree and propose “no controls” that would allow for the demolition of the existing
10 structure without any requirements for a Certificate of Approval. Or the Board staff and
11 ownership may agree on controls and incentives that would require Certificate of Approvals for
12 alterations of the existing exterior features of the Hahn Building. It is impossible to predict how
13 the Board may react to either of these potential outcomes, and what, if any appeals to the
14 Hearing Examiner or City Council may arise. Given these facts, it is speculative to predict
15 outcomes of the Hahn Building controls and incentives negotiation, and whether a Certificate of
16 Approval will ultimately be required by the Department for demolishing the Hahn Building.
17 Each controls and incentives negotiation is unique based on site-specific conditions and factors.

21 15. As the Historic Preservation Officer, I am aware of other controls and incentives
22 negotiations for designated landmarks in Downtown that resulted in the Board approving a “no
23 controls” agreement outcome. In one recent example, on January 18, 2018, the Board voted 5 to
24 2 to approve “no controls” on the Wayne Apartments in Belltown. In the case of the Wayne
25 Apartments, the Board’s approval of “no controls” means that no Certificate of Approval would
26

1 be required for demolishing the existing structure. A true and correct copy of the Board's
2 meeting minutes is attached as Exhibit D to this Declaration. Multiple other landmarked
3 buildings have received no controls in the past.

4 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
5 foregoing is true and correct.
6

7 Dated this 16 of February, 2021, in Seattle, Washington.

8 
9

10 _____
11 Sarah Sodt
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

EXHIBIT A



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 45/21

REPORT ON DESIGNATION

Name and Address of Property: **Hotel Elliott / Hahn Building
103 Pike Street**

Legal Description: LOT 1, BLOCK 25, PLAT OF AN ADDITION TO THE TOWN OF SEATTLE, AS LAID OUT BY A. A. DENNY, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN VOLUME 1 OF PLATS, PAGE 33, IN KING COUNTY WASHINGTON; EXCEPT PORTION HERETOFORE APPROPRIATED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE FOR STREET PURPOSES.

At the public meeting held on January 20, 2021 the City of Seattle's Landmarks Preservation Board voted to approve designation of the Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building at 103 Pike Street as a Seattle Landmark based upon satisfaction of the following standard for designation of SMC 25.12.350:

- C. It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the community, City, state or nation; and*
- F. Because of its prominence of spatial location, contrasts of siting, age, or scale, it is an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood or the city and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood or the City.*

DESCRIPTION

Setting and Site

Located in downtown Seattle, the Hotel Elliott (Hahn Building) occupies a prominent location at the southeast corner of the intersection of Pike Street and First Avenue, adjacent to the main entrance to the City of Seattle Landmark District and National Register of Historic Places Pike Place Market Historic District (PPMHD) and the central business district to the east. The intersection is defined by the following:

- Brick paving (laid in 1979)
- Hotel Elliott (built 1897, 1908 addition) southeast corner

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program

The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

- Corner Market (built in 1912), contributing to the PPMHD, northwest corner
- Economy Market (built ca. 1900) contributing to the PPMHD, southwest corner
- Broderick Building (built 1922), northeast corner

The site slopes downward from the northeast corner, to the west and south, dropping approximately 5 feet, which is most noticeable along First Avenue. An approximately 20-foot-wide sidewalk extends along Pike Street in front of the building, with an approx. 14-foot-wide sidewalk along First Avenue. The width of the sidewalk along Pike Street matches the sidewalk width on the other side of the street and same locations at Pine Street. The wider sidewalk widths at these two entrances (Pike and Pine) to the market support the flow of pedestrians between the market and the central business district.

The building is generally built to the parcel edges with a slight approximately 5-foot set back from the parcel edge along the east two-thirds of the south facade to provide for a setback along the length of this portion of the building. Tall windows at the first story, since filled in with brick, originally used this setback to provide day lighting and ventilation to the south portion of the central ground floor commercial spaces (105 and 107 Pike Street). There are two north-south running light wells extending north from this set back, an approximately 6 by 16-foot west and a 10 by 16-foot east light well. These provide day lighting and ventilation to the second and third story living spaces.

The building's primary north facade fronts Pike Street, with the primary west facade fronting the Pike Place Market. The secondary rear south facade abuts a 60-foot-wide surface parking lot. The 18-foot-wide alley, News Lane, extends along the secondary east facade. The City of Seattle Landmark Showbox (1917, 1939 remodel) is located on the south side of the parking lot.

The Building and Changes Through Time

The three-story brick masonry building features a rectangular 56-by-111-foot plan and has a partial basement. Overall massing consists of a rectangular volume with a flat roof and parapet. The arrangement of ground floor storefronts, a central main entrance on the north facade for the upper stories, and the pattern of window placement and sizes communicate the building's original mixed commercial and residential hotel use and distinguish it from mixed commercial and office buildings. Original design elements on the primary facades convey prevailing design trends and preferences of the builder. These include an egg and dart terra cotta belt course transitioning from the ground floor commercial to upper story residential, slightly projecting bays outlined with brick quoins—three on the north facade and two on the west facade—dense red veneer brick, window openings, and the lug sills and jack arches with raised keystones at the windows.

The building's interior layout is anchored on the north entrance vestibule at Pike Street that provides access to the upper single room occupancy hotel floors via the original wood stairway. The ground floor consists of commercial spaces to either side of the front entrance. Each extends the full depth of the building. The partial basement contains the First Avenue commercial space, with a stairway off First Avenue leading down to the space.

The second and third floors each have a double loaded east-west corridor within the north portion of the floor and connect to the fire escapes at either end of the building. Hallways extended off this corridor to the south.

Street Trees

There are four street trees along Pike Street and two along First Avenue, planted ca. 1980s.

The trees along Pike Street consist of Columnar Sargent Cherries (*Prunus sargentii* 'Columnaris') with trunk diameters of 26, 20, 14, and 8-inches. These match the Columnar Sargent Cherry trees on the north side of Pike Street (4 trees), and along both sides of Pike Street east of News Lane (3 on each side).

The trees along First Avenue consist of two Autumn Blaze pears (*Pyrus calleryana* 'Autumn Blaze') with trunk diameters of 13 and 15 inches. These are consistent with Autumn Blaze pears along the east side of First Avenue south to The Showbox (3 trees).

Foundation & Structure

A foundation, with visible concrete elements, supports the building's load-bearing brick masonry structure. Common bonded brick with header bonding bricks every seventh course is visible on the secondary east and south facades. A mix of darker and lighter colored brick on the secondary facades indicates a variety of firing levels, bonded with struck mortar joints, common for utilitarian bricks. The west upper portion of the south facade has an advertising sign space comprised of added cementitious parging and associated metal frame mounted to the exterior wall. There are multiple louvered vents projecting through the south facade at the first story level. An added concrete block enclosure projects off the southeast corner of the building.

The primary facade veneer brick at the second and third stories is red, dense, and high fired with narrower mortar joints, which present a more monolithic appearance. The original first story brick is not visible at the primary facades. This brick at the upper stories wraps around the outer northeast and southwest corners of the building. Painted original terra cotta elements are used for detailing along the belt course and primary facade windows.

The rebuilt cornice consists of a composite Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems material (EIFS) comprised of foam plastic and exterior coatings. The design is not an exact match to the original. Added tie-rod rosettes project through the north facade at the third-floor line. Added metal ducting extends vertically along the east facade from the ground floor commercial space to the roof.

Roof

The flat roof is clad with membrane type sheet roofing that extends up the backside of the parapets. Rooftop mechanical equipment is grouped towards the center south side and at the east end.

Windows

The treatment of window openings differs between the primary and secondary facades. All windows consist of replacement 1:1 double hung wood clad units.

Primary facade window openings (40 total) feature projecting original terra cotta lug sills with jack arch headers and a raised terra cotta keystone with a steel lintel below the arch. The configuration of the second and third story match, with smaller 1:1 windows (24 by 48 inches) interspersed with the main window openings (42 by 72 inches) on the north facade. These smaller windows correspond to former bathrooms in the rooms. A 1908 advertisement for the hotel promoted the luxury of its hot and cold running water, steam heat, call bells, and private baths. Paired 1:1 windows separated by a wide mullion occur at both stories directly above the front north entrance and at the south end of the east facade. The lowermost of the north facade

windows does not have a lug sill as the former pediment over the main entrance originally extended up into the sill area of the window and is also the reason for the break in the original belt course at this location.

Secondary facade window openings (approx. 35 total) feature original rowlock brick sills with load-bearing, elliptical arch rowlock three course headers. Window openings within the two light wells feature wood sills and casings. Windows at the light wells and at the east facade correspond to living spaces within the building. The east south facade window corresponds to the south end of the original double loaded interior corridor servicing the east end of the building. A single small window occurs on the ground floor level of the east facade, providing day lighting to the commercial space at this end of the building.

Main Entrance

The main entrance for the hotel at 105 1/2 Pike Street is centrally placed on the north facade. The recessed opening retains original brick at the side walls along with a projecting wood cornice at the door header height with raised decorative panels on the side walls above the cornice. The original wood sash, single lite transom remains above the doorway with the cornice continuing as the transom bar.

An added anodized aluminum door with a single lite and flanked by single lite side lites with an added tile surround provide access to the building interior. Added stucco clads the outer faces of the overall doorway opening with flat header of modern red brick that replaces the former projecting pediment.

A large sign mounted at the third story to the northwest corner of the building advertises for the hostel use of the building.

Storefronts

Commercial storefronts extend along Pike Street and First Avenue.

101-105 Pike Street occupies the ground floor west of the main entrance. These storefronts retain their overall design from the 1981 building rehabilitation consisting of a ceramic tile clad bulkhead, wood frame display windows, wood frame transoms, and a projecting metal canopy with neon along the outer edge. The transoms occur above the canopy providing interior day lighting with the original red veneer brick above the transoms up to the belt course. This storefront and canopy continue along the north end of the west facade. A large neon corner sign is mounted to the northwest corner of the building at the first story level and relates to this commercial space and current use. This storefront has a corner entrance (northwest building corner) and two north entrances.

107-109 Pike Street occupies the ground floor east of the main entrance. These storefronts reflect ca. 2000s alterations and consist of EIFS cladding alternating with horizontal metal joint strips and wood display windows along with a projecting metal canopy. This storefront has two sets of paired aluminum doors providing access, and a single aluminum door at the east end providing access to an exterior seating area. The EIFS cladding continues up to the underside of the belt course. A tall blade sign mounted above the canopy advertises for this commercial space and current use.

1432 First Avenue occupies a basement space accessed from First Avenue. This storefront retains its overall design from the 1981 building rehabilitation consisting of a ceramic tile clad bulkhead, display windows, transoms and a short canopy projecting out at the storefront. A plaster-clad

wall transitions between this storefront and the south portion of the 101 -105 Pike Street storefront that wraps onto the west facade.

Secondary Entrances

A fire escape exiting from the second and third stories consists of an open stairwell at the east and west ends of the building with a projecting metal fire escape landing at the second story and a drop-down ladder.

A personnel door and a large loading door provide access to the first floor from the News Lane alley.

Interior

The main north entrance for the single room occupancy hotel spaces consists of a small entrance vestibule that leads to a wide main stairway ascending to the upper residential floors. The interior side of the entrance doorway transom bar features a dentiled wood cornice. The stairway has an intermediate landing before reaching the second floor and then continues up to the third floor. The stairway has wood newels with turned balusters supporting the hand railing. The vestibule has a pressed metal ceiling.

The upper floors retain a double loaded east-west corridor along the north side of the building, with three smaller double loaded corridors extending to the south. Upper floors consist of carpet flooring, gypsum board walls with wood casings at doorways and painted wood baseboards. Flush panel doors provide access to the individual rooms. Window openings retain wood casings, sills and aprons. Interior doors with upper lites and a two-lite transom close off the fire escape openings at the east and west ends of the main corridor on the upper stories.

101-105 Pike Street, west of the main entrance, has a finished ceiling with exposed mechanical systems. The interior consists of an open commercial volume. All interior finishes are added.

107-109 Pike Street, east of the main entrance, consists of a new ceiling, gypsum board wall and concrete floor finishes with recessed ceiling lighting. The interior consists of an open commercial volume with a coffee bar along the south side of the space and seating in the middle and north portions of the space. All interior finishes are added.

1432 First Avenue retains the concrete stairs with metal newels, railings, and wood hand grips on the railings. The tiles at the lower landing stem from the 1981 rehabilitation. The space has a tile floor with finished ceilings and boxed beams.

Alterations

A chronological listing of alterations follows below. In cases where specific dates are not known we have identified date ranges based on available background information.

ca.1879

Construction of the one-story brick building.

1908

Construction of the upper two-story addition and remodeling of the one-story brick building's north facade.

ca. 1920

Work included a remodel as part of the Owl Drug store moving into the ground floor commercial space, though from historic photographs the store appeared to retain the original metal canopy and transoms.

ca. 1932

Work included a remodel as part of Block's Shoe store moving into the ground floor commercial space. Block's modernized the storefront to a more Streamline Moderne design. This change occurred below the belt course on the full length of the west facade and two-thirds of the portion of the north facade that is west of the main entrance. They removed the original metal canopy and covered transoms with a dark marble or similar cladding with raised bands at the outer corners, retractable cloth awnings along the north and west facades, and the company's name spelled out in neon letters above the north storefront.

ca. 1931 to 1936

The original balustrade parapet was removed.

1981

Architects Bassetti Norton and Metler designed a series of improvements, including seismic upgrades to the building that added steel columns, beams and wood-framed shear walls, and upgrades to the second floor and roof to function as a diaphragm. This work was funded through financing from the City of Seattle to support low-income housing within the building. New storefronts were constructed with wood display window and transom framing, ceramic tile clad bulkheads, blue and white hexagonal floor tiles installed at each storefront entrance, and a projecting canopy constructed. Exterior walls were cleaned and repointed and the cornice rebuilt. Existing wood clad windows were installed. Code compliant handrailing and associated newels on the main north stair to the upper floors were added. The existing Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems material (EIFS) cornice was installed.

ca. 2000

The original pediment and associated columns at the main north entrance were removed.

2005

The number of living spaces on the second and third floors was reduced, taking it from a 48-room hotel to a 30-room hostel which included adding additional restrooms, kitchen and dining spaces.

ca. 2007

Storefront alterations consisting of EIFS cladding alternating with horizontal metal joint strips and wood display windows along with a projecting metal canopy.

Character-defining Spaces & Features

The building remains a readily identifiable visual feature of the intersection of Pike Street and First Avenue characterized by 2-3 story buildings at the four corners. The retained brick paving and buildings at the outer four corners of the intersection of First and Pike communicates the commercial importance of this intersection and the pedestrian zone extension from Pike Place Public Market across this intersection.

The following lists character-defining spaces and the character-defining features:

- North and west facades (primary), all features listed below stem from the 1908 addition.
- Egg and dart terra cotta belt course transitioning from the ground floor commercial to upper story residential
- Slightly projecting bays outlined with prominent brick quoins—three bays on the north facade and two on the west facade
- Dense red veneer brick with narrow mortar joints, including veneer wrapping around the outer northeast and southwest corners of the building
- Window openings (40 total), including the rare smaller windows on the north facade corresponding to former private baths
- Projecting terra cotta lug sills and jack arches with raised keystones at the windows
- Metal fire escape on the west facade
- East facade (secondary)
- Common-bonded, brick masonry, consists of a mix of darker and lighter colored brick with struck mortar joints. Brick at the first story are slightly different from the upper stories and remain from the 1897 construction. Upper story bricks stem from the 1908 addition.
- Window openings (approx. 35 total), 1908 addition
- Rowlock brick sills with load-bearing, elliptical arch rowlock three course headers, 1908 addition
- Metal fire escape on the east facade, 1908 addition
- South facade (secondary), all features from the 1908 addition
- Common-bonded, brick masonry, consists of a mix of darker and lighter colored brick with struck mortar joints
- Window openings (approx. 35 total)
- Rowlock brick sills with load-bearing, elliptical arch rowlock three course headers.
- Light wells (2)
- Main Entrance, all features from the 1908 addition
- Recessed entrance and its central placement on the building's front north facade facing Pike Street
- Entrance sequence leading directly to the internal stairway and up to the SRO hotel floors
- Brick at the side walls along with a projecting wood cornice at the door header height with raised decorative panels on the side walls above the cornice.
- Wood sash, single lite transom above the doorway with the cornice continuing as the transom bar.

SIGNIFICANCE

The Hotel Elliott (Hahn Building) was built at the prominent First Avenue and Pike Street intersection, across First Avenue from the prominent main entry to the Pike Place Public Market. The one-story building was constructed in 1897, replacing a cluster of wood-frame structures. It was completed just prior to the 1898 regrading of First Avenue, from Pike Street to Denny Way. In 1907, a major renovation commenced adding two stories and reconfiguring the first floor just as the Pike Place Market was established in 1907. When the building reopened in 1908, the single room occupancy Hotel Elliott occupied the upper two floors and commercial storefronts operated from the first floor. Since that time, the building has hosted a number of commercial ventures—from long-time tenant

Owl Drugs to the infamous International Donut Shop—with the Hotel Elliott’s residential hotel rooms continuing to occupy the upper two floors and functioning as a hostel since 2005.

Development of Seattle’s Central Business District and the Pike Place Market

Seattle’s commercial area moved northward from the original city center around present-day Pioneer Square, and developed along First and Second avenues north from Yesler Way and along Pike Street from Western Avenue east, including the Pike Place Public Market. This development established the beginnings of the current central business district. First and Second avenues became the key commercial corridors for the central business district north of Yesler Way with Pike Street extending east to connect with Capitol Hill. These key commercial corridors had the highest concentration of single room occupancy hotels north of Yesler Way.

Within this context, the intersection of First and Pike developed as a central hub within downtown Seattle. First Avenue provided connection south to Pioneer Square and north to Queen Anne, while Pike Street linked the waterfront with expanding residential development on Capitol Hill. The change in storefront orientation in 1897 when the single-story brick building was built from First Avenue to face Pike Street underscored the growing importance of Pike Street. The access afforded by this intersection supported the establishment at this intersection in 1907 of the Pike Place Public Market. The Hotel Elliott addition opening in 1908 followed on the heels of the market opening. The Corner Market (built in 1912) and the Economy Market (built ca. 1900) buildings, both contributing to the PPMHD, anchor the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection. The 1922 Broderick Building anchors the northeast corner of the intersection and relates to the period of the construction of the covered lighted sidewalk arcades in the Pike Place Public Market at a time when the market was a primary regional food center.

To make downtown Seattle, including the area around First Avenue and Pike Street easier to navigate by foot, auto, and streetcar traffic, City of Seattle engineer R.H. Thompson (1856–1947) led the efforts to regrade the hilly city. The first project he tackled began in 1898 along First Avenue, from Pike Street to Denny Way. Commercial development followed along these newly flat streets. Buildings constructed in the First and Pike area in the early 1900s include the Pythian Temple (1901, demolished), the Leland Hotel (1902, contributing to the Pike Place Market Historic District (PPMHD)), and the Stewart Hotel (1902, contributing to the PPMHD).

The first cable car line was established in Seattle in 1887 with electric streetcars in service in 1889. By 1892, the city had 48 miles of streetcar track. These streetcar lines were operated by several private companies before they were consolidated under the Seattle Electric Railway Company in 1898. By 1911, a streetcar line ran down Pike Street from Capitol Hill and connected with a line running up and down First Avenue.

The formation of Pike Place Market in 1907, Seattle’s first public market, on Pike Place, between First and Western avenues and Virginia and Pike streets, established First and Pike as a key downtown intersection. Streetcars brought easy access to the market’s produce and food stalls as well as downtown’s shops, restaurants, and theaters. The City of Seattle constructed a public restroom at the foot of Pike Street near the Leland Hotel in 1908 which further established the centrality of the First and Pike intersection for developers and customers alike. The 1907 renovation creating the upper two residential floors of the Hotel Elliott capitalized on the establishment and growth of Pike Place Market and the Hotel Elliott’s prominent location at the intersection of First and Pike. As the public market grew, new buildings were added to house market functions, including the Sanitary Market building

(1910, contributing PPMHD) and the North Arcade/Market House (1911, contributing PPMHD). Pike Place Market quickly established itself as a prosperous regional market and had over 175 tenants selling food and specialty products by the early 1920s.

Role of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Buildings

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotels expanded significantly within downtown Seattle from ca. 1880 through ca. 1920. The 1920s brought a decline in the construction of SRO hotels as apartment buildings rose in popularity. A type of residential hotel, SROs catered to a transient and then permanent work force corresponding with population increases from just over 3,500 in 1880 to nearly 43,000 in 1890, 237,000 by 1910, and over 300,000 in 1920. They rented single rooms to residents and had shared bathrooms on each floor and sometimes a sink in individual rooms.

Buildings continued to improve as the city's infrastructure grew providing drinking water, sewer connections, and electricity to buildings. By 1901, clean drinking water arrived through the city's Cedar Water municipal water system and by 1906 the Cedar River Power Plant was providing electricity. Building permits and development recorded in the Pacific Builder and Engineer chronicles growth during this period. A snapshot from a peak period, in 1907, shows many new residential additions to commercial buildings and robust new residential construction.

SROs and tourist hotels became a key part of Seattle's expanding central business district north of Yesler Way along First and Second avenues, Pike Street, and in the Pike Place public market area. As with SROs in the International District and Pioneer Square, these newer additions provided downtown housing for the city's new arrivals and working-class residents as well as temporary quarters for seasonal workers such as longshoremen and farmers. According to historian Katheryn Krafft,

As the [Pike Place] Market evolved, the presence of residential hotels [SROs] contributed to the diversity of shoppers and merchants within the market place. Ultimately low-income and working-class downtown residents sustained the Market during its years of decline during the 1950s and 1960s. An essential part of the argument to preserve the Pike Place Public Market revolved around the need to sustain and continue to provide housing, inexpensive food products and goods, and social services to these traditional populations.

In his seminal work *Living Downtown: The History of Residential Hotels*, Paul Groth outlines the nuanced history of SROs. They were not simply homes to single men working blue collar jobs or to prostitutes, but historically provided affordable housing for temporary or low income workers, those wanting to live downtown, and individuals seeking the freedom that shared housing did not allow. As the most inexpensive type of residential hotel, SROs were comprised almost entirely of residential rooms with very few tourist rooms available for nightly rental.

Other types of residential hotels included palace hotels and midpriced hotels, for the upper and middle classes, respectively. These in turn were also different from lodging and boarding houses. SROs, lodging, and boarding houses far outnumbered palace and midpriced hotels in downtown Seattle.

The Hotel Elliott (Hahn Building) appears to have started as a higher end SRO hotel as it had a number of private baths, which was highly unique for an SRO. Groth argues residential hotels, particularly SROs, were critical to urban economic growth in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. They allowed workers to be close to downtown employment, particularly if their employment was erratic. In a study conducted by Norman Hayner in November of 1927, Seattle had 437 SRO hotels in operation.

Extant SRO hotels in downtown Seattle, north of Yesler Way, include the following:

- Scargo Hotel (1911) in Belltown, 2209 First Avenue, 3 stories
- Lewiston Hotel (next door to Scargo), 3 stories, corner building
- New Latona Hotel (1909) in Belltown, 2419 First Avenue, 2 stories, City of Seattle Landmark
- Strand Hotel (1909), 2212-16 First Avenue, 3 stories
- Hotel Elliott (1897, 1908), 101-109 First Avenue, 3 stories
- Outlook Hotel (LaSalle-Outlook Building, 1908-1909), contributing to the PPMHD, 1423 First Avenue
- Cliff House (1908), contributing to the PPMHD, 1440 Western Avenue
- Leland Hotel (Leland Building, 1902), contributing to the PPMHD, 1501 Pike Place
- Stewart Hotel (Stewart House, 1902), contributing to the PPMHD, 82 Stewart Street
- Silver Oakum/Market Hotel (87 Pine, 1910), contributing to the PPMHD, 87 Pine Street
- Fairmount Hotel (Fairmount Building, 1914), contributing to the PPMHD, 1907 First Avenue.

Typology

The specific physical attributes of SRO hotels that support their operation also make them recognizable for their lodging function and distinguish them from other multi-family buildings. These distinguishing attributes are as follows:

- Mixed use: buildings typically include ground floor commercial and lodgings in the upper stories
- Height: typically two to four stories, no elevators
- Windows and light wells: typically only in sleeping rooms, with small windows corresponding with bathrooms occurring rarely
- Stairways: stairways led directly from the street to the upper story residential floors, with an absence of common space
- Shared bathrooms: bathrooms were shared; sometimes individual rooms contained a sink

Mixed use. The Hotel Elliott (Hahn Building) illustrates a pattern of development within the central business district as it expanded north from Yesler Way along First and Second avenues from Pioneer Square and the International District and east from Pike Place Market along both sides of Pike Street. Mixed use buildings like the Hotel Elliott supported commercial development along these key arterials. The Hotel Elliott began as a single-story commercial building, constructed in 1897 in the midst of the ca. 1880 to 1920s residential hotel growth period. The upper two stories opened in 1908 as an SRO hotel addition during a massive city population growth period which also saw the establishment in 1907 and subsequent growth of the Pike Place Market. Other buildings in this area followed this pattern of development during the 1890s to early 1900s, beginning as single-story commercial buildings and adding residential floors later.

Height developed from building codes and reliance on walk up stairways from the street to access the residential stories, rather than elevators. The most common height was three stories, and the Hotel Elliott was in this group. Of the 43 known SRO hotels built within the central business district by 1905, 29 were three stories, 12 were four stories, one was five stories, and three were two stories. Four was the maximum number of floors allowed under the 1907 City of Seattle building code for Class F

buildings with exterior masonry walls, a wood or steel interior structure on the first story, and load bearing stud partition interior structure on the upper stories. Using wood posts and girders instead of stud partitions on the interior upper story structure enabled six-story buildings; however, the reliance on stairways for tenant access made this a less-desirable option.

Windows are one of the few building features that help interpret internal spaces and uses from looking at the building exterior. The Hotel Elliott is the only known SRO hotel within the central business district, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown–International District to have the small windows on a SRO hotel that indicate private bathrooms in some individual units. A 1908 advertisement for the Hotel Elliott promoted the luxury of its hot and cold running water, steam heat, call bells, and private baths.

The Hotel Morrison, built in 1908 at 501-519 Third Avenue has the same small windows indicating private bathrooms; however, this was built as a seven-story palace type hotel with a partial steel frame, a club room, hotel offices, Turkish baths, and multiple ground floor restaurants. The Fairmount Apartments at 1901 First Avenue also has small windows that correspond with bathrooms, but was built in 1914. None of the other extant residential hotels (Imperial Hotel, Vendome, and Rosenberg Block) in the central business district were built with these small windows.

Direct walk up stairways provided access for residents from the street up to the residential stories. The stairways could have a plain doorway or a prominent entrance surround, but all utilized a minimum of the ground floor commercial space by having only the doorway leading to the stairway, without a larger common space, hotel office, or lobby. Midpriced and palace hotels in contrast had entrance lobbies and offices as part of the arrival sequence for guests and residents. SRO hotels lacked the common dining space of boarding houses.

Placement

In Seattle, SRO hotels were often located along or near streetcar lines and in commercial-oriented neighborhoods like Downtown, Pioneer Square, the International District, Belltown, Ballard, and Fremont. These locations helped the buildings serve two functions:

- Workforce housing close to commercial centers
- Consumer base for commerce at nearby businesses

As Seattle's population grew, between 1888 and 1905, the central business district expansion north along First Avenue and east along Pike Street brought mixed-use commercial buildings, either replacing or expanding smaller commercial buildings and displacing exclusively residential buildings (houses, flats, and boarding and lodging houses). The mixed-use buildings with ground floor commercial and upper-story residential units enabled commercial growth while also providing worker housing. SRO hotels housed a consumer base that relied on the surrounding businesses for meals, laundry, entertainment, and shopping needs; the businesses, in turn, relied on the residents as both a consistent customer base and workers.

The First and Second avenues and Pike Street corridors contrasted notably with areas east of Third Avenue between Yesler and Olive ways that, by 1905, still retained high concentrations of exclusively residential buildings, including houses, flats, apartments and tenements, and boarding and lodging houses. The Hotel Elliott (Hahn Building), at the intersection of both the Pike Street and First Avenue corridors, illustrates the pattern of development characteristic of mixed use growth along First and

Pike, with the first story constructed in 1879 prior to the need for mixed use development followed by the SRO hotel addition opening in 1908, during a massive city-wide population boom. The Hotel Elliott is one of the few remaining buildings along the First, Second, and Pike corridors reflective of early 1900s mixed-use development patterns.

Decades later, two deadly residential hotel fires in just over a year (Ozark Hotel fire on March 20, 1970, and the Seventh Avenue Apartments fire in April 1971) would spur the closure of many of these SRO hotels. The Seattle City Council passed a series of ordinances to increase fire and life safety code requirements: After the Ozark Hotel fire, all buildings four stories or higher had to have fire-resistant stairways and fire doors or a sprinkler alternative; after the Seventh Avenue Apartments fire, the code was revised to apply to buildings three stories or higher as well as to require that all buildings three stories or less had to have at least two exits. For many SRO hotels, it was deemed too expensive to upgrade to the new requirements and between 1970 and 1971, 40 hotels and related residential buildings were closed and 21 were demolished, eliminating over 3,000 low-income housing units.

Construction and Use of the Building

The site of the Hotel Elliott (Hahn Building), the southeast corner of First Avenue and Pike Street, was included in Arthur A. Denny's land claim, established in 1852. On April 5, 1869, Denny filed a plat for an addition to the Town of Seattle which included the Hotel Elliott site (Block 25, Lot 1). Two days after filing the plat, Denny sold Lots 1 and 4 in Block 25 to J. M. Lyon. In 1872 Lyon took out two mortgages on the two lots, one for \$500 with bankers Phillips Horton & Co. and one for \$449.20 with J.V. Dawson. Lyon (and his wife L. M.) sold the two lots to Robert and Mary Abrams for \$1,050 in 1875. In 1882, the Abrams only sold Lot 1, separating it from Lot 4. The Abrams sold Lot 1 in 1882 to Joseph and Anna Ade for \$4,366.30. The Ades—from Zurich, Switzerland—took out a mortgage with Samuel Coulter of Portland, Oregon, for \$2,000. In 1882 Robert Hahn leased the property from owner Joseph Ade, with August Hess to operate a saloon on the property. The lease was for a three-year period for a total of \$810, paid out in \$25 monthly installments.

Meanwhile, ownership of the property changed hands several times over the next few years:

- 1883, August: Joseph Ade sold to Emma Abegg
- 1883, October: Emma Abegg sold to J.C. Haines for \$11,000
- 1885: J.C. Haines sold to B. Engleman
- 1887: B. Engleman sold to August Melhorn

For the sale to Melhorn from Engleman, Robert Hahn operated as the attorney-in-fact (not necessarily an attorney but authorized to act on someone's behalf) for Engleman. Engleman and Hahn were business partners in the saloon buildings on the property (at least by 1889, according to the city directory). By 1884, according to the Sanborn Fire Insurance map for the area, there were three wood-frame buildings on the property—a one-and-a-half story saloon, a one-story grocery, and a two-story saloon. The buildings were oriented with storefronts facing First Avenue. Hahn purchased the property for \$200 in gold coin from Melhorn in October 1889.

Robert Hahn, a German immigrant, arrived in Seattle by the early 1880s. By 1889 he was operating the saloon building on the property at Front (now First) and Pike as Hahn & Engleman in partnership with Bernhardt Engleman. Supposedly, their beer hall/garden was the only one left untouched by the fire that ravaged Seattle's Pioneer Square area in 1889. A "Do You Remember" photograph in The Seattle Times in 1934 recalls that on the day of the fire, June 6, police had to herd patrons into a line to get

into the saloon, who drained 17 barrels of beer that day. The saloon added a beer garden with an arbor to the east by 1893. Around 1897, the three wood-frame commercial buildings and associated beer garden were torn down and replaced with a one-story brick building. The new brick building had four storefronts and was oriented to Pike Street rather than First Avenue like the previous buildings. Early uses included a restaurant, saloon, and billiards hall.

In July 1906, Hahn leased the one-story brick building to Henry A. Beck. Beck's lease of the property, which included the four storefronts (101, 103, 105, and 107 Pike), was for three years for a total of \$18,000 payable in 36 monthly installments. Palace Liquor Company incorporated in July 1907 with Henry Beck, John P. Brill, and F.G. Beck. In October 1907, Henry Beck with Palace Liquor Company negotiated a new lease with Hahn to continue to rent the one-story brick building while also constructing two additional stories on top of the building. The lease was for a 10 year duration and the agreement specified that construction was to start within 12 months. Rent for this 10 year lease was \$60,000, paid out in 120 installments of \$500. Palace Liquor Company provided the proposed plans for the upper story additions and remodel of the first story to Hahn, who approved them and included them as part of the lease agreement; those records were not retained by King County Archives.

Henry Beck, along with his business partner Brill, filed plans for their renovation and additional stories in October 1907. Estimated costs for the work were \$25,000 and the partners hired architects Kingsley & Bittman to design the remodel and addition. The building was complete in 1908 and when it opened it featured five storefronts along Pike Street and the Hotel Elliott, operated by Brill, in the upper two stories. The storefronts had the addresses of 101, 103, 105, 107, and 109 Pike Street and the Hotel Elliott was 105 ½ Pike Street.

Hotel Elliott

The Hotel Elliott encompassed the second and third floor of the building. Although named a "hotel," businesses, including manicurists, baths, and even clairvoyants, also used the floors as their offices. The hotel, a SRO hotel, provided rooms for both transient guests (with daily rates) and permanent residents (with weekly and monthly rates). In 1908, daily rates, were \$1 and up, and weekly rates were \$5 and up. The hotel advertised its hot and cold running water, steam heat, call bells, and private baths—a luxury for single room occupancy hotels. Other hotel advertisements in the same classified section indicate that Hotel Elliott was not alone in offering "modern conveniences" like call bells and hot and cold running water, but did advertise private baths and seemed to have slightly higher prices (\$1 or more per week compared to 75 cents per week).

The 1910 census lists 19 individuals living at 105 ½ Pike Street—all were white, but relatively evenly split between men and women, single and married. The ages of residents ranged from 20 to 53. Occupations included waitress, clerk (dry goods, soft drink), teamster, cook, auto mechanic, plumber, and engineer. The tenancy of women in the Hotel Elliott connects with a larger trend occurring in the city as well as in the nation—SRO hotels allowed women the opportunity to escape the labor of cooking and housework and find independence outside the home. Groth states that in the 1920s,

In Seattle, two-thirds of the women in mid-priced hotels lived alone, and most of them worked if they were below retirement age...Many of these women were not merely sojourners. Married or not, they were escaping female roles in traditional households and fully expected to live in hotels for at least several years.

In 1918, an auction was held to sell the complete furnishings of the Elliott Hotel. The auction notice, posted by John Bushell & Sons, noted that the furnishings included “41 rooms of nice, clean, good furniture, including beds, springs, felt mattresses, pillows, bedding, dressers, wardrobes, center tables, rockers, chairs...tapestry rugs, curtains, crockery.” The auction, according to the notice, was happening because the building’s lease had expired and it needed to be vacated immediately. That aligns with the fact that Henry Beck and John Brill had established a new 10 year lease with Robert Hahn when they enlarged the building in 1908.

The SRO hotel continued in operation with Beck listed as the manager of the hotel until 1926. The 1920 census lists 18 individuals living at 105 ½ Pike Street, all were white, relatively evenly split between men and women, most single or widowed, except for a married couple, and a mother with her three children (age ranges from 9 to 18). Most tenants were in their 20s to 30s, with a couple in their 40s and 50s and one person in their 80s. Most of the tenants were born in the US, except a few from Norway and Russia. Nick D. Margel then managed the hotel between 1927 and 1928, followed by George and Ethel Parker between 1930 and at least 1940. Occupations included restaurant cook, bridge carpenter, machinist, hotel house keeper, house carpenter, railroad engineer, real estate agent, electrician, hotel clerk, hotel waitress, bank cashier, store cashier, traveling salesman, and a marine steamship examiner.

In addition to the short term and permanent residents occupying the hotel, a number of businesses operated out of the Hotel Elliott over the years. A Mrs. Dr. Moynham advertised her services as a medium, offering consultations and healing/psychic circles, from room 1 in the hotel in 1909. A Senorita Mendez, manicurist and chiropodist, advertised from the hotel in 1910 and 1911. In 1915, Miss Blanche Wilson had a massage parlor in office 18; massage and manicures were provided in office 4 and room 26. Madame Frank—card reader, palmist, and clairvoyant—advertised from the hotel in 1916. And a Miss Burns offered massage services from office 27 in 1917. A number of dentists also operated in the Hotel Elliott, including J. H. Sirginson in 1930, as evidenced by the signage in the building’s windows.

In 1981, the hotel had 39 single rooms for low-income residents. In 1982, the hotel was renovated into 48 low-income units. In 2005, it was remodeled as a hostel use with 30 rooms and rebranded as the Green Tortoise.

Ground Floor Storefronts

The storefronts have had the addresses of 101, 103, 105, 107, and 109 Pike Street. It appears that not all the addresses were in use over the time as some businesses utilized more than one storefront. The following overview provides a general summary of the occupancy for each address.

101 Pike Street

This is the corner storefront at First Avenue and Pike Street. At times, businesses utilized both this storefront and the neighboring storefront (103 Pike). In 1909, a cigar stand operated from this storefront, along with Palace Bar. The White Cow Butter store was in the storefront by 1918, but appears to have moved to another storefront (109 Pike) by 1920. A bakery operated by Mrs. H. B. Jessmer advertised in the space in 1919. In 1920, Owl Drug Company moved into the storefront, opening its third branch in the city and 36th in the country. In 1974, Guenter Mannhalt opened the International Donut Shop in the storefront. The donut shop became a late night hang out for homeless teens in the neighborhood who were too young to frequent area dive bars or sleep at shelters. Mannhalt operated the shop with his brother, Herb, along with the B & B delicatessen next door. The

deli and donut shop leases were not renewed in 1981 after Guenter Mannhalt was convicted earlier that year for a series of robberies and possession of a stolen property. An Academy Award nominated documentary, *Streetwise* (1984), depicted the community of homeless teens congregating around Pike Place Market. The First and Pike intersection featured prominently in the film as a key area for loitering, panhandling, and streetwalking. By the late 1970s, the First and Pike intersection had become a new hub for streetwalkers.

103 Pike Street

In 1917, the Chandler Bros. shoe store operated out of the storefront. In 1921, the business became Chandler & Hahn. They occupied the storefront until at least 1923. In 1936, Max Block's shoe was in this storefront until at least 1955.

105 Pike Street

This storefront had Henry Beck's Palace Liquor Company in 1909. And then T.H. Daniels' apparel store was in the storefront between 1917 and 1920. In 1933, Ernest A. Hahn had a restaurant in the building and was granted a beer license on June 12, 1933. By 1933, the restaurant was known as Pub Tavern No. 2. Then it was called Palace Tavern. The Palace Tavern was still identified in the storefront in 1981 (its lease expired later that year).

107 Pike Street

In 1919, the Market Blouse Shop—a women's clothing store—operated out of the storefront. In February 1927, Anderson Food Stores opened a grocery store in the storefront. Owned and operated by Carl G. Anderson, the company had other storefronts at 4214 E. Madison, 5407 Ballard Avenue, and the Post Office Market. Prior to Anderson Food Stores, Connor's—an apparel store—operated in the storefront. In 1932, Max Block opened his 11th shoe store at 107 Pike Street. Vandecamp's Holland Dutch Bakery was in the storefront by 1938 and continued to be there until at least 1965.

109 Pike Street

Sunset Market, later Raab's Sunset Market, operated in this storefront between 1909 and 1932. In 1932, Oliver's Meats moved into the Sunset Market storefront and continued to use the space until the mid-1980s. The space appears to have been shared because the White Butter Store also operated out of this storefront, by at least 1920, and continued until at least 1943.

Architectural Context

The multiple storefront, corner block building reflects late nineteenth and early twentieth century architectural influences without having a specific architectural style. The building marked an important business corner and, in keeping with commercial blocks from the early twentieth century when its storefronts were remodeled and the upper two stories added, the designing architects used the prominent terra cotta belt course and associated egg and dart molding to make a distinction between the street-level commercial storefronts and the upper residential stories.

The 1897 one-story building reflected the Romanesque-revival stylistic influences of this period of construction in Seattle with arched entrances, elliptical window headers, and prominent parapet corbeling. The use of transoms along the storefronts enabled lighting to reach deeper into the long narrow commercial spaces.

The 1908 remodel of the storefronts and the two-story addition afforded an opportunity to modernize the building to reflect then prevailing Classical-revival stylistic influences, this included the use of terra cotta accent elements including the belt course, parapet balustrade, cornice and associated brackets and dentils, raised brick quoins at the outer primary facade corners, the uniform red stretcher-bonded brick veneer on the primary facades that contrasted with the projecting lug window sills, and raised terra cotta keystones at the jack arched window headers. Traces of the Romanesque-revival style persisted through the remodel and included the elliptical arched windows at the first story of the west facade, and the common bond east facade brickwork.

Building Owners and Operators

The building was consistently owned by the Hahn family, from construction of the single story brick building in 1897, through the SRO hotel addition and remodel, until 1986. However, Palace Liquor Company—owned by Henry Beck, John P. Brill, and F.G. Beck—was instrumental in establishing the building as a three-story structure. Beck and Brill operated their saloon from a storefront on the first floor, while Brill operated the Hotel Elliott on the upper two floors.

Robert Ernest Hahn (1841—1915)

Robert Ernest Hahn was born in Saxony, Germany, on March 13, 1841. He immigrated to the United States at age sixteen, arriving through the Port of New York on June 25, 1866, aboard the SS New York before settling in Chicago. In his work *History of Seattle*, Clarence Bagley provides a brief biography of Robert Hahn. According to Bagley, Hahn was initially employed as a weaver but learned the trades of painting and wallpaper hanging in Chicago. After two years, he made his way westward to California to try his luck at gold mining. While Bagley states that Hahn came to Seattle in 1868 and purchased the property at First and Pike other sources don't support that claim; though Hahn was at least in Seattle by 1882 when he leased the property at First and Pike, then purchased it in 1889. He married Minna Srillhof in 1883; August Mehlhorn and Bernard Engleman were the witnesses. It is unclear when Hahn and Srillhof parted ways.

After establishing his business in Seattle, Hahn moved north to Nooksack in Whatcom County and farmed. He married Amelia Schneider (1863–1919) on December 22, 1891, in Nooksack. They had seven children together: Ernest A. (1892-1990), Albert F. (1893-1902), Flora I. (1894–1942, married Willard Dean), Oskar/Oscar W. (1897-1908), August M. (1900–1975), Helen E. (1903–1918), and Elsie M. (1905–2002, married Herbert DeBoer). Robert and Amelia relocated their family to Seattle in 1902 and Hahn had a residence constructed on Beacon Hill (2536 14th Avenue S, demolished). Hahn passed away on April 20, 1915, at the family home at the age of 74 and Amelia passed away in 1919.

The Hahn family continued to own the building after Robert's death. During the Hahn family's ownership, Robert and Amelia's eldest son, Ernest, operated various businesses out of the building's storefronts including a pub, carrying on his father's earliest use of the property. In addition to his business ownership, Ernest (or Ernie) was an avid fisherman and established the Ben Paris Salmon Derby with Ben Paris (owner of a large sporting goods store downtown) and Deskin Reid in 1931—the first major fishing derby in the Puget Sound area.

In 1986, the Hahn family sold the property to Marketview Place Associates, LLC.

Henry Beck (1869–1955) and John P. Brill (1866–1954)

Although the building was owned by the Hahn family, Palace Liquor Co. proprietors Henry Beck and John P. Brill were responsible for the building's conversion from a one-story building to a three-story mixed-use building. Hahn and Brill also partnered in acquiring the Monroe Apartments on Capitol Hill

(Republican Street and Fifteenth Avenue N, demolished) in 1916. They also made extensive additions to that property.

Henry A. Beck was born in December 1869 in Council Bluffs, Iowa. Beck and his family moved to Seattle in 1888, but he returned to Iowa in 1890 to marry his childhood sweetheart, Clara D. Basch (1870–1942). After their marriage, Henry and Clara returned to Seattle. Beck served as a member of the Seattle Volunteer Fire Brigade during the Seattle Fire of 1889. He was part of the reconstruction of Seattle after the fire and entered the hotel business. He was a founding member of the Seattle Aerie No. 1, Fraternal Order of Eagles. He served as chairman of the Eagles' building committee when they constructed the Eagles' Temple at Seventh Avenue and Union Streets. The Becks had two children: Emma (1892-1914) and Matilda (1896–unknown). Their daughter Emma struggled with illness for years and when she died at the age of 22, 500 people attended her funeral.

Beck's career for many years was saloon keeper and hotel manager. He had a good reputation as the proprietor of Palace Liquor Co. at First and Pike. He also ran the Abbott Bar at Third Avenue and Pike Street between 1905 and 1909 with Frank P. Mullen.

John P. Brill was born in Luxembourg in 1866. He moved to Newcastle to work in the coal mines in 1882 and then moved to Seattle about a year later. He worked as a brewmaster and later operated a tavern and the hotel at First and Pike. In 1920 he was appointed a county road foreman and then served as a county appraiser in the 1930s. He was a member of the Seattle Aerie No. 1, Fraternal Order of Eagles, the Sons of Herman, and the Holly Name Society of St. Alphonsus' Church. He was married to Rosa and they had eight children.

Architect and Builder

According to The Seattle Daily Times and Pacific Engineer and Builder, architectural firm Kingsley & Bittman designed the Hahn Building. Kingsley & Bittman was comprised of William Kingsley and Henry W. Bittman. The firm combined architecture and engineering; Kingsley was an architect and Bittman an engineer. Kingsley and Bittman appeared to only practice together for a short time—the Hahn Building may be the only example left of their work together. Between 1906 and 1907, The Seattle Daily Times references three additional projects they worked on:

- A 10-story family hotel, financed by C. B. Russell, at Ninth Avenue and Spring Street (1906)—no such property exists at that intersection
- A 10-story family hotel, financed by C. B. Russell, west of Boren Avenue on First Hill (1906)—there is not enough information to determine if or where this building existed
- Alterations estimated at \$10,000 to Kenneth Mackintosh's building at 1431–1435 Third Avenue (1907), to cut off nine feet of the building to conform with the regulation width of Third Avenue —this building was replaced by the Kress Building (1924)

William Kingsley (1858–1929) was born in Massachusetts. He studied math and bookkeeping in Iowa and then apprenticed with W. H. Eastman in Saint Paul, Minnesota. He moved into architecture, working as a building inspector for the City of Saint Paul and then practicing architecture there in the 1890s. He moved to Seattle in 1900 and formed a partnership Kingsley & Anderson (1902–1905). During that partnership he designed the National Building in Seattle (1905). After his brief partnership with Bittman, Kingsley continued to practice in Seattle, but on his own. Kingsley died in 1929. During his solo practice, Kingsley designed the following projects:

- Cliff House (1908–1909), Seattle, with W.H. Eastman
- Clarence Blethen residence (ca. 1909), Seattle
- Orpheum Theater (1911, demolished), Seattle
- Majestic Theater (1910–1911, demolished), Portland
- Linden Court Apartments (1929), 4321 Linden Avenue N, Seattle

Henry Bittman (1882–1953) was born in Greenport, New York. He studied engineering at Cooper Union and then worked briefly as a bridge engineer in Chicago. He arrived in Seattle in 1906 and briefly worked with Kingsley. He established his own structural engineering practice by 1908 and worked on structural steel buildings in Seattle. He obtained his architectural license in 1923 and established a reputable firm with capable staff. Bittman would later work with Henry Beck of the Hahn Building again in his design for the Eagles Temple in Seattle at 1416 7th Avenue (1924-1925). Beck was the chair of the aerie's building committee during the design and construction of the new building. Bittman continued to practice architecture until his death on November 16, 1953.

Bittman's designed the following projects:

- Terminal Sales Building (1923), Seattle—industrial with Jacobethan elements, City of Seattle Landmark
- United Shopping Tower/Olympic Tower (1928), Seattle—Art Deco, City of Seattle Landmark
- Eagles Temple (1924–1925), Seattle—Beaux Arts, City of Seattle Landmark
- Monte Cristo Hotel (1924–1925), Everett, National Register of Historic Places listed
- Remodel of King County Courthouse and City Hall (1929–1931), Seattle—added 6 stories to the 5-story building designed by August Warren Gould

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Joseph R. "Seattle Street Guide and Business Directory." Map. 1911. Seattle Municipal Archives, #1108.

Bagley, Clarence. "Robert Ernest Hahn." *History of Seattle: From the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time*. Volume III. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1916.

Berger, Knute. "Seattle's Notorious Donut Shop: Runaway haven or sweet-tinged trap?" *Crosscut*. March 18, 2014. <https://crosscut.com/2014/03/seattle-donut-shop-runaways-part-one-knute-berger> (accessed November 5, 2019).

Burns, Ken. "Derby Hopefuls Need More Boats." *The Seattle Daily Times*. September 3, 1939: 14.

"Construction News." *Pacific Builder & Engineer*. Seattle Public Library. October 26, 1907.

Crowley, Walt. "Street Railways in Seattle." *Historylink.org the Free Online Encyclopedia of Washington State History*. October 2, 2000, <https://www.historylink.org/File/2707>. Accessed September 19, 2019.

DeFore, John. "'Streetwise': Film Review." *The Hollywood Reporter*. July 18, 2019. <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/review/streetwise-1225511>.

Demirel, Sinan. "Homeless in Seattle: The Roots of a Crisis." *Crosscut*. July 26, 2016.
<http://features.crosscut.com/homeless-in-seattle-the-roots-of-a-crisis>. Accessed September 18, 2019.

"Elsie M Deboer." 17 Mar 2002, King, Washington, United States. Department of Health, Death Index, 1907-1960; 1965-2014, Washington State Archives, Digital Archives.
<https://www.digitalarchives.wa.gov/Collections/TitleInfo/472>.

Find A Grave. Memorial page for Albert Hahn (unknown–6 Mar 1902), Find A Grave Memorial no. 7464636. <https://www.findagrave.com>. Accessed 20 August 2019.

Gottfried, Herbert and Jan Jennings. *American Vernacular Buildings and Interiors, 1870-1960*. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. New York, 2009.

Groth, Paul. "Living Downtown: The History of Residential Hotels in the United States." Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.

Hancock, Marga Rose. "Kingsley, William." *Shaping Seattle Architecture, Shaping Seattle Architecture*. Ed. Jeffrey K. Ochsner. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014.

Hayner, Norman S. "Hotel Life and Personality." *American Journal of Sociology* 33, no. 5 (1928): 784-95. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2765831>.

Historylink.org the Free Online Encyclopedia of Washington State History . "Historic South Downtown Oral Histories: Marie Wong Discusses Her Research on Seattle's SRO Hotels and the Men and Women Who Lived in Them," interview by Dominic Black with Marie Wong,
<https://www.historylink.org/File/11135> (accessed July 30, 2019), posted November 2, 2015.

Johnson Partnership. *Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building City of Seattle Landmark Nomination*. August 2014.

Krafft, Katheryn H. Krafft & Krafft Architecture/CRM, "Pike Place Public Market Historic District," National Register of Historic Places nomination, August 2010.
<http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Neighborhoods/HistoricPreservation/HistoricDistricts/PikePlaceMarket/PikePlace-National-Register-Nomination.pdf>. Accessed September 13, 2019.

King County Archives, Seattle. "A. A. Denny and J. M. Lyon," April 7, 1869, King County, WA, Deed, Volume 2: 211.

---. "Augustus Mehlhorn and Robert Hahn," October 19, 1889, King County, WA, Deed, Volume 83: 156.

---. "J. M. Lyon and J. V. Dawson," November 28, 1872, King County, WA, Mortgage, Volume 2: 621.

---. "J. M. Lyon and Phillips Horton & Company," June 4, 1872, King County, WA, Mortgage, Volume 2: 378.

---. "J. M. Lyon and R. Abrams," August 19, 1875, King County, WA, Deed, Volume 11: 122.

---. "Joseph Ade and Robert Hahn." May 15, 1882. King County, WA, Lease. Volume 8: 103-104.

---. "Joseph Ade and Samuel Coulter," February 8, 1882, King County, WA, Mortgage, Volume 7: 327.

---. "Plat of An Addition of the Town of Seattle as Laid Out by A. A. Denny," April 22, 1869, King County, WA, Deed, Volume 2: 196-197.

---. "R. Abrams and Joseph Ade," February 9, 1882, King County, WA, Deed, Volume 20: 680.

---. "Robert Hahn and Henry A. Beck." July 11, 1906. King County, WA, Lease. Volume 19: 373.

---. "Robert Hahn and Palace Liquor Company," October 21, 1907, King County, WA, Lease, Volume 18: 276.

McNerthney, Casey. "Where are fire escapes in Seattle townhouses." *The Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. November 7, 2008. <https://blog.seattlepi.com/seattle911/2008/11/07/where-are-fire-escapes-in-seattle-townhouses/>. Accessed September 18, 2019.

Pacific Builder & Engineer. "Construction News." Seattle Public Library. October 26, 1907.

Provost-Smith, Caterina. "Henry W. Bittman." *Shaping Seattle Architecture*. Ed. Jeffrey K. Ochsner. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014.

"Robert Hahn - Minna Srillhof." King County Marriage Records, 1855-Present, Washington State Archives, Digital Archives. <http://digitalarchives.wa.gov>. Accessed September 5, 2019.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. 1893. Volume 1, Sheet 2.

Seattle City Council Bills and Ordinances. Ordinance no. 7040, "Building Code." Seattle Municipal Archives. <http://clerk.seattle.gov/search/ordinances/7040>. Accessed September 6, 2019. Filed with Clerk July 3, 1901.

---. Ordinance no. 17240, "Building Code." Seattle Municipal Archives. <http://clerk.seattle.gov/search/ordinances/17240>. Accessed September 6, 2019. Filed with Clerk October 26, 1907.

---. Ordinance no. 31578, "Building Code." Seattle Municipal Archives. <http://clerk.seattle.gov/search/ordinances/31578>. Accessed September 6, 2019. Filed with Clerk July 22, 1913.

Seattle City Directories. 1921–1940.

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections, microfilmed building permits and drawings.

Seattle Met. "A Red Light History of Seattle." February 2010.

<https://www.seattlemet.com/articles/2010/1/29/red-light-history-0210>. Accessed November 8, 2019.

Sheridan, Mimi. "Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900 – 1957 Multiple Property Submission," National Park Service (2008).

The Seattle Daily Times. "All Cuts of Meat Sought as Point-Rationing Begins." March 29, 1943: 2.

---. "Auction Notices: John Bushell & Sons Will Hold." June 9, 1918: 47.

---. "Babies, Children and Grown-ups." Ad. February 4, 1927: 22.

---. "Bussell to Build Two Great Hotels." December 14, 1906: 18.

---. "Capitol Hill Business Block Changes Owners." December 3, 1916: 25.

---. "Conner Fails." Ad. January 7, 1927: 13.

---. "Councilman Sells Abbot Bar." August 15, 1909: Classified Advertising Section, 10.

---. "Couple, Wed 50 Years, Recall Childhood Ties." April 18, 1940: 3.

---. "Do You Remember: 'Way Back When...'" March 8, 1934: 13.

---. "First Ave. Doughnut Shop's Lease Won't Be Renewed." August 22, 1981: 12.

---. "For Rent, Rooms: Hotel Elliott." October 19, 1908: 15.

---. "J. H. Raab and Son." Ad. May 22, 1925: 25.

---. "John P. Brill, Father of Coroner, Dies." November 24, 1954: 31.

---. "K. McIntosh." July 21, 1907: 39;

---. "Madame Frank." Ad. October 28, 1919: 29.

---. "Many Mourn Death of Young Educator." March 9, 1914: 11.

---. "Max Block To Open Another Shoe Store." November 4, 1932: 13.

---. "Miss Blanche Wilson." Ad. March 15, 1915: 16.

---. "Miss Burns." Ad. January 3, 1917: 15.

---. "Mrs. Dr. Moynham." Ad. November 28, 1909: 50.

---. "New Corporations: The Palace Liquor Company." July 3, 1907: 8.

---. "New York Financial Troubles Cause No Uneasiness Here: Beck & Brill." October 27, 1907: 39.

---. "Rainier District Objecting to Beer Sale Ban." June 13, 1933: 4.

---. "Save a Little!" Ad. December 6, 1917: 18.

---. "Senorita Mendez." Ad. December 21, 1910: 22. "

---. "Senorita Mendez." Ad. January 1, 1911: 35.

---. "Sensational Shoe Sale." Ad. July 21, 1921: 8.

---. "The Market Blouse Shop." Ad. August 6, 1919: 14.

---. "Third Store in Seattle." October 29, 1920: 7.

---. "Tide Land Block Sold for \$15,000." July 16, 1907: 9.

---. "Wanted." Classified. December 25, 1919: 19.

United States of America, Bureau of the Census. "Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910 — Population, Seattle, King County, Washington, Enumeration District No. 76." Sheets 3B and 4A, via HeritageQuest.

"Washington Death Index, 1965-2014." Database. FamilySearch.

<https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:QLW9-76BD>.

Wong, Marie Rose. *Building Tradition: Pan-Asian Seattle and Life in the Residential Hotels*. Seattle, WA: Chin Music Press, 2018.

Yuasa, Mark. "Salmon Derbies on the Sound Enjoy Popularity." *The Seattle Times*. July 18, 2008.

<https://www.seattletimes.com/sports/other-sports/salmon-derbies-on-the-sound-enjoy-popularity/>. Accessed November 8, 2019.

The features of the Landmark to be preserved include: *the exterior of the building.*

Issued: February 2, 2021



Sarah Sodt
City Historic Preservation Officer

Cc: Jonas Jonsson, Marketview Place Associates
Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary
Katie Pratt and Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular
Ruth Danner, SaveTheMarketEntrance.org
Jordan Kiel, Chair, LPB
Patrick Downs, Law
Tami Garrett, SDCI
Nathan Torgelson, SDCI
Katrina Nygaard, SDCI
Ken Mar, SDCI

EXHIBIT B



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

February 2, 2021

LPB 46/21

Marketview Place Associates
C/O Stellar Holdings, Inc.
Attn: Jonas Jonsson
5350 Carillon Point
Kirkland, WA 98033

Subject: Hotel Elliott / Hahn Building - 103 Pike Street

Dear Mr. Jonsson,

The following paragraphs outline the legally prescribed procedures for negotiating controls and incentives for designated Landmark properties in Seattle. Also enclosed is a copy of the Landmarks Preservation Board's Report on Designation for the subject property as a City of Seattle Landmark.

In accordance with Subchapter V of the Seattle Municipal Code Section 25.12, the Board hereby issues notice of the Board's meeting to be held:

Wednesday, April 7, 2021, 3:30 p.m.
Seattle City Hall, Room L2-80 "Boards & Commissions" (*likely Webex Event*)
600 4th Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98124

At that meeting the Board will consider controls and incentives, if any, to be applied to preservation of specific features of the site, improvement or object in question.

The Landmarks Preservation Board hereby requests you to consult and confer with the Board staff to develop and agree upon controls and incentives. In accordance with SMC 25.12.490, if, within fifteen (15) days of the commencement of the negotiation period (commencement date is February 5, 2021) you fail to contact the Board staff, or notify the staff that you decline to negotiate controls and incentives, the staff will prepare and transmit to the Board their recommendation for controls and incentives for the subject property to be considered at a public meeting to be held at the date and time a noted above.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

The negotiation period may run for a maximum of seventy-five (75) days from the date of service on the owner of the Board's Report on Designation. The negotiations will terminate if either party concludes that an impasse has been reached and so notifies the other party in writing and if the other party does not object within seven (7) days after receipt of such notice. If you and the Board staff reach written agreement within the period allotted for negotiation, the staff will promptly submit the agreement to the Board for approval at the Board meeting to be held not later than twenty (20) days after the written agreement is reached, or within such further time as the Board and you may stipulate in writing. Notice of such Board meeting will be served on you and mailed to interested persons of record, notice of its approval or disapproval of the agreement and specific the reasons therefore. If the agreement on controls and incentives between the Board Staff and owner is approved by the Board, the Board will transmit the agreement to the Council with a request for Council action pursuant to Sections 510, 650 and 660 of SMC 25.12.

In the event, we are unable to reach an agreement by negotiation, or in the event the agreement reached is disapproved by the Board, the Board will file its recommendation on controls and economic incentives, if any, with the Hearing Examiner and serve same on you and you shall have an opportunity to file objections. The controls proposed in such recommendation will relate to the specific feature or features of the site, improvement or object which are to be preserved. The recommendation will set forth the reasons and the need for each proposed specific control and for any proposed economic incentive and shall, in addition, state the circumstances under which a Certificate of Approval is required with respect to any alteration or significant change to a site, improvement or object if the proposed controls are imposed. The Board may hold a public hearing prior to the making of its recommendation.

Please contact me in writing by **February 19, 2021**, indicating that you either do or do not wish to negotiate controls and incentives.

Sincerely,



Sarah Sodt
City Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary
Katie Pratt and Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular
Ruth Danner, SaveTheMarketEntrance.org
Jordan Kiel, Chair, LPB
Patrick Downs, Law
Tami Garrett, SDCI
Jordan Kiel, Chair, LPB
Nathan Torgelson, SDCI
Katrina Nygaard, SDCI
Ken Mar, SDCI

EXHIBIT C

McCULLOUGH HILL LEARY, PS

February 9, 2021

Ms. Sarah Sodt
Historic Preservation Officer
City of Seattle
600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor
Seattle, WA 98104
Email: sarah.sodt@seattle.gov

VIA EMAIL

Re: Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building LPB 45/21
Negotiation of Controls & Incentives

Dear Sarah:

We are writing on behalf of Marketview Place Associates, LLC, the owner of the Hotel Elliot/Hahn Building at 103 Pike Street, to confirm the owner's intent to participate in the controls and incentives negotiations as provided in Seattle Municipal Code Ch. 25.12. Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

s/Ian S. Morrison

cc: Patrick Downs, City Attorney's Office
Client

EXHIBIT D



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 29/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, January 17, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson
Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordon Kiel
Russell Coney

Vice Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

011718.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 1, 2017

MM/SC/KJ/JP 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

November 15, 2017

MM/SC/ST/JP 6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

011718.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

011718.21 Bleitz Funeral Home
316 Florentia Street

Proposed exterior alterations and window replacement

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said they have been to ARC for review and were looking for guidance on the pattern of window restoration and replacement.

Brian Collins-Friedrichs, SkB Architects, said they are excited about bringing new life to the building and they are committed to making it a great project. He provided context of the building and site and said they will clean up the building and remove non-original components; repair/restore select windows, repaint, and replace deteriorated historic elements. He indicated on the elevations which elements were original and existing and which were later additions. He proposed to restore all windows and doors on the primary (south) façade; and replace windows on the secondary façades except for the leaded glass windows which will be restored.

He proposed to add a railing at the porch on the north elevation, open blocked opening and replace garage door with one with a light in it, infill existing arch, and add a window to light interior of basement. The proposed color scheme is off-white for the body, dark window surround brick detail and sills, and deep green windows. He said the standing seam metal roof is non-original and they propose to paint it dark charcoal; it is green now. He proposed light fixtures more in keeping with original size fixtures. He said security cameras will be tucked away up in the roof overhang.

Mr. Collins provided a window sample, aluminum-clad wood sash; they will match operations and configuration of divided lights. He went over the window survey and said that where they are replacing windows they will use Marvin windows to match what is there.

Ms. McKernan asked about the new basement windows.

Mr. Collins indicated on the plan and said it is a light well windows that is boarded up now.

Mr. Treffers said ARC generally supported the window plan but there were mixed comments about the need to replace the upper level east façade because they are in good condition.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported the project as proposed, and said the community is looking forward to it.

Ms. Patterson asked if reglazing the original sashes with an insulated glass assembly was something that they explored.

Mr. Collins said they looked at that and felt it wasn't feasible due to the width and configuration of divided lights.

Ms. Patterson asked if they considered this for the 1/1 sashes on the first floor.

Mr. Collins said no.

Ms. Barker said they did a great job on the window survey; there are so many good windows on the eastern façade. She was concerned the replacing restorable windows would set a bad precedent.

Mr. Treffers said that good windows shouldn't be replaced; they are character defining and visible on the façade. He said if restored properly they could closely meet energy needs.

Ms. Johnson noted the effort to restore the really character defining windows and considering the give and take, it seems acceptable.

Ms. Patterson said historically, keeping windows that are in good condition is not a huge ask, especially when it is less expensive to do so. She noted the possibility of restoring the ground level windows using double pane glazing. She noted that all windows are listed as good or fair in the BOLA report.

Ms. Durham asked for clarification on the window plan.

Mr. Treffers said they are replacing just the secondary façades and non-original windows.

Mr. Collins-Friedrichs said their plan provides consistency, allows for maintenance and are not character defining windows.

Ms. Patterson said they are character defining windows; she said they are 100 years old.

Mr. Hodgins said he had no strong opinion.

Ms. Durham supported replacement for first floor windows on the east side. She said it is an uncomfortable precedent to replace good windows. She asked about dormers.

Mr. Collins-Friedrichs said they are not planning to replace the dormer windows.

The owner said he is willing to refurbish the east dormer.

Ms. McKernan noted the consistency issue with some replaced and some restored. She suggested consistency by floor.

Mr. Treffers supported the application and suggested replacement of the first-floor windows, noting security issues; he suggested retaining and repairing upper floor windows. He noted that windows are already inconsistent.

The owner said he could live with that; he noted they will retain and restore the dormer windows and will replace north side.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at Bleitz Funeral Home, 316 Florentia Street, as per the attached submittal, noting the condition to also restore the second floor and dormer windows on the east facade.

This action is based on the following:

1. Proposed selective removal of original windows affects the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation LPB 282/17, as the proposed work removes historic materials that characterize the property. However, the applicant has demonstrated the need to make these alterations to address security issues and programmatic needs.
2. The remaining proposed exterior alterations, do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation LPB 282/17, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/ST/GH 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Patterson opposed.

011718.22

Lake City Library
12501 28th Avenue NE
Proposed exterior and interior building alterations

Matt Inpanbutr, SHKS, proposed changes to a previously approved application for interior renovations that will open up the space for more programming.

Hannah Allender, SHKS, provided historic photos and noted the curved brick walls, low arch openings, bronze entry gate will be retained. She said that

over time the collection has grown, and the natural light has been diminished with building alterations. She said they propose to improve sightlines, upgrade HVAC, and mechanical. She noted that one courtyard has been previously infilled. They propose mostly interior upgrades but noted they want to replace glazing, add a window in the entry courtyard, and add a new entry vestibule. She said they will demo the concrete at the double height curtain wall and will create a new pad. She said the original courtyard intent was a nicely scaled entry experience; the 2003 renovation eliminated that. She said they will project into the courtyard 4'-3" and add an accessible entry; it won't detract from the courtyard experience. She said people will be able to directly enter library from courtyard.

Mr. Inpanbutr said interior modifications to the window stops will be made to accommodate the thicker insulated glazing. He said the exterior ramp replacement will comply with ADA.

Ms. Allender said the aluminum curtain wall will match existing. She said they will relocate the art wall to the community café. She said the ceiling lighting, glass system and brick will remain the same. She said they will demolish the walls in the public meeting room; wood slats and ceiling will remain. She said they will repaint the reading room; brick and ceiling will remain the same. Responding to questions she said they will create ADA access and allow room for opening a sequence of doors.

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed this. She said the building is currently disorienting when you walk in, and this is a nice change. She said not much is happening to historic material and the window being added is in non-historic storefront. She said it seems reasonable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Treffers said his concern was that the lobby/courtyard was being altered again, and it is a missed opportunity to correct the previous changes. He said now you are stepping further into the courtyard with the vestibule but you kind of have to; he noted the challenge of how to address accessibility.

Ms. McKernan said when viewing from inside looking out you will look at the side of the new projected opening rather than at the courtyard.

Mr. Treffers said they talked about the window opening being vertical rather than horizontal; horizontal differentiates it.

Ms. McKernan asked what determined the width of the window.

Ms. Allender said the windows are sandwiched between existing columns that are furred out, without having to demolish more original fabric than they had to.

Ms. Patterson said the design intent of the stucco panel doesn't serve its purpose anymore; she had no problem putting the window in.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations and site improvements at the Lake City Library, 12501 28th Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121105, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

011718.23

Pier 56
1201 Alaska Way
Proposed storefront alterations

Dick Causey, Seattle Shirt, explained they are expanding into the adjacent tenant space. They want to construct an accordion wall to allow them to open it up and stack when it is nice outside and to close it when weather is inclement. He said they will paint the wood frame to match existing and will extend the soffit from the column.

Ms. Sodt provided a cut sheet for the accordion doors. She said they are not changing flooring – it is all concrete. She said the storefront system is non-original.

Mark Astor, property manager, read from the Controls and Incentives agreement and said it is easily restorable if the tenant changes; they are leaving the columns and column cladding.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said it was straightforward.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations at Pier 56, 1201 Alaskan Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123858 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

011718.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

011718.31 Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena
305 Harrison Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three-month extension. She said the team is working on the proposed renovation and expansion, and the owner has made design briefings about Key Arena and the Bressi Garage. She said they hope to make a briefing to the full board in February.

Mr. Treffers said they came to ARC and things are progressing well; they are headed in the right direction. He supported a three-month extension.

Ms. Barker agreed.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olsen, Queen Anne Historical Society, said they are moving in the right direction and just need to refine things.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Century 21 Coliseum, 305 Harrison Street, for three months.

MM/SC/KJ/ST 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011718.32 Bressi Garage
226-232 1st Avenue North
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Bressi Garage, 226-232 1st Avenue North, for three months.

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

011718.33 Broad Street Substation
319 6th Avenue North
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said she sent the owner a draft of the agreement and they requested some more time; she said their request for two-months seemed reasonable to her.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Broad Street Substation, for two months.

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

011718.34 Wayne Apartments
2224 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt read from staff memo (in DON file) and said the due diligence was performed; analysis was done and there are limited development opportunities. She said no controls are recommended.

Mr. Treffers appreciated the information presented but was undecided; he said it is outside his area of expertise. He was not comfortable looking at a proforma and rate of return; it is over his head in some ways yet what the board has to look at per the Ordinance and the Hearing Examiner.

Ms. Johnson said the potential for redevelopment is challenging. She said it is a small site; the roofline is defined, it is hard to develop and to provide a reasonable rate of return. She said she was trying to understand all the pieces and said it is unfortunate. She said that scenarios were reasonable to explore and didn't pencil out. She supported no controls.

Ms. McKernan supported no controls. She trusted that it didn't pencil out and that all resources would have been tried.

Mr. Hodgins supported no controls; he noted he was part of the review committee. He cited the Ordinance section.

Ms. Patterson said the board can't delay the vote noting requests by public; she said it would be in violation of the Ordinance.

Ms. Barker said the recommendation was written without an ounce of joy – it was written with sorrow. She said the Code does not give credence to the fact we are in a real estate market no one could have predicted, and it is sad.

Public Comment:

Brian Platt, building ownership, said they reached out to every historic organization and some developers; all had extensive rehabilitation expertise. He said they still invite anyone interested in rehabilitation to contact them.

Tiffany Jorgenson, Friends of Historic Belltown, asked the board not to approve the no controls decision. She said the rents were intentionally kept too low with no improvements. She said the information is outdated; the business has been there less than a year. She said there is not enough information to support no controls.

Steve Hall, Friends of Historic Belltown, said it is difficult to argue against staff and board who share their values and are trying to do the best for the community. He requested an extension. He said the law says it has to go to the board, but it does not say the board has to vote. He said the record is lacking; it doesn't meet comparables. He said the \$4.5 millions assessment is high. He wanted to see the rehabilitation scenarios. He wanted more time to work with Historic Seattle and the City to provide realistic scenarios.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, echoed Mr. Hall's comments. She said it is difficult for the board and staff; staff did her due diligence. As mentioned in their letter, Historic Seattle was in the midst of Washington Hall rehabilitation at the time and had no capacity to take on another large project. She said Historic Seattle wants to talk and asked that 'no controls' not be approved. She said Historic Seattle is interested in working with the community and property owner. She noted a recent similar situation with the Galbraith House and said she did not want to see any more after seeing two in the span of two months.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the Wayne is a significant building that tells the history of the neighborhood and the regrade. He agreed with Mr. Hall and Ms. Woo and asked the board to vote no. He said after 30 years on Historic Seattle council there is no mention of this happening with frequency; it is a bad precedent.

Nicholas said this is one of the oldest buildings downtown; if this goes, so too will the rest of the block. He said he has never seen anyone try to work on it or do anything. He said people love and support this building and people are interested.

Ms. Sodt said that if SEPA is applied to a project, then the Landmarks Board's decision on designation, controls & incentives, and/or a certificate of approval would provide compliance with SEPA.

Mr. Treffers said it ties impact to resource to financial consideration.

Ms. Patterson asked about legality of deferring vote.

Patrick Downs said this is the time to make a decision.

Ms. McKernan asked about information in the documents that may not be factual.

Mr. Downs said that doesn't undermine staff's decision. He didn't think claims of false information would undermine board's ability to support staff's decision.

Ms. Sodt said that there will be no controls on the building; later an owner could possibly renegotiate Controls and Incentives to take advantage of incentives. She said they would have to come back and negotiate and then come before the board; she noted FUMC is an example of this occurring. She said the Seattle Tower had a Controls agreement; there were some legal issues and it was never codified. They renegotiated and that will be reviewed by the board.

Mr. Hodgins supported staff recommendation.

Ms. Patterson said it is difficult; it is a significant building to the neighborhood and the City. She noted all the community support backs that up. She noted the ridiculous real estate market. She said the Ordinance and how it was written is clear what can and can't be done. She said dirt is more valuable than this building. She was encouraged by the owner's comment that they are interested in finding a sympathetic buyer; hopefully that will happen.

Ms. Durham was troubled with the situation and the frequency with which it is happening. She said no one is happy and no one wants this. She said the bigger question is what do we do to improve the Ordinance so this – and demolition by neglect, and deferred maintenance - can be prevented. She hoped the advocates can send a message to City Council. Now there is no language to prevent demolition by neglect; it is done in other cities and should be done here. She said the board's hands are tied; reluctantly she would support staff decision.

Ms. Johnson said she looked at the materials. She said reluctantly she would support.

Ms. McKernan echoed Mmes. Johnson and Durham's comments; she saw no other alternative.

Mr. Treffers said he was troubled and struggled with the decision. He said he does not have technical experience solely related to real estate and financial environment. He appreciated the information presented and said that staff weighed heavily and looked for alternatives. He said it takes creative minds and approaches to fulfil preservation Ordinance. He said was torn between civic pride and a decision that is tied back to financial concerns. He said it is not his decision to make – it is the Hearing Examiner's decision to make if they have not looked at all the alternatives. He said they should impose controls and let it go to the Hearing Examiner; if information is not addressed, that will provide opportunity. He recommended following Controls and Incentives like what was done at Shannon and Wilson building, where the owner was non-responsive.

Ms. Barker said staff has bent over backwards for years on this. She said she was excited when the building was nominated and designated because the building survived the regrade. She said the landmark code was written at a time that reflective of that time; it has not kept up with the real estate boom time. A lot of people make speculative purchase and hope to make a windfall. She didn't want to give the green light to demolish a building that withstood the regrade. She said people really tried; she said she couldn't support no controls.

Mr. Treffers said we need people to push for stronger Ordinance; it is discouraging and not easy. He said to do what you can to change it.

Action: I move to approve no controls on the Wayne Apartments, 2224 Second Avenue.

MM/SC/KJ/JP 5:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker and Mr. Treffers opposed.

011718.4 BRIEFING

011718.41 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and new development

Jack McCullough said they are trying to resolve the landmark issue and use the space. He provided an overview and history of the site.

Bonnie Geers, Quadrant Homes, provided an overview of their company and said they will be creative and work with the community.

Mr. McCullough said ownership went through a process to take the property to market; many looked at re-zoning. He noted the history with Laurelhurst Community Club and said they hope to maintain a single-family approach to a portion of the site. He said they want to retain the single-family sense and agreement in covenants.

Ms. Geers proposed to bring a new neighborhood to the property; she said the park-like setting is important and they will utilize the existing street and majority of buildings. She said they will develop the perimeter and create a harmonious community. She said they are assembling the team which will include consultation with Bill Bain. She said they will continue to work with the Laurelhurst Community Club, Landmarks Preservation Board, Friends of Battelle, and City of Seattle directors (SPU, SDCI). She said they have developed a site plan that encapsulates the vision and that respects current zoning. She said lots will be 5,500 square feet; 63 homesites are planned. She said access will be from existing roads which will be maintained as private roads. She said the conference center, dining room, Buildings A, B, C, D and F are significant and will be kept. She said they propose to demolish the lodge (Building E) and the offices (Building G). She showed a site plan with the insertion of the new homesites.

Mr. McCullough said they are trying to build on work done earlier. They plan to have ARC briefings, to look at site plans, and space, and what can go away; and then look at issues of houses. He noted the design book used at Ft. Lawton as possible process.

Ms. Barker disclosed having worked in the Federal Way planning department and she reviewed many Quadrant plans.

Neither the board nor the owner's representatives had issues with her participation.

Ms. Patterson said there will be one ordinance for the landmark and she asked how they would deal with that, if they would 'condominiumize' the site.

Mr. McCullough said they looked at platting the site, unit lot subdivision. He said they can play with lot size and land form to minimize grading. He said they will keep interior buildings.

Ms. Patterson asked if board will review design.

Ms. Doherty said yes.

Mr. Treffers questioned the appearance of the site in 20 years.

Mr. McCullough said that they will use a design book approach and will build on the experience of other areas.

Ms. Doherty said there is no Ordinance in place yet. She said an agreement would be crafted but they aren't there yet.

Ms. Sodt said there is precedent with the First Avenue Group and Waterfront Piers; design Guidelines are attached to the Controls agreement.

Ms. McKernan asked about ownership.

Mr. McCullough said there will be an HOA, but they aren't there yet and haven't figured out the mechanism yet.

Ms. Geers said they will explore that.

Ms. Durham asked about community use; it was an amenity at one point but not now.

Ms. Geers said they have no plan for fences. There will be connections; they will be part of the larger neighborhood and not separate and apart. She said you will be able to see in, enter in, and have pedestrian access.

Mr. Treffers said 63 single family homes are planned; he asked what is the minimum they need to make their project pencil out.

Mr. McCullough said it is too early to know.

Ms. Geers said they are working to reassemble the original campus design team as much as possible.

Mr. Treffers said it is helpful to have identification of character defining features.

Ms. Barker said another site visit is important for the Board.

Ms. McKernan asked who is using the property and how will it be used. Will kids be playing, will fences go up?

Ms. Patterson said she is more amenable to new building if the existing buildings are incorporated holistically.

Mr. Hodgins asked about access.

Mr. McCullough noted the existing access points.

Ms. Barker asked if there will be setback for wetlands. She said the southwest portion is low and wet; she asked about lots 19 and 20 relative to the stream.

Mr. McCullough said there is a culvert as part of Yesler Creek underground.

Ms. Barker asked about the eagle's nest.

Community member said the nest is still there.

Ms. Geers said it is in a cluster of trees near the southwest portion of the site.

Ms. Barker said it is a curvy road with light traffic; people stroll and walk dogs. She asked about issues with rebuilding it and storm drainage.

Ms. Geers said they are starting that conversation.

Mr. McCullough said they want to keep the road as it is.

Ms. Geers said they want to keep the character.

Ms. Barker said density may destroy that especially with trucks coming in. She said to plan pedestrian corridors, entrances, private streets, tracks. She requested a vegetation plan, tree maintenance plan, so there are no retroactive reviews. She said that there have been five instances and there is always different staff.

Public Comment:

Jan Sutter, Friends of Battelle, said they submitted the landmark nomination. She said the site reflects Japanese architecture and spiritual feeling. She said Rich Haag studied in Japan and that inspired him. She said it is scary to think of development. She said three days after landmark designation the property owner put a fence around the site; no one was allowed to walk around anymore. She noted the wetlands. She said a family of coyotes was shot in the middle of the night at the behest of the owner. She said the sense of trust is low. She appreciated the presentation. She said you must see the site to truly appreciate it.

Jeff Davies, Friends of Battelle, said the group was formed with intent to nominate the site with Historic Seattle. He said it is a spectacular example. He said the buildings reflect 1960's architecture. He said the landscape has the affect of a stone dropped in pond echoing outward with building and landscape part of the entire effect.

Deborah Binder, Orion Center, provided handouts (in DON file) and said the Integrative Medicine Cancer Care is campaigning to purchase the property for the center. She said they want to preserve is as an urban oasis. She said it should be a wellness center for families and caregivers and community. She said that is the original intended purpose of the built site.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said they worked with Friends of Battelle on the nomination. She encouraged a site visit to explore it and get a feel for it. She said Rich Haag and David Hodemaker were part of the original design team. She said having a use that is more compatible with the design would be a more sensitive project. She said Phase 1 and Phase 2 design is all together, all buildings are significant. She said this site plan is not sensitive approach to landscape. She said this is not the suburbs nor is it the east side. She said what is proposed would have an adverse impact on the campus.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said he has spent many hours at Talaris; he said he was alarmed by the proposed density on the south side, and the suggestion that the Phase 2 buildings can be dismissed. He encouraged a site visit and said to go alone and experience the place.

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club, thanked the board and said three major proposals have been looked at. She said to take the time to visit the site. She said the site is in the heart of their neighborhood and it is important to its look and feel. She said they have a settlement agreement for the property. She said the buildings relate to the site and the history going back to Battelle.

Jim Romano said he is a neighbor. He said the site is an integral part of the neighborhood and to keep the property open and inviting. He said developing private homes in a private neighborhood suggest something other than an open community. He said to integrate it into the bigger neighborhood. He said the openness makes it special. He said he wasn't sure 63 homes can be done.

Marylee McRoberts said it is a magical amazing property. She said she has done events there. She said when McGregor moved onto the property there was a steering committee that was interested in the advance use of the property the way it is now. She said history is important and putting houses and construction there will destroy it.

Leslie McGowan said this proposal will damage the feel of the place. She said they need to think it through, plan, research and work with arbitration and mediators to help community shape the conversation. She said a Buddhist community showed interest. She asked Quadrant what they will do with the existing buildings. She asked if non-profits or research groups have been explored.

Carol Arnold, Friends of Yesler Swamp, said they rescued it and turned it into a community asset. She said Richard Haag was aware of Yesler Creek flow. She said there has always been hope that that part could be daylighted. She said Talaris is a receptacle of Yesler Creek. She said it is a community asset that was used by all before the new owner fenced it and put up 'no trespass' signs.

Leslie McGowan said there are catacombs below the building.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers thanked the presenters for starting the dialog early. He said he read the nomination to gain insight into the significance of the resource. He said a site visit will be helpful. He said we can't immediately write off Phase II buildings and need

informed discussion and report noting the period of significance, character defining features, and where there might be room for alterations. He said introduction of housing seems a way to make it work within reason, to respect the solace of the property. He said we need to retain that and finding balance is key. He said what are the numbers, realistically, and where can we limit and manage change the best we can. He said in a perfect world it would be a park, but we are working with what is in front of us. He wondered what all can gain – opening back up to public, repairing things. He noted concerns about the infill of interior of landscape. He said to keep development to outer perimeter. He was glad they are attempting to retain the circular pattern. He said a holistic approach – not piecemeal – is needed. He said they need a plan for the existing buildings first.

Ms. McKernan said there is potential here but be careful to protect the experiential qualities – meadow, pond, view. She said all units in the inner circle compromise that; you would be looking into backyards / houses. She said to increase side yard setbacks to allow views into the larger site.

Ms. Durham said single family use is not outside the realm of possibility, but she questioned the density and impact to character of the site. She said not to write off Phase 2 buildings. She said to make sure the site – landscape – continues to be accessible. She said you need permission to go there. She said it is an important piece of the community. She noted mini planned development concerns about what happens to semi-public space; when does the HOA put up a gate. She said the plan has potential but to approach it carefully.

Mr. Hodgins said he is encouraged and it seems possible. He said it feels tight and balance is the key. He thanked the presenters for getting ahead of the process. He said keep communication open with all parties.

Ms. Patterson said she read the nomination and has been to the site. She said it seems possible and could be compatible. She said the site was holistically planned; the existing buildings were incorporated into the site and are integral. She said to preserve all historic buildings. She said losing 9 – 11 lots would preserve two buildings. She said she wants to see a virtual reality rendition of the site – what is there now and the impact to the site and scale of changes. She wants to get a sense of what is happening to the site holistically.

Ms. Doherty said she will work with the ownership representatives to arrange a tour. She reminded the Board members that it is private property and to please not go in without an invitation.

011718.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator