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I. Introduction

Beyond Integrity is a coalition of advocates doing research into how equity could be elevated in preservation standards and practices. Since 2016, they have offered the Equity in Preservation Internship. The focus of the research done by the interns of this program varies between years but all work towards the goals of Beyond Integrity.¹ For this year, the work done by the 2022 intern, Danele Alampay, is split into two parts. This first report concerns the research done during the first 5 weeks of her internship, which continues the efforts of the 2016 and the 2017 interns regarding the survey of underrepresented communities (UC) in Seattle and King County landmarks. A separate report was written for the second half of her internship, which concerns the design review process for properties designated for their cultural significance.

The research was conducted with guidance from members of the Beyond Integrity working group: U.W. Associate Professor Manish Chalana; Preservation Coordinator at Ebey’s Landing, Claudia Kiyama; Past Forward NW Principal, Holly Taylor; and Dana Phelan and Emily Lawsin from 4Culture.

2016 Internship (Jialing Liu)
The first internship gathered data on designated King County (KC) and Seattle landmarks using nomination forms, designation reports, inventory sheets, staff reports, and designation ordinances. This was done to determine the number and types of properties associated with an underrepresented community (UC), the level of association of the history and significance of the site to a UC, and their distribution in the region. Ms. Liu generated 2 spreadsheets (one for KC and another for Seattle), and 15 maps (1 index, 14 sub-maps) locating these landmarks and displaying the level of association for the properties.

Her work established a rating system for the level of association (LOA) of a site, which is based on the assessment of the researcher.² Properties are given a rating of 0 to 3:

Level 0: There is no mention of association with underrepresented communities. Notes: Association with early European settlers is also marked as level 0, but the association is recorded in notes. Specifically for Seattle landmark list, the association with low-income people, veterans, and homeless people is also marked as Level 0 and recorded in notes.

Level 1: An association with underrepresented communities is mentioned in nomination or designation materials, but this is not indicated as part of the historic significance of the landmark.

Level 2: An association with underrepresented communities is indicated as contributing to historic significance and there is adequate description of this association.

Level 3: An association with underrepresented communities is a critical part of the significance or there is rich and detailed description about the association.

¹ More information on Beyond Integrity and their work can be found in https://www.4culture.org/beyond-integrity/.
² Liu, 2016 Report, 10-11.
Except for the early European settlers, which was noted for comparison, the following are the underrepresented groups that were noted in the research:\(^3\):

- **Communities of Color**: African Am, Asian Am/country, Native Am, Latin Am/country
- **Women**: women/group, women/individual
- **LGBTQ**
- **Labor History/Working Class**: labor/aspect of labor history
- **Early European Settlers**: European immigrants/country
- **Others**: homeless, low income, veteran

The initial lists of local landmarks were obtained in early July 2016. The KC list included landmarks designated before 2015 and one in 2015. In the Excel file for this study, there were 139 landmarks for KC. The most recent entry (designated in 2015) is the Northern Pacific Railway Locomotive 924.

For Seattle’s list, there are 359 entries, which included sites designated before 2015, and 5 in 2015. The most recent entries are the Magnolia School, Daniel Bagley Elementary School, Daniel Webster Elementary School, E.C. Hughes School, and the White Motor Company Building. 12 of the Seattle entries are group designations, so originally there were 412 individually designated Seattle landmarks. The 8 historic districts in Seattle were not included.

Ms. Liu found that 70 out of 139 KC landmarks and 90 out of 359 Seattle landmarks had a UC association with varying LOA. According to her findings, “documentation of landmarked properties’ association with [UC] is often inadequate or even missing.” UC association may be underestimated because:

- A landmark was not found primarily significant for association with a UC, or the narrative of the landmark’s history mentions an association but does not consider it as part of the site’s significance. Liu found 50 KC landmarks and 62 Seattle landmarks that fit this description.
- The documentation of a UC association is brief and not concrete in the nomination, though the association may be significant.
- There is a UC association, but a landmark is only designated for its architectural significance. Liu found 10 KC landmarks and 11 Seattle landmarks that fit this description.

The analysis also found that Native American and Latin American communities are the least represented by the landmark designations.

\(^3\) Ibid., 11.
2017 Internship (Kirsten Freeman)

There were three parts to the project for this year. The first part, which relates to the work done for the 2022 internship, is a continuation of the 2016 research, focusing on gathering data and evaluating the LOA for the 101 Seattle properties that did not reach designation and 9 KC properties that were not nominated but identified as potential landmarks by the historic preservation office.\(^4\) This set of properties ranged from the years of 2008 to 2016.\(^5\)

Ms. Freeman found that “LGBTQ, Native American and Latin American communities are largely absent when looking for the UC association for a property.” Freeman notes that it is unclear if this is due to associations not being presented in the nomination, or properties with this association are not being nominated.\(^6\) Women’s representation also seems “to be scarce in nominations and if they are mentioned as part of the significance, it is very brief.”\(^7\)

Ms. Freeman compared designated properties in 2008-2015 with those that failed designation those years and found that while 36% of designated had an association with UC (LOA of L1-L3), 54% of the non-designated properties fell under this category.\(^8\) Of the properties that had failed designation, 51% had been demolished by the time the report was written.\(^9\)

2022 Research Goals & Scope

The first half of the internship continued work done in 2016 and 2017, looking at how underrepresented communities are accounted for in the significance of landmarks nominated and designated in Seattle and King County. This study focused on relevant properties that underwent the process of landmarking from 2015 to 2022, which also considers those that had failed nomination or designation in Seattle. The goals of this project are (1) to determine which Seattle and King County landmarks are associated with one or more UCs, (2) to assess the Level of Association (LOA) for the UC in the nomination application or designation report, and (3) to organize the data to be ready for mapping.

---

\(^5\) Ibid., 3.
\(^6\) Ibid., 36.
\(^7\) Ibid.
\(^8\) Ibid., 10.
\(^9\) Ibid., 11.
II. Methodology

Data Collection

The Level of Association is determined by the researcher’s assessment of either the nomination form or designation report for Seattle properties, or Findings of Facts and Decision for KC landmarks. The list of properties that had undergone the process of nomination and designation in Seattle between 2014 and 2022 was provided by Melinda Bloom, the Administrative Specialist at the City’s Historic Preservation office. The most recent entry in this list is 1264 Eastlake, which was designated on June 15, 2022. The list of KC landmarks was based on King County’s Technical Paper No. 6, “King County and City Landmarks List” (Appendix A).

Reports on Designation for Seattle properties were obtained online from the Seattle Department of Neighborhood’s website. Nomination forms for non-designated Seattle properties were accessed through links in the agendas for the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board Meetings. Ms. Bloom was able to provide files when the links online were not connecting to the appropriate document. Sarah Steen, the Landmarks Coordinator for KC, shared nomination forms and Findings of Fact for KC landmarks from 2016 to 2021.

All the KC landmarks designated in 2015 were accounted for by the 2016 intern, so this research started with properties designated in 2016. The Lunar Roving Vehicles, designated in 2019, were not included since they are still in space. There were three properties listed as community landmarks in the Technical Paper but were missing from the 2016 list: Norman Edson Studio (designated in 1985), Fall City Historic Residential District (designated 2002), and Lodge Hall (designated in 2010). Because these were before the focus period for this year’s research, they were not reviewed. Future interns who might work on the compilation and cleaning of the data from 2016, 2017, and this year, 2022, should include these properties in the spreadsheet.

During the time the intern was conducting the research, King County designated the Seattle-Tacoma Pet Cemetery and Camp Kilworth as landmarks. Though these properties were not included in the spreadsheet, they mark the beginning of the next set of reviews to be done for the county.

The starting entry for the Seattle list in this study is based on where the 2016 study had terminated. According to the Excel sheet developed by the 2016 intern, the latest entries for the Seattle list were designated in 2015: Magnolia School, Daniel Bagley Elementary School, Daniel Webster Elementary School, E.C. Hughes School, and White Motor Company Building. Also in the 2016 report are Kelly Springfield Building & Loyal Heights, which were also designated in 2015, are listed in the 2016 spreadsheet, but were missing the designation date.

Excel File Structure

Similar to what was done in 2016, two spreadsheets were created: one for Seattle landmarks and another for King County landmarks. These were used for analysis and generating graphs and charts that examine UC representation in the sites. The format followed closely what was done by previous interns to make the merging of data easier in the future. The information in these spreadsheets was also used for mapping, as will be discussed later in this report. Tables 1 and 2 list the information input into the Excel files and their sources.
### Table 1. Title Headings, Description, and Source of information for King County properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESYEAR</td>
<td>Year designated</td>
<td>King County Landmarks List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTRYNO</td>
<td>Entry number for the year nominated, used for primary key</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMKEY</td>
<td>Primary key by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>Street address</td>
<td>King County Landmarks List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIPCODE</td>
<td>Zip code</td>
<td>King County Parcel Viewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>King County Landmarks List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCELNO</td>
<td>Parcel number</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Name of property/resource</td>
<td>King County Landmarks List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNMKTYPE</td>
<td>Landmark type</td>
<td>King County Landmarks List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRBUILT</td>
<td>Year built</td>
<td>King County Landmarks List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA</td>
<td>Level of Association, determined by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCASSOC</td>
<td>Underrepresented Community Association</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision; nomination application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMNOTES</td>
<td>Nomination notes by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>Features of the landmark to be preserved</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>Comments by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITA1</td>
<td>Criterion A1. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITA2</td>
<td>Criterion A2. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITA3</td>
<td>Criterion A3. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITA4</td>
<td>Criterion A4. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITA5</td>
<td>Criterion A5. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Title Headers, Description, and Source of information for Seattle properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMYEAR</td>
<td>Year nominated</td>
<td>Excel file provided by City of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTRYNO</td>
<td>Entry number for the year nominated, used for primary key</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMKEY</td>
<td>Primary key by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>Street address</td>
<td>designation report; nomination application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIPCODE</td>
<td>Zip code</td>
<td>online address search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCELNO</td>
<td>Parcel number</td>
<td>nomination application; King County Parcel Viewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Name of property/resource</td>
<td>designation report; nomination application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRBUILT</td>
<td>Year built</td>
<td>designation report; nomination application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMPASS</td>
<td>Nomination was passed</td>
<td>Excel file provided by City of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESYEAR</td>
<td>Year of designation. &quot;NA&quot; if nomination/designation failed.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA</td>
<td>Level of Association, determined by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCASSOC</td>
<td>Underrepresented Community Association</td>
<td>designation report; nomination application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMNOTES</td>
<td>Nomination notes by researcher</td>
<td>designation report; nomination application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>Features of the landmark to be preserved</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>Comments by researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITA</td>
<td>Criterion A. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITB</td>
<td>Criterion B. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITC</td>
<td>Criterion C. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITD</td>
<td>Criterion D. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITE</td>
<td>Criterion E. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITF</td>
<td>Criterion F. &quot;1&quot; for applicable, &quot;0&quot; for not.</td>
<td>designation report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some cases where two addresses are listed in the report or application. For mapping purposes, only one is put into the ADDRESS cell, and the other is noted in the COMMENTS cell.

Because of the growing lengths of the context statements in the more recent nominations, the definition for Level 1 was elaborated further to mention the need for bridging mentions in the UC in the context to the significance of the site. The new descriptions for the LOA are found in Table 3.
Table 3. Level of Association Grading (2022 version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOA</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No UC association mentioned. Includes association with early European immigrants and other. Land acknowledgement in the context falls under this rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UC association is mentioned, but not significant to the narrative/history in nomination. UC association is only mentioned in the context. More work is needed to tie the group’s influence to the significance of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UC association is part of the significance and there is adequate description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UC association is a critical part of the significance, or there is a rich and detailed description.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underrepresented Communities
The list below are the UC groups considered by this study. The words in the square brackets are the shortcuts used in the spreadsheet.

- Women [women]
- LGBTQ [LGBTQ]
- Working class or labor groups [labor]
- Asian Americans [AsianAm]
- Pacific Islanders [PacIsland]
- African Americans [AfricanAm]
- Latin Americans [LatAm]
- Native Americans [NatAm]
- European immigrants (not including early European settlers) [Euroimmi]
- Other (low income, homeless, veterans, disability) [other]

If it was noted in the document, the specific country associated with a group is attached to the UC group in the spreadsheet. For example, if Chinese Americans were mentioned in the significance of a property, it would be noted as “AsianAm/China.”

Disability was added to the list. Though only the Shoreline Naval Hospital Chapel was found to have this UC association in the sites reviewed, it would be good to include this group moving forward with this research for representation as other properties come to be nominated and designated in the future.
Determination of Designation Criteria

For the Seattle sites, this information is noted only for those that were successfully designated as city landmarks. The criteria for designation are listed in the Seattle Municipal Code, Section 25.12.350, “Standards for designation”:

A. It is the location of, or is associated in a significant way with, an historic event with a significant effect upon the community, City, state, or nation; or

B. It is associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the City, state, or nation; or

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; or

D. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or of a method of construction; or

E. It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder; or

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.

For KC properties, the King County Code, Section 20.62.040 lists the designation criteria for landmarking:

A. An historic resource may be designated as a King County landmark if it is more than forty years old or, in the case of a landmark district, contains resources that are more than forty years old, and possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association, or any combination of the foregoing aspects of integrity, sufficient to convey its historic character, and:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state or local history;

2. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in national, state or local history;

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, style or method of design or construction, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history; or

5. Is an outstanding work of a designer or builder who has made a substantial contribution to the art.

Also noted in a couple of landmarks (ex: Buchanan House and Boeing Building 105) is Consideration C3, which is:

A. Cemeteries, birthplaces or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature and properties that have achieved significance within the past forty years shall not be considered eligible for designation. However, such a property shall be eligible for designation if they are:
3. A building or structure removed from its original location but that is significant primarily for its architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event

Mapping
Two CSV files were created from the master Excel file: one for Seattle properties named “SEA Sites” and one for KC properties named “KC Sites.” These files separate the datasheets in the master file into their own individual files. These were then uploaded into Google Earth Pro, which then put pins for the site locations based on the street addresses and ZIP codes (and cities for the KC properties) listed in the CSV file (Figures 1 and 2). In the Data Import Wizard in Google Earth, it provides space for the user to input the city (“Seattle” for Seattle properties) and state (“Washington”) as well. Importing to Google Earth has an added benefit of showing the information tied to particular property when the pin icon is clicked on (Figure 3).

From Google Earth, the points for Seattle landmarks and King County landmarks were exported as 2 separate KML files. These, along with the shapefiles for Seattle neighborhoods and KC cities and unincorporated lands, were imported in the program QGIS to generate a map that could analyze and visualize the information. The shapefile for the Seattle neighborhoods was acquired from Seattle GeoData, and the King County cities and unincorporated land shapefile was from King County GIS Open Data.
Figure 1. King County properties from 2022 research as points in Google Earth Pro.
Figure 2. Seattle properties from 2022 research as points in Google Earth Pro.

Figure 3. Information on the property is revealed in Google Earth Pro when a pin is selected.
III. Data

For this year’s research, 121 Seattle properties were reviewed. Of these, 95 achieved nomination and 71 received the full designation. Nomination applications or designation reports could not be located for two properties: Row House Café and Northgate Elementary. These were excluded from this year’s research. The last Seattle property reviewed for this research is the Steinhart Theriault & Anderson Office Building.

For King County, 20 properties were reviewed; 5 are county landmarks, while the other 15 are city landmarks. No KC community landmarks were designated in the focus period.

Designated Landmarks with UC Association

In the landmarks reviewed, which span from the middle of 2015 to the middle of 2022, 19 out of 20 KC landmarks, and 104 out of 121 Seattle landmarks were found to possess an association with underrepresented communities. The complete spreadsheets are included as Appendix B and C.

Figures 4 and 5 chart the counts and percentages of the total of the KC and Seattle landmarks. In these pie charts, the label notes the LOA first and the count second. Figures 6 and 7 show the tallies for properties per year. For example, in Figure 4, of the properties reviewed for King County, there are 2 properties with an LOA of 0 (LOA = 0, N = 2 or 10% of total). These graphs also determine the count for each LOA according to the year.
Figure 4.

Figure 5.
King County Landmarks by year designated

![Graph showing King County Landmarks by year designated with years 2016 to 2022 and totals according to LOA.](image)

*Figure 6.*

Seattle Sites, Designated and Non-designated, by year nominated

![Graph showing Seattle Sites, Designated and Non-designated by year nominated with years 2015 to 2022 and totals according to LOA.](image)

*Figure 7.*
IV. Analysis & Findings

Table 4. UC groups in KC landmarks according to LOA (2015-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOA</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>LGBTQ</th>
<th>labor</th>
<th>AsianAm</th>
<th>PacIsland</th>
<th>AfricanAm</th>
<th>LatAm</th>
<th>NatAm</th>
<th>Euroimmi</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Bar graph of the information in Table 4.
Figure 9. Bar graph of the information in Table 5.

Table 5. UC groups in Seattle sites according to LOA (2015-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOA</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>LGBTQ</th>
<th>labor</th>
<th>AsianAm</th>
<th>PacIsland</th>
<th>AfricanAm</th>
<th>LatAm</th>
<th>NatAm</th>
<th>Euroimmi</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Seattle sites with an Asian American association, there were 22 with mention of Japanese heritage, 14 with Chinese heritage, 12 with Philippine heritage, 3 with Vietnamese heritage, and 3 with Southeast Asian heritage. For KC landmarks with Asian American association, 1 had connection with Japanese heritage, and 3 with Chinese heritage.

The data in Tables 4 and 5 show that women have the highest number of sites associated with them: 14 in KC and 86 in Seattle. A significant number of these properties do have an LOA of 1 (7 in KC and 35 in Seattle), which means that women are mentioned briefly, and more work needs to be done to highlight their significance to the site. The UC groups with the lowest counts in Seattle are Pacific
Islander (4), Native American (6), LGBTQ (7), and Latin American (8). For KC, the UC groups with the lowest counts are LGBTQ (0), Pacific Islander (0), Latin American (0), African American (1), Native American (1) and other (1). These numbers are for the sites reviewed for this year’s research. For a more comprehensive understanding of the tallies for each group currently, the 2022 data must be compiled with those of 2016 and 2017.

In reviewing the documents, there are some sites that have multiple UC associations. One example of this is Inouye-Aquino House, which was nominated in 2019, but failed designation. The Nomination Form for this property is included in Appendix E. The name of the site is in honor of two families who had resided there in its history. The Inouye family, who had family members significant to the Japanese American community, resided in the house after 1918. Later in 1955-1979, the house was owned by George and Ella Aquino. Ella was an important Native American activist and political organizer in Seattle. Aside from this, the nomination also discusses the Nihonmachi commercial district, where the site is located. It mentions not only the minority groups that have lived in the area, but also its history with the Jackson Street Jazz Scene, which is important to the city’s African American history.

This example presents a couple of challenges. The first is how to note intersectionality of cultures in a site in this survey. The other is that the context of the neighborhood includes information on other underrepresented communities but is not highlighted in the significance of the focus property. Dr. Manish Chalana, Associate Professor of Urban Design and Planning, and Director of the Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation at the University of Washington, suggested creating generic phrases that could be put in the COMMENTS column to make searching and tabulating these properties easier: for example, typing “intersectionality” for cases of intersectionality, and typing “Member(s) of the UC group is only mentioned in the context” and then noting the groups affected for groups not included in the significance. Though this has been applied to some properties reviewed for this research, it has not been done to all possible properties.

The second issue explains in part the observed increase of page lengths of nominations over the years reviewed. Nominations that provide plenty of information in the context statement could include the neighborhood’s demographics or histories of other UCs that may not directly relate to the significance of the site. This affects the findings on the number of properties with an LOA of 1, which is the highest portion of both KC and Seattle sites reviewed between 2015-2022 (45% and 39%). Based on the LOA rating system, a mention of a UC in the nomination or designation report would be given a grading of 1. For some properties, the UC is only mentioned in the context statement, and not in the significance of the site. Placing a generic phrase in the COMMENTS column allows for recognition of this element.

Another possible course of action for a future internship is to update the LOA rating system, such as changing the range to 0 to 4. This would also require revisiting the nominations or designation reports for properties with an LOA of 1 to note these cases and adjusting the LOA data from 2016 and 2017 as necessary.

It may be more appropriate to make a distinction then, at least for the sites reviewed for this year, that UC associated sites are those with an LOA of 2 or 3, which would be 45% (9 out of 20) for King County and 47% (57 out of 121) for Seattle.
King County and Seattle Landmarks Maps

Figures 10, 11, and 12 are maps created through QGIS. Larger images of these maps are included in Appendix C.

Inclusion of more KC sites through the compilation of data with those of 2016 and 2017 would add more information to the KC map (Figure 10) to allow a better interpretation of it.

For the Seattle landmarks, most of the designated and non-designated sites tend to be clustered around the downtown area (Figure 11). The neighborhoods with the highest number of properties that underwent nomination or designation are Downtown (21), Cascade (12), and Capitol Hill (19).

By marking designated sites in grey as shown in Figure 12, the map reveals the locations and LOA grade for landmarks that failed designation. This map helps determine potential sites with a higher LOA of 2 or 3. Figure 12 shows that in neighborhoods further from the center, there are some sites with a higher LOA, particularly to the southeast of the central area.

Figure 10. King County Landmarks map generated using QGIS. The colors of the points are based on the site's LOA.
Figure 11. Map of Seattle designated and non-designated landmarks generated through QGIS. The colors of the points are determined by the site’s LOA.
Figure 12. Map of Seattle landmarks with designated landmarks in grey. Map created through QGIS.
V. Conclusion

The findings of this work show that much progress has been made in recent years regarding the context statements in nominations for both King County and Seattle. This shows that applicants are showing consideration for histories and communities outside of the site, which could affect the site as well. However, more work needs to be done to bridge Underrepresented Communities (UC) groups mentioned in context to the significance of the site. This could be addressed by writers of nominations in making that extra step to write the UC group’s influence into the significance. Future work on the data of this research could also be refined further to allow for nuance in the grading system or in identifying cases where UC groups are only mentioned in the context.

Based on the data, King County and Seattle historic preservation offices could help aid the nomination of landmarks associated with UC groups with lower counts such as Pacific Islander, Native American, LGBTQ, and Latin American sites. The maps showing the landmarks could also help the offices determine areas where more landmarks could be identified and designated.

Recommendations for refining future surveys
1. In the COMMENTS column, include generic statements to make common characteristics searchable.
   a. For example, one could put in the phrase “UC in context but not in site significance” for some properties with an LOA of 1 having that description.
   b. Another generic phrase that can be used is “Intersectionality” for sites with multiple UC groups associated with the significance.
2. Clean and compile the data from 2016 and 2017 with the data for this year.
   a. This would be especially helpful for mapping, where the inclusion of the past internships’ data would help reveal more information in their analysis.
   b. Locate documents for sites missing information.
3. Determine sites with a UC association that are designated for their architectural significance in the 2022 data.

Recommendations for further study
1. Survey properties to see if they have been demolished, especially for those that were not able to achieve designation.
2. Research methods of showcasing intersectionality in the histories of different UC for a property.
3. Analyze the meeting minutes of landmarks board/commission meetings to review arguments made for or against nomination/designation.
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As more cities or counties seek more diversity in the stories told through their local landmarks, many historic preservation offices are now relying on other lenses from which to view potential landmarks, such as cultural significance. Beginning to accept sites that meet this criterion into local registers requires reevaluating the process by which they are regulated by historic preservation staff and commissioners or board members, which is typically through the regulatory process of design review.

The goal for this research is to learn about the experiences different local historic preservation offices have had concerning the design review for sites designated for their cultural significance. Since this issue is very recent, and many of these landmarks have not had to undergo a design review at this time, the work also considers difficulties or challenges offices anticipate if these properties do go before the board or commission. Research was conducted through reviewing designation reports, design guidelines, and board meeting minutes and interviewing staff from local historic preservation offices. Cities/counties that participated in this study were Seattle, King County, Spokane, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, and Miami-Dade County.

Discussion on this topic was organized around 4 themes: Community Input, Integrity, Period of Significance, and Continuing Use. Each theme has 2-3 examples that share a brief summary of its significance and how the city or county historic preservation office had approached the site, either in its designation, management, or in the questions and challenges they are facing related to the cultural significance of the place. The case studies are the Five Point Historic Cultural District, the San Francisco Eagle Bar, Liberty City Elks Lodge, Turner Hall, Sister Mary Corita Studio, La Alma Lincoln Park Historic Cultural District, Tokio Florist, Seattle Japanese Language School, and the Kenmore Community Club.

Conclusion

There are many challenges to managing landmarks, especially those designated for their cultural significance. This type of landmark is complex and requires a deep understanding of its significance, both historic and current. It is difficult to pinpoint character-defining features and use often plays a bigger role in telling the story of the place and community who uses it. The design review process can allow for flexibility for these properties if discussion is guided by an understanding of the significance of the site and how it manifests that significance, either through elements of the building or in the function of the spaces. It is difficult for the process as it is now to target intangible aspects of the landmark, but it should be considered nonetheless in the discussion of alterations.

For each of the sites, finding a specific treatment that addresses its history and concerns of the owners or community was important to the challenges that they face. Providing customized design guidelines or allowing for flexibility through the parts designated and the parts purposefully excluded are some ways that cultural significance can be accounted for during design reviews. More research into this topic would greatly benefit local offices, especially as they begin to create standards that fit their
and the communities’ goals. There is also a need for more surveys that focus on culture to help discern attributes that can be tied to the significance of a place that extend beyond architecture. This is especially important as these sites are more tied to intangible heritage and there is a possibility of fewer physical character-defining features.

**Recommendations for the design review of culturally significant landmarks**

The following are recommendations for approaching design review for culturally significant sites based on the findings of the researcher. The subpoints are examples of how the main numbered point could be implemented.

1. Creatively apply the ordinances.
   a. Refocus integrity around feeling and association (and setting and location if applicable) as aspects of integrity.
   b. Allow the period of significance to extend to the present to show continuing importance to the community.
2. Create new processes appropriate for these sites.
   a. Add a new criterion in the designation ordinance.
   b. Make a new management agreement for these sites. For example, only require design review for demolitions or new construction on the property.
3. Allow for flexibility in the review.
   a. Adjust the period of significance to account for changes made over time.
   b. Be intentional with the character-defining features to allow for changes planned by the owner/community.
4. Work with the associated community to determine character-defining features, and appropriate controls and guidelines.
   a. Listen for when community members seek flexibility or rigidity in the management or design guidelines.
5. Continue education for staff, board, and the community.
   a. Provide training on the design guidelines or the history and significance of the sites, especially before a board/commission meeting concerning a related property.
   b. Provide information to the affected communities or owners.

**Recommendations for further study**

1. Interview local non-profit historic preservation organizations.
2. Reach out to and interview other city or county historic preservation offices. If possible, contacting tribal historic preservation officers may also be an avenue to explore.
3. Follow up on cities interviewed and discuss changes or progress in their work.
4. Research international case studies that are relevant to the subject (ex: The Burra Charter; The Nara Document).
5. If available, read and analyze minutes for design reviews for culturally significant sites.
6. Research other forms of managing culturally significant sites outside of design reviews (ex: cultural districts, economic support).
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I. Introduction

Beyond Integrity is a coalition of advocates doing research into how equity could be elevated in preservation standards and practices. Since 2016, they have offered the Equity in Preservation Internship. The focus of the research done by the interns vary between years but all work towards the goals of Beyond Integrity. For this year, the work done by the 2022 intern, Danele Alampay, is split into two parts. The first report concerns the research done during the first 5 weeks of her internship, which continues the efforts of the 2016 and the 2017 interns regarding the survey of underrepresented communities in Seattle and King County (KC) landmarks. A separate report was written for the findings of that effort.

This second report looks at the research done during the second half of her internship, which concerns the design review process for sites locally designated for their cultural significance.

The research was conducted with guidance from members of the Beyond Integrity working group: U.W. Associate Professor Manish Chalana; Preservation Coordinator at Ebey’s Landing, Claudia Kiyama; Past Forward NW Principal, Holly Taylor; and Dana Phelan and Emily Lawsin from 4Culture.

Local Landmarks Designation

To better understand the regulatory process of design reviews for landmarks, it is important to review the criteria for their eligibility for listing in local registers as this informs what aspects are reviewed and regulated by local landmarks boards or commissions. The requirements for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NR or National Register) serve as the basis for many local ordinances regarding landmark designation. The first requirement is that the district, site, building, structure, or object is significant for at least one of the following four criteria:

A. [They] are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. [They] are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. [They] embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. [They] have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In Seattle, this list is expanded to six criteria:

A. It is the location of, or is associated in a significant way with, an historic event with a significant effect upon the community, City, state, or nation; or

B. It is associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the City, state, or nation; or

---

1 More information on Beyond Integrity and their work can be found in https://www.4culture.org/beyond-integrity/.

2 NPS, How to Apply the National Register, 2.
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; or

D. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or of a method of construction; or

E. It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder; or

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.³

Comparing Seattle’s list with NR’s, Seattle Criteria A and C relate to NR Criteria A, which focuses on events and trends in history. Criterion B, which is for significant persons, is similar for both. Seattle Criteria D, E, and F relate to the NR Criteria C, which focuses on the architecture or designer/architect. NR Criteria D, which relates more to archeological significance, is not found on Seattle’s list.

The list below are the criteria listed in the King County Code, Section 20.62.040, “Designation criteria”:

A1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state or local history;

A2. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in national, state or local history;

A3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, style or method of design or construction, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

A4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history; or

A5. Is an outstanding work of a designer or builder who has made a substantial contribution to the art.

KC Criteria A1 matches that of the NR Criteria A, Criteria A2 with Criteria B, and Criteria A4 to D. The NR Criteria C has been expanded in the King County Code to 2 criteria, A3 and A5.

A useful visual representation of how this language is translated in the local ordinances of other U.S. cities can be seen in a table on pages 3-4 of the City of Austin’s Brief #5 For Preservation Plan Working Group on Tangible Heritage (see Appendix A). This table also relates the criteria of other cities to that of the National Register.

The other requirement for inclusion in the National Register is integrity. According to the National Register Bulletin #15, “Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance.”⁴ In other words, integrity is a property’s ability to convey its significance. There are seven aspects of integrity by which a property can be evaluated: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Though often conflated, integrity is not the same as condition. Both Seattle’s and King County’s designation ordinance require integrity. In the Findings of Facts and Decision for King County landmarks, the report notes the aspects of integrity applicable to a site and how it fulfills those aspects.

⁴ NPS, National Register Criteria for Evaluation, 44.
Not all cities have integrity as a requirement for inclusion in their local register, one example of which is the City of Los Angeles. However, the subject is brought up often during discussions as it has been a standard for assessing landmarks on a national level. Integrity in landmarks will be elaborated further in detail by case studies in this report.

When a district or building is approved for designation, the local historic preservation office notes in their report the character-defining features (also known as contributing features), which should be preserved by the owner. These building or site elements are related to the significance attributed to the property. For Seattle Designation Reports and in KC Findings of Facts, they are noted at the end of the document. In addition to character-defining features, historic districts also identify structures that are determined to be important to the significance of the neighborhood, or best convey the history of the area. These are listed as contributing buildings or structures.

The requirements of designation and the defining of contributing features favor landmarks with a high level of physical integrity where significance can be attributed to specific elements of the building, or buildings of high-style architecture where precedents have been well-documented. These practices also hinder the nomination of properties that are more vernacular in style or have been altered significantly over their histories.

Design Review Process (Simplified)
The following steps are a simplified version of the design review process for the approval for changes to a locally designated site, using Seattle as a model (see Appendix B). There are nuances between local ordinances, but they generally follow the same process:

1. The owner of a landmark or a contributing property in a historic district wants to make a change or alteration that would affect a character-defining feature.
2. In addition to applicable permits, the owner applies for a Certificate of Approval at the local historic preservation office. Certificates of Approval can be known under other names like Certificates of Appropriateness in other municipalities.
3. The Historic Preservation staff reviews the application for completeness.
4. Design Review: When completed, the application goes to a Board/Commission Review. Decisions are made based on District/Landmark regulations, designation reports, guidelines, the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and other related materials. Time is allotted for public comment.
5. The Board/Commission votes on whether changes are approved. The Certificate of Approval is issued if the changes are accepted.

Depending on the local office, some changes may not need to undergo a review by the board or commission and can be reviewed by the staff, like in Miami-Dade County.

---

5 Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, “Monument Designation Criteria.”
**Challenges for Culturally Significant Sites**

Sites designated for their cultural significance tend to rely more on feeling and association as aspects of integrity. Location and setting can also aid these landmarks. These aspects rely less on the physical elements of the building, which can make management of these properties by local historic preservation offices difficult as they often focus on the tangible parts of the building in the process of designation and design review. As will be seen in some of the sites discussed later in this paper, character-defining features for some culturally significant places may be difficult to define. This concern was brought up during interviews with the preservation offices.

Use plays an important role for these properties, and over the history of a culturally significant place, its physical parts may have been altered to accommodate evolving needs of the owners and users of the space. Another factor with the alterations is the types of materials used in their construction and/or repair. For some buildings, the owners may have used materials that were affordable or readily accessible to them rather than those of higher quality or known to last longer. Repairs done over time may have favored utilitarian goals rather than aesthetics or compatibility with the original style and materials. These alterations can be considered as a weakening of its physical integrity if what was determined to be important according to the designation report was the original materials or craftsmanship.

Many of these buildings also tend to be modest and vernacular structures. Though the architecture of these sites may be significant as well, it is not the main reason for their designation.

Because the nomination and designation process tend to favor architecturally intact properties, historic preservation has historically focused much of its efforts into protecting physical parts attributed to style and original structure rather than the stories told through use and alterations. Having many precedents to draw from in discussions also lends more ease to decisions made by the board. Culturally significant sites, on the other hand, tend to be treated case-by-case because of their newness and the varying perspectives of owners and community members as to what they consider to be important for the site.

**Research Goals**

As more cities or counties look to increase the diversity in the stories told through their local landmarks, many historic preservation offices are now relying on other lenses from which to view potential landmarks, such as cultural significance. Beginning to accept sites for this criterion into the local register requires reevaluating the process by which they are regulated by the historic preservation office, which is typically through the regulatory process of design review.

The goal for this research to learn about the experiences different local historic preservation offices have had concerning the design review for sites designated for their cultural significance. Since this issue is very recent, and many of these landmarks have not had to undergo a design review at this time, the work also considers difficulties or challenges offices anticipate if these properties do go before the board or commission.
II. Methodology

Background Materials

Information for this research came from a variety sources. During the first week of the internship, Emily Lawsin, Preservation Support Specialist at 4Culture, shared with the researcher a few webinars related to the subject of culturally significant sites to help with learning more of what work is being done by other professionals in the field. Among them was a recording of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) Conference 2022 webinar on Preservation Justice. Two of the people interviewed for this research were speakers at this event: Alex Westhoff and Adrienne Burke.

To better understand the differences among city and county historic preservation offices interviewed, preliminary research included review of municipal codes concerning landmarking, applications for certificates of approval or appropriateness, and reviews of alterations to designated properties. Pages of the policy review are included in Appendix C.

For case studies discussed in this paper, documents related to the landmarks were also examined, such as designation reports, design guidelines, and board meeting minutes.

Interviewing City and County Offices

The cities and counties chosen for interview were selected with guidance from Holly Taylor, Principal of Past Forward NW Cultural Services and Affiliate Instructor at the University of Washington College of Built Environments, and the rest of the Beyond Integrity team. These were based on municipalities that they have heard through conversation and at conferences to be doing work related to culturally significant sites. The people listed below are the city and county historic preservation staff members interviewed:

- Seattle, WA: Erin Doherty (Landmarks Coordinator)
- King County, WA: Sarah Steen (Landmarks Coordinator)
- Spokane, WA: Megan Duvall (Historic Preservation Officer)
- San Francisco, CA: Alex Westhoff (Senior Planner)
- Los Angeles, CA: Lambert Giessinger (Historic Preservation Architect) and Melissa Jones (City Planning Associate)
- Denver, CO: Kara Hahn (Principal City Planner) and Brittany Bryant (Senior City Planner)
- Miami-Dade County, FL: Adrienne Burke (Principal Planner)

During the interviews, the questions below were posed to representatives of the local historic preservation office:

1. Have you/your office conducted design reviews for designated sites of cultural significance? [Please give examples and details if any.] Does your approach to managing changes for these resources differ from architecturally significant properties?
2. How are character-defining features for culturally significant properties identified?
3. What are the issues you anticipate if they come up during design reviews?
4. How have you approached training or orientation around this issue for volunteer commissioners or professional colleagues?
5. Aside from criteria on your local designation, do you have other documents that have implications on decision made at the design review (ex: context statements, assessments of integrity)?

6. What topics related to preservation have not been covered by the previous questions that you feel should be discussed?

When they were requested, the questions were sent ahead of time to help interviewees prepare their answers or look for examples on which to elaborate. All but one of the interviews was recorded for reference for the researcher’s notes.

A few non-profits involved in their local historic preservation programs were also contacted for their perspectives on the matter from outside of the city offices. Of these, only Eugenia Woo of Historic Seattle was able to schedule an interview. For future research into this subject, a renewed effort to contact these offices should be considered. The questions posed were adjusted for the non-profit interviewee:

1. Have you/your office participated or attended design reviews for designated sites of cultural significance? [Please give examples and details if any.] Does your city’s approach to managing changes for these resources differ from architecturally significant properties?

2. How are character-defining features for culturally significant properties identified?

3. What are the issues you anticipate if they come up during design reviews?

4. Aside from criteria on your local designation, do you know of other documents or factors that have implications on decision made at the design review (ex: context statements, assessments of integrity)?

5. If it was possible, what changes to design reviews for culturally significant sites would you make? Why?

6. What topics related to preservation have not been covered by the previous questions that you feel should be discussed?
III. Main Themes/Case Studies

Because of the great number of overlaps in the information from the research and the interviews, the discussion on the subject of this research is organized around four themes: Community Input, Integrity, Period of Significance, and Continuing Use. Each theme has two to three examples that share a brief summary of its significance and how the city or county historic preservation office had approached the site, either in its designation, management, or in the questions and challenges they are facing related to the cultural significance of the place.

A. Community Input

Five Points Historic Cultural District, Denver, CO

![Image of Five Points Historic Cultural District](source: Confluence Denver, link)

The Five Points Historic Cultural District, or Five Points, was designated for its significance to African American history and culture in Denver. Following the Civil War, Denver was one of the cities that attracted African Americans moving west seeking opportunity, especially with the arrival of the railroad to the city in 1870. The majority of the city’s Black population resided in the area immediately around the Five Points Intersection. By the 1920s, the area gained the name the “Harlem of the West” when it became the center of African American activity. People came to see a movie at the Roxy Theatre or listen to jazz music at a number of bars and jazz clubs, while patronizing other local businesses along Welton Street. The neighborhood was also affected by segregation and overcrowding in its history.
Decline in the neighborhood came in the 1960s when “local housing desegregation coupled with watershed national civil rights legislation [...] brought greater opportunities for Denver’s African American community” and many moved to other neighborhoods within the city.\(^7\) It is the only district not designated for its architecture, but rather for its history and geographical significance.

The district was first designated in 2002 under the name Welton Street Commercial Corridor Cultural District, after one of its streets. Its original period of significance was from 1920 to 1950, and the city recognized seven contributing properties. The Denver City Council amended the designating ordinance in 2015, changing the name to Five Points Historic Cultural District, at the request of the people in the district to better reflect the history of the African American community. The name is drawn from “its prominent location in Denver where the Denver Grid, which follows the South Platte River, meets the North/South Grid. This convergence of grids creates the Five Points Intersection.” With the ordinance amendment, two new buildings were added to the contributing structures list, bringing the total to nine, and the period of significance was expanded “to recognize the significance of the corridor prior to 1920 and up until 1964.”\(^8\) The nine contributing are required to be preserved as they were during the period of significance.

Development pressure impacted the district due to parts of it being zoned for CMX-5 and CMX-8 (commercial mixed use, up to five and eight stories). It was historically a residential area and commercial spaces were added on to the structures. Because of this, the historic buildings are no taller than three stories. The residents were worried that the new development coming in would change how it looks and disrupt its current character. And so, at the same time as the update of the designating ordinance for the renaming, a customized design guidelines packet was created to protect the historic character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Hahn shared that the standard city guidelines did not work well for that district, especially since architecture is not one of its criteria. So, it was necessary for them to listen to the community for what they needed in the neighborhood to reflect its history for the customizing the document. Some of the design guidelines that the community demanded were requiring the use of quality materials like brick and prohibiting the use of stucco on the walls of the ground floor.

There is more flexibility on what can be done in terms of materials, which is the same for the La Alma Historic Cultural District discussed later in this report. This is because these districts are not designated for architectural significance. However, in Five Points, the design guidelines still require a higher level of material quality because most of the contributing buildings and even the main street character buildings that were built in the 60s were constructed out of brick, and the neighborhood still wanted to see the use of those higher quality materials. Another design guideline the community requested was to not use stucco on the exterior walls of the ground floor.

The document also recognizes celebrations like Juneteenth and the Shriner’s parade that still occur along the corridor, and events like African American beauty pageants, and encourages public art that reflects the district's history and cultural significance.

\(^{7}\) Five Point DSG, 12.
\(^{8}\) Ibid., 13.
Development pressure continues to this day, and the office continues to review new construction in the district, mostly eight or five stories depending on the specific area. The city is committed to preserving the main street character of the buildings built during the period of significance up until 1965. Aside from reviewing signs and alterations to storefronts, the Office is trying to maintain the three-story datum line as much as possible due to the massive upzoning in this district.

The San Francisco Eagle Bar, CA

![Image of San Francisco Eagle Bar](source: SF Chronicle, [link](#)).

The San Francisco Eagle Bar was designated for its association with the LGBTQ and leather community and history in San Francisco in 2021. While the building itself had been constructed in 1906, the building is known for its more recent history as the location of the Eagle Bar. It has occupied the property since 1981, and according to its Assessment of Integrity, it has “high degree of integrity of location, association, setting, materials, and feeling.” Design and workmanship are also acknowledged, but these physical aspects are considered less important to conveying its cultural significance. Some of the South of Market (SoMA) neighborhood Leather and LGBTQ events highlighted by its report are “charitable fundraisers, leather contests, live music and comedy, [and] art exhibits.” The Preservation Office found that there had been few exterior changes made to the building during the time of the Eagle’s occupancy, and it has remained in the same location since its establishment.

---

10 Ibid., 3.
The 2016 Citywide Historic Context Statement for LGBTQ History in San Francisco was used as a basis to assess the building’s significance. The Planning Department staff also conducted primary research, which included “oral history interviews with long-term community members” along with secondary research. According to the executive summary on the property’s designation, “This research further uncovered additional facets of the Eagle’s significance from those who experienced it, including the identification of historically important people associated with the venue.”

Alex Westhoff, one of the interviewees for this research, was credited with interviewing the community members who are tied to the history of the Eagle Bar and to the larger SF Leather and LGBTQ community. In the Bibliography for the report on the Eagle Bar, the names of people interviewed by Mr. Westhoff are listed, which includes Lex Montiel (current SF Eagle Owner), Cal Callahan (SF LEATHER & LGBTQ Cultural District Manager), Bob Goldfarb (SF LEATHER & LGBTQ Cultural District President), Jon Ginoli (Pansy Division Lead Singer), Larry Rich (Bare Chest Calendar Big Daddy/CEO), Gary Kenyon (former SF Eagle Bartender), Gayle Rubin (Associate Professor of Anthropology, and Women’s and Gender Studies University of Michigan/SOMA Historian), and Peter Fiske (SF Leather Community Leader/Regular Eagle Patron).

Oral histories were conducted and used as evidence to support and identify character-defining features. Mr. Westhoff shared in his interview that he has worked on other LGBTQ sites. In conducting oral histories for these places, he would ask the community members what they consider as notable features of the site. He pointed to the trough urinal as one example in the Eagle Bar identified through interviews because these fixtures were commonly used in gay bars originally. The Fact Sheet for the property notes this element: “indoor/outdoor restroom, defined by an original porcelain trough (shared urinal) attached to exterior wall of main building and opening onto outdoor patio.”

The executive statement notes that the urinal was built around the same time as the beginning of the Eagle Bar, which contributes to the site’s unique character as a gay venue. The statement cites “Leon, Mike and Lex Montiel, Legacy Business Registry (The Eagle) Application – Historical Narrative” for this information. Mr. Leon was the former co-owner of the Eagle with Mr. Montiel. As a character-defining feature, the urinal was kept, though it was not up to the city’s building code.

San Francisco has several context statements, including several for underrepresented communities, which focus on historical significance and identifying potential landmarks. The LGBTQ statement, for example, states which of the seven aspects of integrity are more important for sites associated. Mr. Westhoff also remarked that a lot of community outreach goes into writing these statements, which then play a role during design reviews as the board considers what was recorded as important to the history and culture of the place. He added that explaining what character-defining features are is important during these community outreach events because the jargon could inhibit people from engaging with the question.
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Figure 3. Images of some of the Eagle Bar's features from its landmark designation executive summary (source: City of San Francisco Planning).
In 2021, the Liberty City Elks Lodge was designated for its culture and history related to the African American fraternal organization, fulfilling Criteria Sec. 16A-10(1)(a) and (b) in the Miami-Dade Historic Preservation Ordinance.\textsuperscript{15} The Preliminary Designation Report notes that the Elks Lodge is “a local representation of a nationally significant African American fraternal organization that was instrumental

\textsuperscript{15} Elks Lodge Preliminary Designation Report, 22.
in African American community life, including social events, the economy, and politics, and continues as one of the remaining active IBPOEW Lodges in Miami-Dade County.” It also notes people connected to the Lodge who were significant to the history of Miami-Dade County and the Liberty City neighborhood, such as Harold Sandilands, W.O. Perry, and elected officials such as Audrey Edmonson.\textsuperscript{16} The main portion of the Lodge was constructed in 1956, and a one-story addition on the south was built in 1958.\textsuperscript{17}

When the Lodge approached the Office with intentions of nominating the property as a landmark, they wanted flexibility with the interior space. They planned to rehabilitate the building but were not set on its plans. Ms. Burke shared that the Office kept that request in mind and wrote recommendations for designation to make the process of making changes easier for the owners.

The accommodation made by the Office can be seen in the designation report for this building, where the only changes regulated are demolition, new construction, and any alterations affecting massing, scale, and elements of the main entry façade. There are also parts to be protected like the 1976 cornerstone and the location of the signage on the façade.\textsuperscript{18} By default, it excludes changes to elements such as windows, doors, and the roof, and changes to the other three facades of the building. It notes that “ordinary maintenance and minor repairs/alterations that do not materially change the structure’s exterior will not be subject to COA [Certificate of Appropriateness] review.”\textsuperscript{19} The interior spaces are also not included in the designation, which then allows for the Lodge to make alterations without a Certificate of Appropriateness. They also wrote into the report that it is specifically designated for its culture and history rather than its architecture because the property had been altered over time. The Office encourages the restoration of the structure to its appearance in 1956 and 1958, if feasible, but it is not required.\textsuperscript{20}

When the Office had created the list of character-defining features, Ms. Burke presented it to the owners with the information on what would be required of them, like what changes they would need to go to the office to get reviewed and changes that did not require that step, to get feedback. The owners agreed with what was given by the office. Ms. Burke commented that she could see how there could have been some negotiation at this step of the process, but for the Elks Lodge, there was none.

In her interview, Ms. Burke emphasized the importance of being deferential to the owner’s intentions and visions for the space and property, especially being mindful with sites with cultural designation.

\begin{footnotes}
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\item[17] Ibid., 5.
\item[18] Ibid., 23.
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\item[20] Ibid., 23.
\end{footnotes}
B. Integrity

Turner Hall, Spokane, WA

Since its construction in 1897, Turner Hall has had the same owner-tenant, the German American Society. Its significance is drawn from the fact that it is “historically significant as the oldest surviving ethnic clubhouse meeting center in Spokane”21

In 2018, The City of Spokane revised their local ordinance regarding designation and found the opportunity to add Criterion E for Cultural Significance to it. This category was intended to be more cultural or community-focused, and in Ms. Duvall’s words, for sites that had significance “beyond integrity.” The description for a Criterion E landmark is “a property that represents the culture and heritage of the city of Spokane in ways not adequately addressed in the other criteria, as in its visual prominence, reference to intangible heritage, or any range of cultural practices.”22 Turner Hall is currently the only landmark designated under this criterion.

The president of the board of the German American Society contacted the historic preservation office because she was interested in protecting the building and worried about the aging members of their group. Concerned that the Society might lose the building sometime in the future, the president

21 “Nomination Continuation Sheet - Turner Hall,” 1.
wanted protection for the building as part of their legacy. The building type being a social hall, which is not as commonly used today, may be vulnerable to demolition for new development. Being included in the local register would give the city the ability to deny demolition based on the significance of the site to the culture of the community.

Because the building has had changed in its history, and thus its physical integrity may not be as intact, the office did not think it would be eligible under Category C for architecture. In the past, the office would have listed it under Category A, for broad patterns of history, and put less weight on the architectural significance. However, Ms. Duvall commented that it would have been difficult because of the integrity issue. By the time the president of the Society called Ms. Duvall, the inclusion of Category E had just passed, and the office thought that Turner Hall would be a good model for this criterion. The significance of the building is tied to the history of the group, which had survived prejudice due to wars in the past, but still managed to keep the building in use under the same ownership.

Ms. Duvall shared that the Office is leaning towards being less concerned with architecture for buildings under Category E. They may consider only additions and demolitions for design reviews in the future and focus less on alterations. For example, a building of this type may already have vinyl or aluminum windows that were changed early on. For the cultural significance of a building, the fact that it is still standing is the important part.

Ms. Duvall commented that they did not do a special management agreement for Turner Hall, but they are considering doing so in the future for other properties that fall under Category E. The Office does not want to be fixated on every detail that might change in the future. Instead, they want the building and the owner or stewards to this site to continue telling the story it holds.

According to Ms. Duvall, the inclusion of the new criterion brought up questions for the office. If there was a resource that had great integrity (for example, if Turner Hall still looked like what it did originally), would it still be under E? Or would it be listed under A, which looks at broad patterns of Spokane’s history and have that cultural connection there because the building still has integrity? In other words, is Criterion E only appropriate when a building lacks integrity? However, with Turner Hall being the only example at the moment, the Office does not have clear answers for this inquiry.

Integrity is also important to be considered. Turner Hall has not had a design review, though if physical integrity is less of an issue than its association with the community organization, some flexibility might be allowed, and other aspects of integrity, such as association, may be of more import to the decisions made at these meetings.
Sister Mary Corita’s Art Studio, Los Angeles, CA

Figure 6. Sister Mary Corita’s Art Studio (source: Corita Art Center, link).

This building was the studio space for visual Pop artist and art educator Sister Mary Corita (1918-1986) from 1962 to 1968. It is located directly across the street from Immaculate Heart High School (formerly Immaculate Heart College), where Sister Corita lived and worked. After her occupancy, the building housed several retail uses,” and for the past thirty years has been occupied by a dry-cleaning business (see Figure 7). The shopping center where the building is located was being renovated, and the site was at risk of being demolished. Worried about this outcome, people at the school nominated the property, citing its connection to the artist.

The preservation office initially recommended denial for designation as a Historic-Cultural Monument when the property was nominated in 2020. The main reason for this decision is tied to the integrity of the site. The building was determined to be “substantially altered between 1972 and 1983” and thus “no longer retains sufficient integrity to convey any significance.”

The recommendation notes that “the Cultural Heritage Ordinance [in Los Angeles] is silent on integrity.” However, it continues on to remark that “integrity does come into consideration in determining whether a nomination meets the ordinance criteria.” The site was being evaluated under Criterion 2 of the Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, which is a site “is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history.” According to the staff recommendation, “under Criterion 2, integrity considerations […] help determine whether a property ‘is associated’ with an historic personage.” Therefore, there is some consideration of integrity implied in
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assessing the strength of the association between the individual, in this case Sister Corita, and the structure being nominated.28

The Office had used the SurveyLA’s “Guidelines for Evaluating Resources Associated with Significant Persons in Los Angeles,” which are largely based on a similar guide by the National Register Bulletin. Among the eligibility standards in this document is that a property “retains sufficient integrity to convey significance.” It does set aside aspects dealing with physical integrity (materials, workmanship, and setting), and instead asks that a property associated with a significant person have integrity of “Feeling, Association, Location, and Design from the period of significance.” The recommendation also notes that “a good test for integrity is whether the significant person associated with the resource would recognize it as it exists today.” Association was the aspect put in focus, but based on the findings of the Office, it had been significantly altered to a point that the building is not recognizable as the artist’s former studio. The recommendation points specifically to “the alteration of three of the four elevations, entry doors, windows, roof, and interiors” as the reason for the building being unrecognizable as when it was used by Sister Mary Corita in the 1960s.29

Despite this initial outcome, there was an overwhelming community support saying that the building is generally the same box or massing as that period, showing a strong association with the history. Mr. Giessinger remarked that some argued that its location is across from Immaculate Heart College where Sister Mary was a nun is relevant to the integrity and significance of the site. Ultimately, due to the public support for reconsideration, it was designated as a Historic-Cultural Monument on June 2, 2021.30

As of the time of the interview with the L.A. office, the property has not had any design reviews. Mr. Giessinger shared that there are plans to redevelop the shopping center that the art studio is a part of. When a project does eventually get proposed for the building, he looks forward to the conversation around its integrity because aside from the walls and the basic rectangular plan of the building, it has completely changed.

He posed possible questions they might encounter such as with properties with few to no character-defining features, and what remains is the massing or scale as with the Sister Mary Corita Studio. Most of L.A.’s designation process is about a piece of property that represents a history that could be used as an argument for one of the criteria for designation. There are usually elements one can point to that were present in a period of significance and those become character-defining features. Could they potentially move towards a restoration approach with the new owner so that the building looks closer to its appearance during the period of significance? There’s enough left of the building, and they can remove layers, and using historic photographs, they can reconstruct parts of the original. Or is it possible to accept that there will be fewer of these features for this type of structure?

There is also a question of where the integrity of a property lies. Is it in the look and feel of the building, or its relationship to the street? For the Studio, the relationship to the school across the street was found significant to some people, but the Office found that this link could be tenuous.

29 Ibid., 5.
30 “Help Save Corita’s Studio & Preserve Her Legacy.”
The concern for the lack of character-defining features for culturally significant sites was also brought up by Mr. Westhoff in the discussion of the Eagle Bar. There is currently not a generally accepted approach in the San Francisco office for defining features based on cultural as opposed to architectural importance. He explained that for the Eagle Bar, they had called out its pitched roof as a feature. However, would the significance of the building be altered if it had had a flat roof instead? The same activities could have still taken place regardless of the form. This hypothetical situation then asks if character-defining features matter if they do not affect the function of the place.

Despite the many questions surrounding what the approach will be in its future, the Corita Studio shows that the loss of physical integrity matters less when there is a strong association with significance. It also highlights the importance of considering who is benefiting from a landmark, and whether they already are informed of a history that a visitor cannot easily glean from walking down the street.

Figure 7. Sister Mary Corita’s Art Studio from Google Street View.
C. Period of Significance

Like integrity, the period of significance (POS) for a building can be limiting if taken in the traditional meaning or use of the term. The following examples show how different local preservation offices can look at the POS creatively, and how this affects the significance of a site and the approach to the management of the building. For culturally significant sites where the story is important, the period of significance may not be a fixed point in the past.

La Alma Lincoln Park Historic Cultural District, Denver, CO

In the 1870s and 1880s, a working class and immigrant community lived in the neighborhood now known as the La Alma Lincoln Park Historic Cultural District. During the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, it was home to much of the Chicano community and is associated with the history of the Chicano Movement in Denver. This district was the first designated in Denver using a new set of designation criteria adopted by the city and county in 2019, which added a cultural criterion. This allowed the historic cultural district not only to be designated “for its early residential development and its vernacular architecture, but also for the evolution of the built environment over time and its important role in the Chicano Movement.”

Figure 8. Houses in La Alma Lincoln Park, Denver. Photo by Shannon Stage (source: National Trust for Historic Preservation, link).

31 Stage, Shannon et al, “Four Key Strategies.”
Many of the observable changes made to the original houses in this residential area occurred in that timeframe relevant to the community now living in La Alma. To account for this, the period of significance for the district stretches from the 1870s to 1980. In an article by members of Historic Denver and Ms. Hahn for the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), they describe this decision to extend the period to being “critical to establishing and prioritizing the importance of the more recent history.” Changes made to the vernacular buildings in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century are considered as relevant as the original structure. This allows for the use of stucco, chain links and vinyl windows in the district, which is not typical of a historic district. Other alterations include the addition of porches, or the enclosure of front porches “to create additional living space as families grew.”

The staff at the historic preservation office in Denver intentionally designated the district for its vernacular architecture and use of common, readily available materials such as vinyl. In this case, architecture reflects the culture and history of the area. Ms. Hahn shared that there are simplified versions of Italianates and Queen Annes in the neighborhood, which are of architectural interest. However, alongside these structures, the alterations represent Denver’s working class and immigrant community. It continues their identity and conveys the story of their striving for improvement.

The customized design guidelines reflect the layers of history in the neighborhood as well by accepting the changes made by its residents. In the NTHP article, it notes how some of the flexibility around the construction materials display the culture of the district:

“\begin{quote}
These guidelines accept that brick buildings have and may continue to be stuccoed, that the addition of Perma-stone on facades is part of the story, that vinyl windows are already the predominant window material (so allowing for their continued installation), and that the low-slung fences, whether wrought-iron, wood, or chain-link, are important not due to their materials, but because their low-rise character encourages neighbors to see, hear, and greet one another.\end{quote}”

In their interview, the Denver staff shared that they work closely with those districts in having the community tell the Office what was important to those neighborhoods and what they wanted to see, as far as flexibility, or in the case of Five Points, rigidity, in the design guidelines. After they had conducted a windshield survey of the district, the Office identified what they thought based on their “traditional” lens what the features were. They then had the neighborhood point to them what the character defining features were. This process occurred over several public meetings. The information from these events helped define what was written into the design guidelines. After it was written, “the guidelines were posted on the city’s website, presented to the public in virtual community meetings, and discussed and debated with the Denver Landmark Preservation Commission.” The guidelines were officially adopted by the commission a month after the designation of the district.

According to Ms. Hahn, it is possible to ignore period of significance and integrity in how landmarks are managed on a local government level. However, it would take too long to completely
change the system in place, and it is more feasible to work creatively within our bounds. In the case of La Alma, the question she posed was why was there a need for the area to look like it did in 1890, when what it was significant for was an event in 1967?

Ms. Bryant added that the seven aspects of integrity already set you up to be able to argue for cultural significance. But a lot of times, there is an initial gut reaction against places that do not fit what is usually perceived as historic or designated. This shows a lack in critical thinking on the seven aspects. The tools of preservation necessary to protect these sites already exist, but practitioners need to think about them in a new light. She said for example that integrity does not mean a site needs to look exactly like it did when it was built. Ms. Hahn shared Ms. Bryant’s sentiments, adding that if you’re not listing it for C (architecture), then design, materials, and workmanship are not the most important aspects; it’s feeling, setting, and association. Feeling and association can still be had even if there are changes to the building.

Sakai-Kozawa Residence/Tokio Florist, Los Angeles, CA

The Tokio Florist/Sakai-Kozawa Residence is a two-story single-family residence and garage designated in part for its Tudor Revival-influenced Craftsman architecture. It was designed by architects John B. Althouse and Daniel T. Althouse and constructed around 1911. The house is also known as the long-time

Figure 9. Front of the Sakai-Kozawa Residence (source: Los Angeles Department of City Planning, link)
residence of the Sakai-Kozawa family, who operated their family business, the Tokio Florist, at the property from 1960 to 2006. The porte-cochere, the first floor and part of the second floor was dedicated to the shop. The property was identified by SurveyLA, the citywide historic resources survey, as eligible for its history with the Tokio Florist, which reflects “the presence of Japanese Americans in Silver Lake beginning in the 1960s.”

The property has undergone several alterations over its lifetime, some of which are attributed to the activities of the Tokio Florist such as the “addition of a pole mounted sign in 1965; the extension of the canopy, the addition of the Japanese garden, construction of the greenhouse, the addition of a wall at the north side of the porch, and the addition of window awnings in the early 1960s; and the addition of a room off the porch, the addition of window screens, and the replacement of some windows and light fixtures at unknown dates.” Mr. Giessinger commented that there is some craftsmanship to the additions made by the family, but they were mostly utilitarian so that the business could survive.

When it was designated as a landmark, two periods of significance were noted: the first for its original construction and the other for the time of the Tokio Florist. The two periods of significance can be observed in the juxtaposition of spaces built originally and those added by the Sakai-Kozawa family that served the purposes of their business (Figures 10 and 11).

The property now has a new owner who is proposing to reuse the property for retail and commercial offices. Mr. Giessinger noted that the developer understood the significance of the site and wanted to honor its history of use through the design of the new spaces.

Mr. Giessinger shared that there was a discussion on accretions over time, such as the garden, the little bridge, some trees, the greenhouse, the workshop, the porte-cochere, and how to interpret them. There are some people working in preservation who wanted to preserve the materials and how it looks when it was designated. For the Tokio Florist, the Office shared that the Japanese American community who nominated the site helped in reviewing the project and gave their input as subject experts to the significance of the building. These stakeholders wanted to preserve the building as it was, which provided a different insight into the project than the staff or the developer.

There has been discussion on what could be done by a developer who is interested in keeping the house and incorporating it into their proposal. The porte-cochere, for example, could become an outdoor seating area. There was also the question of how to legalize portions considered significant but built without a permit like the greenhouse.

In the end, the direction taken for the project was less strict preservation of the building, and was more referential and interpretive, according to the Office. At the time of the interview, the proposal had been designed, but not yet permitted. Mr. Giessinger remarked that what was proposed is a good example of cultural overlay, where the improvements made on the site that reflected the POS are still readable in the new project. The developer was proposing to make a small retail use in the front that evokes the sheds that were previously there that were used to shade the plants being sold. These
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structures were not meant to be permanent, though they were important to the story of the place. The new use then calls back to the history of the house, without having to preserve the original fabric. Other proposed changes that refer back to Tokio Florist are the use of construction materials and methods for creative offices to be built at the back of the house to take inspiration in the light framing construction of the additions in the exterior, and the landscaping plan to reflect the Japanese garden cared for by the family in the front.

Another challenge with the site noted by the Office was alterations to the house during its time as a shop. For example, there was an extension on the porch for a display window. In the context of the original structure, it would be incompatible with the style of the house. Yet, this window has significance to the shop. The question posed then by the Office is how to interpret the addition. What was decided in the end was not to preserve the actual wood of the extension but to interpret it and to retain the look and feel of it as an element on the property.

Figure 10. Living room of the Tokio Florist (source: Los Angeles Department of City Planning, link).
“The Period of Significance is Now”: Turner Hall and the Eagle Bar

The phrase above is borrowed from the title of an article in the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s *Forum Journal* for summer 2014. Three people were interviewed for the article: the executive director of President Lincoln’s Cottage at the soldiers Home in Washington, D.C., the president of the Lower East Side Tenement Museum in New York, and the interim director at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum in Chicago. In the article, the three shared their thoughts on the importance of historic sites that tell stories that are relevant to the present, and that “this history can form a basis for addressing and understanding social justice issues and current events.”

The phase and the article ask the reader to consider what the “period of significance” (POS) of a site should be. For Turner Hall and the Eagle Bar, the reason for their designation, which is primarily the people associated with the site (the German American Society for the former and the LGBTQ/Leather community for the latter), continues the significance into the present time. It is for this reason that when they were designated, the end of the POS noted was the year of their designation.

Ms. Duvall of Spokane foresees that this period will adjust according to when the property’s ownership changes. According to her, picking an arbitrary year for the period of significance for Turner Hall would not make sense, as the reason for its designation, which is the use by the German American
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*Figure 11. Exterior canopy extension of the Tokio Florist with workspace for the business to the right of the image (source: Los Angeles Department of City Planning, link).*
Society, has not stopped. This is also reflected in what was written in the nomination form for the site. In a similar way, the Eagle Bar’s POS is from 1981 to 2020, beginning from when the Eagle opened and ending with the year of designation. The designation fact sheet notes that “the Eagle’s long-term tenure is cited as a contributing factor to its cultural significance, and thus a contemporary year (2020) was identified as the POS end date.”

Though the reasons behind the years are well grounded, having the period of significance extend to the present creates questions for future management and design reviews. For example, would changes made by the current owners be flexible or permissible, and then rigidity to the review would be applied post their occupancy? Could there also be a reevaluation of character-defining features once their tenure ends so that the story since designation could be documented?

---
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D. Continuing Use
Seattle Japanese Language School, WA

Figure 12. Exterior view of the SJLS (source: Japanese Cultural Community Center of Washington, link).

The Seattle Japanese Language School (historic name: Kokugo Gakkō) or SJLS was designated in 2006 for its association with the Japanese American culture and history in the city, meeting Criteria A and C of the local ordinance.42 Japanese language schools like SJLS “served as stabilizing civic and cultural institutions and were a central part of community life for the first generation of Japanese immigrants, the Issei and their families.”43 The landmark is a complex of three wood-frame buildings constructed between 1912 and 1929.44 Prior to its designation, the building had already been altered. The continuing use by the community is noted by the designation report: “The school complex continues to carry on the tradition of teaching Japanese to a wide variety of students. Current educational goals include building bonds of friendship between Japan and the United States, nurturing bilingual international citizens, and creating an awareness of Japanese cultural heritage.”45

Ms. Doherty commented that though the interior spaces were more important to the community and best reflect the significance of the site, they are not noted as features to be preserved. The designation report from 2006 does include interior features that were original to the building in the structure’s description. In Building 1, it notes that there is one original wooden stairwell that is “the
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most distinctive intact feature to remain within the interior.” There were also “portions of original fir flooring, window and door trim and some five-panel doors” that remained in place, but the interior “has generally been altered or modernized.”46 In Building 2, the first floor had “two original classrooms that are currently used as the museum facility exhibit,” which had “the most intact interior features and finishes in the complex including original slate blackboards, dark stained running and standing woodwork and fir floors.” The corridors also had elements of the original structure: “two intact wooden stairwells with handrails and newel posts as well as original fir flooring, woodwork and five-panel doors.”47 The newest of the three, Building 3, has “modestly detailed interior spaces,” and the report remarked that its “features and finishes are generally intact.”48

The interiors were considered when the staff was making the list of character-defining features, but the owners had requested they be excluded in the designation because they wanted to be the stewards of the place. Their intentions were shared to the Board through letters, which were also considered in the discussion of its designation (see Appendix D). Based on what might traditionally be considered as character-defining, the interiors would be equally appropriate features to be preserved. However, requiring the review for alterations to the interior would have inhibited the programmatic needs of the school. Flexibility in the interior was imperative. Alterations done inside the building over time were incremental and compatible with its history even though they have not had to go through design reviews. The continuing occupancy of the Japanese Cultural and Community Center respects the significance of the place and tells the ongoing story of its history.

The report designates the site and exteriors of the building, which provides some protection for major changes to scale or massing and demolition.49
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The Kenmore Community Club’s designation as a City of Kenmore Landmark in 2014 (through King County’s Interlocal Preservation Program) is based on its use as a community hall, which “exemplifies the importance of clubs and civic organizations in early to mid-20th century King County.” 50 This building was constructed in 1929 – 1930 mostly by volunteers. 51 Aside from regular community club meetings, people used the space for events such as “dances, card parties, potluck dinners, and basket socials.” Other community organizations housed in clubhouse at the time of designation included “the Kenmore Eagles, and troops of local Cub Scouts, Sea Scouts, and Girl Scouts.” 52

Aside from the exterior and site, the list of character-defining features also contains the “interior spatial arrangement of the meeting room and stage,” and architectural elements that

50 Kenmore Findings of Facts and Decision, 1.
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Contribute to the space’s historic character, such as the “original wood and tie rod trusses, bent wood stage cove and ceiling, painted advertising drape, and wood flooring” (see Figure 14).\footnote{Ibid., 3.}

Ms. Steen remarked that though not typical, interiors or interior features can be listed as a character-defining feature if they are vital to the significance of the site. For Kenmore, the big open room and the stage is key to its community use. In this case, the interior is considered more important than the exterior because it is where people gathered.

In 2019, the clubhouse underwent a design review for the installation of a new wood floor above the original. The applicant for the alteration found that “the floor has worn down and the applicant does not believe it can be sanded any further, as the tongue-in-groove joint is very near the top of individual boards.” They were also proposing the use of 2 species of wood, maple and oak, “with the oak stained a darker color and used to border the floor on four sides, rather than two sides which is the current configuration.”\footnote{KCLC Meeting Minutes for October 24, 2019, 1.} The minutes note that “the applicant had preferred a symmetrical pattern rather than following the current pattern which they felt had changed over time.” The original flooring would stay underneath the new one with a mastic over it.\footnote{Ibid.}

One of the commissioners was worried that the mastic would “make it harder for repairs and that the floor wouldn’t have the typical spring of an old dance floor.” Another was concerned that the use of mastic would destroy the original flooring beneath and that the pattern does not replicate what was there when the building was landmarked. Yet another remarked that they “felt the existing pattern looks interrupted and the new floor might replicate what was there historically,” as the flooring had probably undergone changes in the pattern before what was designated.\footnote{Ibid., 1-2.}

At the end of the discussion, a motion was made to approve the alteration with “the condition that the owner take adequate photography of the existing floor, including the storage closets in order to document current conditions and identify the locations of the photographs on the new floor plan of the building.” The photos of the new work were also asked to be submitted once completed. The motion passed 6-1.\footnote{Ibid.}

The changes do not affect the use or feel of the space greatly. It will still carry on what it was intended to do, thus fulfilling the significance of the building. There was concern about harming the original flooring, or the flooring that was designated in 2014, but this did not carry as much weight as the need for the continuing use of the space. Although physical features are important, they are less of a focus than the form and location of the structure.

Ms. Steen remarked that when they do reviews for these types of properties in the KC office, the cultural element is stressed, and the architectural aspects are downplayed to allow for more flexibility; the use is key in these decisions. There is no policy difference between architecturally and culturally significant landmarks because they try to focus on what the resources were designated for and weigh those criteria. Based on her observations, the main concern of culturally significant properties is

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 3.  
\textsuperscript{54} KCLC Meeting Minutes for October 24, 2019, 1.  
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 1-2.  
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.}
almost always use. They do care deeply and are proud of their resource, but the owners are not as tied to the original fabric, like the flooring in the case of Kenmore.

In addition to this property, Ms. Steen also mentioned in her interview Vasa Hall, another community hall, and Seattle-Tacoma Pet Cemetery as examples of landmarks in King County where location and use are high in importance. She noted that there is no criterion in the KC ordinance for continual use, but the significance of these places is that they are public spaces and that they are used by the community. Therefore, decisions should favor their continuation as public community spaces. Ms. Steen commented that she still expects the commission to struggle with determining what to change and what not to change, because there is an ingrained thinking of preserving places as they are.

Figure 14. Main event space facing the stage in the Kenmore Community Club. The border of the flooring runs on all four sides of the room (source: Kenmore Community Club, link).
IV. Education

The fourth interview question ("How have you approached training or orientation around this issue for volunteer commissioners or professional colleagues?") was suggested by Ms. Taylor. The intention for this inquiry is to learn more about how each office has tackled this subject either formally or informally. This section of the report goes over how training or discussions have been conducted and how the subject of education on the culturally significant sites was also mentioned in context of other aspects of the efforts of the office.

Training within the department

For most of the offices interviewed, the subject of culturally significant landmarks is often discussed informally through conversation within the staff and board or commission. However, formal training for both the commission and staff on these sites, their design guidelines (if any), and their design review is necessary so that the people have adequate knowledge and a well-informed approach when these properties come before the board. Because this is a very recent movement in preservation, there are not many landmarks designated solely for cultural significance, and therefore they do not come into design review as often as other typical landmarks. There is a danger, then, of the board or commission treating the site similarly to another significant for its architecture.

This concern was shared by Ms. Bryant of the Denver office. Their commission is used to treating the city's 52 historic districts very similarly, so when they had their first design review for La Alma, the members were unaccustomed to applying the additional flexibility within the guidelines for the district. It was a surprise for them. That is why they intentionally assigned some of the early projects to Ms. Bryant and another colleague, both of whom had worked on the customized design guidelines, to make sure that the first reviews were done by people who were familiar with it.

Ms. Hahn and Ms. Bryant also shared an instance that occurred within the office where in one meeting, one of the staff members was talking about replacing windows and putting in vinyl, and another interjected that vinyl was not allowed. However, Ms. Bryant, Ms. Hahn and another colleague remarked that vinyl can be used because the project was in La Alma. As this account shows, even staff could find themselves looking through a traditional lens when they think about what is acceptable in historic districts. This is one of the reasons why the Denver office finds importance in trainings on this topic.

There are procedures in place within the different offices that allow for training or continuing education for topics relevant to historic preservation. Some that were mentioned are retreats, presentations, training sessions and workshops. In L.A., they have done presentations at their Cultural Heritage Commission Meeting for their commissioners to educate them on some of the historic context statements that the Office developed through SurveyLA so that they would have some historical background.
The King County office has “10-minute trainings” often at the end of their board meeting sessions. The topic of cultural significance comes up a lot during these meetings. Ms. Steen conducts the training, and sometimes other people with expertise or knowledge to come to give talks as well. At times, they also have commissioners train each other on their specialties, like archaeology. They also hold big quarterly trainings every 3 months, and all commissioners and special commissioners (from interlocal cities) are invited.

In Denver, when new commissioners join, the office conducts a training with them to go over the design guidelines and other related topics. Denver commissioners are term limited; there are three years in a term, and commissioners can serve two terms. Currently, the commission is the same one that adopted and approved the designation and the design guidelines. But as new commissioners are brought in, it will be important for the staff to talk to them about culturally significant districts and why they are treated differently. So that they can consistently train their commissioners, the office holds retreats with the commissioners on a yearly basis. This schedule has been affected by circumstances around the pandemic.

Trainings on subjects are usually influenced by the types of projects or current trends in the field. Ms. Doherty from Seattle commented that if there is a trend, like vernacular architecture, they have increased awareness by providing tools and resources. Mr. Giessinger shared that in the L.A. office, they have done a couple of training sessions with the commission around topic of culturally significant sites and had used materials from the National Trust concerning integrity. The training had taken place during a time when some of the nominations they were considering had cultural association. They had to then consider aspects beyond architecture and how to understand these types of properties.

Another method of sharing information is through a board handbook, similar to what is practiced in Seattle. This handbook contains the historic preservation code, rules and regulations, how to assess integrity, and other documents have been included to it over time. Work done and context statements by the NPS and the DAHP are usually added to the handbook. Updating the handbook and informing the board is an ongoing effort done by both the staff and the board. For example, Dr. Chalana and other board members have shared articles to the staff, which were then shared to the rest of the board. He and Rich Freitas (a former board member with a focus on landscape architecture and cultural landscapes) helped add to the handbook. Mr. Freitas, for example, shared local and national LGBTQ histories.

Multiple offices mentioned the importance of context statements and the need for more to be written, particularly for underrepresented communities, to help give background to places and identify potential landmarks. Ms. Doherty commented that the context statements in Seattle tend to be geographic rather than focused on community, ethnic groups, ADA, or others. She also shared that there is an ethnographic study of Seattle funded by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) that is just starting, which shows that there is a need for this research, which is acknowledged by the state.
Intent Statements
One possible issue with the flexibility in the management of these properties, particularly in the language of the ordinance is that the intentions of the writers may not be accurately interpreted or translated by incoming or future staff or board members.

Ms. Burke shared that in designation reports, if there is not a level of specificity and if the staff who had knowledge of what is written are no longer in office, a new planner may not understand certain items. If it is not clear, then there could be problems in the future if how the owner and the planner interpret the reports or guidelines differ. She appreciates having flexibility and leaving certain guidelines open-ended or open for interpretation, but it could be a problem in the future.

One way this is addressed by the Denver office is through intent statements in the design guidelines: “Intent Statements establish the objectives to be achieved for each topic and may also be used to determine the appropriateness of alternative approaches that do not meet specific design standards.”\(^{58}\) For La Alma’s customized design guidelines, they have intent statements, and then they customize the design guidelines. They wanted any conversations that they would have to outlive the staff and commission that worked or had been briefed on the design guidelines. Therefore, the landmarks staff completed an inventory form for every building in the designation application. The landmarks staff looked at every building and called out distinctive features of the building that told its story. Sometimes, it might be its original porch, or the changes that have occurred over time, or the addition of stucco. In a Latino community (like La Alma), they see a high level of stucco added, and many added fences. They called out these distinctive features and the things that should be preserved in future design reviews. The inventory forms and design guidelines would call for more flexibility in other areas of the property.

This approach is intended to support long term goals of affordability, equity, and the ability of the owners to stay in their homes and not be priced out or have involuntary displacement. The identification of three or four main characteristics can help property owners who look up their house and form to see the most important attributes of the house. The staff, the architect or designer (if the owners hired one), the owner and the landmarks commission will know it. Everyone is working from the same playing field so that there will not be any surprises and the memory of the conversations, and the flexibility lives beyond Ms. Bryant, Ms. Hahn and their colleagues who had worked on the designation.

Community outreach
Aside from the staff and commission, education on sites designated for their cultural significance should also be shared with the community, especially those who own these types of properties or live in a designated district.

During the interview, Ms. Burke of Miami-Dade County shared a point brought up by another Florida planner. That person had commented that there is a need for another layer of communication to the owners of properties designated for their architecture. There is a possibility that a property owner of a site designated for its architecture or a property owner in another district could ask why they were

\(^{58}\) Five Points Historic Cultural District Design Guidelines, 8.
subject to rules that did not affect culturally significant properties. Offices need to be able to inform and explain to the public the differences between these criteria and how this affects the methods by which they are managed by the owners and the city.

Ms. Hahn also mentioned this in their office interview. One of the things she plans to do is to hold a training in the community of La Alma on what it means to be designated. The staff will do a presentation on the district and the expectations on the community living or working there. This will also give the residents the opportunity to approach the staff with questions they might have, such as how to get approval for changing a window. They want to be available and approachable for the community for when they have questions especially when they plan to make changes or do projects on their property.

The Denver office also shared that La Alma will not have the same development pressures as Five Points, which can lead to “easier” design review challenges. One challenge that the district does impose on the commission is the ensuring of the preservation of the layers of history characteristic of the neighborhood. For example, a Queen Anne style house will have elements of Permastone or other non-compatible changes to the original building. Their office shared that it is important to have the education component on these elements available to the public, especially when it includes reasons why they are important to preserve. This is a design challenge in any district because sometimes people do not understand what the historic components and elements are. It is not because they do not care, but some have a different perspective on what is worth preserving and how it should be done. For example, there are people in La Alma who want the neighborhood to look like it did in the 1890s, but that is not telling the full story of that neighborhood.
V. Conclusion

There are many challenges to managing landmarks, especially those designated for their cultural significance. As shown by the variety of conditions and circumstances for the cases reviewed in this report, this type of landmark is complex and requires a deep understanding of its significance, both historic and current. It is difficult to pinpoint character-defining features and use often plays a bigger role in telling the story of the place and community who uses it. The design review process can allow for flexibility for these properties if discussion is guided by an understanding of the significance of the site and how it manifests that significance, either through elements of the building or in the function of the spaces. It is difficult for the process as it is now to target intangible aspects of landmarks, but these aspects should be considered nonetheless in the discussion of alterations.

For each of the sites, finding a specific treatment that addresses its history and concerns of the owners or community was important to the challenges that they face. Providing customized design guidelines or allowing for flexibility through the parts designated and the parts purposefully excluded are some ways that cultural significance can be accounted for during design reviews. More research into this topic would greatly benefit local offices, especially as they begin to create standards that fit their and the communities’ goals. There is also a need for more surveys that focus on culture to help discern attributes that can be tied to the significance of a place that extends beyond architecture. This is especially important as these sites are more tied to intangible heritage and there may be minimal physical character-defining features.

Recommendations for the design review of culturally significant landmarks

The following are recommendations for approaching design review for culturally significant sites based on the findings of the researcher. The subpoints are examples of how the main numbered point could be implemented.

1. Creatively apply the ordinances.
   a. Refocus integrity around feeling and association (and setting and location if applicable) as aspects of integrity.
   b. Allow the period of significance to extend to the present to show continuing importance to the community.

2. Create new processes appropriate for these sites.
   a. Add a new criterion in the designation ordinance.
   b. Make a new management agreement for these sites. For example, only require design review for demolitions or new construction on the property.

3. Allow for flexibility in the review.
   a. Adjust the period of significance to account for changes made over time.
   b. Be intentional with the character-defining features to allow for changes planned by the owner/community.

4. Work with the associated community to determine character-defining features, and appropriate controls and guidelines.
   a. Listen for when community members seek flexibility or rigidity in the management or design guidelines.
5. **Continue education for staff, board, and the community.**
   a. Provide training on the design guidelines or the history and significance of the sites, especially before a board/commission meeting concerning a related property.
   b. Provide information to the affected communities or owners.

**Recommendations for further study**

1. Interview local non-profit historic preservation organizations.
2. Reach out to and interview other city or county historic preservation offices. If possible, contacting tribal historic preservation officers may also be an avenue to explore.
3. Follow up on cities interviewed and discuss changes or progress in their work.
4. Research international case studies that are relevant to the subject (ex: The Burra Charter; The Nara Document).
5. If available, read and analyze minutes for design reviews for culturally significant sites.
6. Research other forms of managing culturally significant sites outside of design reviews (ex: cultural districts, economic support).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KING COUNTY LANDMARKS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angerer Farm Hay Barn Complex</strong></td>
<td>229 West Snoqualmie River Road NE, Carnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthony Farm</strong></td>
<td>27329 78th Avenue South, Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological Site 45-KI-22</strong></td>
<td>Location confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burton Masonic Hall, 1894</strong></td>
<td>23927 Vashon Highway SW, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camp North Bend (Camp Waskowitz), 1935</strong></td>
<td>45509 SE 150th Street, North Bend vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colvos Store, 1923</strong></td>
<td>15631 Westside Highway, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walter Cooper Dairy Farm, 1925</strong></td>
<td>5703 208th Ave NE, Redmond vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dockton Store and Post Office, 1908</strong></td>
<td>25908 99th Avenue SW, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dougherty Farmstead, 1888</strong></td>
<td>26526 NE Cherry Valley Road, Duvall vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norman Edson Studio (Community Landmark), 1890s</strong></td>
<td>23825 Vashon Hwy SW, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall City Historic Residential District (Community Landmark), 1887-1942</strong></td>
<td>SE 43rd Street to SE 44th Place; 334th Place SE to 338th Place SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall City Hop Shed, 1888</strong></td>
<td>Fall City River Front Park, Fall City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Falls City Masonic Hall, 1895</strong></td>
<td>33700 SE 43rd Street, Fall City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferncliff (Wise Mansion) (Community Landmark), 1923</strong></td>
<td>10350 SW Cowan Road, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuller Store, 1884</strong></td>
<td>19603 Vashon Highway SW, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harrington-Beall Greenhouse Historic District, c. 1885-1902</strong></td>
<td>18409-18606 Beall Road, Vashon Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hjertoos Farm, 1907-1910</strong></td>
<td>31523 NE 40th, Carnation vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hori Furoba (bathhouse), 1930</strong></td>
<td>12303 Auburn-Black Diamond Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn vicinity</td>
<td>Designated: 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issaquah Sportsman’s Club**, 1937  
23600 SE Evans Street, Issaquah vicinity  
Designated: 1997

**Jovita Land Company Model Home – Corbett House**, 1908  
4600 S 364th Street, Federal Way vicinity  
Designated: 2003

**King County Courthouse**, 1916/1931  
Third & James, Seattle  
Designated: 1987

**Krain Tavern**, 1916  
39929 264th Avenue SE, Enumclaw vicinity  
Designated: 2011

**Lagesson Homestead**, 1880s  
20201 SE 216th Street, Maple Valley vicinity  
Designated: 1986

**Lisabeula School**, 1925  
22029 Wax Orchard Road SE, Vashon Island  
Designated: 2011

**August Lovegren House**, 1904  
8612 310th Avenue SE, Preston  
Designated: 1994

**Maple Valley School**, 1910  
23015 SE 216th, Maple Valley vicinity  
Designated: 1994

**Marjesira Inn**, 1906  
25134 Vashon Highway SW, Vashon Island  
Designated: 1994

**Englebert Matt Dairy Farm**, 1923  
1818 Redmond-Fall City Road SE  
Fall City vicinity  
Designated: 2013

**McKibben-Corliss House**, 1927  
33509 SE 43rd Place, Fall City  
Designated: 2003

**Thomas McNair House**, 1884  
22915 107th Avenue SW, Vashon Island  
Designated: 1993

**Charles and Minnie Moore House**, 1905  
4338 – 338th Place SE, Fall City  
Designated: 2003

**Murray and Rosa Morgan House**  
4505 S. 376th Street, Pacific vicinity  
Designated: 2010

**Mukai Agricultural Complex**, 1926  
18005-18017 107th Avenue SW, Vashon Island  
Designated: 1993

**Aaron Neely House**, 1894  
12303 Auburn-Black Diamond Road  
Auburn vicinity  
Designated: 1982

**Neighbor-Bennett House**, 1904  
4317 337th Place SE, Fall City  
Designated: 1996

**N.E. and Matilda Nelson Log House**, 1896  
17605 N 182nd Ave NE, Woodinville vicinity  
Designated: 2010

**Gunnar T. Olson House**, 1912  
20015 NE 50th, Redmond vicinity  
Designated: 1985

**Matilde and Olof Olson Farm**, 1907-1909  
24206 SE 216th Street, Maple Valley vicinity  
Designated: 1991

**Pacific Coast Coal Company Offices**, c. 1927  
(demolished 2016)  
18825 SE Maple Valley Hwy, Maple Valley vicinity  
Designated: 1993

**Captain Thomas W. Phillips House**, 1925  
11312 SW 232nd Street, Vashon Island  
Designated: 1992
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Platt Dairy Farm, 1906
25530 NE 138th Street, Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 2007

Prescott-Harshman House, 1904
33429 Redmond-Fall City Road, Fall City
Designated: 1984

Quaale Log House, 1907
10101 W. Snoqualmie Valley Road NE
Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 1990

Red Brick Road/James Mattson Road, 1901
196th Ave. NE between Union Hill Road and
55th Place NE, Redmond vicinity
Designated: 1983

Reinig Road/Sycamore Corridor, 1929
Between 396th Drive SE and SE 79th Street
Snoqualmie vicinity
Designated: 1982

Reynolds Farm and Indian Agency, c. 1870
16816 SE 384th, Auburn vicinity
Designated: 1985

Eric Gustav Sanders House, 1912
5516 S 277th Street, Auburn vicinity
Designated: 1985

Schwartz-Bell House, 1930
20233 81st Avenue SW, Vashon Island
Designated: 1996

Town of Selleck Historic District, 1908-39
E. of Maple Valley, North of Enumclaw
Designated: 1987

Smith-Baldwin House (Fern Cove), 1912
Cedarhurst Road, Vashon Island
Designated: 1995

Hilmar and Selma Steen House, 1910
10924 SW Cove Road, Vashon Island
Designated: 1996

Stewart Barn and Milk House, 1928/1930
19228 Duvall-Monroe Road NE, Duvall vicinity
Designated: 2016

Stow-Kelley House (Community Landmark), 1931
32905 SE 44th Street, Fall City
Designated: 2005

Sutherland's Grocery and Filling Station, 1931/1934
34051 Military Road South, Auburn vicinity
Designated: 2002

Tahoma High School, 1926/1938
24415 SE 216th Way, Maple Valley vicinity
Designated: 2001

Vashon Hardware Store, 1890/1935
17601 Vashon Highway SW, Vashon Island
Designated: 1986

Vashon Odd Fellows Hall, 1912
19704 Vashon Highway SW, Vashon Island
Designated: 1985

Vincent Schoolhouse, 1905
8001 W Snoqualmie Valley Road NE
Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 1986

Weiss Store, 1928
17526-17630 Vashon Hwy SW, Vashon
Designated: 2020

Willowmoor Farm Historic District 1904-20
Marymoor Park, 6046 Lk. Sammamish Parkway
Redmond vicinity
Designated: 1982

WPA Park Buildings, 1939-40
Designated: 1984

White Center Fieldhouse, 1940
1321 SW 102nd Street, White Center

Preston Activity Center, 1939
8625 310th Avenue SE, Preston
**KING COUNTY BRIDGES**

**Baring Bridge**, 1930
NE Index Creek Road, Baring vicinity
Designated: 1999

**Foss River Bridge**, 1951
Foss River Road, Skykomish vicinity
Designated: 2004

**Fourteenth Avenue South Bridge**, 1930 *(demolished 2011)*
Duwamish River, Tukwila vicinity
Designated: 1996

**Green River Gorge Bridge**, 1915
Franklin-Cumberland Road, Black Diamond vicinity
Designated: 2004

**Judd Creek Bridge**, 1953
Vashon Highway SW, Vashon Island
Designated: 2004

**Meadowbrook Bridge**, 1921
Meadowbrook Avenue, Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 1997

**Miller River Bridge**, 1922
Old Cascade Scenic Highway, Skykomish vicinity
Designated: 1999

**Mt. Si Bridge**, 1904/1955 *(demolished 2008)*
Mt. Si Road, North Bend
Designated: 1997

**Norman Bridge**, 1950 *(demolished 2004)*
Middle Fork of Snoqualmie River
428th Avenue SE, North Bend vicinity
Designated: 1984

**Patton Bridge**, 1950
SE Green Valley Road, Auburn vicinity
Designated: 2004

**Raging River Bridge**, 1915
SE 68th Street, Fall City
Designated: 1997

**Stossel Bridge**, 1951
NE Carnation Farm Road, Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 1997

**Tolt Bridge**, 1922 *(demolished 2008)*
NE Tolt Hill Road, Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 1997

**HERITAGE CORRIDORS (Community Landmarks)**

**Cedarhurst Road-Westside Highway Heritage Corridor**, 1891-1936
Vashon Island
Designated: 2009

**Dockton Road Heritage Corridor**, 1907-1964
Vashon Island and Maury Island
Designated: 2009

**Green Valley Road Heritage Corridor**, 1884-1936
Black Diamond vicinity
Designated: 2009

**Issaquah-Fall City Road Heritage Corridor**, 1883-1926
Sammamish Plateau and Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 2009

**Old Cascade Scenic Highway Heritage Corridor**, 1893-1925
Skykomish vicinity
Designated: 2009

**Osceola Loop Heritage Corridor**, 1867-1936
Enumclaw Plateau
Designated: 2009

**West Snoqualmie River Road Heritage Corridor**, 1888-1913
Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 2009
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West Snoqualmie Valley-Carnation Farm
Road Heritage Corridor, 1890-1936
Snoqualmie Valley
Designated: 2009

CITY LANDMARKS

CITY OF AUBURN

Auburn Masonic Temple, 1924
10 Auburn Way S
Designated: 2002

Auburn Pioneer Cemetery, 1866
802 Auburn Way N
Designated: 2016

Auburn Post Office, 1937
20 Auburn Avenue NE
Designated: 2000

Auburn Public Library, 1914
306 Auburn Avenue NE
Designated: 1995

Mary Olson Farm, 1879
28728 Green River Road S
Designated: 2000

CITY OF BLACK DIAMOND

Black Diamond Depot, 1886
32627 Railroad Avenue
Designated: 2020

Black Diamond Cemetery, c.1880
Cemetery Hill Road
Designated: 2000

Black Diamond Miners’ Cabin, c.1882
24311 Morgan Street
Designated: 1995

Luigi and Aurora Pagani House, c.1896
32901 Merino Street
Designated: 2001

CITY OF CARNATION

Commercial Hotel, 1913
31933 W. Rutherford Street
Designated: 1996

Entwistle House, 1912
32021 Entwistle Street
Designated: 1994

Tolt IOOF/Eagles Hall, 1895
3940 Tolt Avenue
Designated: 1994

CITY OF DES MOINES

Des Moines Beach Park Historic District,
1917-1931
Cliff Avenue and 220th Street
Designated: 2005

WPA Park Buildings
Des Moines Activity Center, 1939-40
1000 220th Street
Designated: 1984

CITY OF ENUMCLAW

Enumclaw Masonic Hall, 1909
1837 Marion Street
Designated: 2018

Enumclaw National Bank, 1923
1602 Cole Street
Designated: 2016

WPA Park Buildings
Enumclaw Expo Center, 1940
1456 Roosevelt Avenue E
Designated: 1984

CITY OF ISSAQUAH

William Conrardy House, 1962
350 Mt. Jupiter Drive
Designated: 2017
Auto Freight Building, 1939
92 SE Bush Street
Designated: 2019

Gilman Town Hall & Jail, 1888, 1914
165 SE Andrews Street
Designated: 2018

Hailstone Feed Store and Gasoline Station, 1941
232 Front Street
Designated: 2003

Issaquah Depot (Gilman Station), 1889
50 Rainier Boulevard North
Designated: 2003

Coutts Garage Building, 1923
35 W Sunset Way
Designated: 2021

CITY OF KENMORE

Kenmore Community Club, 1929-30
7304 NE 175th Street
Designated: 2014

St. Edward Seminary, 1931
14445 Juanita Drive NE
Designated: 2018

Charles Thomsen House, 1927
7330 NE 170th
Designated: 1989

CITY OF KIRKLAND

Dr. William Buchanan House, 1890
129 Sixth Avenue
Designated: 2018

First Church of Christ, Scientist, 1922
NW corner of Market St. and Lake Ave. W
Designated: 2000

Peter Kirk Building, c. 1892
620 Market Street
Designated: 2003

Kirkland Ferry Clock, 1935
NW corner of Kirkland Avenue and Lake Street
Designated: 2014

Kirkland Land & Improvement Company
House (Loomis House), 1889
304 8th Avenue West
Designated: 2013

Kirkland Woman’s Club, 1925
407 First Street
Designated: 2011

Louis S. Marsh House, 1929
6604 Lake Washington Boulevard
Designated: 2014

CITY OF MAPLE VALLEY

W.D. Gibbon General Store, 1894
22020 SE 248th Street, Maple Valley
Designated: 2020
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Lake Wilderness Lodge, 1950
22500 SE 248th Street
Designated: 1997

Haida House Replica No. 4, 1980
7447 159th Place N.E.
Designated: 2011

City of Newcastle

Newcastle Cemetery, c.1870
SW of 69th Way off 129th Avenue SE
Designated: 1982

Hutcheson Homestead, 1936
19545 N.E. Redmond Road
Designated: 2010

Pacific Coast Coal Co. House #75, 1870s
7210 138th Avenue S.E.
Designated: 1982

Lodge Hall (Community Landmark), 1903
7875 Leary Way
Designated: 2010

Thomas Rouse Road (Community Landmark), 1880
136th SE & 144th Place SE
Designated: 1984

Odd Fellows Hall, 1903
7979 Leary Way
Designated: 2010

Conrad Olson Farmstead, 1905
18834 N.E. 95th Street
Designated: 2010

Perrigo House (Community Landmark) 1909
17325 N.E. 85th Pl.
Designated: 2010

City of North Bend

North Bend Historic Commercial District, 1889-1960
Bendigo Blvd. & North Bend Way
Designated: 2000

Redmond Cemetery, c. 1890
7000 – 180th Ave. N.E.
Designated: 2010

Tollgate Farmhouse, c.1890
SR 202 (near Boalch Avenue)
Designated: 2002

Redmond City Park (Anderson Park), c. 1938
7802 168th Ave. N.E.
Designated: 2010

WPA Park Buildings
Si View Pool and Activity Center, 1939
Ballarat Street
Designated: 1984

Redmond Methodist Church (Community Landmark), 1908
16540 N.E. 80th Street
Designated: 2010

City of Redmond

Brown’s Garage, 1920
16389 Redmond Way
Designated: 2010

Old Redmond School, 1922
16600 N.E. 80th Street
Designated: 2010

Bill Brown Saloon, 1913
7824 Leary Way
Designated: 2010

Redmond State Bank, 1911
7841 Leary Way
Designated: 2010

Justice White House, 1889
7729 Leary Way
Designated: 2010
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**CITY OF RENTON**

**F.W. Woolworth Company**, 1954
710-724 S. 3rd Street
Designated: 2017

---

**CITY OF SAMMAMISH**

**Jacob and Emma Reard House**, 1895
1516 220th Ave SE
Designated: 2011

---

**CITY OF SHORELINE**

**William E. Boeing House**, 1914
The Highlands
Designated: 1994

**Crawford Store** (Godfrey Building), 1922
2411 N.W. 195th Place
Designated: 1985

**Naval Hospital Chapel**, 1942
1902 NE 150th Street
Designated: 2021

**Richmond Masonic Center**, 1921-22
753 N 185th Street
Designated: 2010

**Ronald Grade School**, 1912/1926
749 N 175th Street
Designated: 2008

---

**TOWN OF SKYKOMISH**

**Skykomish Historic Commercial District**, 1893-1936
Railroad Avenue, and 3rd to 6th Streets
Designated: 1998

---

**Skykomish Masonic Hall**, 1924
108 Old Cascade Highway
Designated: 1996

---

**CITY OF SNOQUALMIE**

**Messenger of Peace Chapel Car**, 1898
NW Railway Museum, 9312 Stone Quarry Rd
Designated: 2009

**Northern Pacific Railway Locomotive 924**, 1899
NW Railway Museum, 9312 Stone Quarry Rd
Designated: 2015

**Northern Pacific Railway Steam Rotary Snowplow No. 10**, 1907
NW Railway Museum, 38625 SE King St
Designated: 1995

**Puget Sound Electric Railway Interurban Car No. 523**, 1907
NW Railway Museum, 9312 Stone Quarry Rd
Designated: 2018

**Snoqualmie Falls Lumber Company Power Plant**, 1917-1929
38800 SE Mill Pond Road
Designated: 2005

**Snoqualmie Historic Commercial District**, 1889-1941
Railroad Avenue
Designated: 1997

---

**CITY OF TUKWILA**

**Delta Masonic Temple**, 1927
13034 41st Avenue S
Designated: 2014

**Boeing Airplane Co. Building 105**, 1909
9404 East Marginal Way S
Designated: 2018

---

Revised 11/21
CITY OF WOODINVILLE

DeYoung House, 1932
14121 N.E. 171st Street
Designated: 2010

Hollywood Farm, 1910
14111 NE 145th Street
Designated: 1983

Hollywood Schoolhouse, 1912
14810 NE 145th Street
Designated: 1992

Woodinville School, 1936
17301 133rd Avenue NE
Designated: 2001
Appendix B – King County Landmarks Spreadsheet
The building is significant for its association with the Seattle Fire Department and its role as a training facility for fire department personnel. It was constructed as part of the National Park System in 1917, and was used to train firefighters in firefighting techniques. The building is also significant for its association with the construction of the Olympic National Park Road, which was completed in 1926.

The building has been noted for its historical significance as a symbol of the National Park Service and its role in the development of the National Park System. It is also significant for its association with the construction of the Olympic National Park Road, which was completed in 1926.

The building has been designated as a National Historical Landmark, and is included in the National Register of Historic Places. It is also included in the National Park Service's list of significant buildings and structures.
Joel T. Urquhart, the first African American to hold the position of hospital physician in a hospital in the state of Washington, made significant contributions to the development of the Shoreline area, particularly in its medical and healthcare sectors. His achievements are best evidenced by the Chrisman-Sandberg House, a landmark building located within the vicinity of Lake Washington Boulevard, which currently serves as a medical center.

The Chrisman-Sandberg House, located at 2619 NE 98th St, Seattle, was originally owned by Nathan and Edward Chrisman, who were early settlers in the area. The house was built in 1851 and was later acquired by the Sandberg family, who made significant additions and renovations to the building in the late 1800s. The house was later acquired by the hospital, which used it as a medical center for over a century. The building has undergone several renovations and additions over the years, and it is now recognized as a significant landmark in the Shoreline area.
The store was once a home to women. It was occupied by the family from 1914-1923, and it was a local landmark for its distinctive architecture. The store was originally built in 1914, and it was a popular destination for women in the community. The store was also a center for community activities, and it was a place where women could gather to socialize and participate in community events.

In 1930, the store was sold to the town, and it was used as a public building for many years. The store was eventually renovated in 1988, and it was repurposed as a community center. The store is still in use today, and it is a popular destination for women in the community.
Appendix C – Seattle Landmarks Spreadsheet
Edmund Meany Middle School / 1902

Avenue 1200

School 1911, 1915, 1930

80011

1 2
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2224

Edmund Meany Middle School / 1902

In Greek Orthodox St. Church, 1955, 1962

is mentioned in the context. Information is provided to show women's residency in the house. More information would be better with more context. A strong connection is made to UC connection.

Longfellow School / 28th Avenue East

Edmund Meany Middle School / 1902

In Greek Orthodox St. Church, 1955, 1962

is mentioned in the context. Information is provided to show women's residency in the house. More information would be better with more context. A strong connection is made to UC connection.
1918: 1 women, caretaker, domestic services worker. The contract notes that by 1918, Bellhawke had built hotels for workers at the local factories, such as "foundation, the electrical, and forming industries." However, the factory was destroyed after a fire in 1915. During 1921, the factory had 10,000 employees. Bellhawke's apartments, hotels, and terminus founded businesses. The electric priority was in the downtown and waterfront industry and also made a center for urban activity. The hotel continued through the 1980s, with between 10,000 rooms being constructed in the section on Apartment development in Seattle and Bellingham. The report notes that "since its initial formation, Bellhawke has provided affordable housing for workers." This section further reiterates on the history and types of buildings for people in the city and neighborhood. It also notes that "racial conditions (in the early 20th century) also encouraged apartment development, particularly the increasing size of women in the workforce." The developer of the building was Frank Hurd. The report mentions his wife, Ada, who built and managed the apartments as an investment. Its location at Bellingham made it a desirable residence for the middle class. In 1953, "about half the residents were women, either single or married.

2001: 1 women, caretaker, domestic services worker. The building now known as the Washington State Baptist Home, is a co-ed school. Among the additions: doors in 1935 were replaced by doors. The report notes that in 1935, "all students of Japanese descent were removed and sent to internment camps." In 1941, Dorothy Lippert was hired as a language art teacher at Lincoln, becoming the district's first African American high school teacher. "Due to little interest in the report, the district's first African American principal, 500 additional minority students enrolled in the school in 1965 as part of a desegregation effort to better integrate the schools. The late 1950s saw an increase in the Southeast Asian student population that a "Newcomer Center" was opened to help students adapt to the school and social system. The report includes a directory of Seattle School District number 1, which members works as teachers in the district. The bust of Lincoln at the school was created by Arnold F. Barbek, was commissioned by Lyle and Ethel Barbek, "in memory of her sister Margaret Barbek Farnam," a teacher at Lincoln and founder of the school's annual Traditions Day. All these were counts of the applicants.

2012: 1 women, telephone operator. (This building served as an administration and emergency for the Black Truck Inc. Little information is given about the women however.)

1914: 1 women, telephone operator. This is the former building was in the Frances H. Seattle Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank. The building is now a branch office and service branch of the Federal Reserve Bank.

1937: 1 women, telephone operator. This is the former National Bank of New York, state and federal bank in the office of the company. The company organized the building in 1931.

2016: 1 women, telephone operator. This is the former Pacific Telephone & Telegraph building in Washington D.C. This building is a former telephone operator. The bank is the former bank of the Bank of New York, state and federal bank in New York. This was an office for a bank in the office of the company. The company organized the building in 1931. This is the former bank of the Bank of New York, state and federal bank in New York. The company organized the building in 1931.

2018: 1 women, telephone operator. This is the former Western Union, state and federal bank in New York. This is the former bank of the Bank of New York, state and federal bank in New York. This was an office for a bank in the office of the company. The company organized the building in 1931. This is the former bank of the Bank of New York, state and federal bank in New York. The company organized the building in 1931.
The 2006 06 2016 owner of the theatre was William Locke and wife. He was the grand owner of the Theatre, starting in 1903. Hugh W. Brown, previously owned a movie picture theatre in Wenatchee in 1923. He sold the theatre while his wife, Dorothy, provided the musical accompaniment to the silent films. The theatre burned in 1928. His leasehold interest at the theatre that his husband held transferred his effectiveness to Howard Tate, his sonographer, and a formeraiser of movie players. The old theater burned down in 1918. The new theater was opened in 1919. The old theater was a small rental and the new one was a larger. In 1930, this was used as a small restaurant and a cell. In a rear addition to this building was made a rented apartment for the restaurant’s owner. Manager in 1928, the theater recorded for this space were Clark Brown in 1910, Elmer Clark bought the theater. He also owned 2115, where he established his home. First coffee house called the "The Plea for the Dead." Among the notable players at the cafe were The Turkey Packers (an early Phil and Jerry Wallace band), Maggie Taylor (later agosto), and Henry Quin ("C.O. Walton followed by Bob Weil). Edward M. Nielson managed the property (1923). After 1930 through most of the mid 1940s, family owned and operated. That included installing a door opening between the theatre and 2015 through the '40s and '50s.

The Paramount Theatre was the location that the architecture which was the restoration of the 1930s. It was in 1925. This, however, is not related to the significance of the building. Men could be included about this place worked in this site and the experience for a stronger association.

The Port of Everett is a location that is the building. The Port of Everett is a location that is the building. The Port of Everett is a location that is the building. The Port of Everett is a location that is the building.
In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

The site was also known as "Gulch," located in Central District. It was an important site for the Chinese and Japanese communities, and it was known as "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.

In the context of Rainier Valley, the site was known as the "Gulch" or "Little Tokyo" for the high concentration of people of Japanese descent. This was the center of the garment industry, which was closely associated with the expansion of the Japanese community in the International District. The site was also known for its "Little China," which was a commercial district for Chinese businesses and residential areas.
1927 07 201707 1005 Westlake Avenue N 98248

**Faximus Hotel & Apartment Building**

1927

1001

2

Typology:

- **Owner:**

- **Tenants:**

- **Primary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as the post office, a bakery, and a restaurant.

- **Secondary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a florist, a pharmacy, and a dry cleaner.

- **Rental information:**

- **Building:**

- **Location:**

- **Architect:**

- **Construction:**

- **Alterations:**

- **Demolition:**

1927 07 201707 207 Pike Street 98201

**Subaraba Hotel/Shaftesbury Apartments**

1927

1001

1

This building was constructed as a hotel and apartment building and was originally known as the "Subaraba Hotel." It was later renamed the "Shaftesbury Apartments." The building was designed by architect Frank Lloyd Wright and was constructed in 1927.

- **Owner:**

- **Tenants:**

- **Primary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a restaurant, a bar, and a bakery.

- **Secondary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a laundromat, a dry cleaner, and a barber shop.

- **Rental information:**

- **Building:**

- **Location:**

- **Architect:**

- **Construction:**

- **Alterations:**

- **Demolition:**

1927 07 201707 2515 Bressi Avenue 98108

**Mandala Apartments**

1927

1001

1

This building was constructed as a hotel and apartment building and was originally known as the "Mandala Apartments." It was later renamed the "Bressi Apartments." The building was designed by architect Frank Lloyd Wright and was constructed in 1927.

- **Owner:**

- **Tenants:**

- **Primary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a restaurant, a bar, and a convenience store.

- **Secondary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a dry cleaner, a laundromat, and a barber shop.

- **Rental information:**

- **Building:**

- **Location:**

- **Architect:**

- **Construction:**

- **Alterations:**

- **Demolition:**

1927 07 201707 35th Avenue West 98107

**Hotel/Gatewood Company**

1927

1005

1

This building was constructed as a hotel and apartment building and was originally known as the "Hotel/Gatewood Company." It was later renamed the "35th Avenue West Hotel." The building was designed by architect Frank Lloyd Wright and was constructed in 1927.

- **Owner:**

- **Tenants:**

- **Primary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a restaurant, a bar, and a convenience store.

- **Secondary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a dry cleaner, a laundromat, and a barber shop.

- **Rental information:**

- **Building:**

- **Location:**

- **Architect:**

- **Construction:**

- **Alterations:**

- **Demolition:**

1927 11 201711 10011 Avenue 98234

**Architect:**

1927

1001

1

This building was constructed as a hotel and apartment building and was originally known as the "Architect." It was later renamed the "10011 Avenue." The building was designed by architect Frank Lloyd Wright and was constructed in 1927.

- **Owner:**

- **Tenants:**

- **Primary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a restaurant, a bar, and a convenience store.

- **Secondary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a dry cleaner, a laundromat, and a barber shop.

- **Rental information:**

- **Building:**

- **Location:**

- **Architect:**

- **Construction:**

- **Alterations:**

- **Demolition:**

1927 11 201711 3899 10th Avenue N 98103

**Hotel/Gatewood Company**

1927

1005

1

This building was constructed as a hotel and apartment building and was originally known as the "Hotel/Gatewood Company." It was later renamed the "3899 10th Avenue N." The building was designed by architect Frank Lloyd Wright and was constructed in 1927.

- **Owner:**

- **Tenants:**

- **Primary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a restaurant, a bar, and a convenience store.

- **Secondary tenants** included a variety of businesses such as a dry cleaner, a laundromat, and a barber shop.

- **Rental information:**

- **Building:**

- **Location:**

- **Architect:**

- **Construction:**

- **Alterations:**

- **Demolition:**
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30 May 1970s
16th Avenue

Mount Zion Baptist Church

1901
3
1967
2 African-American

The Mount Zion Baptist Church has been a pillar of the Seattle community for over 100 years. The oldest Baptist church in Seattle. The Mount Zion Baptist Church was founded in 1891 by a group of African-American men and women. This church has played a significant role in the history of Seattle's African-American community. The church has hosted many important events, including civil rights meetings and community gatherings. The architecture of the church is a blend of Gothic Revival and Romanesque styles. The church's dome and clock tower are notable features. The church's stained glass windows depict scenes from the Bible and are a testament to the church's commitment to spiritual growth and community engagement. The church's bell is a symbol of the church's commitment to justice and equality. The church has been a center for social justice efforts, hosting meetings and gatherings for civil rights organizations. The church's history is a testament to the resilience and strength of the African-American community in Seattle.

30 June 1970s
10th Avenue

Shields Baptist Church

1911
4
1916
2

This church was founded in 1911 and is located at 10th Avenue and Denny Way. It is one of the oldest Baptist churches in Seattle. The church was built in 1914 and is a beautiful example of Early American Gothic Revival architecture. The church has a large auditorium and a small meeting room. The church has a long history of community involvement and has hosted many important events, including civil rights meetings and community gatherings. The church is a center for social justice efforts, hosting meetings and gatherings for civil rights organizations. The church's history is a testament to the resilience and strength of the African-American community in Seattle. The church is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The church's clock tower is a notable feature. The church's stained glass windows depict scenes from the Bible and are a testament to the church's commitment to spiritual growth and community engagement. The church's bell is a symbol of the church's commitment to justice and equality.
The building was constructed by Anna Mary Donahoe as an automobile sales business and service garage for the Alfred J. Donahoe Auto Agency. Her husband, Michael, was also a wealthy real estate executive. The report includes a history of Michael Donahoe and his career. When Michael died in 1918, the building was sold to the family.

The address is a list of owner names, locations, and dates.

The address is a list of owner names, locations, and dates.
In 2018, the Masonic Temple of Seattle's African American workforce of 306 included African Americans, Asian Americans, and Euroimmi/Germany, Euroimmi/Italy. More information could be provided in a discussion of working-class African Americans and the Prime Hall Masonic Lodge, the association with fraternal organizations, the realization, and an excellent job in tying the building to the larger African American community of Seattle. It also does enough to show how women (black males) were also influential in events held in the building.

In 2019, the movement of the 1st group is very reminiscent in the context: Laden, Esther/Ex Libris. The realization does an excellent job in showing the association of African American and Filipino American history with place, and if the efforts of both those and the Navy to provide low-rent housing as an incentive to join the army, then improving the workplace. More information could have been provided to show the experience of the families living in this area. What was included about the community center was very brief in the realization.

The Masonic Lodge of Seattle's African American women's group was a significant provider of low-rent housing, and the Navy may have been involved in the construction of the building. The realized effort to provide for people especially of social services for the working-class community is supported by the fact that people living in this area could gather/celebrate/establish a community. A former resident of the community, Cynthia Davis (Filipino American) recounts spending time at the community center for groceries and parties.

The Masonic Lodge of Seattle's African American women's group was a significant provider of low-rent housing, and the Navy may have been involved in the construction of the building. The realized effort to provide for people especially of social services for the working-class community is supported by the fact that people living in this area could gather/celebrate/establish a community. A former resident of the community, Cynthia Davis (Filipino American) recounts spending time at the community center for groceries and parties.

The Masonic Lodge of Seattle's African American women's group was a significant provider of low-rent housing, and the Navy may have been involved in the construction of the building. The realized effort to provide for people especially of social services for the working-class community is supported by the fact that people living in this area could gather/celebrate/establish a community. A former resident of the community, Cynthia Davis (Filipino American) recounts spending time at the community center for groceries and parties.
The building is located in (South) Beacon Hill, which has "historically been populated by the city's oldest and largest community of color, including African American, Asian, and Hispanic". The neighborhood is home to some of the city's largest Japanese businesses and restaurants, including a "Japanese American" restaurant. The building also has a "Japanese American" history, including being "the site of the first Japanese American community center in the city".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".

The building was designed by "architects who were actively involved in the Seattle architectural community" and was "constructed in the modernist style of the 1950s, featuring clean lines and large windows with a focus on natural light and indoor-outdoor spaces".

The building was originally intended to be a "community center" for the neighborhood, but was later converted into a "school building". The building has been used for "thousands of students" and "is still used for educational purposes".
The significance of the women who performed at the building is vast, especially considering that many female performers did not have equal opportunities elsewhere. The history of the building's original use is significant, as it was originally owned by Charles Frye. His legacy includes the Frye Art Museum, which is now considered a significant cultural institution.

The Frye Art Museum has a long history of showcasing the work of women artists. The museum's initial focus was on the art of women, and it remains committed to highlighting female artists today. During the 2019 exhibit, "Women in Art: 20th Century to Today," the museum featured works by notable women artists such as Frida Kahlo, Georgia O'Keeffe, and Mary Cassatt.

The museum also has a strong connection to the local community, with programs and events that celebrate the arts and engage with the public. The museum's commitment to education is evident in its extensive outreach programs, which include workshops, lectures, and guided tours for all ages.

In conclusion, the Frye Art Museum is a testament to the power of art and the importance of supporting women's art. Through its exhibits and programs, the museum continues to inspire and celebrate the contributions of women artists, making it an essential resource for both artists and art lovers alike.
The property was originally developed and owned by the (company) Corporation, which was founded by (founder) and named (name). The name of the company's wife is (name). In 1990, the property was sold to (buyer), who renamed it (new name). The new owner made significant improvements to the property, including (list of improvements). The property was later sold to (new buyer) in (year), who continued to (describe changes). The building was (descriptive term) by (organization) on (date). It is (descriptive term) to the (historic) district.

Additional notes:
- The property was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in (year).
- It was designated a (state or national) landmark in (year).
- The property is (descriptive term) for its (specific feature).

The property was once the home of (famous person), who (description of historical significance). The property is (descriptive term) to the (historical context).

For more information, please contact (organization) at (phone number) or visit their website at (website).

In the 1920s, part of a blackাণ্ড, the neighborhood was particularity associated with Italian and Black residents. 

2. AsianAm/FarmersWeekly, AfricanAm, women, other. 

The owners, Frank and Bettie Williams, were successful business owners in Seattle. They were both involved in the Seattle’s garment industry. In the 1920s, the Williams Company was established by Frank Williams and his wife, Bettie. The company produced women’s and men’s clothing. 

3. AsianAm/NA, AfricanAm/other, women, labor. 

The owners, Frank and Bettie Williams, were successful business owners in Seattle. They were both involved in the Seattle’s garment industry. In the 1920s, the Williams Company was established by Frank Williams and his wife, Bettie. The company produced women’s and men’s clothing.

4. AsianAm/owners, AsianAm/labor, AsianAm/labor, AsianAm/women/leaders, 

The owners, Frank and Bettie Williams, were successful business owners in Seattle. They were both involved in the Seattle’s garment industry. In the 1920s, the Williams Company was established by Frank Williams and his wife, Bettie. The company produced women’s and men’s clothing.
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The buildings located in the Capitol HI Neighborhood was a former automobile dealers, garage, service, and storage spaces, and significance is based on its location along Auto Row. The building's first owner was Henry Stevens, who emigrated to the city around 1877. He opened (second) automobile school in Seattle in 1907 and purchased multiple properties until they separated in 1909. The site includes a mention as "Women in Seattle Real Estate." The newer mentions the building's first occupant George (owner of the Seattle Autobahn Company) Sr, Alice Weiss, but not much is said about the life. G. worked with Link to conduct renovation to design the building. From 1965 to 1962, the Centennial Lumber Company occupied the building. The company was founded by John B. Nisbet Jr., who also owned its profits to be the first real estate firm for women's clothing merchants. The building is located in the Capital HI Neighborhood. The current mention is that Cap HI is "the unofficial center of Seattle's LGBTQ community." It was a site for an auto garage for automobile repair businesses, and on the court toward today, the area now has the history Auto Row.

The building is located in the Capitol HI Neighborhood. The current mention is that Cap HI is "the unofficial center of Seattle's LGBTQ community." Over the years, upper floor businesses comprised larger music, art, and dance instruction and schools. The Washington College of Music was located there in the city directories from 1912 to 1915. In 1916, Willet Carrick, a music teacher, established the Cornish School of Music in Seattle. More information about the school is provided in the supplemental information. Among the people who lived in the school was Martha Graham, who taught at the college's Summer School in 1909. "Later, one of the principals included the famous studio in 1917, and the Seattle Symphony Orchestra from 1918 to 1919." In 1996, Glenn and Kiro Burschow the Barney School of Professional Arts in the health building. Other occupancies, 1980s to 1990s: Horace Mann, music teacher; Marion Kato, Kato Architects; Andrew Osberg; and the building was used as one of the retail spaces along Broadway. The supplemental information also includes a mention "Women in Music - Musicians and Teachers 1901-1973," which considers women's status and increasing in Seattle, but in Seattle.

The building was located in the Capitol HI Neighborhood. The current mention is that Cap HI is "the unofficial center of Seattle's LGBTQ community." Over the years, upper floor businesses comprised larger music, art, and dance instruction and schools. The Washington College of Music was located there in the city directories from 1912 to 1915. In 1916, Willet Carrick, a music teacher, established the Cornish School of Music in Seattle. More information about the school is provided in the supplemental information. Among the people who lived in the school was Martha Graham, who taught at the college's Summer School in 1909. "Later, one of the principals included the famous studio in 1917, and the Seattle Symphony Orchestra from 1918 to 1919." In 1996, Glenn and Kiro Burschow the Barney School of Professional Arts in the health building. Other occupancies, 1980s to 1990s: Horace Mann, music teacher; Marion Kato, Kato Architects; Andrew Osberg; and the building was used as one of the retail spaces along Broadway. The supplemental information also includes a mention "Women in Music - Musicians and Teachers 1901-1973," which considers women's status and increasing in Seattle, but in Seattle.

The building is located in the University District. The original owner of the building was William G. G. He lived with his wife, Margaret. In the area, the owner was Albert G. Hoes, a teacher and daughter of a Seattle pioneer. He was active in various civic groups in the city. The firm was the owner in the years, which also notices the name of the property owner. In a number of the residents over the years were women, including sales workers, teachers, writers, at times, women managed the building like Barbara Willinger (1969-1983).

The building is located in the University District. The original owner of the building was William G. G. He lived with his wife, Margaret. In the area, the owner was Albert G. Hoes, a teacher and daughter of a Seattle pioneer. He was active in various civic groups in the city. The firm was the owner in the years, which also notices the name of the property owner. In a number of the residents over the years were women, including sales workers, teachers, writers, at times, women managed the building like Barbara Willinger (1969-1983).
Avenue - Carkeek Park, behind. It comprises Canyon - American Creek, which was considered a sacred place by the Native Americans who inhabited the area prior to the Euro-American settlement. After the 1910s, as the neighborhood expanded, the park became known as "Indian Park." It was renamed "Carkeek Park" in 1963, after a prominent Seattle politician and the park's benefactor.

The park is located in the northwestern corner of the city, near the University District. It is a popular destination for outdoor activities, such as hiking, picnicking, and playing sports. The park also features a large pond, which is home to a variety of wildlife, including ducks, geese, and herons. The park has several trails, ranging from easy to moderate in difficulty, that are suitable for a variety of skill levels.

Carkeek Park is an important part of the local community, hosting numerous events and activities throughout the year. It is also a major landmark in the city, known for its natural beauty and recreational opportunities.
Another name for the site for the Thunderbird Treatment Center. In 1882, the newly formed Frances Crittenton Home of Seattle purchased the [Sisterhood’s] property (building or Frontier Beach), its furnishings, and Shares of all associated property to serve as a home for a ‘village of fallen women’ and their children. The organizational goal, if it was realized, was wider cultivation and could provide income for the home. In 1900, the Crittenton name went to all but a few of the property. Due to the [Sisterhood’s] 1901 and the use of religious orders and conventual institutions that led to murders, people of color lived in desolate areas, the part of Frontier Beach. The Frances Crittenton Home of Seattle was part of a “state-wide social welfare organization” created by Charles F. Crittenton in remembrance of his young daughter who died of scarlet fever. He co-founded the organization with Sister Kate Mellen Crittenton. Crittenton’s visit to Seattle in 1899 led to the formation of local Frances Crittenton Rescue Corps, consisting of a group of women led by Harriet Postlewait. **The house opened with five women residents, or inmates, as they were called, under the care of Anna Ora Duga Barrett, who owned the home’s first superintendent, [ ] and physician Dr. [ ] Clark, who oversaw her services.** When the Seattle house was first inspected in March 1904, it was considered a “serious matter.” In 1904, the building served as a halfway house for the Frontier Cooperatives. In 1905, the house added health-based acquired the building and opened the Thunderbird Treatment Center. The purpose of the inpatient residential treatment facility was to help brothel’s women people combat the challenges of addiction, suicide, unemployment, and access to healthcare.

The significance gives a biography of Frances Bornholt, whose children were both in the industry, but *why* the children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>80th Avenue E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2021 La Cita Apartments

Two story, brick-built rental site. Capital Hill neighborhood north of 15th Avenue and north of the waterfront. This new apartment project for older adults and people with special needs was built in 1977. The site was surrounded by construction, with the neighbors in the area. A site survey found that the existing site is a two-story, brick-built building with a first floor. The site was a 1977-1978 building, which was a two-story, brick-built rental site.

2021 Capital River House

The house was a two-story, brick-built rental site in the Capitol Hill area. The site was surrounded by construction, with the neighbors in the area. A site survey found that the existing site is a two-story, brick-built building with a rooftop. The site was a 1977-1978 building, which was a two-story, brick-built rental site.

2021 Wagner Floating Home

The house was a two-story, brick-built rental site in the Capitol Hill area. The site was surrounded by construction, with the neighbors in the area. A site survey found that the existing site is a two-story, brick-built building with a rooftop. The site was a 1977-1978 building, which was a two-story, brick-built rental site.
I think Hillman Beacon Valley, a neighborhood in West Seattle, has involved not only workers of African American, Asian, Hispanic, and other ethnic backgrounds, but also students who have brought increased diversity to the neighborhood. The demographics of the neighborhood have evolved due to significant population changes, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.

There has been a shift in the demographics of the neighborhood, with an increase in Asian and Pacific Islander populations. The neighborhood has experienced significant changes over the years, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.

The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community. The demographics of the neighborhood have evolved due to significant population changes, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.

The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community. The demographics of the neighborhood have evolved due to significant population changes, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.

The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community. The demographics of the neighborhood have evolved due to significant population changes, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.

The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community. The demographics of the neighborhood have evolved due to significant population changes, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.

The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community. The demographics of the neighborhood have evolved due to significant population changes, including the arrival of new residents from diverse backgrounds. The neighborhood has benefited from the diversity of its residents and continues to evolve as a diverse and inclusive community.
The history of Japanese Americans in the neighborhood is significant. The neighborhood was once the center of Japanese American life in Seattle. The building was donated to the Seattle Park's Neighborhood Center, which is significant to the neighborhood's history and identity.

In 1920, the building was used as a community center serving Japanese Americans who lived in the area. The building's history includes contributions from Japanese Americans, including the building's use as a community center for Japanese Americans during World War II and after the war.

The building was a significant community center serving Japanese Americans and served as a center for cultural and social activities. It was also significant to the local Japanese American community, providing a space for cultural events and gatherings.

The building was donated to the Seattle Park's Neighborhood Center in 1920, and it continued to be used by the community until 1950. After that time, it was used as a community center for Japanese Americans until 1980, when it was again donated to the Seattle Park's Neighborhood Center.

The building was significant to the neighborhood because it served as a center for cultural and social activities. It was also significant to the local Japanese American community, providing a space for cultural events and gatherings.

The building's history includes contributions from Japanese Americans, including the building's use as a community center for Japanese Americans during World War II and after the war.

In 2000, the building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places, highlighting its importance to the neighborhood's history.

The building's significance is reflected in its use as a community center and its role in the neighborhood's history. It is an important example of the contributions made by Japanese Americans to the neighborhood and the city as a whole.
Appendix D – Maps
Appendix E - Aquino-Inouye House Nomination Form
Name: Inouye-Aquino House /1010 E Spruce Street  Year Built: 1900
(Common, present or historic)

Street and Number: 1010 E Spruce Street

Assessor’s File No.: 2197600476

Legal Description: (see below)

Plat Name: Eastern Add E 1/2  Block 11  Lot 1
THE EAST HALF OF LOT 1, BLOCK 11, EASTERN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF SEATTLE ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED IN VOLUME 1 OF PLATS, PAGE 43, RECORDS OF KING COUNTY WASHINGTON.

Present Owner: Anthony Talevich  Present Use: Residence

Address: 7253 South Taft Street, Seattle, WA 98178

Original Owner: Conway Thomson

Original Use: Single-family residence

Architect: Unknown

Builder: John J. Power
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1. Introduction

This report provides information regarding the architectural design and historical significance of a building located at 1010 E Spruce Street in the Yesler Terrace neighborhood in Seattle, Washington. The building was not documented on the Seattle Historical Site survey. The Johnson Partnership prepared this report at the request of Emerald Bay Equity.

1.1 Background

The City of Seattle’s Department of Construction and Development (SDCI)—formerly the Department of Planning and Development—through a 1995 agreement with the Department of Neighborhoods, requires a review of “potentially eligible landmarks” for commercial projects over 4,000 square feet in area. As any proposed alterations or demolition of the subject building described within this report will require a permit from DCI.

To be eligible for nomination as a City of Seattle Landmark, a building, object, or structure must be at least 25 years old, have significant character, interest, or value, the integrity or ability to convey its significance, and it must meet one or more of the following six criteria (SMC 25.12.350):

A. It is the location of or is associated in a significant way with an historic event with a significant effect upon the community, city, state, or nation.
B. It is associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the city, state, or nation.
C. It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the community, city, state, or nation.
D. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, period, or method of construction.
E. It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder.
F. Because of its prominence of spatial location, contrast of siting, age, or scale, it is an easily identifiable feature of its neighborhood or the city and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood or city.

1.2 Methodology

Larry E. Johnson, AIA, The Johnson Partnership, 1212 NE 65th Street, Seattle, WA, completed research on this report between February and May 2019. Research was undertaken at the Puget Sound Regional Archives and the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections. Research also included review of internet resources, including the Seattle Times digital archive, available through the Seattle Public Library, and Ancestry.com. The building and site were inspected and photographed on February 13, 2019 and on May 22, 2019 to document the existing conditions.
2. Property Data

**Historic/Current Building Names:** Thomson house, 1002 E Spruce Street/1010 E Spruce Street

**Address:** 1010 E Spruce Street

**Location:** Yesler Terrace Neighborhood

**Assessor's File Number:** 2197600476

**Legal Description:** THE EAST HALF OF LOT 1, BLOCK 11, EASTERN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF SEATTLE ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED IN VOLUME 1 OF PLATS, PAGE 43, RECORDS OF KING COUNTY WASHINGTON.

**Date of Construction:** 1900-1901

**Original/Present Use:** Residence

**Original/Present Owner:** Conway Thomson/Anthony Talevich

**Original Designer:** Unknown

**Original Builder:** John J. Power

**Zoning:** MR

**Property Size:** 3,600 sq. ft.

**Building Size:** 1,810 sq. ft.
3. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION: 1010 E SPRUCE STREET

3.1 Location & Neighborhood Character
The subject property is located on a city block bordered by Tenth Avenue to the east, Eleventh Avenue to the west, E Alder Street to the north, and E Spruce Street to the south. The general area is made up largely of multi-story apartment houses, although eight older single-family properties on Tenth and Eleventh Avenues and on E Spruce Street are near or adjacent to the subject property. The major arterial Boren Avenue cuts diagonally through the immediate neighborhood and is located approximately one block to the southwest. There are a number of mature trees within the block and all rights-of-ways have sidewalks. Horiuchi Park is located approximately one-half block to the south, and the Japanese Baptist Church is located approximately one and a half blocks to the southwest. The King County Juvenile Detention Facility is located approximately two blocks to the east from the subject site. Nearby City of Seattle Landmarks include Washington Hall (1907, 153 14th Avenue) and Victorian House (1900, 1414 S Washington Street) to the southeast of the subject site, and Old Fire Station #3 (1903, 310 Terry Avenue), Yesler Terrace Steam Plant (1941, 120 Eighth Avenue), and Harborview Medical Center (1931, 325 Ninth Avenue). See figures 1-2.

3.2 Site
The subject site is located mid-block along E Spruce Street and is adjacent to an unimproved alley on the east. The lot is approximately 60'-0" feet square. The single-family residence that occupies the site is located on the eastern edge of the lot adjacent to the alley and a concrete driveway is located on the western side of the lot. Three mature trees are located along the western property line and two other mature trees are located at the lot's southeastern corner. The site slopes approximately ten feet down from the northwestern lot corner to the southeastern lot corner. There is a paved sidewalk and parking strip along E Spruce Street, three mature trees located along the western property line, and two other mature trees located at the lot's southeastern corner. See figures 3-10.

3.3 Architectural Description: Structure & Exterior
The subject building measures approximately 38'-6" north-south along the alley and 24'-6" inches east-west where it fronts E Spruce Street. The building itself is a simple wood-framed two-story rectangular box with a hip roof and a gable dormer on the western façade and a small hip roof dormer on the southern, primary façade. The building roof has a two-foot overhang, with a non-original vinyl soffit. Many of the downspouts are disconnected. The house originally was sheathed with bevel siding that was covered with asbestos siding in the 1930s. The house is presently sheathed with vinyl siding, and has vinyl cladding at the window trim. The exterior of the house has had all of its original wood-sash double-hung windows replaced with vinyl sash windows. There are brick chimneys located at the center of both the western and eastern sides of the house.

The southern façade faces E Spruce Street. There is a partially recessed entry porch on the building’s southeastern corner with a hip roof porch roof supported a pair of original Tuscan wood columns. A stairway leads down to grade to the west. The porch has non-original baluster guardrails, and the southern side of the porch is sheathed with artificial stone. Fenestration at
this façade consists of the following: a large, vinyl-sash picture window north of the entry porch at the main floor level; the non-original single-light steel entry door and, under that to the south, a vinyl-sash single-hung window under the entry porch; a pair of double-hung, vinyl-sash windows at the northern end of the second-floor level; a single double-hung vinyl-sash window at the southern end of the second-floor level; and a single square wood-sash nine-light window at the hipped attic dormer.

The western façade fronts an overgrown side yard. It contains a slight angled bay at the main floor level with a hipped roof and a gable dormer centered above it. The angled bay at the main floor level contains three double-hung vinyl sash windows, one on each side of the bay. Centered above the bay and hipped roof is a pair of double-hung vinyl-sash windows at the upper floor level, and centered above that at the attic level is a single, square, vinyl-sash, single-light window. One vinyl-sash double-hung window is located at each floor level on the southern end of the façade, and one vinyl-sash double-hung window located at the main floor level at the northern end of the façade.

The northern (rear) façade is almost inaccessible due to thick overgrown vegetation and fencing. This façade contains a steel entry door at the eastern side of the main floor level, two additional vinyl-sash double-hung windows spaced across the façade at the main floor level, and two vinyl-sash double-hung windows symmetrically placed at the upper floor level.

The eastern (alley) façade contains a pair of double-hung vinyl-sash windows to the east of the center of the façade at the first floor level. These windows light the kitchen. Another vinyl sash window is located midlevel at the center of the façade, lighting the stair landing. Directly above the kitchen window is a single smaller double-hung vinyl-sash window, which lights the bathroom. Vegetation obscures the basement level and eastern end of this façade. See figures 11-18.

3.4 Architectural Description: Interior Plan & Finishes

The plan of the house reflects a typical four-square organization, with an entry hall in the southwestern corner, a former parlor or sitting room in the southeastern corner, a dining area on the northwestern corner and a kitchen and powder room on the northeastern corner. The former parlor now functions as a bedchamber, and opens to the dining room and entry hall via wide pocket doors, typical of the era of original construction. The kitchen is accessed by a low hallway under the L-shaped stair in the entry hall. A window-sized pass-through connects the kitchen to the dining area. The dining area has a slight three-window bay and a small alcove located on the eastern end. The alcove is now used for storage, but may originally have functioned as a breakfast room or study. Much of the millwork appears original at the entry, former parlor, and dining area. The flooring in the entry hall is painted cement board that has been installed sometime in the last 20 years. The ceiling in the entry hall is a non-original acoustical tile treatment. There is fir flooring in the dining area and former parlor. A now non-functioning direct-vent gas fireplace was added to the northeastern corner of the parlor within the last 20 years.

At the upper floor, there is a bedchamber in each of the four corners of the house connected by a north-south hallway. The chamber on the northwestern corner is the largest, as the bathroom and stair occupy the central portion of the plan on the eastern side. Finishes at the upper floor include fir flooring, plaster walls and ceilings, and probably original millwork. A steep stair to the
attic is located on the northern side of the hall. The attic room is finished and functions as a bedchamber. Finishes in the attic include gypsum drywall at the walls and sloped ceilings and wall-to-wall carpet on the floor. See figures 19-33.

3.5 Documented Building Alterations and Physical Integrity

A basement foundation was constructed in 1909.\textsuperscript{1} At the completion of this report in 2019, the basement was inaccessible. A photograph from February 2019 indicates that the basement has a dirt floor and is used for storage. The property owner indicated that the interior was remodeled in 2001 after a fire.\textsuperscript{2}

The building retains its original form and massing, although it is missing many of its original character-defining elements such as the entry porch balusters, soffits, and its original siding. The original wood-sash double-hung windows have been replaced with vinyl-sash windows. The 1937 photograph indicates the southern attic dormer window is not original, as the 1937 window had a single light, not the nine lights of the present-day window. The photograph also indicates that originally the western bay windows had continuous head trim, and that the exterior trim profiles of all the window trim has been altered.

The upper portion of the western chimney has been removed. See figure 34.

Recorded Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Permit #</th>
<th>Designer/Builder</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/12/1900</td>
<td>5902</td>
<td>John J. Powers</td>
<td>Build 2-Story Frame House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/1902</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Okada</td>
<td>Cut window in wall of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/12/1909</td>
<td>74963</td>
<td>C. J. Post</td>
<td>Put in 8&quot; concrete wall basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>475693</td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-side existing residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections, Building Permit #74963.

\textsuperscript{2} Personal communication Anthony Talevich to Ellen Mirro, May 22, 2019.
4. SIGNIFICANCE

4.1 Historic Neighborhood Context: Nihonmachi & Yesler Terrace

The subject property is located within and near the eastern edge of the Yesler Terrace neighborhood, adjacent to First Hill, although the immediate area was traditionally associated with the Nihonmachi (or Japantown) commercial district, the northern portion of Seattle’s International District before Yesler Terrace was developed during and after World War II and further separated by the construction of Interstate 5.

The Yesler Terrace neighborhood sits between First Hill to the north and the International District to the south, with the second Avenue S extension of the Pioneer Square neighborhood also adjacent to the west. Historically there would have been no hard neighborhood boundaries between these neighborhoods. The "Racial Map" of Seattle overlaid on a 1936 Kroll map on display at the 2019 Wing Luke Museum exhibit "Excluded, Inside the Lines” shows the present-day Yesler Terrace neighborhood as the confluence of the "Oriental," "Jewish," and "Italian" races. The practice of "redlining" became popular in the 1930s as part of the Federal Housing Authority’s home loan guarantee program. The FHA guaranteed loans for private homes in areas that were not considered “hazardous.” An area’s hazard rating increased if it contained any minority or non-white populations, along with other environmental factors such as propensity for landslides. The effect was that banks would not grant mortgages to people of color. On the Seattle redline map, area D5—comprising the entire eastern side of Seattle's Downtown and areas of the Central District, Squire Park and the International District—is described as "composed of various mixed nationalities. Homes are occupied by tenants in a vast majority. Homes generally old and obsolete in need of extensive repairs." See figure 35-39.

"Profanity Hill"

First Hill, also known as Yesler, had a third name: "Profanity Hill." Originally known as “The Hill,” by 1883 "the crest of the hill entered a new era as the first retreat of its ‘first families,’ including mayors, judges, industrialists, timber barons, and art collectors.” However, by the 1890s the name “Profanity Hill” had solidified in reference to the hill’s southern edge. This was a “folk creation […] and appreciation for the naughty words heard from lawyers and litigants climbing the hill to reach the courthouse – and for the muffled cussing heard in the halls.”

As the city’s affluent families moved to more fashionable neighborhoods farther from downtown and the area became more populous with working class people, the meaning of “Profanity Hill” evolved as well. “With its mansions falling into disrepair, and an unusual patchwork of small businesses and wood-frame homes cropping up in between them, the neighborhood increasingly accommodated a diverse collection of low-income residents and ethnic businesses. The nickname Profanity Hill […] also came to refer to the underworld economy of drugs, crime, and 18 houses of prostitution that flourished there by the 1930s.” See figures 40-41.

Nihonmachi & the Japanese Community

Nihonmachi extended from the eastern side of Chinatown, around Fourth Avenue all the way east to around 15th Avenue between Jackson and Yesler, with significant Japanese populations.

---
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living south of Jackson between Sixth and Twelfth avenues. The northern portions of Nihonmachi, especially by the 1920s, occupied the southern portion of Profanity Hill.

From the 1880s to the early 1900s first-generation Japanese immigrants (Issei) were mainly single men, often second or third sons, seeking to accumulate sums of money before returning to Japan. Japanese immigration in the 1880s was stimulated by the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882 that established an absolute ten-year moratorium on Chinese labor immigration. During this period most Japanese men found work in the surrounding canneries, railroad, and the logging industry in the Puget Sound area. These labor-intensive jobs, however failed to provide the rapid economic advancement they had planned on for their short three-to-five-year stays. Since most of the early Japanese immigrants had only planned to stay temporarily, the early community was unstable, with a ratio of five men to every woman, and lacked social and religious support. As with the Chinese, Japanese immigrants also suffered racial discrimination often associated with labor disputes pitting them against white Americans. Racial covenants also excluded Asians from owning or renting in many Seattle neighborhoods.

In the early 1900s, Japanese businesses were concentrated north of what was known as Chinatown. Real estate covenants and employment discrimination led to the creation of the overlapping ghettos of 1936 Chinatown and Nihonmachi, east of Fourth Avenue between Yesler Way and Dearborn Street. To support the burgeoning Japanese population, Nihonmachi contained hotels, laundries, bathhouses, restaurants and clubs catering to Japanese people that included gambling and prostitution. This commercial district became the heart of the Japanese community. In 1909 completion of the Jackson Street regrade and the 1911 construction of the Union Depot at Fifth Avenue and King Street opened up new opportunities for Asian entrepreneurs in Seattle’s International District.5

However, real estate development by Issei was hampered at that time by the Washington State constitution that prohibited alien land ownership. As a result, construction was often facilitated by bicultural umbrella companies.6 The Panama Hotel (Sabro Ozasa, 605 S Main Street) was constructed in this manner in 1910, with a Japanese bathhouse in the basement. The Northern Pacific Hotel (308 Fourth Avenue S) followed in 1914, and under the management of Niroku Frank Shitamae quickly became one of the social anchors in the community.

In the 1910s, the Japanese population reached 6,127, and was recognized as Seattle’s largest non-white population.7 The population grew primarily as Issei bachelors began to think of themselves as permanent settlers and started putting down roots in the community. Unlike their Chinese counterparts these bachelors were allowed by the United States to marry eligible Japanese women, “picture brides” in arranged marriages, allowing the women to obtain passports necessary to immigrate to the United States.8 The subsequent rise in the number of Japanese births fostered an attitude of eijū dochaku—to live permanently on the soil.9 Women were charged with the responsibility of establishing a family that would create the foundations of a permanent

---

community life. Their children, second generation Japanese Americans, or *Nisei*, were expected to integrate into the community while retaining a sense of Japanese culture. Examples of small businesses within Nihonmachi ranged widely to include Aiko Photo Studio, the Tazuma Ten-Cent Store, the Home Brew Supply Store, Pacific Market, and the Cherry Land Florist, many of which were located on Jackson Street. See *figures 42-49*.

The *Kokugo Gakkō* (a.k.a. the Japanese Language School) was established in Seattle in 1902. By around 1913 the school was located at 1414 S Weller Street (Suekichi Shimizu, *City of Seattle Landmark*). By 1907 there were a total of 37 students, and by 1917 the student body had grown to 175. This included many students also attending public school (South School, later Bailey Gatzert) in the mornings who then spent two hours at the language school in the afternoon. See *figure 50*.

The Seattle Japanese Baptist Church was established in 1899. With the coming of women from Japan and the establishment of family life, the church began a Sunday School, which served an enrollment of 270 in 1908. In 1922 the church completed a large building with a gymnasium on the corner of Broadway and E Spruce Street. In these years most of the Japanese American community resided near the church, which became one of the centers of community activity with various associated clubs and organizations. The gymnasium was in constant use with athletic events for all ages. Located at 160 Broadway, before World War II and the development of Yesler Terrace, the Japanese Baptist Church was adjacent to the northwestern edge of Nihonmachi. See *figure 51*.

The first Jodo Shinshu Buddhist service in the Pacific Northwest was performed in 1901. By 1905, the Seattle Buddhist Church, also known as the Seattle Betsuin Buddhist Temple, was renting a small two-story house at 624 Main Street, Nihonmachi, west of present-day Interstate 5. By 1914, the Seattle Buddhist Church relocated to 1020 South Main Street, also in the Nihonmachi area. This building was destroyed as part of the demolition making way for the construction of Yesler Terrace. The current Seattle Betsuin Buddhist Temple (Kichio Allen Arai and Pierce A. Horrocks, 1427 S Main Street) was dedicated on November 15, 1941. See *figures 52-55*.

**Jackson Street Jazz Scene**

Jackson Street borders Yesler Terrace on the south, the International Special Review District on the east, and is significant for the jazz scene that flourished there between 1937 and 1951. Jackson Street was home to 34 nightclubs during those years. Geographically, Jackson Street connected King Street Station to the International District and the Central District, areas where residency was not restricted on the basis of race, and which therefore had diversity in racial and cultural populations. The city had two musicians' unions that until 1958 were racially segregated: the whites-only American Federation of Musicians (AFM) Local 76 and the largely black AFM

---
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Local 493. The Negro Musicians Union Local 493 shared space with the Blue Note jazz club north of Yesler Terrace, on Jefferson Street near the corner of 13th Avenue. A northern axis of the jazz scene would have been formed with the Mesob and No Way Café located next door to the Blue Note, and the Rocking Chair on the Corner of Yesler and 14th Avenue. Quoting Amy Rolf of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

The Jackson Street jazz scene may sound romantic today, but it’s important to remember that racial attitudes of the time influenced the public’s perception of the music then. Like rock 'n roll in the 1950’s, jazz was considered by many to be immoral. The abundance of vice and questionable activities in and around the clubs of Jackson Street caused many Seattletes consider the area unsafe.

The other cultural factor enabling the rise of the jazz scene and the Jackson Street nightclubs was the entrenched police corruption in Seattle at the time, so that the police would look the other way when nightclubs served alcohol before Prohibition ended in 1933.

The corner of 12th Avenue and Jackson Street was famous for E. Russell “Noodles” Smith’s nightclubs, including Seattle’s longest-running jazz club, the Entertainer’s Club, and the Alhambra, which was eventually renamed the Black & Tan. The term “Black and Tan” was shorthand for a location serving all races. the Black & Tan may have been Seattle’s most well-known jazz nightclub, being instrumental in the early career of Ray Charles (who originally played at the Back & Tan under the name R. C. Robinson), and hosting jazz greats like Duke Ellington, Charlie Parker, Quincy Jones, and Patti Brown. See figures 56-59.

Yesler Terrace & the Seattle Housing Authority

The formation of the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) was initiated in 1937 by the efforts of local attorney Jesse Epstein, and formalized in 1939. The first development of the SHA, Yesler Terrace, built as a low-income housing project, was completed by the spring of 1942. The motivations for the construction of Yesler Terrace was two-pronged: to provide housing for the poor, and to clear out the area's slums. Yesler Terrace was located on a swath of land located between Jackson Street and Yesler Way in what would have been recognized as part of Nihonmachi.

The legacy of this type of public housing project, so-called "slum clearance," associated with population displacement and the redesign of whole neighborhoods, has since been reevaluated in the context of its social benefit. Seattle Housing Authority archives have records of “359 families living in the south end of First Hill” and of these 137 were Japanese. Yesler Terrace’s construction not only displaced these families, but also displaced a number of significant Japanese institutions: three churches, four grocery stores, and four hotels. The residents of the land used for Yesler Terrace had all been moved out by 1940, well before the beginning of World War II. See figures 60-69.
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The housing to the northeast of Yesler Terrace continued to be occupied by mostly Jewish populations; the housing to the southwest was still considered part of Nihonmachi. Both areas continued to exhibit questionable housing conditions. The residents displaced by the construction of Yesler Terrace were relocated to other areas of Seattle, although there was a shortage of decent homes at modest rental prices. The SHA included language for social justice and racial integration in its formation and as a policy feature of each of its housing projects. However, SHA required that applicants who lived in Yesler Terrace be two-parent families and United States citizens. These policies excluded many immigrant families, single-parent households, and unmarried poor people living on First Hill. Many resorted to moving back down the hill, to Skid Row.  

The designers of Yesler Terrace included some of the early practitioners of the Modern movement in the Pacific Northwest: William Aitken, William J. Bain, John T. Jacobsen, J. Lister Holmes, and George W. Stoddard. The design of Yesler Terrace reflected the European Modernist design ethos, but with American materials such as platform framing and wooden siding. Yesler Terrace, along with other Seattle Housing Authority projects such as Holly Park (1942, Paul Thiry, now NewHolly) in Rainier Valley, had flat or low-slope roofs with corner windows, reflecting the influence of Modernist design ideas. By 1944, the Seattle Housing Authority had transformed from an agency providing housing to the poor during the Great Depression to one serving mostly veterans, military families and defense workers. See figures 70-73.

Nihonmachi during World War II

Prosperity in the International District declined in the 1930s due the Great Depression, but picked up again by the beginning of the 1940s. After the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, which led to the incarceration of Japanese and Japanese Americans after the United States entered World War II. Japanese families, numbering more than 7,000 individuals from the Seattle area, were forced to leave businesses and property behind during incarceration, causing many of them to lose all their acquired wealth. Between April 18, 1942 and September 23, 1942, many Seattle families were sent to the Puyallup Assembly Center, also known as “Camp Harmony.” For the most part, these families were sent on to the Minidoka concentration camp in Idaho. Those from Bainbridge Island took a special ferry to Seattle, where they were then transferred to a train bound for the Manzanar concentration camp in California. Nihonmachi lost its identity as a neighborhood, and the last remnants of Japanese culture in Seattle were held at places like the Panama Hotel, where Japanese families stored their possessions during incarceration, most of them never to be recovered. See figures 74-83.

Aftermath of World War II

After the war, many Japanese people returned to Seattle’s International District, although some families relocated to the suburbs, particularly to the eastern side of Lake Washington. Japanese
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families essentially had to start over economically, and faced open hostility in the Northwest. The War Relocation Authority (WRA) had begun a campaign to show how good life was for Japanese Americans outside of the camps. “Beginning in summer 1942, WRA began to release incarcerees [but] encouraged them to resettle in areas of the United States other than the West Coast. […] Incarcerees did not depart in large numbers until 1944.” The Issei, the older generation of sixty years or more, had a particularly difficult time starting over after losing businesses and farms.29 By the mid-1950s, second generation Japanese Americans were seeing employment opportunities open up, and many enrolled in college, earning professional degrees. The 1952 McCarran-Walter Immigration Act lifted the restriction against first-generation Japanese immigrants becoming naturalized citizens, and the Immigration Act of 1965 eliminated national origin quotas. See figure 84.

The Seattle chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), a national organization based in San Francisco, successfully fought for and eventually saw the repeal of Washington State’s racist Alien Land Law in 1966.30 The 1960s also saw the elimination of ethnically based real estate covenants via the federal Housing Rights Act of 1966, which allowed Asian Americans greater flexibility in purchasing homes in formerly restricted neighborhoods. In 1966 the Wing Luke Asian Museum was established in a storefront on Eighth Avenue S. The museum was named for the first Chinese American to be elected to the city council of a major American city.31

4.2 Building History: 1010 E Spruce Street

The original building permit, issued on December 12, 1900, granted Conway Thomson 90 days to construct a two-story residence on the subject property, originally addressed 1002 E Spruce Street.32 Conway Thomson (1851-1932) was born in India, of Scottish/English parentage.33 Thomson arrived in Seattle around 1899, and by 1902 was working as an inspector for the City of Seattle Street Department.34 In 1903 he took a job as an inspector for the United States Customs Department, and in 1907 transferred to the United States Immigration Service in 1907.35 Thomson and his wife Retta lived in the residence on the subject property from 1901 until at least 1918.36 In 1930 Thompson, then widowed, was living in Los Angeles.37 He passed away there in 1932.38

The subject building was occupied and then owned by the Tsuyoshi Inouye (1887-1968) and his family from 1922 to 1942.39 Inouye and his wife Yayoi (nee Iseka, 1900-1989) were both Issei, or

32 Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections, Building Permit no. 5902.
38 California Death Index, 1905-1939.
first generation Japanese immigrants. When the family purchased the house in 1925 the title of the house was put in their oldest daughter’s (Bessie K. Inouye) name since neither Tsuyoshi nor Yayoi were American citizens, and were therefore prohibited by the Washington State constitution from owning property. Tsuyoshi owned the State Café on First Avenue and Madison Street, where his wife and later his children assisted him in its operation. The couple had six children, five girls and one boy. The second girl, Ruby, would become Seattle’s first Japanese American woman physician, a staunch supporter and advocate for Japanese facilities for the elderly, and an icon in Seattle’s Japanese community. See Section 4.3.1 of this report for more information.

The Inouyes lived in the house until 1942, whereupon when the family was deported, first to Camp Harmony on the Puyallup Fair Grounds, and in August 1942 to the Minidoka Internment Camp in Idaho. The house was rented during the family’s internment, which lasted until early 1946. The family had stored what they couldn’t carry in boxes and trunks in the house’s basement. Other Japanese families also used the basement to store personal effects. Aside from being a generous act, sharing their basement may not have been uncommon for Japanese homeowners, who took in what they could. Other places, such as the Panama Hotel and the Baptist church, also offered storage.

The family returned to the house in 1946 but found it and the contents of the basement ransacked. After returning to Seattle the family allowed other former internees to stay with them in the house until they could find housing. See figures 85-88.

The Inouye family left the house around 1948, moving to 1909 Minor Avenue. Subsequent tenants included James Gochis (1943), G.S. Hatsukano (1948-1949), and George R. and Ella Aquino (1955-1979). Recent tenants include members of Seattle band Tacocat. See Section 4.3.2 of this report for more information.

4.3 Associated Individuals

4.3.1 Dr. Ruby Inouye Shu (1920-2012)

Dr. Ruby Inouye Shu was born on November 17, 1920, at her family’s home at 1010 E Spruce Street in Seattle. She was the second daughter Tsuyoshi and Yayoi Inouye. Tsuyoshi Inouye immigrated to the United States from Japan in 1905 and owned the State Café on First Avenue and Madison Street. Ruby’s mother was a Japanese “picture bride” who married Tsuyoshi through an arranged marriage in Japan, arriving in Seattle in 1918.

Growing up in the house on Spruce Street, Dr. Ruby remembers that besides her parents and their six children (five girls and one boy) a couple of rooms were always occupied by Japanese bachelors. She also remembers that Japanese was always spoken at home, while outside of the home—at school and at her father’s restaurant, where the children were expected to chip in—

---
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English was spoken. She attended Pacific Grammar School, and after school the Japanese Language School on Weller Avenue and 14th Street, where she learned to read and write in Japanese.

Although a self-admitted bookish stay-at-home girl, any social life she had while growing up revolved around the Japanese Baptist Church, located a few blocks from her home. Her family also attended *kenjinkai* (mutual aid society) events. She had numerous friends in the neighborhood, mainly other Nisei children whose families lived nearby. During her childhood she remembered that her house did not have central heating, so the whole family and roomers would congregate in the kitchen, where there was a coal stove.

Ruby attended Broadway High School and graduated in 1939 with a straight-A average and was named the class salutatorian. Her parents expected all their children, including the girls, to attend college, and she entered the University of Washington in the fall of 1939 planning to major in home economics. She switched to pre-med with her father’s permission in her sophomore year, following her desire to contribute more to her community.

She was forced to drop out of college in her junior year due to President Franklin D. Roosevelt order detaining Japanese people in America. As with most Japanese Americans affected, the Inouye family peaceably obeyed the order to evacuate. The family sold their restaurant, storing restaurant equipment and dishes in their basement. Personal belongings that they couldn’t bring with them were also packed away and stored in the basement of their home. The family accepted and packed away other belongings of other Japanese, and in the weeks before internment, they accepted a number of other families into their home.

Ruby and her family spent from May to August 1942 at Camp Harmony in the Puyallup Fairgrounds, where her older sister Bessie received her college degree. In August, the family was transferred by train with other Japanese families to the Minidoka Internment Camp in Idaho.

At Minidoka Ruby applied and was accepted into a pre-med program at the University of Texas and received permission to leave the camp to continue her education. Her ability to apply to a college outside what was known as the West Coast Exclusion Zone was facilitated by a group of concerned educators worked to see that more than 2,500 Nisei college students were allowed to continue their education. These educators included Lee Paul Sieg, president of the University of Washington, Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University California at Berkeley, and Remsen Bird, president of Occidental College.  

She arrived in Texas in January 1943, where she entered spring semester at the University. A local family, Mr. and Mrs. A. Moffit, offered her room and board in exchange for assisting the family with household work and childcare. She graduated with honors and a bachelor’s degree after three semesters.

After graduation Ruby was accepted at the Women’s Medical College of Philadelphia along with Kazuko Uno, another Japanese American and former internee. After receiving their medical degrees, the two women were the only two graduates not initially accepted at any hospital for internships. The dean of the medical college was able to place her at St. Francis Hospital in Pittsburgh, where she worked from 1948 until 1949.

---
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The Inouye family was released from Minidoka in early 1946. Returning to their home on E Spruce Street they found the house in poor condition and the basement storage ransacked. Again, the family allowed other Japanese families and individuals to stay at their house until they could find permanent housing.

After her internship, Ruby returned to Seattle and applied for residency at Providence and Harborview hospitals but was denied. Undeterred, Dr. Inouye opened her general practice office on the second floor above the Higo Variety Store at 602-608 Jackson Street in Seattle's International District. Her first patient was a young bakujin (European American) boy with a minor injury but she recalls giving him a complete examination since she was eager to do a good job. Dr. Inouye's practice prospered and many of her patients were Issei who spoke little or no English and found her proficiency in the Japanese language comforting. Many of them were obstetrical patients who were so-called war brides. From them she learned the Japanese names of various organs and other body parts that she had not learned in medical school. She eventually received medical privileges at Seattle General Hospital, Providence Hospital, Swedish Hospital, Virginia Mason, and Maynard Hospital.

At Seattle General Hospital, Dr. Inouye met her future husband, Evan Shu, a Chinese national who was interning at the hospital. The couple married in 1951 and in 1953 they began a joint practice in Seattle and later built a new clinic at 202 16th Avenue S (1961, also addressed at 1601 S Washington Street, Blaine McCool). The clinic building was shared with the Planned Parenthood Center of Seattle.47 See figure 89.

Drs. Inouye and Shu had three children, Evan Jr., an architect in Boston; Geraldine, a University of Washington scientist; and Karen, an Auburn school administrator. Her children thought of her as a big personality in a little body. She taught them to be unafraid of the world and gave them a strong work ethic.48 See figure 90.

Dr. Inouye and her husband shared a desire to assist elderly Issei Japanese who felt out of place at various nursing homes in the Seattle area. They were culturally isolated since they didn’t understand the English language and the food served was unfamiliar. What these patients needed was a place where they could be comfortable in their surroundings with other Japanese-speaking people and with traditional Japanese food. See figure 91.

In 1972 Dr. Inouye and her husband attempted to open a 100-bed nursing home that would cater to these patients, but their plan failed to meet administrative hurdles and was abandoned. Nevertheless, the couple were not alone in wanting to help elderly Japanese. The Shus joined the newly formed Issei Concerns Committee in late 1972. The group worked diligently and on September 19, 1976, Seattle Keiro, a nursing facility located in the old and refurbished Mount Baker Convalescent Center on Massachusetts Avenue, was opened. In 1980, the Issei Concerns Board voted to change the corporations name to Nikkei Concerns. The organization was committed now to including all generations of Japanese descendants. Additionally, in 1987, a new Seattle Keiro was opened on E Yesler Avenue with 150 beds and built on some of the property owned by the Shus. In 1988, Dr. Inouye became the first female president of Nikkei Concerns and exerted a strong influence in fundraising.49

48 Henry.
49 Henry.
Drs. Inouye and Shu retired in 1995, and the couple donated their clinic at 202 16th S to Seattle Keiro. Dr. Ruby Inouye passed away on September 2012. She was considered by many to be an enormous force in the Japanese community. See figure 92.

4.3.2 Associated Individual: Ella Aquino

From 1955 until at least 1979, the house was owned by George and Ella Aquino. Ella Aquino was an activist and political organizer known as "the matriarch of Seattle's Native American community." She was a co-founder of the American Indian Women's Service League, and was part of the 1970-1971 occupation at Fort Lawton that led to the creation of the Daybreak Star Center at Discovery Park.50

She was born in 1902 in Puyallup, and was a descendent of the Lummi and Yakima tribes. As a child she was sent to a school run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the Tulalip reservation, then to a Catholic school in Federal Way. She moved to Seattle in 1944. In 1958, after performing a door-to-door "census" of Native Americans in Seattle, she and several friends founded the American Indian Women's Service League (AIWSL). This led to the formation of at least four more social and community service organizations for Native American people in the region.51

As part of her work with the AIWSL, Aquino founded the Indian Center News, which operated from 1960 to 1970. On March 8, 1970 Aquino, at age 67, was part of a group of activists associated with the United Indian People's Council52 who scaled the fence at the decommissioned military base Fort Lawton in the Magnolia neighborhood. The group laid claim to the land, citing an 1865 treaty between the United States government and Native American tribes, under which surplussed military land would be returned to the land's original owners. After a 15-month-long occupation of the site—accompanied by much political maneuvering, national attention, and a military standoff—the City and the Native American groups agreed to negotiate. The city agreed to lease 20 acres of the former Fort Lawton to the United Indians of All Tribes. That land became the Daybreak Star Cultural Center, which opened in 1977.53

Aquino wrote a column called "Teepee Talk" for Northwest Indian News, and went on to become the editor of the newspaper, which operated from 1970 to 1980. In the late 1970s she produced a weekly radio program focusing on Native American issues for KRAB-FM.54

In 1984 the local chapter of the United Nations Foundation honored her for her work and activism. When she was 86, she was the subject of the 1987 documentary film Princess of the Powwow.55 Her years of activism earned her the nickname "Give 'Em Hella Ella."

She passed away in 1988, at age 86, and was mourned by the Native American community at large.

51 Moore.
52 The name was later changed to the United Indians of All Tribes.
55 Susan Applegate Krouse and Heather A. Howard, Keeping the Campfires Going: Native Women's Activism in Urban Communities (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), n.p.
4.4 Architectural Style: Seattle Foursquare Houses

The subject building is a modest vernacular variant of a Georgian Revival-style Foursquare house, constructed in 1900.

In Folke Nyberg's and Victor Steinbrueck's 1975 pamphlet *Queen Anne: An Inventory of Building and Urban Design Resources*, a companion booklet illustrates 32 common Seattle building styles, including the “Classic Box” from circa 1900-1918. In addition to being called “Foursquare,” this style also went by the names “Seattle Box,” “Box House,” “Denver Square,” “Double Decker,” and “Double Cube.” This fairly utilitarian style was important to the growth of middle-class suburbs, as these boxy houses were inexpensive and simple to build. They were so popular that Sears Roebuck & Company featured fifteen Foursquare pre-cut kit homes.

Foursquare homes are typically square in plan and elevation and have a hip roof with centered dormer, and a one-story porch across the front elevation. The two second-story windows are on either side of a decorative feature. The foursquare houses are generally symmetrical and incorporate simple neoclassical decorative elements. The interior typically has four squares, or rooms, per floor. This was an efficient use of space as a short corridor could connect the rooms. The first floor tends to have an entry foyer, a living room, a dining room, and a kitchen. The second floor tends to have a bedroom in three corners and bathroom in the fourth.

According to *Shaping Seattle Architecture*, Seattle grew from 80,000 people in 1900 to nearly 240,000 by 1910, and the residential neighborhoods had to keep up with the rapid expansion. At the time of this growth spurt, the design of middle-class housing was largely drawn from plan books and other similar publications. National and local architects and builders sold pre-drawn plans and provided limited customization of plans. The Radford Architectural Company in Chicago and the Aladdin Company in Bay City, Michigan, regularly published house plans, including the “Standard”—a Foursquare house popular among builders and homeowners from the 1890s to the 1920s. See figure 93.

Locally, Seattle newspapers frequently published schematic plans for homes with accompanying paid advertising by local architects and plan book companies. Two of the most successful local architects to publish plans were Victor W. Voorhees and Elmer E. Green. Together they were responsible for the design of literally hundreds of houses in Seattle neighborhoods between the early 1900s and early 1930s. Jud Yoho, a promoter of the Craftsman bungalow style, went even further, publishing a national magazine, *Bungalow Magazine*, selling both house plans and completed homes (the latter on installment purchase plans). See figure 94.

There are dozens of examples of the Foursquare house type in the established Queen Anne Hill single-family neighborhood, and hundreds in the city as a whole. This house form is readily recognized by architectural laymen and appreciated by their owners. Although all have been adapted to changes in technology and family lifestyle, most of these homes retain a fair degree of historical integrity. See figures 95-97.

Although more modest in design and ornamentation than those built on Queen Anne Hill, many

---

58 Ibid.
foursquare style homes were built on First Hill, contemporary with the subject building, and still exist today. Examples include: 919 13th Avenue (1900), 907 14th Avenue (1902), 815 13th Avenue (1903), and 903 14th Avenue (1906). See figures 98-101.

4.5 Building Designer: Unknown

The original designer of the subject building is unknown, although the design is probably derived from a residential plan book from the turn of the twentieth century.

4.6 Building Contractor: John J. Power

John Joseph Power (1865-?) was born in Prince Edward Island, Canada, on July 29, 1865, of Irish/Scottish parentage. He arrived in Seattle around 1898. By occupation he was a carpenter and house contractor. Power had moved to San Diego by 1910.
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Figure 5 • View A - Viewing west on E Spruce Street

Figure 6 • View B - Viewing north on E Spruce Street and alley
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Figure 7 • View C - Viewing north on E Spruce Street

Figure 8 • View D - Viewing northeast on E Spruce Street
Figure 9 • View E - Viewing east on E Spruce Street and 10th Avenue

Figure 10 • View F - Viewing south on alley
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Figure 11 • 1010 East Spruce Street: Site Plan
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Figure 12 • 1010 East Spruce Street, southern façade

Figure 13 • 1010 East Spruce Street, southern façade, recessed porch front detail
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Figure 14 • 1010 East Spruce Street, southeastern corner, recessed porch
**Figure 15 • 1010 East Spruce Street, western façade**
Figure 16 • 1010 East Spruce Street, northern façade, upper

Figure 17 • 1010 East Spruce Street, northern façade, lower
Figure 18 • 1010 East Spruce Street, eastern façade, lower
Figure 19 • View of basement
Figure 22 • Former parlor

Figure 23 • Former parlor, pocket door detail
Figure 24 • View of dining area

Figure 25 • View of dining area
Figure 26 • View of kitchen

Figure 27 • View of kitchen
Figure 28 • View of northeast bedroom

Figure 29 • View of northwest bedroom
Figure 30 • View of southeast bedroom

Figure 31 • View of southwest bedroom
Figure 32 • View of second-floor hall

Figure 33 • View of attic
Figure 34 • Original permit: Build 2-story Frame House with basement 24x38, #5902, 1900
Figure 35 • 1890 Whitney’s Map of Seattle
Figure 36 • 1915 Seattle Railways

Figure 37 • Japanese Population, 1920, Social Trends in Seattle by Calvin Schmidt
Figure 38 • City of Seattle Redline map, 1936, overlaid on a 1935 Kroll Map
Figure 39 • Seattle racial distribution map, overlaid on Kroll Map
Figure 40 • View from Hoge Building looking towards King County Courthouse and “Profanity Hill,” 1908

Figure 41 • View east from Smith Tower, Seattle, ca. 1914
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Figure 42 • Main Street, Nihonmachi, viewing west midway between Maynard Street and Seventh Ave, 1915

Figure 43 • Men on a corner in Seattle’s International District, 1932
Figure 44 • International Distric street scene looking northeast, Seattle, 1934

Figure 45 • Aiko Photo Studio, located on the second floor on Sixth and Jackson, date unknown
Figure 46 • The Tazuma Ten-Cent Store, Twelfth Avenue and Jackson Street, ca. 1920

Figure 47 • Ayako Uyeda, Masato Uyeda, Fumiko Uyeda (L-R), ca. 1935. Masato owned Home Brew Supply Store
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Figure 48 • Frank Kubo stands in Pacific Market, located at 1305 Jackson Street, 1936

Figure 49 • The Cherry Land Florist, located on Jackson Street, Nihonmachi, ca. 1940s
Figure 50 • Kokugo Gakkō, Japanese Language School, 1414 S Weller Street, Nihonmachi (Japantown), 1935

Figure 51 • Japanese Baptist Church, 160 Broadway, ca. 1930
Figure 52 • Seattle Buddhist Church members, ca. 1900

Figure 53 • Seattle Buddhist Church with Rev. Gendo Nakai on the stairs, 624 Main Street, Nihonmachi, 1903
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Figure 54 • Seattle Buddhist Church, 1020 South Main Street, Nihonmachi, 1914

Figure 55 • Second location Seattle Buddhist Church, 1427 S Main Street, 1939 (City of Seattle Landmark)
Figure 56 • Musician’s Protective Union, Local 493, AFM aka “The Blue Note,” 1319 E Jefferson Street, ca. 1953

Figure 57 • The Rocking Chair, ca 1940s
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Figure 58 • The Black & Tan Jazz Orchestra, ca. 1928

Figure 59 • The Black & Tan, ca. 1946
Figure 60 • Building to be demolished for Yesler Terrace housing project, 1939

Figure 61 • Houses in the First Hill neighborhood, 1940
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Figure 62 • Houses in the First Hill neighborhood, ca. 1940

Figure 63 • Residences on First Hill, future location of Yesler Terrace development, ca. 1940
Figure 64 • Houses being demolished for Yesler Terrace housing project, 1940
Figure 65 • Aerial view of construction of Yesler Terrace, 1941
Figure 66 • First Hill prior to construction of Yesler Terrace, 1940

Figure 67 • First Hill during construction of Yesler Terrace, 1941
Figure 68 • Yesler Terrace before completion, 1941

Figure 69 • Yesler Terrace, 1941
Figure 70 • Public Housing 10th Anniversary Report, Yesler Terrace, 1949

Figure 71 • Public Housing 10th Anniversary Report, “We Still Have Blight” Map, 1949
Figure 72 • Yesler Housing units with Smith Tower, September 18, 1965

Figure 73 • Yesler Terrace, September 18, 1965
Figure 74 • “High Court Upholds Jap Curfew,” Seattle Times, June 21, 1943
Figure 75 • Seattle chapter of the JACL conducts emergency “evacuation” registration on or around March 14, 1942

Figure 76 • Japanese Americans catching a special ferry to Seattle from Bainbridge Island, 1942
Figure 77 • Army trucks transport Japanese Americans on Bainbridge Island to the Eagledale ferry dock, 1942. Pvt. Tony Bova, Seijiro Nakamura with his children, and pastor of the Japanese church at Winslow, Kihachi Hirakawa (L to R)

Figure 78 • Puyallup Assembly Center, 1942
Figure 79 • Japanese Americans walking between barracks at Puyallup Assembly Center, 1942

Figure 80 • Waving goodbye as detainees are bussed away from Puyallup Assembly Center, 1942
Figure 81 • Japanese Americans relocating to Minidoka, 1943

Figure 82 • Minidoka concentration camp, 1943
Figure 83 • Entrance to Minidoka concentration camp, 1944

Figure 84 • WRA resettlement image, Milwaukee, 1944
Figure 87 • 1010 E Spruce, Tax assessor's photo, 1960

Figure 88 • 1010 E Spruce, Tax assessor’s photo, 1960
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Figure 89 • Dr. Ruby’s clinic, 202 16th Avenue S (1961, Blaine McCool, architect)

Figure 90 • Dr. Ruby Inouye Shu, husband Evan, and children Evan Jr. and Geraldine, 1955
Figure 91 • Dr. Ruby Inouye Shu, 1970s

Figure 92 • Still from “Dr. Ruby,” a short documentary produced as a ‘Community Stories’ segment for the Seattle Channel, 2016
Figure 93 • Martha John (center) demonstrating Native American crafts, 1960. Ella Aquino, third from left.

Ron DeRosa, Seattle Times

Figure 94 • Ella Aquino (right), with Letoy Eike of the American Indian Women’s Service League, and Dorothy Lombard, Indian Arts and Crafts shop manager
Figure 95 • Aladdin Home Plan, “The Standard,” 1916
Figure 96 • “Design No. 43,” home plan by Victor Voorhees

Figure 97 • 108 Hayes Street, Queen Anne Hill
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Figure 97 • 108 Hayes Street, Queen Anne Hill

Figure 98 • 207 Seventh Avenue W, Queen Anne Hill

Figure 99 • 1624 Seventh Avenue W, Queen Anne Hill
Figure 100 • First Hill foursquare: 919 13th Avenue, 1900

Figure 101 • First Hill foursquare: 907 14th Avenue, 1902
Figure 102 • First Hill foursquare: 815 13th Avenue, 1903

Figure 103 • First Hill foursquare: 903 14th Avenue, 1906
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What can be designated

**Individual buildings**
(Historic landmarks)

**Collections of buildings**
(Historic districts)

**Structures**

Icons from the Noun Project: home by Danishicon, buildings by Laurent Genereux, gazebo by Chintuza, cemetery by Juan Pablo Bravo, archaeology by Phatchara Bunkhachary, schooner by Dolly Holmes, mural artist by Gan Khoon Lay. Photos not owned by City of Austin: Haskell House from Clarksville CDC; Driskill Hotel from TEXScout / Texas Film Commission; West Sixth Street Bridge from Ted Lee Eubanks via Shoal Creek Conservancy; Moontower from Peter Tsai Photography / Alamy Stock Photo; Sneed House from Austin Chronicle; Diego Rivera mural from Banco de México Diego Rivera Frida Kahlo Museums Trust, Mexico, D.F./Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York, via San Francisco Art Institute; Steam Engine No. 786 from Austin Steam Train Association.
“Tangible heritage refers in general to the material traces such as archaeological sites, historical monuments, artifacts, and objects that are significant to a community, a nation, or/and humanity”

- D. Munjeri, “Tangible and intangible heritage,” Museum

The term historic resources includes multiple forms of the built environment: buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts.
Why resources are designated

In most cities, designation criteria for historic landmarks and districts fall under four categories from the National Register of Historic Places:

**Events**

Resources that reflect important events or trends

**People**

Resources associated with significant people

**Design/construction**

Typical of a building type, construction period, or construction method; that represent the work of a master; or that possess high artistic values

**Information potential**

Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory. This is typically used to designate archaeological sites.

Most historic designation criteria focus on tangible ties to the past and can be limiting as traditionally applied. For example, architecture is heavily privileged. Larger, fancier buildings are more likely to be designated than smaller, simpler buildings, though both could meet the same criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must meet...</th>
<th>2 of 5</th>
<th>2 of 7</th>
<th>3 of 10</th>
<th>1 of 11</th>
<th>2 of 8</th>
<th>1 of 3</th>
<th>1 of 10</th>
<th>3 of 16</th>
<th>1 of 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, cultural, economic, or political history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in planning or urban design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important group, institution, or business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistry / artistic value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of a master architect, builder, or craftsman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-of-a-kind building / unique visual feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to other important sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique or prominent location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for public education / awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or state recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Automatically qualifies</th>
<th>50 years ago</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>30 years ago</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>50 years ago</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>50 years ago</th>
<th>25 years ago</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Landmarks

Underrepresented communities in Austin’s existing and recommended landmarks

Different designation levels

In England, historically significant buildings are designated at three levels. Unlike in the U.S., where historic landmark designation recognizes all individually significant properties in the same way with the same regulation, the English system recognizes that different buildings require different types of protection and stewardship.

The English designation level is based on a building’s history, physical and site characteristics, historic and current use, and other contextual factors. Municipal authorities and building owners use this system to balance preservation needs with other factors, such as current use and economic impact.

- **Grade I** listed buildings are of exceptional national, architectural, or historical interest—like Buckingham Palace. **2.5%** of designated buildings

- **Grade II*** listed buildings are particularly important buildings whose histories are more far-reaching than those of Grade II. **5.5%**

- **Grade II** buildings are of special interest and warrant preservation. They may tell more locally or regionally important stories. **92%**

Credit: Preservation Austin classified historic landmarks’ associations with underrepresented communities.
Districts

Historic districts

Historic districts are collections of historic properties that tell a common story. Designation is a planning tool to steward that story into the future.

District types

Historic districts can be geographically contiguous, recognizing the development of one area, or thematic, recognizing resources that speak to an important theme across multiple neighborhoods. Historic districts in Austin currently are required to be contiguous, with no “donut holes.”

Designation criteria

Most other cities use the same designation criteria for districts as for historic landmarks. In Austin, there is no requirement for an area to be historically significant. In practice, though, our historic districts have important histories documented in the district applications.

Austin does require at least 51% of the buildings in a potential historic district to retain historic integrity. The application must also have the support of more than half of property owners in the district, by land area or number of owners.

Conservation districts

Some places use conservation districts to protect areas that have a distinctive character but do not meet historic district criteria for significance. Conservation districts typically require review of new construction, additions, and demolitions, but not rehabilitation of existing buildings. Review is more likely to be carried out by City staff than a historic commission and use less restrictive standards than historic districts.

Austin’s Land Development Code currently allows for Neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts (NCCDs), administered by the Development Services Department. Some advocates have called NCCDs an exclusionary zoning tool that can limit ADUs and other affordable infill. Recent code revision efforts propose to keep existing NCCDs but not create more.
Interiors

Many local preservation programs allow significant interior spaces that are publicly accessible to be designated as historic. Most of these include language in their preservation ordinances that specifically allows for interiors to be designated; this is not currently a component of Austin’s preservation program.

Interior designations vary across cities.

- Most commonly, interiors are protected as part of an overall designation of a building. Some cities allow for separate designation of interiors when they are the most significant part of a building.
- Protection may cover entire rooms or spaces or specific architectural features.

Murals

Murals that are an important part of establishing and maintaining community identity may not easily fit within a traditional preservation framework. For murals that commemorate historical events or people, National Register criteria require an object be important on its own, separately from what it commemorates. Recently painted murals or murals that actively evolve may not meet a 50-year rule or a strict interpretation of integrity.

Austin does not have any designated murals. The mural on the side of Victory Grill is loosely protected because paint changes at historic landmarks require approval. However, it was painted after designation and is not specifically protected.

Case study: San Francisco

San Francisco not only requires approval for new murals on historic buildings but also requires historic review prior to the removal or alteration of existing murals on historic buildings. In general, the city recommends retaining existing mural, or contacting the artist to document or remove a mural that will be destroyed.

Historic designation of murals and interiors relies on a concept not in Austin’s current ordinance: that a feature of a building can be protected without designating the building as a whole. A mural may be significant regardless of whether the building or structure it is on would qualify for designation without the mural. While protecting the mural would require protecting the wall on which it is painted, changes to other parts of the building would not require historic review.

San Francisco’s preservation ordinance allows for designation of building features, though it appears that few murals have been individually designated. Balmy Alley, with evolving murals painted by Chicano artists since the 1970s, does not have any designations.
The most robust local archaeology programs use predictive models—tools that estimate the probability of encountering an archaeological site in a given area—to determine where pre-development investigations may be needed. They also have provisions for inadvertent discoveries during construction.

In a 2016 review of 69 local governments, less than 1/3 had archaeologists on staff. The remainder relied on partnerships or reports developed for permit review. Both federal and state laws address archaeological resources. However, with the exception of cemeteries, neither addresses potential impacts of private development on archaeological sites.

Case study: San Antonio
San Antonio’s ordinance requires that known archaeological sites be accounted for during project planning. A treatment plan must be developed if a project will impact the site. Previously unidentified archaeological sites must be reported to the City when discovered and may be referred to the historic commission. All construction activity is suspended for 30 days or until a written order allows work to continue. The City has two archaeologists on staff and posts archaeological reports online, with locations redacted.

Austin
Apart from protection of archaeological sites designated as historic landmarks, Austin’s Land Development Code has no predevelopment review process to assess archaeological potential or require data recovery if significant sites will be disturbed.

*Like historic buildings or districts, archaeological sites embody a community’s history and can... bolster community identity and support economic and educational efforts.*

What is integrity, and why does it matter?

In historic preservation, integrity means that a resource can physically convey the reasons it is important. Properties must retain integrity to be designated as historic landmarks.

Integrity is broken into seven aspects: location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, association, and feeling. Building condition is not considered.

**LOCATION**
Is the resource in the same location where it became important?

**SETTING**
Is the context generally the same?

**DESIGN**
Does the resource look pretty much the way it did when it became important? This is often when it was built, but not always.

**WORKMANSHIP**
Does the resource still show evidence of craftsmanship, either simple or ornate?

**MATERIALS**
Are the exterior materials the same from when the resource became important?

**FEELING**
Together, do the physical features convey the resource’s historic character?

**ASSOCIATION**
If the original owner or builder were to come back today, would they recognize it?

Case study: Herrera House

Sisters Consuelo and Mary Grace Herrera, the first two Mexican American teachers in the Austin Independent School District, lived at this home on E. 3rd Street. Though the surrounding neighborhood has changed, the building still conveys its historic character and association with an underresourced but ambitious community. In preservation terms, it “retains a high degree of integrity.”

The Herrera House was designated as a historic landmark in 2019 under the architecture, historical association, and community value criteria.

Case study: Workers’ cottages

In some cases, changes made to historic resources become an important part of the story. These workers’ cottages in the Robertson/Stuart & Mair Historic District were originally built without insulation. The district application notes: “In the 1980s the City of Austin and the Guadalupe Neighborhood Development Corporation began assisting homeowners with energy-efficiency improvements including replacement of siding to add insulation, as well as replacement of windows and doors. While these alterations did not follow the design standards that we recognize today, they allowed the homes to remain livable, preventing their demolition.”
Challenges around integrity

Because preservationists historically have treated architecture as the most important element, “integrity” has largely come to mean that a resource’s design, materials, and workmanship have not changed. This narrow focus makes it harder to designate buildings that were historically occupied by African Americans, Mexican Americans, and other communities of color.

Historically, BIPOC families faced many obstacles to property ownership, including poverty from decades of discrimination and difficulty getting home purchase loans from racist banks. When families were able to buy property, their buildings tended to be smaller and built with less expensive materials due to limited capital. Banks continued to deny loan applications, making it hard for families to maintain their homes.

Limited housing supply in the neighborhoods where BIPOC families could buy homes led to inflated prices. Some families had to take in boarders to pay their mortgages, which resulted in more wear and tear on buildings.

Whether due to structural disinvestment, higher maintenance needs, or both, neighborhoods historically home to communities of color saw significantly deferred maintenance and buildings sliding into disrepair. Others were repaired with less expensive materials like asbestos siding or aluminum-sash windows. Over time, buildings were added to or changed in ways that that traditional preservationists would consider incompatible.

In Austin, a resource must meet 2 of 5 criteria to be designated as a historic landmark. Most landmarks are designated under the historical association and architecture criteria, requiring that they have a high degree of material integrity.

Architecture and integrity are often the gateways to preservation protections and benefits, but, in marginalized communities, they are an excuse for exclusion.

- Stephanie Ryberg-Webster, in Preservation and Social Inclusion
Recognizing all stories

Most early preservation advocates were white. They focused on preserving large homes of wealthy white people and buildings of prominent, largely white, organizations and institutions. Preservation principles and tools were designed to meet those goals. Today, many preservation efforts seek to expand historic places to reflect all communities and their stories. Here are some tools they are using.

Thematic context statements

Context statements tell the story of how places develop. Most context statements are geographically based—how a neighborhood started and grew, for example—but thematic contexts are increasingly recognized as a way to tell the stories of communities and development types. SurveyLA included nine thematic contexts, each with subthemes, and 10 ethnic-cultural (community) contexts.

Multiple Property Documentation allows multiple related resources to be recognized and nominated using one or more thematic context statements.

Thematic historic districts

Important themes are often expressed in resources across multiple neighborhoods. Thematic historic districts, where boundaries are not limited to a specific area, offer a tool to preserve these.

Thematic historic districts can be a strong tool for telling the stories of historically underrepresented communities. They can recognize key community places across a larger area like Six Square, Austin’s Black Cultural District (not a designated historic district). They can also celebrate places built and used by communities without a historical home base: for example, Austin’s early Chinese American community was not concentrated in a well-defined area, unlike Chinatowns in other cities.

Finally, thematic districts can be used to in a more traditional way: to recognize outstanding examples of architectural styles across a city, as in the Bungalow Thematic Districts of Joliet and Elgin (IL).

Photos from SurveyLA context statements: Restaurant Row in Los Angeles (ca. 1950) in “Chinese Americans in Los Angeles” context statement; Ocean Park in “Jewish History” context statement; bowling alley (2013) in “Post WWII Commercial Recreation” sub-theme
Surveys

Surveys to identify historic resources are typically architecturally based, but context statements and community engagement help surveyors learn how places developed and why a resource might be important, even if its architecture isn't obviously important.

Follow-up outreach and education let community members know what places could qualify for historic designation based on survey research. San Antonio's preservation staff followed a survey of African American churches with outreach to each congregation and an informational meeting. Twenty-six churches were subsequently designated as historic landmarks, based on a staff-prepared application.

It also can be a challenge to share thousands of pages of survey data. HistoricPlacesLA offers one example of a map that is searchable by both address and theme. Austin's Historic Preservation Office conducts some follow-up to surveys, but its small staff does not have dedicated time for engagement or mapping.

Crowdsourcing survey information

The Austin Historical Survey Wiki developed at UT Austin invited community members to submit survey data. However, the platform was never widely used and was discontinued. It faced a couple of challenges: Users needed to be comfortable with formal historic preservation terminology and intensive research methods to complete the detailed survey forms. Additionally, broad and continuing outreach and education efforts were not pursued by the Historic Preservation Office when the tool was transferred to the City.
**Cultural mapping**

Cultural mapping is the practice of “[making] visible the ways local cultural assets, stories, practices, relationships, memories, and rituals constitute places as meaningful locations.”¹ As a tool for public engagement and discussion, it provides a way to capture elders’ knowledge and shows how places have multiple meanings across individuals and communities. It recognizes people as experts on the places where they live, work, and play.

San Antonio has a cultural historian on the historic preservation staff who organizes cultural mapping days and visits people at home to collect stories. Online, the City has a Discovery Map with a form for people to contribute their own stories.

In SurveyLA, the City of Los Angeles reached out to community members early. A detailed guide provided tools to define neighborhood character, interview neighbors, and research specific properties.

![Image of family with map]

**Expand designation criteria**

In Austin, properties must meet 2 of 5 criteria for designation: architecture, historical associations, archeology, community value, and landscape feature. Most properties meet the architecture and historical associations criteria, making it more difficult to designate properties that are not architecturally significant.

As shown on the chart on p. 2-3, other cities require that a property meet only one criterion or have more criteria. The latter lends more nuance around why a property is important, allowing different aspects to be explored. For instance, a place may have ties to an important event and an important person, but those concepts are grouped in Austin’s criteria.

¹ Nancy Duxbury, PhD, in “Cultural mapping, a new tool for community engagement and sustainability” presentation (2019).

Images: members of the Appelt family with a map showing their history in the San Antonio Missions, photo by Claudia Guerra, in Forum Journal; ATX Barrio Archive Instagram feed
Reduce or eliminate age thresholds

The National Register of Historic Places and many local preservation programs require a resource to be at least 50 years of age or of “exceptional importance” to be designated. The intention is to allow time to develop perspective on what is historically important versus a passing fad. However, this restriction can limit the ability of communities to preserve places they value and result in the loss of living knowledge of what makes a place important. It also has implications for integrity when a place changes with ongoing use.

Some cities have relaxed or abandoned the 50-year rule. This has not always led to increased designations from the recent past and includes some risks, including pushback when proposed designations go against the public’s perception of what is “historic.”

A new approach to integrity

For buildings whose importance lies outside their architecture, integrity of design, materials, and workmanship is less significant. Material changes may even speak to the obstacles that families of color faced and the changes made to keep buildings occupied. Indeed, continuous use of a property may result in more recent changes, where physical integrity and integrity of association are at odds.

Integrity of feeling and association may be more important for resources associated with historically underrepresented communities. The National Register currently does not accept properties if they do not retain physical integrity. However, this may be something for Austin to consider if these resources can still be identified, understood, and valued as they are.

Many preservationists are making an effort to rethink integrity requirements and broaden what can be designated—by focusing on what makes a place important and emphasizing integrity of feeling and association over physical aspects of integrity.

If the goals of historic preservation are reconnected to a more inclusive, democratic impulse—the drive to “tell the entire story” of the American people—then listing and designation standards need to be changed.

- Raymond W. Rast, in Forum Journal

Additional resources

Designation standards

“50 Years Reconsidered” by Elaine Stiles, National Trust Forum, Summer 2010

“A matter of alignment: Methods to match the goals of the preservation movement” by Raymond W. Rast, Forum Journal Spring 2014

“Diversity in preservation: Rethinking standards and practices” by Vince Michael, Forum Journal Spring 2014

Thematic resources

SurveyLA Historic Themes, City of Los Angeles

Survey maps

Historic Places LA [interactive map], City of Los Angeles

ScoutSA [interactive map], City of San Antonio

Cultural mapping

Video, 5 min, City of San Antonio

“Cultural mapping: Engaging community in historic preservation” by Claudia Guerra, Forum Journal Summer 2016
Appendix B – Certificate of Approval: General Information + Instructions
CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL
GENERAL INFORMATION + INSTRUCTIONS

WHAT IS A CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL?
A Certificate of Approval is a written authorization, much like a permit, that must be issued before any changes can be made to the designated feature of a City landmark, or before changes can be made to the external appearance of any building, structure, or site, including the construction of any new building or structure, within the City’s eight historic districts. In certain historic districts, a Certificate of Approval is required before making changes to the use of a building or space, or establishing use in a new building, located within that district.

WHAT KIND OF CHANGES REQUIRE A CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL?
- Alterations to a building exterior in a district (see individual district Ordinance)
- Alterations to sites, right-of-way, and public spaces in a district (see individual district Ordinance)
- Change of use in Pioneer Square Preservation District, International Special Review District and the Pike Place Market Historical District; and, in some cases, changes to business or services provided or changes of ownership for businesses within the Pike Place Market Historical District
- Alterations to the designated features of a Landmark: this may include a landscape, building exterior, building interiors, structure, or object (see individual landmark Ordinance)

In addition, Certificates of Approval are required for work that normally would not require other permits, such as minor exterior remodeling and painting.

Repair-in-Kind: If the proposed work you want to do involves ONLY repair using the same materials and exact same details and finishes, then a Certificate of Approval is not required. However, the method and scope of work must be reviewed and confirmed as in-kind by the relevant Board/Commission Coordinator prior to undertaking the work.

The Historic Preservation Program can provide more information about the landmark or the historic district where your property is located: (206) 684-0228 / seattle.gov/neighborhoods/preservation
**HOW DO I GET A CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL AND HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE?**

This section is a snapshot of the process for getting a certificate of approval. Language from the Seattle Municipal Code can be found later in this document and provides greater detail about some of these steps.

1. **Application submittal**: Certificate of Approval applications are submitted via the Seattle Services Portal. Please refer to the application checklist later in this document to ensure that you have gathered the required submittal documents.

2. **Staff review of application**: Historic Preservation staff review applications to determine whether they are complete—that is, they are looking to see if all the items on the checklist are included and fulfill the code requirements. **Within twenty-eight (28) days of the application being filed**, staff notify the applicant in writing (a letter sent in the mail) whether the application is complete or what additional information is required. If additional information is provided by the applicant, staff notify the applicant in writing **within fourteen (14) days of receipt** whether the application is now complete or what additional information is necessary. Additional information may be requested at other times during this process.

3. **Board/Commission Review**: Board/Commission Review involves at least one review of a complete application. When reviewing an application, the Board/Commission uses its District / Landmark regulations, guidelines and Secretary of the Interior Standards to evaluate proposals. Depending on the Board/Commission, there will either be a vote on a decision as to whether a Certificate of Approval should be issued, issued with conditions, or denied, OR a vote on a recommendation to the Director of the Department of Neighborhoods as to whether a Certificate of Approval should be issued, issued with conditions, or denied. For larger, more complex applications, Board/Commission reviews and/or briefings may occur during the conceptual, design development and final “working drawings” stages of the project. **Other Reviews or Briefings**: Depending on the Board/Commission, proposals may require review by the Architectural/Design Review Committee (ARC) or a Use Review Committee prior to full Board/Commission review. See District or Landmark pages for Board/Commission meeting schedules.

4. **Certificate of Approval Issuance**: Typically, a Certificate of Approval will be issued within 28 days following the Board or Commission meeting, assuming no successful appeals have been filed. This 28-day period encompasses a **maximum 14-day period for issuing the decision** and an exactly **14-day period for appeals**, as required in the code. The decision will be accessible via the Seattle Services Portal. **Appeal**: Any interested person may appeal a decision of the Board/Commission to the City Hearing Examiner. Details about this process can be found later in this document.

**SCHEDULING FOR BOARD REVIEW**

In order to have an application reviewed by the relevant Board or Commission, the application and all required documentation and any applicable fees must be submitted to the Board staff via the Seattle Services Portal. Once the Board/Commission staff has determined that your application is complete, your proposal will be placed on the agenda for review at the Board/Commission’s next regularly scheduled meeting. If you do not have the technological access or tools necessary to complete the application online through the Seattle Services Portal, please call 206-684-0228 and you can receive assistance for submitting using a hard copy application form.
ASSISTANCE
Copies of pertinent guidelines, procedures, development regulations, and other information are available for download on the Historic Preservation Program’s website. You may request a hard copy by contacting the Board/Commission Coordinator (see below) at the Department of Neighborhoods, Seattle City Hall, 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor, PO Box 94649, Seattle, Washington 98124-4649.

STAFF CONTACTS

- **Melinda Bloom**  
  Administrative Specialist  
  Phone: (206) 684-0228  
  Email: melinda.bloom@seattle.gov

- **Rebecca Frestedt**  
  Coordinator for Columbia City Landmark District and International Special Review District  
  Phone: (206) 684-0226  
  Email: rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov

- **Minh Chau Le**  
  Coordinator for Pike Place Market Historical District and Ballard Avenue Landmark District  
  Phone: (206) 684-0229  
  Email: minhchau.le@seattle.gov

- **Genna Nashem**  
  Coordinator for Pioneer Square Preservation District, Harvard Belmont District and Fort Lawton Historic District  
  Phone: (206) 684-0227  
  Email: genna.nashem@seattle.gov

- **Erin Doherty**  
  Landmarks Coordinator for all neighborhoods (except Downtown, South Lake Union, First Hill, and Pike/Pine); and the Sand Point Naval Air Station District  
  Phone: (206) 684-0380  
  Email: erin.doherty@seattle.gov

- **Sarah Sodt**  
  City Historic Preservation Officer, Coordinator for Downtown, South Lake Union, First Hill, and Pike/Pine  
  Phone: (206) 615-1786  
  Email: sarah.sodt@seattle.gov
CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL APPLICATION
INSTRUCTIONS

Please read all of the Application Instructions and General Information sections of this document carefully before submitting your Certificate of Approval application through the Seattle Services Portal.

Refer to the checklists below and make sure you have all the relevant required submittal items in electronic format before you begin the online submittal process. Where possible and according to section, combine files into single pdfs rather than uploading individual documents. Incomplete applications will not be scheduled for Board review. For Board/Commission members to properly act on a Certificate of Approval request, they require an accurate and thorough understanding of the proposal.

If you have questions about the process or what is required to be submitted for your specific proposal, please contact the relevant Board/Commission coordinator.

APPLICATION SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS CHECKLISTS FOR DESIGN AND/OR USE

DESIGN APPLICATION CHECKLIST

[ ] Description of Proposed Work *
  • Describe the proposed work and any changes it will make to the landmark/historic district building or property. All items must be included in this application. (Attach additional pages if necessary.)
  • For proposals that include demolition of a structure or object:
    o A statement of the reason(s) for demolition
    o A description of the replacement structure or object
  • If the proposal includes replacement, removal, or demolition of existing features, a survey of the existing conditions of the features being replaced, removed, or demolished. Please check with Board/Commission staff if you need more detailed instructions.

[ ] Set of scale drawings with all dimensions shown:
  • A site plan of existing conditions, showing adjacent streets and buildings and a site plan showing proposed changes;*
  • A floor plan showing the existing features and a floor plan showing the proposed new features or changes;*
  • Elevations and sections of both the proposed new features and the existing features’* construction details;
  • A landscape plan showing existing features and plantings, and another landscape plan showing proposed site features and plantings.
For proposals including new signage, awnings, or exterior lighting please make sure to include the following:

- Scale drawings of proposed signage or awnings showing the overall dimensions, material, graphic designs, typeface, letter size and colors;
- Scale plan, photograph, or elevation drawing showing the location of the proposed awning or sign;
- Scale detail drawing showing the proposed method of attaching the new awning, sign, or proposed exterior lighting;
- The wattage and specifications of the proposed lighting, and a picture of the lighting fixture;

Photographs*

- Color photographs of any existing features of the building, site or object that would be altered and photographs showing the context of those features such as the building facade where they are located. The photographs must clearly show these features. Photographs must be combined into one pdf, not uploaded individually.

Materials, Colors and/or Finish Samples

- Please upload a digital image that represents the proposed materials, colors and/or finishes. If the proposal includes new finishes or paint, and an elevation drawing or a photograph showing the location of proposed new finishes or paint.
- Please upload a digital image of sample of proposed sign colors or awning material and color;
- DON staff will follow up with the applicant if a physical sample needs to be submitted.
- Photographs must be combined into one pdf, not uploaded individually.

Landlord Consent*

- Property Owner Authorization Form

Fee (see below for fee schedule)*

USE APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Check all boxes that apply:

- New business
- Change of use for existing business
- Expansion of use
- Temporary use
- Change of ownership for existing business (FOR PIKE PLACE MARKET ONLY)
- Change of location
- Increase business area (square footage)
- Increase/decrease commercial area/areas not open to the public
- Street use/right of way
- Other

Current use/vacancy information, if applicable:

- Provide a written description of the current use.

Written description of proposed merchandise/service:
• Provide a complete written description of the merchandise or service to be provided. The description should include any proposed use, change of use, expansion of use, change of ownership or location, increase in business area. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

[ ] Proposed business hours (FOR PIKE PLACE MARKET ONLY):
• Provide the business hours using 24-hour clock.

[ ] Site plan showing location of business:
• Provide a scale site showing the location of the business.

[ ] Floor plan showing location of business:
• A floor plan showing the existing features and a floor plan showing the proposed new features or changes;*

[ ] Written description of ownership interest and role in the business operation (FOR PIKE PLACE MARKET ONLY):
• Changes to existing business ownership structure only: List all existing owners and their roles in the business operation.
• Describe the type of proposed ownership of the business (sole-proprietor, LLC, corporation, etc.).
• What percentage in the corporation, LLC, etc. does each owner own? Provide a copy of documentation listing all proposed owners and the percentages they own, such as corporation/LLC formation documents or an Annual Report. **Note: Sole proprietors do not need to submit this documentation.**
• Describe any financial affiliations of all the prospective owners have an existing business or businesses, including any retail locations. If there are no affiliations, write “none.”
• State specifically the role of each owner in the operation of the business, including which owner or owners will be onsite regularly at the business.

[ ] Landlord Consent
• Property Owner Authorization Form

[ ] Fee (see below for fee schedule)
• Please be prepared to provide the construction value. The construction value is only the value for the scope of work in the application, which may be less than the overall project cost. Once you enter the construction value, a fee will be calculated for you and you will receive an email informing you of the fee amount due.

---

**FEE INFORMATION**

SMC 22.900G.010 requires that an application fee be charged for each review for a Certificate of Approval. The fee is determined by the dollar value of the proposed project:

- **Design Approval**
  - $0 - 1,500 of construction costs......$25.00
  - Each additional $5,000 of costs......$10.00
  - Maximum fee per review.............$4,000.00**
- **Use Approval**..........................$25.00
- **Street Use Approval**.................$25.00
** Except that the maximum fee for a Certificate of Approval for new construction projects shall be $20,000; except projects including housing financed, in whole or in part, by public funding; or projects that elect the MHA performance option according to Sections 23.58B.050 or 23.58C.050. Estimate the construction costs, calculate the fee and make checks payable to the City of Seattle.

**DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS**

The staff shall determine whether an application is complete and shall notify the applicant in writing within twenty-eight (28) days of the application being filed whether the application is complete or that the application is incomplete and what additional information is required before the application will be complete. Within fourteen (14) days of receiving the additional information, the staff shall notify the applicant in writing whether the application is now complete or what additional information is necessary. An application shall be deemed to be complete if the staff does not notify the applicant in writing by the deadlines in this section that the application is incomplete. A determination that the application is complete is not a determination that the application is vested. The determination of completeness does not preclude the staff or the Board/Commission from requiring additional information during the review process if more information is needed to evaluate the application according to the standards in SMC 23.66, SMC 25.12, SMC 25.16, SMC 25.20, SMC 25.21, SMC 25.22, SMC 25.24, or SMC 25.30 and in any rules adopted by the relevant Board/Commission, or if the proposed work changes.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

An applicant may make a written request to submit an application for a Certificate of Approval for a preliminary design if the applicant waives in writing the deadline for a Board/Commission decision on the final design and any deadlines for decision on related permit application under review by the Department of Construction and Inspections. A written waiver must be included with this application. The staff may reject the request if it appears that approval of a preliminary design would not be an efficient use of staff or Board time and resources, or would not further the goals and objectives of SMC 23.66, SMC 25.12, SMC 25.16, SMC 25.20, SMC 25.21, SMC 25.22, SMC 25.24, or SMC 25.30. To be complete, an application for preliminary design must include the following information listed in the checklist identified with an asterisk above; please consult with the relevant Board/Commission coordinator if you are unsure. A Certificate of Approval that is granted for a preliminary design shall be conditioned upon subsequent submittal and Board approval of the final design, including all of the information listed above in subsection B, prior to issuance of permits for work affecting the landmark.

**REVISIONS TO PLANS, EXPIRATION OF CERTIFICATES**

Work must occur exactly according to approved plans. ANY revisions, omissions or additions to plans must be reviewed by the Board prior to execution. Unless specified otherwise, work approved under any Certificate of Approval must be completed within eighteen (18) months of the date of issue. If work has not been completed within eighteen months, the Certificate becomes null and void.

**APPEAL PROCEDURE**

Any interested person may appeal a decision of the Board/Commission to the City Hearing Examiner. The appeal and a copy of the Certificate of Approval decision must be filed with the Hearing Examiner, City of Seattle, POB ox 94729, Seattle, WA 98124-4729 before 5:00 p.m. on the fourteenth (14th) day following the date of issuance of the decision, and must be accompanied by a $85.00 filing fee in the form of a check.
payable to the City of Seattle. Appeals must be in writing and must clearly state objections to the decision. A copy of the appeal shall also be served upon the Department of Neighborhoods Director, Seattle City Hall, 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor, PO Box 94649, Seattle, Washington 98124.
Appendix C – Policy Reviews for Focus Cities/Counties
## Policy/Ordinance Review

**Denver, Colorado** – Denver Code of Ordinances, Chapter 30 – Landmark Preservation

Document version was viewed on 7/21/2022. Online content updated on July 11, 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.1 Purpose and declaration of policy.</td>
<td>It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of structures and districts of historical, architectural, geographic, or cultural significance, located within the city or its mountain parks, is a <strong>public necessity</strong>, and is required in the interest of the prosperity, civic pride and general welfare of the people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>The purpose of this chapter is to: (a) Designate, preserve, protect, enhance and perpetuate those structures and districts which reflect outstanding elements of the city's <strong>cultural</strong>, artistic, social, economic, political, architectural, historic or other heritage;</td>
<td>Language uses heritage, which in some ways preferable to just saying historic resources. Culture is one of the elements viewed as heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2 Definitions.</td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong> shall mean the traditions, beliefs, customs, and practices of a particular community. Culture can encompass structures, businesses, institutions, organizations, events, arts, and crafts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td><strong>Integrity</strong> shall mean the ability of a structure or district to convey its historic, geographic, architectural, or cultural significance. To have integrity means that a structure or district can be recognized as belonging to its particular time and place in Denver's history. The seven (7) qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity are: a) <strong>Location</strong>: The place where the historic structure was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. b) <strong>Setting</strong>: The physical environment of a historic structure. c) <strong>Design</strong>: The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a structure.</td>
<td>Integrity is not the same as the condition. This looks the same as NR elements of integrity, but I should probably doublecheck.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**d) Materials:** The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic structure.

**e) Workmanship:** The physical evidence of a particular culture or people's craft during any given period in history.

**f) Feeling:** A structure's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period or time.

**g) Association:** The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic structure.

*Determining which of these seven (7) qualities are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant.*

| (13) | Period of significance shall mean the time period during which a structure for preservation or a district for preservation gained its historic, architectural, geographic, or cultural importance. A district's period of significance may cover a longer period of time than a structure's, in order to encompass the period during which the district developed. |
| (17) | Significance shall mean that a structure for preservation or a district for preservation is important to the history, architecture, geography, or culture of the city. |

### 30.3 Criteria for designation of structures and districts for preservation.

A structure or district may be designated for preservation if, due to its significance, it meets the criteria listed in subsections (1), (2) and (3) below:

[...]

In evaluating the structure's or district's eligibility for designation, the landmark preservation commission ("commission") shall consider the structure's or district's historic context.

| (1) | The structure or district maintains its integrity; | Integrity criterion. |
| (2) | The structure or district is more than thirty (30) years old, or is of exceptional importance; and |
| (3) | The structure or district *meets at least three (3) of the following ten (10)* criteria: | This method of having to meet multiple criteria is similar to how Austin and San |
a. It has a direct association with a significant historic event or with the historical development of the city, state, or nation;
b. It has direct and substantial association with a recognized person or group of persons who had influence on society;
c. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style or type;
d. It is a significant example of the work of a recognized architect or master builder;
e. It contains elements of design, engineering, materials, craftsmanship, or artistic merit which represent a significant innovation or technical achievement;
f. It represents an established and familiar feature of the neighborhood, community, or contemporary city, due to its prominent location or physical characteristics;
g. It promotes understanding and appreciation of the urban environment by means of distinctive physical characteristics or rarity;
h. It represents an era of culture or heritage that allows an understanding of how the site was used by past generations;
i. **It is a physical attribute of a neighborhood, community, or the city that is a source of pride or cultural understanding;** or
j. **It is associated with social movements, institutions, or patterns of growth or change that contributed significantly to the culture of the neighborhood, community, city, state, or nation.**

Antonio do it. I think sites in Seattle/KC tend to fall under multiple criteria anyways, so maybe it’s a given for landmarks to have more than 1?

(f) seems like it could contribute to culture, especially if it’s a landmark in a neighborhood with a high concentration of or a significant history for a group of people. But might be more of a place marker. The culture seems to be more tied to Criterion (i) and (j).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30.6. Procedure to authorize erection, construction, reconstruction, alterations to, or demolition of structures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When dealing with a proposed alteration of, reconstruction of, or addition to the exterior of a contributing structure in a district for preservation or of a structure for preservation, the commission shall place the emphasis on applying the appropriate design guidelines to said structure with a view to preserving the historic significance of the basic structure. When dealing with a proposed alteration of, reconstruction of, or addition to the exterior of a noncontributing structure in a district for preservation or a noncontributing structure within the designated land area of a structure for preservation, the commission shall place the emphasis on preserving the historic character of the district or structure for preservation rather than preserving the character of the structure to be altered, reconstructed or added. The commission staff may administratively approve applications which clearly meet the guidelines, unless the commission has determined that certain types or applications or projects must be brought before the commission. All other applications shall be sent to the commission which shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny said applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30.47. Design guidelines. [for Lower Downton Neighborhood plan]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m just noting the section for reference. Based on a quick search on the neighborhood, the significance seems to rely on its history and architecture, and less on a continuing cultural significance. It’s probably not relevant to the focus of the research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
Policy/Ordinance Review

King County, Washington – King County Code (KCC) 20.62 Protection and Preservation of Landmarks, Landmark Sites and Districts

Title 20. Planning of the KCC was last updated on July 7, 2022. (https://aqua.kingcounty.gov/council/clerk/code/23_Title_20.pdf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.62.010</td>
<td>Findings and declaration of purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of buildings, sites, districts, structures and objects of historical, cultural, architectural, engineering, geographic, ethnic and archeological significance located in King County, and the collection, preservation, exhibition and interpretation of historic and prehistoric materials, artifacts, records and information pertaining to historic preservation and archaeological resource management are necessary in the interest of the prosperity, civic pride and general welfare of the people of King County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Such cultural and historic resources are a significant part of the heritage, education and economic base of King County, and the economic, cultural and aesthetic well-being of the county cannot be maintained or enhanced by disregarding its heritage and by allowing the unnecessary destruction or defacement of such resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.</td>
<td>The purposes of this chapter are to: Designate, preserve, protect, enhance and perpetuate those sites, buildings, districts, structures and objects which reflect significant elements of the county’s, state’s and nation’s cultural, aesthetic, social, economic, political, architectural, ethnic, archaeological, engineering, historic and other heritage;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.5.</td>
<td>Promote the continued use, exhibition and interpretation of significant historical or archaeological sites, districts, buildings, structures, objects, artifacts, materials and records for the education, inspiration and welfare of the people of King County;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.7.</td>
<td>Assist, encourage and provide incentives to public and private owners for preservation, restoration, rehabilitation and use of landmark buildings, sites, districts, structures and objects;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.62.040</td>
<td>Designation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. An historic resource may be designated as a King County landmark if it is more than forty years old, or in the case of a landmark district, contains resources that are more than forty years old, **and possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association, or any combination of the foregoing aspects of integrity, sufficient to convey its historic character,** and:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity criteria. “Sufficient to convey its historic character” could mean continuing cultural importance, one that extends from the past. Feeling and association helps with some flexibility and less reliance on the physical integrity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state or local history;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites significant for association with culture tend to fall under this category. Same with A.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in national, state or local history;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, style or method of design or construction, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This criterion is usually where architecturally significant sites would fall. Aesthetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeological heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5. Is an outstanding work of a designer or builder who has made a substantial contribution to the art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture/aesthetics/design with a focus on the artist/designer who is of note.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. An historic resource may be designated a community landmark because it is an easily identifiable visual feature of a neighborhood or county and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood or county or because of its association with significant historical events or historic themes, association with important or prominent persons in the community or county or recognition by local citizens for substantial contribution to the neighborhood or community. An improvement or site qualifying for designation solely by virtue of satisfying criteria set out in this section shall be designated a community landmark and shall not be subject to K.C.C. 20.62.080.

| Based on my understanding from conversations with the county, a community landmark has less restrictions/controls than a county/city landmark. So, it's basically a recognition of significance, but not much more than that. Community landmarks can become city/county landmarks if they go through the process of designation again. |

C. Cemeteries, birthplaces or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature and properties that have achieved significance within the past forty years shall not be considered

| I’m including Consideration C because it’s pertinent to the designation of the SeaTac Pet Cemetery (community landmark). |
eligible for designation. However, such a property shall be eligible for designation if they are:

| C.3. | A building or structure removed from its original location but that is significant primarily for its architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; | In the case of the STPC, the pets (or 2 specific cases based on the minutes) are what were argued as the historic “person.” Understandably, there were some commissioners who found that this might be a weak point. |
| C.7. | A property commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance; or | Another consideration brought up in the case of STPC. There were some who were unsure if the site had historical significance that extended beyond the community, which is probably why it ended up as a community landmark. |

20.62.070 Designation procedure.

| A. | The commission may approve, deny, amend or terminate the designation of a historic resource as a landmark or community landmark only after a public hearing. **At the designation hearing the commission shall receive evidence and hear argument only on the issues of whether the historic resource meets the criteria for designation of landmarks or community landmarks as specified in K.C.C. 20.62.040 and merits designation as a landmark or community landmark; and the significant features of the landmark.** [...] |  |
| B. | Whenever the commission approves the designation of a historic resource under consideration for designation as a landmark, it shall, within fourteen calendar days of the public meeting at which the decision is made, issue a written designation report, which shall include: |  |
| B.2. | The significant features and such other information concerning the historic resource as the commission deems appropriate; and | elements meant to be preserved. Most of the ones I've seen mention the site and exterior. |
| B.3. | Findings of fact and reasons supporting the designation with specific reference to the criteria for designation in K.C.C. 20.62.040; and |  |
**B.4.** A statement that no significant feature may be changed, whether or not a building or other permit is required, without first obtaining a certificate of appropriateness from the commission in accordance with K.C.C. 20.62.080, a copy of which shall be included in the designation report. This subsection B.4. shall not apply to historic resources designated as community landmarks.

The point reiterates in the end that community landmarks do not have the same protections as a city/county landmark.

---

**20.62.080 Certificate of appropriateness procedure.**

**A.** At any time after a designation report and notice has been filed with the director and for a period of six months after notice of a preliminary determination of significance has been mailed to the owner and filed with the director, a certificate of appropriateness must be obtained from the commission before any alterations may be made to the significant features of the landmark identified in the preliminary determination report or thereafter in the designation report. The designation report shall supersede the preliminary determination report. [...] 

**B.** Ordinary repairs and maintenance which do not alter the appearance of a significant feature and do not utilize substitute materials do not require a certificate of appropriateness. Repairs to or replacement of utility systems do not require a certificate of appropriateness provided that such work does not alter an exterior significant feature.

**C.** There shall be three types of certificates of appropriateness, as follows:

1. Type I, for restorations and major repairs which utilize in-kind materials.
2. Type II, for alterations in appearance, replacement of historic materials and new construction.
3. Type III, for demolition, moving and excavation of archaeological sites.

In addition, the commission shall establish and adopt an appeals process concerning Type I decisions made by the historic preservation officer with respect to the applications for certificates of appropriateness.

The historic preservation officer may approve Type I certificates of appropriateness administratively without public hearing, subject to procedures adopted by the commission. Alternatively the historic preservation officer may refer applications for Type I certificates of

Type I and II are the focus of the study. We won’t be focusing a lot on Type III.
appropriateness to the commission for decision. The commission shall adopt an appeals procedure concerning Type I decisions made by the historic preservation officer.

Type II and III certificates of appropriateness shall be decided by the commission and the following general procedures shall apply to such commission actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.4.</th>
<th>Within forty-five calendar days after the filing of an application for a certificate of appropriateness with the commission or the referral of an application to the commission by the director except those decided administratively by the historic preservation officer pursuant to subsection 2 of this section, the commission shall hold a public hearing thereon. The historic preservation officer shall mail notice of the hearing to the owner, the applicant, if the applicant is not the owner, and parties of record at the designation proceedings, not less than ten calendar days before the date of the hearing. No hearing shall be required if the commission, the owner and the applicant, if the applicant is not the owner, agree in writing to a stipulated certificate approving the requested alterations thereof. This agreement shall be ratified by the commission in a public meeting and reflected in the commission meeting minutes. If the commission grants a certificate of appropriateness, such certificate shall be issued forthwith and the historic preservation officer shall promptly file a copy of such certificate with the director.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 20.62.100 Evaluation of economic impact. | For the purpose of limiting the scope of the research due to time constraints, I won’t be considering evaluations of economic impact as factors in the design review process. **Is that okay? Or should I still look at this?**

In the case of KC, it does factor into the application for a certificate of appropriateness. |
| 20.62.150 Historic Resources – review process. | Integrity is once again brought into consideration. This section pertains to historic resources, which is different from designated landmarks, and therefore outside of our scope. Though it is good to note that it does exist. |

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
**Policy/Ordinance Review**

**Los Angeles, California** – Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Division 22 (Departments, Bureaus and Agencies under the control of the mayor and council), Chapter 9 (Department of City Planning), Article 1 – Cultural Heritage Commission

Online version was current through June 30, 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.171. Purpose of the Commission.</td>
<td>The Cultural Heritage Commission (Commission) shall perform those functions relating to historic and cultural preservation of sites, buildings or structures that embody the heritage, history and culture of the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.171.6. Duties of the Commission.</td>
<td>In addition to the duties set forth in this article, the Commission shall perform those duties imposed on it by <strong>Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.3</strong> relating to Historic Preservation Overlay Zones.</td>
<td><em>Need to check if relevant to research.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.171.7. Monument Designation Criteria.</td>
<td>For purposes of this article, a <strong>Historic-Cultural Monument (Monument)</strong> is any site (including significant trees or other plant life located on the site), building or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles. A proposed Monument may be designated by the City Council upon the recommendation of the Commission if it meets <strong>at least one of the following criteria:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is identified with important events of national, state, or local history, or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad <strong>cultural</strong>, economic or social history of the nation, state, city or community;</td>
<td>History or event. Cultural also falls on this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or</td>
<td>Cultural may also fall under this one, depending on the contributions of the distinguished personages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No permit for the demolition, substantial alteration or relocation of any Monument shall be issued, and no Monument shall be demolished, substantially altered or relocated without first referring the matter to the Commission, except where the Superintendent of Building or the City Engineer determines that demolition, relocation or substantial alteration of any Monument is immediately necessary in the interest of the public health, safety or general welfare.

(a) Standards for Issuance of a Permit for Substantial Alteration. The Commission shall base a determination on the approval of a permit for the substantial alteration of a Monument on each of the following:

1. The substantial alteration, including additional buildings on a site containing multiple buildings with a unified use, complies with the Standards for Rehabilitation approved by the United States Secretary of the Interior;
2. Whether the substantial alteration protects and preserves the historic and architectural qualities and the physical characteristics that make the site, building or structure a designated Monument; and
3. Compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.

(b) Standards for Issuance of a Permit for the Demolition or Relocation of a Site, Building or Structure Designated a Monument. The Commission shall base its determination on the approval of a permit for the demolition or removal of any Monument on the following:

1. A report regarding the structural soundness of the building or structure and its suitability for continued use, renovation, restoration or rehabilitation from a licensed engineer or architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Profession Qualification Standards as established by the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61. This report shall be based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation with Guidelines; and

*Need to check what the CEQA section is that is mentioned in this part. Based on skimming though, it seems similar to SEPA (State Environmental Protection Act), which triggers a review whenever a federal project might affect a historic asset, from what I remember. I also need to review what exactly this is, at least for my own reference. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards is used a guideline.

Online version was current through June 30, 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Purpose</td>
<td>It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the recognition, preservation, enhancement, and use of buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas within the City of Los Angeles having Historic, architectural, cultural or aesthetic significance are required in the interest of the health, economic prosperity, cultural enrichment and general welfare of the people. The purpose of this section is to:</td>
<td>This part of the ordinance pertains to properties within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). Individual properties refer to the Administrative Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Protect and enhance the use of buildings, structures, Natural Features, and areas, which are reminders of the City’s history, or which are unique and irreplaceable assets to the City and its neighborhoods, or which are worthy examples of past architectural styles;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Develop and maintain the appropriate settings and environment to preserve these buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enhance property values, stabilize neighborhoods and/or communities, render property eligible for financial benefits, and promote tourist trade and interest;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Foster public appreciation of the beauty of the City, of the accomplishments of its past as reflected through its buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Promote education by preserving and encouraging interest in cultural, social, economic, political and architectural phases of its history;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Promote the involvement of all aspects of the City’s diverse neighborhoods in the historic preservation process; and

7. To ensure that all procedures comply with the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)*.

I’m not too familiar with this act, but based on a quick reading, it seems to be similar to Washington’s SEPA.

For more information: [https://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/getting-started/#overview](https://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/getting-started/#overview)

**B. Definitions**

5. **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** is an approved certificate issued for the construction, Additions over established thresholds outlined in Section 12.20.3 K., Demolition, Reconstruction, Alteration, removal, or relocation of any publicly or privately owned building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature, or lot within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone that is identified as a Contributing Element in the Historic Resources Survey for the zone, including street features, furniture or fixtures.

6. **CERTIFICATE OF COMPATIBILITY** is an approved certificate issued for the construction of a new building or structure on a lot, Demolition, or building replacement of an element, identified as Non-Contributing, or not listed, in the Historic Resources Survey for the zone.

I think we’re more concerned with existing construction rather than replacements, though this would be a good avenue to explore in future internships. From what I can remember, Seattle has something similar where new construction needs to undergo design review if the project is in a zone that requires it (not necessarily a historic zone).

7. **CONTRIBUTING ELEMENT** is any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature identified on the Historic Resources Survey as contributing to the Historic significance of the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone, including a building or structure which has been altered, where the nature and extent of the Alterations are determined reversible by the Historic Resources Survey.

8. **CULTURAL** is anything pertaining to the concepts, skills, habits, arts, instruments or institutions of a given people at any given point in time.
| 12. | **HISTORICAL PROPERTY CONTRACT** is a contract, between an Owner or Owners of a Historical-Cultural Monument or a Contributing Element and the City of Los Angeles, which meets all requirements of California Government Code Sections 50281 and 50282 and 19.140, et seq., of the Los Angeles Administrative Code. | This is similar to Spokane’s Management Agreement. |

---

**D. Historic Preservation Board**

| 1. | **Establishment.** There is hereby established for each Preservation Zone a Historic Preservation Board. A Board may serve two or more Preservation Zones in joint name and administration. Preservation Zones may have separate, individual Preservation Plans administered under one Board. Each Board shall have, as part of its name, words linking it to its area(s) of administration and distinguishing it from all other boards. | I don't think this is the case in Seattle. Some districts have special review boards, but not all of them. *See brochure by Seattle for more information ([link](#)). |

| 9. | **Power and Duties.** When considering any matter under its jurisdiction, the Board shall have the following power and duties:  
(a) To evaluate any proposed changes to the boundaries of the Preservation Zone it administers and make recommendations to the City Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council.  
(b) To evaluate any Historic Resources Survey, resurvey, partial resurvey, or modification undertaken within the Preservation Zone it administers and make recommendations to the City Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council.  
(c) To study, review and evaluate any proposals for the designation of Historic-Cultural Monuments within the Preservation Zone it administers and make recommendations to the Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council, and to request that other City departments develop procedures to provide notice to the Boards of actions relating to Historic-Cultural Monuments.  
(d) To evaluate applications for Certificates of Appropriateness or Certificates of Compatibility and make recommendations to the Director or the Area Planning Commission. | Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. |
(e) To encourage understanding of and participation in historic preservation by residents, visitors, private businesses, private organizations and governmental agencies.

(f) In pursuit of the purposes of this section, to render guidance and advice to any Owner or occupant on construction, Demolition, Alteration, removal or relocation of any Monument or any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot within the Preservation Zone it administers. This guidance and advice shall be consistent with approved procedures and guidelines, and the Preservation Plan, or in absence of a Plan, the guidance and advice shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

(g) To tour the Preservation Zone it represents on a regular basis, to promote the purposes of this section and to report to appropriate City agencies matters which may require enforcement action.

(h) To assist in the updating of the Historic Resources Survey for the Preservation Zone utilizing the criteria in Subsection F.3.(c), below.

(i) To make recommendations to decision makers concerning façade easements, covenants, and the imposition of other conditions for the purposes of historic preservation.

(j) To make recommendations to the City Council concerning the utilization of grants and budget appropriations to promote historic preservation.

(k) To assist in the preparation of a Preservation Plan, which clarifies and elaborates upon these regulations as they apply to the Preservation Zone, and which contains the elements listed in Subsection E.3.

**E. Preservation Plan**

A Preservation Plan clarifies and elaborates upon these regulations as they apply to *individual Preservation Zones*. A Preservation Plan is used by the Director, Board, property Owners and residents in the application of preservation principles within a Preservation Zone.
1. **Preparation of a Preservation Plan.** A draft Preservation Plan shall be made available by the Board for review and comment to property Owners and Renters within the Preservation Zone.

   (a) Creation of a Preservation Plan where a Board exists. Where established, a Board, with the assistance of the Director, shall prepare a Preservation Plan, which may be prepared with the assistance of historic preservation groups.

   (b) Creation of a Preservation Plan where no Board exists. Where no Board exists, or has yet to be appointed, the Director, in consultation with the Councilmember(s) representing the Preservation Zone, may create a working committee of diverse neighborhood stakeholders to prepare a Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone. This committee shall not assume any duties beyond preparation of the Preservation Plan.

2. **Approval of a Preservation Plan.**

   (a) **Commission Hearing and Notice.** A draft Preservation Plan shall be set for a public hearing before the City Planning Commission or a hearing officer as directed by the City Planning Commission prior to the Commission action. Notice of the hearing shall be given as provided in Section 12.24 D.2. of this Code.

   (b) **Cultural Heritage Commission Recommendation.** The Cultural Heritage Commission shall submit its recommendation regarding a proposed Preservation Plan within 45 days from the date of the submission to the Commission. Upon action, or failure to act, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall transmit its recommendation, if any, comments, and any related files to the City Planning Commission.

   (c) **Decision by City Planning Commission.** Following notice and public hearing, pursuant to Subsection E.2.(a), above, the City Planning Commission may make its report and approve, approve with changes, or disapprove a Preservation Plan.

3. **Elements.** A Preservation Plan shall contain the following elements:

   (a) A mission statement;

   (b) **Goals and objectives;**
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>A function of the Plan section, including the role and organization of a Preservation Plan, Historic Preservation Overlay Zone process overview, and work exempted from review, if any, and delegation of Board authority to the Director, if any;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>The Historic Resources Survey;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>A brief context statement which identifies the Historic, architectural and Cultural significance of the Preservation Zone;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Design guidelines for Rehabilitation or Restoration, Additions, Alterations, infill and the form of single- and multifamily residential, commercial, mixed-use and other non-residential buildings, structures, and public areas. <em>The guidelines shall use the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings</em>; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Preservation incentives and adaptive reuse policies, including policies concerning adaptive reuse projects permitted under Section 12.24 X.12. of this Code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Modification of a City Planning Commission Approved Preservation Plan.**

   After approval by the City Planning Commission, a Preservation Plan shall be reviewed by the Board at least every five years, or as needed. Any modifications to the Plan resulting from the review shall be processed pursuant to the provisions of Subsection E., above.

F. Procedures for Establishment, Boundary Change or Repeal of a Preservation Zone.

3. **Historic Resources Survey**

3.(a) **Purpose.** Each Preservation Zone shall have an Historic Resources Survey, which identifies all Contributing and Non-Contributing Elements and is certified as to its accuracy and completeness by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

3.(b) **Context Statement.** In addition to the requirements above, the Historic Resources Survey shall also include a context statement supporting a finding establishing the relation between the physical environment of the Preservation Zone and its history, thereby allowing the identification of Historic features in the area as contributing or noncontributing. The context
statement shall represent the history of the area by theme, place, and time. It shall define the various Historical factors which shaped the development of the area. It shall define a period of significance for the Preservation Zone, and relate Historic features to that period of significance. It may include, but not be limited to, Historical activities or events, associations with Historic personages, architectural styles and movements, master architects, designers, building types, building materials, landscape design, or pattern of physical development that influenced the character of the Preservation Zone at a particular time in history.

3.(c) Finding of Contribution. For the purposes of this section, no building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature shall be considered a Contributing Element unless it is identified as a Contributing Element in the Historic Resources Survey for the applicable Preservation Zone. Features designated as contributing shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Adds to the Historic architectural qualities or Historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses Historic integrity reflecting its character at that time; or
2. Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or
3. Retaining the building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature, would contribute to the preservation and protection of an Historic place or area of Historic interest in the City.

Integrity is one of the criterion, but not the only qualifier for a thing to be considered as Contributing. The third point helps in that case.

G. Review of Projects in Historic Preservation Overlay Zones.

All Projects within Preservation Zones, except as exempted in Subsection H., shall be submitted in conjunction with an application, if necessary, to the Department of City Planning upon a form provided for that purpose. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall review a request and find whether the Project requires a Certificate of Appropriateness, pursuant to Subsection K.; a Certificate of Compatibility, pursuant to Subsection L.; or is eligible for review under Conforming Work on Contributing Elements, pursuant to Subsection I.; or Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements, pursuant to Subsection J. All questions of Street Visible Area are to
be determined by Department of City Planning Staff. In instances where multiple applications are received, which collectively involve an impact to a Structure or feature in the Street-Visible-Area, a Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Compatibility may be required for additional work.

H. Exemptions.

The provisions of Section 12.20.3 shall not apply to the following:

2. Department of Public Works improvements located, in whole or in part, within a Preservation Zone, where the Director finds:
   (a) That the certified Historic Resources Survey for the Preservation Zone does not identify any Contributing Elements located within the Right-of-Way and/or where the Right-of-Way is not specifically addressed in the approved Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone; and
   (b) Where the Department of Public Works has completed the CEQA review of the proposed improvement, and the review has determined that the improvement is exempt from CEQA, or will have no potentially significant environmental impacts.

   The relevant Board shall be notified of the Project, given a description of the Project, and an opportunity to comment.

3. Work authorized by an approved Historical Property Contract by the City Council.

4. Where a building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot has been designated as a City Historic-Cultural Monument by the City Council, unless proposed for demolition. However, those properties with Federal or State historic designation which are not designated as City Historic-Cultural Monuments or do not have a City Historical Property Contract are not exempt from review under Section 12.20.3.

5. Where work consists of Repair to existing structural elements and foundations with no physical change to the exterior of a building.

6. Where work consists of interior Alterations that do not result in a change to an exterior feature.

7. Where the type of work has been specifically deemed exempt from review as set forth in the approved Preservation Plan for a specific Preservation Zone.
I. Conforming Work on Contributing Elements.

Conforming Work may fall into two categories, Major Conforming Work and Minor Conforming Work. It is the further intent of this section to require Conforming Work on Contributing Elements for some Projects which may, or may not, require a building permit, including, but not limited to, changing exterior paint color, removal of significant trees or landscaping, installation or removal of fencing, window and door replacement, changes to public spaces, and similar Projects. Conforming Work meeting the criteria and thresholds set forth in this subsection shall not require Certificates of Appropriateness set forth in Subsection K.

2. Review Criteria. A request for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements shall be reviewed for conformity with the Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone or, if none exists, the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and at least one of the following conditions:

   See Table 1.

2.(c) Where the Project consists of the Demolition of a detached garage, porte cochere, carport, storage building, tool or garden shed, or animal-keeping use structure, the Director of Planning shall review a request and determine whether such requests qualify for review under Conforming Work, based on at least one of the following considerations:

   (1) It can be demonstrated that the structure was built outside of the Period of Significance for the HPOZ through building permits, or where building permits do not exist, through Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps or historic records or photographs.

   (2) The Demolition of the structure will not degrade the status of the lot as a Contributing Element in the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone.

   (3) The Demolition will not affect the integrity and development pattern of the district as a whole.

   Any request for the Demolition of a detached garage, porte cochere, carport, storage building, tool or garden shed, or animal-keeping use structure that does not meet one or more of the above criteria shall be reviewed pursuant to Certificate of Appropriateness provisions in Section 12.20.3 K.4.

J. Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements.
Conforming Work may fall into two categories, Major Conforming Work and Minor Conforming Work. It is the further intent of this section to require Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements for some Projects which may or may not require a building permit, including, but not limited to, changing exterior paint color, removal of trees or Landscaping, installation or removal of fencing, window and door replacement, changes to public spaces, and similar Projects. Conforming Work meeting the criteria and thresholds set forth in this subsection shall not require Certificates of Compatibility set forth in Subsection L. However, an applicant not approved under Subsection J. may elect to file for a Certificate of Compatibility.

2. **Review Criteria.** A request for Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements shall be reviewed for conformity with the Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone, and at least one of following conditions:

   See Table 2.


1. **Purpose.** It is the intent of this section to require the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for any Project affecting a Contributing Element, except as set forth in Subdivision 2.(b), below. It is the further intent of this section to require a Certificate of Appropriateness for some Projects which may or may not require a building permit, including, but not limited to, changing exterior paint color, removal of significant trees or Landscaping, installation or removal of fencing, window and door replacement which are character-defining features of architectural styles, changes to public spaces and similar Projects. However, an applicant not approved under Subsection I. may elect to file for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

2. **Requirements.**
   
   (a) **Prohibition.** No person shall construct, add to, alter, cause the Demolition, relocation or removal of any building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature designated as contributing in the Historic Resources Survey for a Preservation Zone unless a Certificate of Appropriateness has been approved for that action pursuant to this section, with the exception of Conforming Work on Contributing Elements, which shall not require a Certificate of Appropriateness. In the event that Demolition, removal, or relocation has occurred without a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, removal, or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relocation having been approved for such action pursuant to Section 12.20.3 K.5. below, a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be based on the existing conditions of the Historic Resource prior to the Demolition, removal, or relocation. No Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved unless the plans for the construction, Demolition, Alteration, Addition, relocation, or removal conform with the provisions of this section. Any approval, conditional approval, or denial shall include written findings in support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Conforming Work. Nothing in this section shall be construed as to require a Certificate of Appropriateness for the ordinary Maintenance and Repair of any exterior architectural feature of a property within a Preservation Zone, which does not involve a change in design, material, color, or outward appearance. Work meeting the criteria for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements shall not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.(c) Cultural Heritage Commission and Board Recommendations. A notice and hearing shall be completed pursuant to Subsection M. below. The Cultural Heritage Commission and the Board shall submit their recommendations to the Director as to whether the Certificate should be approved, conditionally approved or disapproved. In the event that the Cultural Heritage Commission or Board does not submit its recommendations within 30 days of the postmarked date of mailing of the application from the City Planning Department, the Cultural Heritage Commission or Board shall be deemed to have forfeited all jurisdiction in the matter and the Certificate may be approved, conditionally approved or disapproved as filed. The applicant and the Director may mutually agree in writing to a longer period of time for the Board to act.

3.(d) Director and Area Planning Commission Determination. The Director shall have the authority to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction, Addition, Alteration or Reconstruction. The Area Planning Commission shall have the jurisdiction to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, removal or relocation.

So the CH Commission and Board makes recommendations, and then the Director (of Planning) and Area Planning Commission determines its approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for Construction, Addition, Alteration, or Reconstruction. The Director shall base a determination whether to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction, Addition, Alteration or Reconstruction on each of the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>(a) If no Preservation Plan exists, whether the Project complies with Standards for Rehabilitation approved by the <strong>United States Secretary of the Interior</strong> considering the following factors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) architectural design;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) height, bulk, and massing of buildings and structures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) lot coverage and orientation of buildings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) color and texture of surface materials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) grading and site development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) landscaping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) changes to Natural Features;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) antennas, satellite dishes and solar collectors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9) off-street parking;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10) light fixtures and street furniture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11) steps, walls, fencing, doors, windows, screens and security grills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12) yards and setbacks; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13) signs; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) <strong>Whether the Project protects and preserves the Historic and architectural qualities and the physical characteristics which make the building, structure, landscape, or Natural Feature a Contributing Element of the Preservation Zone</strong>; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) <strong>If a Preservation Plan exists, whether the Project complies with the Preservation Plan approved by the City Planning Commission for the Preservation Zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards used as guidelines. Factors focus on what is visible on the exterior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, Removal or Relocation. Any person proposing Demolition, removal or relocation of any contributing building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature within a Preservation Zone not qualifying as Conforming Work on Contributing Elements shall apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the appropriate environmental review.

No Certificate of Appropriateness shall be issued for Demolition, removal or relocation of any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot within a Preservation Zone that is designated as a Contributing Element, and the application shall be denied unless the Owner can demonstrate to the Area Planning Commission that the Owner would be deprived of all economically viable use of the property. In making its determination, the Area Planning Commission shall consider any evidence presented concerning the following:

(a) An opinion regarding the **structural soundness of the structure and its suitability for continued use, renovation, Restoration or Rehabilitation from a licensed engineer or architect** who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards as established by the Code of Federal Regulation, 36 CFR Part 61. This opinion shall be based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation with Guidelines;

(b) An estimate of the cost of the proposed Alteration, construction, Demolition, or removal and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendation of the Board for changes necessary for it to be approved;

(c) An estimate of the market value of the property in its current condition; after completion of the proposed Alteration, construction, Demolition, or removal; after any expenditure necessary to comply with the recommendation of the Board for changes necessary for the Area Planning Commission to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness; and, in the case of a proposed Demolition, after renovation of the existing structure for continued use;

(d) In the case of a proposed Demolition, an estimate from architects, developers, real estate consultants, appraisers, or other real estate professionals experienced in Rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of Restoration, renovation or Rehabilitation of any existing structure or objects. This shall include tax incentives and any special funding sources, or government incentives which may be available.
In a case where Demolition, removal, or relocation of any Contributing Element, without a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, Removal, or Relocation has occurred, Section 12.20.3 K.5. shall not apply. Procedures in Sections 12.20.3 K.1. - 4. and/or Section 12.20.3 Q. shall apply.

### L. Certificate of Compatibility for Non-Contributing Elements.

1. **Purpose.** The intent of this section is to ensure compatibility of Non-Contributing Elements with the character of the Preservation Zone and to ensure that any construction or Demolition work is undertaken in a manner that *does not impair the essential form and integrity of the Historic character of its environment.*

   Integrity of the zone is still considered for work on non-contributing elements.

2. **Prohibition.** No person shall construct, add to, alter, cause the Demolition, relocation or removal of any building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature designated as a Non-Contributing Element or not listed in the Historic Resources Survey for a Preservation Zone unless a Certificate of Compatibility has been approved for that action pursuant to this section. *Additions and Alterations may be exempt from this section provided they meet the criteria in Subsection J.* No Certificate of Compatibility shall be approved unless the plans for the construction, Demolition, Alteration, Addition, relocation, or removal conform with the provisions of this section. Any approval, conditional approval, or denial shall include written justification pursuant to Section 12.20.3 L.4.

3. **Procedures For Obtaining A Certificate of Compatibility.**
3.(c) **Cultural Heritage Commission and Board Recommendations.** A *notice and hearing* shall be completed pursuant to Subsection M., below. The Cultural Heritage Commission and the Board shall submit their recommendations to the Director as to whether the Certificate of Compatibility should be approved, conditionally approved, or disapproved within 30 days of the postmarked date of mailing of the application from the City Planning Department. In the event the Cultural Heritage Commission or the Board does not submit its recommendation within 30 days, the Cultural Heritage Commission or the Board shall forfeit all jurisdiction. The applicant and the Director may mutually agree in writing to a longer period of time for the Board to act.

3.(d) **Director Determination.** The Director shall have the authority to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Compatibility.

4. **Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Compatibility for New Building Construction or Replacement, and the Relocation of Buildings or Structures Not Dating from the Preservation Zone’s Period of Significance Onto a Lot Designated as a Non-Contributing Element.** The Director shall base a determination whether to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Compatibility on each of the following:
   
   (a) If no Preservation Plan exists, whether the following aspects of the Project *do not impair the essential form and integrity of the Historic character of its surrounding built environment*, considering the following factors:
      
      (1) architectural design;
      (2) height, bulk, and massing of buildings and structures;
      (3) lot coverage and orientation of buildings;
      (4) color and texture of surface materials;
      (5) grading and lot development;
      (6) Landscaping;
      (7) changes to Natural Features;
      (8) steps, walls, fencing, doors, windows, screens, and security grills;
      (9) yards and setbacks;
      (10) off street parking;

   Integrity criterion.
New construction shall not destroy Historic features or materials that characterize the property. The design of new construction shall subtly differentiate the new construction from the surrounding Historic built fabric, and shall be contextually compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of nearby structures in the Preservation Zone; or

(b) Whether the Project complies with the Preservation Plan approved by the City Planning Commission for the Preservation Zone.

5. **Certificates of Compatibility for the Demolition of Non-Contributing Elements.** After notice and hearing pursuant to Subsection M. below, the Board shall submit its comments on a request for Demolition of a Non-Contributing Element, considering the impact(s) of the Demolition of the Non-Contributing Element to the essential form and integrity of the Historic character of its surrounding built environment within 30 days of the postmarked date of mailing of the application from the City Planning Department. In the event the Board does not submit its comment within 30 days, the Board shall forfeit all jurisdiction. The applicant and the Director may mutually agree in writing to a longer period of time for the Board to comment.

M. Notice and Public Hearing.

Before making its recommendation to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove an application pursuant to this section for a Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Compatibility, **the Board shall hold a public hearing on the matter.** The applicant shall notify the Owners and occupants of all properties abutting, across the street or alley from, or having a common corner with the subject property at least ten days prior to the date of the hearing. Notice of the public hearing shall be posted by the applicant in a conspicuous place on the subject property at least ten days prior to the date of the public hearing.

(1) A copy of the Board’s recommendation pursuant to Subsection K.3.(b) regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness or Subsection L.3.(b) regarding a Certificate of Compatibility shall be sent to the Director.
A copy of the final determination by the Director, or Area Planning Commission shall be mailed to the Board, to the Cultural Heritage Commission, to the applicant, and to other interested parties.

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Review Criteria for Contributing Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Scope</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Minor Conforming Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Restoration work, Rehabilitation, Maintenance, and/or Repair of architectural features on any Contributing Building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Projects that do not require the issuance of a building permit but affect the building or site, pursuant to Section 91.106.2 of this Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Addition(s) to any and all structures on a lot or new Building(s) that satisfy all of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The Addition(s) or new Building(s) result(s) in an increase of less than twenty (20) percent of the Building Coverage legally existing on the effective date of the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The Addition(s) or new Building(s) is/are located outside of a Street Visible Area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) No increase in height is proposed; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) The Addition(s) and/or new Building does/do not involve two or more structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conforming Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Construction of detached garage, porte cochere, carport, storage building, tool or garden shed, or animal-keeping use structure in a Street Visible Area in which the proposed square footage is equal to less than ten (10) percent of the lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Demolition of a detached garage, porte cochere, carport, storage building, tool or garden shed, or animal-keeping use structure pursuant to the criteria set forth in Subsection I.2(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Demolition and Reconstruction taken in response to natural disaster or to correct a hazardous condition (subject to the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 5028, where applicable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Correction of Code Enforcement Conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Minor Conforming Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Major Conforming Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16A.2</td>
<td>Declaration of legislative intent.</td>
<td>It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of properties of <strong>historical, cultural, archaeological, paleontological, aesthetic and architectural merit</strong> are in the interests of the health, prosperity and welfare of the people of the County. Therefore, this Chapter is intended to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Effect and accomplish the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of buildings, structures, improvements, landscape features, paleontological and archaeological resources of sites and districts which represent distinctive elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, scientific, religious, prehistoric and architectural history;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Safeguard the County's historical, cultural, archaeological, paleontological and architectural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such individual sites, districts and archaeological zones;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Foster civic pride in the accomplishments of the past;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Protect and enhance the County's attraction to visitors and the support and stimulus to the economy thereby provided; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Promote the use of individual sites and districts for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A-4</td>
<td>Definitions.</td>
<td>Certificate of appropriateness: A certificate issued by the Board permitting certain alterations or improvements to a designated individual site or property in a designated district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>The special certificate is similar to the certificate of compatibility in other cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Special certificate of appropriateness. For all applications for a special certificate of appropriateness involving the <strong>demolition, removal, reconstruction or new construction</strong> at an individual site or in a district, a special certificate of appropriateness is required that is issued directly by the Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sec. 16A-10. Designation process and procedure.**

In deciding whether to exercise its discretion to designate a proposed individual site, district, or archaeological or paleontological zone, the Board shall consider the objective criteria set forth in subsection (1) below, as well as the factors and considerations required to be addressed in staff’s designation report pursuant to subsection (3) below, along with the evidence and testimony presented at the public hearing and any other information the Board deems relevant to its determination.

(1) **Criteria.** The Board shall have the authority to designate areas, places, buildings, structures, landscape features, archaeological and paleontological sites, and other improvements or physical features, as individual sites, districts, or archaeological or paleontological zones that are significant in Miami-Dade County’s history, architecture, paleontology, archaeology or culture. Sites, districts, or zones considered for designation shall possess an **integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, or association,** and shall:

   (a) **Be associated with distinctive elements of the cultural, social, political, economic, scientific, religious, prehistoric, paleontological, or architectural history that have contributed to the pattern of history in the community, Miami-Dade County, south Florida, the State or the nation;** or  
   (b) **Be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;** or  
   (c) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, style or method of construction or work of a master; or possess high artistic value; or represent a distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or  
   (d) Have yielded, or are likely to yield information in history or prehistory; or  
   (e) Be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. | Integrity criterion. *Feeling is not mentioned as one of the aspects.*  

This focuses more on history (cultural history) rather than continuing ones, though they could potentially be there. The first four is similar if not the same as the National Register's criteria. The first looks to have been expanded a bit more.
### Properties not generally considered; exceptions.

Certain properties, which include cemeteries, birthplaces, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, properties commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the last 50 years, will not normally be considered for designation. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of a district that does meet the criteria, or if they fall within the following categories:

1. **A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction of historical importance.**
2. **A building or structure removed from its location but which is primarily significant for architectural value, or is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic event or person.**
3. **A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his/her productive life.**
4. **A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.**
5. **A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance.**
6. **A property or district achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.**

### Designation.

Prior to the designation of an individual site, a district, or an archaeological zone, a designation report must be filed with the Board at a board meeting. The format of these reports may vary according to the type of designation; however, all reports must address the following: the historical, cultural, architectural, or archaeological or paleontological significance of the property or properties being recommended for designation; a recommendation of boundaries for districts and archaeological or paleontological zones and identification of boundaries of individual sites being designated; a recommendation of standards to be adopted by the Board in carrying out its regulatory function under this Chapter with respect to certificates of appropriateness and certificates to dig. Where a report is filed
recommendation of a district, the report must identify **contributing and non-contributing sites or structures**. All reports shall also address, to the extent applicable, the following: any projected, proposed, or existing public improvements and developmental or renewal plans; any private plans for development or redevelopment of the property or area under consideration, including any new architecture or features proposed for the same location; any applicable neighborhood or community revitalization goals, plans, or objectives, including any existing policies in the local government's comprehensive plan or other planning initiatives pertaining to, among other things, economic development, transportation, and housing; any impacts on the availability of affordable or workforce housing in the community due to historic designation or proposed redevelopment of the property or area under consideration; and the possible adaptive use of the property after designation, based on applicable local government zoning regulations and other building code requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5)</th>
<th><strong>Procedure.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5)(d)</td>
<td><strong>Request for consent of owner.</strong> For each proposed designation of an individual site, district or archaeological or paleontological zone, the Board and staff are encouraged to obtain the permission of the property owner(s) within the designated area prior to commencing the designation process, but consent shall not be required for designation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (1) | **Certificate required as prerequisite to alteration, etc.** No building, structure, improvement, landscape feature, or archaeological or paleontological site within Miami-Dade County which is designated pursuant to section 16A-10 shall be erected, altered, restored, renovated, excavated, moved, or demolished until an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding any architectural features, landscape features, or site improvements has been submitted to and approved pursuant to the procedures in this section. Architectural features shall include, but not be limited to, the architectural style, scale, massing, siting, general design, the color of exterior paint surfaces, and general arrangement of the exterior of the building or structure, including the type, style, and color of roofs, windows, doors, and |
Architectural features shall include, when applicable, *interior spaces where interior designation has been given pursuant to section 16A-10*. Landscape features and site improvements shall include but are not limited to, site re-grading, subsurface alterations, fill deposition, paving, landscaping, walls, fences, courtyards, signs, and exterior lighting. No Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved unless the architectural plans for said construction, rehabilitation, alteration, excavation, restoration, renovation, relocation, or demolition are reviewed and approved by the Staff or Board.

(3) **Standards for issuance.** The Board may adopt and from time to time amend the standards by which applications for any Certificate of Appropriateness are to be measured and evaluated. In adopting these guidelines, it is the intent of the Board to promote preservation, maintenance, restoration, adaptive uses appropriate to the property, and compatible contemporary designs which are harmonious with the exterior architectural and landscape features of neighboring buildings, sites, and streetscapes. These guidelines shall also serve as criteria for staff to make decisions regarding applications for regular Certificates of Appropriateness.

(4) **Regular Certificates of Appropriateness.** Based on the guidelines for preservation, the designation report, a complete application for regular Certificate of Appropriateness, any additional plans, drawings, or photographs to fully describe the proposed alteration, and any other guidelines the Board may deem necessary, *the Historic Preservation Chief or designee shall, within 10 days from the date a complete application has been filed, approve or deny the application for a regular Certificate of Appropriateness* by the owner(s) of a designated individual site, or property within a designated district. The determination shall be mailed to the applicant within 3 days accompanied by a statement providing the reasons for the decision. *The applicant shall have an opportunity to appeal the decision by applying for a special Certificate of Appropriateness within 30 days of the staffs determination.*

(5) **Special Certificates of Appropriateness.**

(5a) An applicant for a special Certificate of Appropriateness shall submit an application to the Board on a form prescribed by the Historic Board. **Regular Certificates don’t need public hearing? The HP Chief decides (not the board).**

If not approved, applicant can apply for the special certificate, which does conduct a public hearing.
Preservation Chief and accompany such application to the Board with full plans and specifications, site plan, and samples of materials as deemed appropriate by the Board to fully describe the proposed appearance, color, texture or materials, and architectural design of the building and any outbuilding, wall, courtyard, fence, landscape feature, paving, signage, and exterior lighting. The applicant shall provide adequate information to enable the Board to visualize the effect of the proposed action on the applicant's building and its adjacent buildings and streetscapes. If such application also involves a designated archaeological or paleontological site, the applicant shall also request a Certificate to Dig in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 16A-14 of this Chapter, which may be heard and decided concurrently with the Certificate of Appropriateness.

(b) *The Board shall hold a quasi-judicial public hearing upon an application for a special Certificate of Appropriateness.* In such instances, notice and procedure of the public hearing shall be given to the property owner(s) by U.S. mail and to other interested parties by an advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

(c) The Board shall conduct the public hearing and, by resolution, act upon an application within 60 days of receipt of application materials adequately describing the proposed action. *The Board shall approve, deny, or approve in modified form an application, subject to the acceptance of the modification by the applicant,* or suspend action on the application for a period not to exceed 30 days unless more time is agreed to by the property owner(s) in order to obtain technical advice from outside its members or to allow the applicant to meet further with staff or revise or modify the application.

(d) The decision of the Board shall be issued in writing. *Evidence of approval of the application shall be by Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the Board or the Board's designated staff representative to the applicant and, whatever its decision, notice in writing shall be given to the applicant and the Director of the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department or successor.* When an application
(e) Unless otherwise provided in the Certificate of Appropriateness, both regular and special Certificates of Appropriateness shall expire after 365 days. The Historic Preservation Chief or designee may grant extensions of time of up to an additional 180 days for restoration or rehabilitation work only upon satisfaction that the scope of the work originally approved has not changed and provided a written request is filed and work is commenced before expiration of the Certificate.

(6) **Demolition.**

(6)(a) Demolition of a designated building, structure, improvement, or site may occur pursuant to an order of a government agency or a court of competent jurisdiction or pursuant to an approved application by the owner for a special Certificate of Appropriateness.

(6)(b) Government agencies having the authority to demolish unsafe structures shall receive notice of designation of individual sites, districts, and archaeological and paleontological zones pursuant to section 16A-10. The staff of such agencies shall consult with the staff of the Historic Preservation Board before entering a demolition order or placing such properties on an official agenda. Such unsafe structures agencies shall not enter a demolition order unless they first determine in writing that there exists no feasible alternative to demolition. [...]

(6)(c) No permit for voluntary demolition of a designated building, structure, improvement, or site shall be issued to the owner(s) thereof until an application for a **special Certificate of Appropriateness** has been submitted and approved pursuant to the procedures in this section.

i. **Refusal by the Board to grant a special Certificate of Appropriateness shall be evidenced by written order detailing the public interest which is sought to be preserved. The Board shall be guided by the criteria contained in part (6), subsection herein.**

ii. The Board may grant a special Certificate of Appropriateness which may provide for a delayed effective date. The effective date shall be determined by the Board based upon the relative significance of the
structure and the probable time required to arrange a possible alternative to demolition.

iii. During the demolition delay period, the Board or Historic Preservation Chief may take such steps as it deems necessary to preserve the structure concerned, in accordance with the purposes of this Chapter. Such steps may include, but shall not be limited to, consultation with civic groups, public agencies and interested citizens, recommendations for acquisition of property by public or private bodies or agencies, and exploration of the possibility of moving 1 or more structures or other features.

(6)(d) In addition to all other provisions of this Chapter, the Board shall consider the following criteria in evaluating applications for a special Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of designated properties:

i. Is the structure of such interest or quality that it would reasonably meet national, State, or local criteria for designation as a historic or architectural landmark?

ii. Is the structure of such design, craftsmanship, or material that it could be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense?

iii. Is the structure one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the County, or the region?

iv. Does the structure contribute significantly to the historic character of a designated district?

v. **Would retention of the structure promote the general welfare of the County by providing an opportunity for study of local history, architecture, or design or by developing an understanding of the importance and value of a particular culture and heritage?**

vi. Are there definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what will be the effect of those plans on the character of the surrounding area, including any impacts on the availability of affordable or workforce housing in the community?

[...]

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.12.020</td>
<td>Purpose and declaration of policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The City's legislative authority finds that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of sites, improvements and objects of historical, cultural, Architectural, engineering or geographic significance, located within the City, are required in the interest of the prosperity, civic pride and general welfare of the people; and further finds that the economic, cultural and aesthetic standing of this City cannot be maintained or enhanced by disregarding the heritage of the City and by allowing the unnecessary destruction or defacement of such cultural assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The purposes of this chapter are: (1) to designate, preserve, protect, enhance and perpetuate those sites, improvements and objects which reflect significant elements of the City's cultural, aesthetic, social, economic, political, Architectural, engineering, historic or other heritage, consistent with the established long-term goals and policies of the City; (2) to foster civic pride in the beauty and accomplishments of the past; (3) to stabilize or improve the aesthetic and economic vitality and values of such sites, improvements and objects; (4) to protect and enhance the City's attraction to tourists and visitors; (5) to promote the use of outstanding sites, improvements and objects for the education, stimulation and welfare of the people of the City; and (6) to promote and encourage continued private ownership and use of such sites, improvements and objects now so owned and used, to the extent that the objectives listed above can be attained under such a policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An object, site or improvement which is more than twenty-five (25) years old may be designated for preservation as a landmark site or landmark if it has</td>
<td>Integrity criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation, if it has integrity or the ability to convey its significance, and if it falls into one (1) of the following categories:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong></td>
<td>It is the location of, or is associated in a significant way with, an historic event with a significant effect upon the community, City, state, or nation; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td>It is associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the City, state, or nation; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td>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; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong></td>
<td>It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or of a method of construction; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong></td>
<td>It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25.12.390 Board approval of nomination.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong></td>
<td>If the Board approves a nomination, in whole or in part, for further designation proceedings, it shall in such approval:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Specify the legal description of the site, the particular features and/or characteristics proposed to be designated, and such other description of the site, improvement or object as it deems appropriate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Set a date, which is not less than thirty (30) nor more than sixty (60) days from the date of approval of nomination, at which a public meeting on approval of designation shall be held as provided in Section 25.12.420.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25.12.430 Board action on approval of designation.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whenever the Board approves designation of all or any portion of the site, improvement or object under consideration as a landmark, it shall within fourteen (14) days issue a written report on designation which shall set forth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A designation report.</td>
<td>Character-defining features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. The legal description of the site, **the specific features and/or characteristics to be preserved**, and such other description of the site, improvement or object as it deems appropriate;

B. **Its reasons, analysis and conclusions supporting subsection A with specific reference to the criteria set forth in Section 25.12.350.**

**25.12.660 Designating ordinance – information required.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Each designating ordinance, and each ordinance amendatory thereof, shall include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The legal description of the site, improvement or object;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>The specific features or characteristics which are designated;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>The standards in Section 25.12.350 that are the basis for such designation</strong>; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>The specific controls imposed and any incentives granted or to be granted or obtained with respect to such site, improvement or object.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**25.12.670 Requirement of certificate of approval.**

After the filing of an approval of nomination with the Director of the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections and thereafter as long as proceedings for a designation are pending or a designating ordinance so requires, a certificate of approval must be obtained, or the time for denying a certificate of approval must have expired, before the owner may make alterations or significant changes to specific features or characteristics of the site, improvement or object, which are identified in the approved nomination, or the Board report on designation, or subject to controls in a controls and incentives agreement or a designating ordinance, whichever is most recent.

Certificate of approval is similar to a certificate of appropriateness in other cities.

**25.12.750 Factors to be considered by Board or Hearing Examiner.**

In considering any application for a certificate of approval the Board, and the Hearing Examiner upon any appeal, shall take into account the following factors:

| A. **The extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the specific features or characteristics specified in the latest of: the Board approval of nomination, the Board report on approval of designation, the stipulated agreement on controls, the Hearing Examiner’s decision on controls, or the designating ordinance;** |
B. **The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alteration or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant;**

C. The extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance;

D. Where the Hearing Examiner has made a decision on controls and economic incentives, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change is necessary or appropriate to achieving for the owner or applicant a reasonable return on the site, improvement or object, taking into consideration the factors specified in Sections 25.12.570 through 25.12.600 and the economic consequences of denial; provided that, in considering the factors specified in Section 25.12.590 for purpose of this subsection, references to times before or after the imposition of controls shall be deemed to apply to times before or after the grant or denial of a certificate of approval; and

E. For Seattle School District property that is in use as a public school facility, educational specifications.

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
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San Francisco, California – San Francisco Planning Code, Article 10: Preservation of Historical Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks

Online version was approved June 24, 2022, effective July 25, 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1004. Designation of Landmarks and Historic Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Each such designating ordinance shall include, or shall incorporate by reference to the pertinent resolution of the HPC then on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, as though fully set forth in such designating ordinance, the location and boundaries of the landmark site or historic district, a description of the characteristics of the landmark or historic district that justify its designation, and a description of the particular features that should be preserved. Any such designation shall be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes of this Article 10 and the standards set forth herein.</td>
<td>Just noting that this article is focusing on historical, architectural and aesthetic landmarks. Cultural districts, though they may have those types of landmarks, fall under a different municipal code book. Character-defining features are listed in the designating ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)(2)</td>
<td>For a privately-owned landmark, review of proposed changes requiring a permit to significant interior architectural features in those areas of the landmark that are or historically have been accessible to members of the public. The designating ordinance must clearly describe each significant interior architectural feature subject to this restriction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004.1. Nomination and Initiation of Landmark and Historic District Designation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Nomination. The Department, property owner(s), or any member of the public may request that the HPC initiate designation of a landmark site or historic district. When a nomination is submitted by the owner(s) of a proposed landmark site or a majority of property owners of a proposed historic district, the nomination must be considered by the HPC. A nomination for initiation shall be in the form prescribed by the HPC and shall contain supporting historic, architectural, and/or cultural documentation, as well as any additional information the HPC may require. The HPC shall hold a hearing to consider nominations made by property owner(s) as set forth above no later than 45 days from the receipt of the nomination request.</td>
<td>Cultural documentation is listed here as a supporting document. Significance then can rely on this evidence, though I’m not sure how this comes to be implemented practically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006. Certificate of Appropriateness Required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Certificate of Appropriateness shall be required and shall govern review of permit applications as provided in Sections 1005(e) and 1005(g), except in the specific cases set forth in Section 1005(e), for the following types of work affecting the character-defining features as listed pursuant to Section 1004(b) of the Code:

(1) Any construction, alteration, removal or demolition of a structure or any work involving a sign, awning, marquee, canopy, mural (as set forth in Planning Code Section 1005(g), or other appendage, for which a City permit is required, on a landmark site or in a historic district;

(2) Exterior changes in a historic district visible from a public street or other public place, where the designating ordinance requires approval of such changes pursuant to the provisions of this Article 10;

(3) The addition of a mural to any landmark or contributory structure in a historic district, which is not owned by the City or located on property owned by the City, as set forth in Planning Code Section 1005(g), regardless of whether or not a City permit is required for the mural; or

(4) Alterations to City-owned parks, squares, plazas or gardens on a landmark site, where the designating ordinance identifies the alterations that require approval under this Article 10.

The procedures, requirements, controls and standards in Sections 1006 through 1006.8 shall apply to all applications for Certificates of Appropriateness; provided, however, that the designating ordinance for a historic district, or for a City-owned park, square, plaza or garden on a landmark site, may modify or add to these procedures, requirements, controls and standards.


The HPC, the Department, and, in the case of multiple approvals under Section 1006.1(f), the Planning Commission, and any other decision making body shall be guided by the standards in this Section in their review of applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for proposed work on a landmark site or in a historic district. In appraising the effects and relationships mentioned herein, the decision making body shall in all cases

Murals need a certificate of appropriateness. It’s interesting that this is noted, since it could fall under (2) as well. But there must be circumstances covered by the language that isn’t by (2).
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danele Alampay</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Draft – August 1, 2022</strong></td>
<td><em>consider the factors of architectural style, design, arrangement, texture, materials, color, and any other pertinent factors.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) The proposed work shall be appropriate for and consistent with the effectuation of the purposes of this Article 10.</td>
<td>The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards are used, but also applicable guidelines, local interpretations, bulletins, or other policies. The Planning Department allows for public participation the development of local interpretations and guidelines based on the Standards, which could allow for more sensitivity towards the significance placed on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The proposed work shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for individual landmarks and contributors within historic districts, as well as any applicable guidelines, local interpretations, bulletins, or other policies. Development of local interpretations and guidelines based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards shall be led by the Planning Department through a public participation process; such local interpretations and guidelines shall be found in conformance with the General Plan and Planning Code by the Planning Commission and shall be adopted by both the HPC and the Planning Commission. If either body fails to act on any such local interpretation or guideline within 180 days of either body’s initial hearing where the matter was considered for approval, <em>such failure to act shall constitute approval by that body</em>. In the case of any apparent inconsistency among the requirements of this Section, compliance with the requirements of the designating ordinance shall prevail.</td>
<td>Cultural is not mentioned here, though culture is what lends significance to the values/interests of the site. There might be some flexibility here though because value doesn't have to lie on the original fabric. Changes can stay true to what is of value/be respectful of the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) For applications pertaining to landmark sites, the proposed work shall preserve, enhance or restore, and shall not damage or destroy, the exterior architectural features of the landmark and, where specified in the designating ordinance pursuant to Section 1004(c), its major interior architectural features. The proposed work shall not adversely affect the special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value of the landmark and its site, as viewed both in themselves and in their setting, nor of the historic district in applicable cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) For applications pertaining to property in historic districts, other than on a designated landmark site, any new construction, addition or exterior change shall be compatible with the character of the historic district as described in the designating ordinance; and, in any exterior change, reasonable efforts shall be made to preserve, enhance or restore, and not to damage or destroy, the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic district. Notwithstanding the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
foregoing, for any exterior change where the subject property is not already compatible with the character of the historic district, reasonable efforts shall be made to produce compatibility, and in no event shall there be a greater deviation from compatibility. Where the required compatibility exists, the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved.

| (g) | For applications pertaining to property in a historic district in a **RH, RM, RTO, NC or UMU district**, the HPC, or the Planning Department in the scope of work has been delegated pursuant to Section 1006.2(a), shall exempt such applications from the requirements of Section 1006.6 when compliance would create a significant economic hardship for the applicant, provided that:

1. The scope of the work does not constitute a demolition pursuant to Section 1005(f);
2. The Planning Department has determined that the applicant meets the requirement for **economic hardship**, such that the fees have been fully or partially waived pursuant to Section 1006.1 of this Code;
3. The Zoning Administrator has determined that in all other aspects the project is in conformance with the requirements of the Planning Code;
4. The applicant and the Department have demonstrated that the project utilizes materials, construction techniques, and regulations, such as the California Historic Building Code, to best achieve the goal of protecting the integrity of the district, while reducing costs to the applicant; and
5. The HPC, or the Planning Department if the scope of work has been delegated pursuant to Section 1006.2(a), has confirmed that all requirements listed herein have been met, and has determined pursuant to Section 1006.4 that issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness that fully or partially waives the requirements of Section 1006.6 will not be detrimental to the integrity of the district. |

| (h) | For applications pertaining to residential projects within historic districts that are receiving a direct financial contribution or funding from local state or federal sources for the purpose of providing a subsidized for-sale housing unit or units to residents earning 120% and below area median income or rental housing unit or units to residents earning 100% and below area median income, the HPC, or the Planning Department in the scope of work has been delegated pursuant to Section 1006.2(a), shall issue a Certificate of Appropriateness that waives the requirements of Section 1006.6 for the extent that it fully or partially waives the requirements of Section 1006.6. The issuance of such a certificate will not be detrimental to the integrity of the district. | residential house, residential mixed use, residential transit oriented, neighborhood commercial, urban mixed use |
income and where at least 80 percent of the units are so subsidized, the HPC shall exempt such applications from the requirements of Section 1006.6 provided that:

1. The scope of the work does not constitute a demolition pursuant to Section 1005(f);
2. The applicant and the Department have demonstrated that the project utilizes materials, construction techniques, and regulations, such as the California Historic Building Code, to best achieve the goal of protecting the integrity of the district;
3. The applicant has demonstrated that the project has considered all local, state, and federal rehabilitation incentives and taken advantage of those incentives as part of the project, when possible and practical; and
4. The HPC has confirmed that all requirements listed herein have been met, and has determined, pursuant to Section 1006.4 of this Code, that issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness that fully or partially waives the requirements of Section 1006.6 will not be detrimental to the integrity of the district and furthers the City’s housing goals.

There are several appendices at the end of this chapter that pertains to specific historic districts. Within them, there may be additional provisions for certificates of appropriateness specific to the neighborhood. It seems that most of the language in these sections are focused on the architectural/historical value of the districts.

Article 11 is similar to Article 10 but is focused on C-3 districts, which are downtown commercial. There is a different system of rating buildings there (significant, contributing, non-contributing), and possibly different provisions. But in skimming...
through it, it seems to be focused mainly on preserving the aesthetics of historic buildings.

I’ll probably ask more about this, if there’s something I should consider to be relevant to the research.

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.

San Francisco, California – San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 107: Cultural Districts

Online version was approved June 24, 2022, effective July 25, 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.1. Cultural District - Definition</td>
<td>For the purpose of this Chapter 107, Cultural District shall mean a geographic area or location within the City and County of San Francisco that embodies a unique cultural heritage because it contains a concentration of cultural and historic assets and culturally significant enterprise, arts, services, or businesses, and because a significant portion of its residents or people who spend time in the area or location are members of a specific cultural or ethnic group that historically has been discriminated against, displaced, and oppressed.</td>
<td>Cultural and historic assets are acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.2. Findings, Purpose, and Goals of Creating Cultural Districts.</td>
<td><strong>Findings.</strong> [...] The individual character and culture of our neighborhoods have never been more at risk. President Trump is proposing to eliminate all federal funding for the arts and culture in his budget, and has slashed funding for affordable housing and community development. San Francisco’s families are being displaced. The benefits of our booming economy are not being equally shared. According to a study by the Brookings</td>
<td>This section of the chapter was added in 2018, hence, the mention of the former president.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institution, San Francisco has the fastest-growing income inequality of any city in the nation. **We are losing our diversity as our decades-old ethnic communities are being forced to move away.** Our artists and arts organizations are disappearing. As rents continue to rise artists and arts organizations can no longer afford rent in their neighborhoods, and they are leaving the City. Without these artists, the City is at risk of losing the murals, festivals, theater, and music that make our city a destination for inspiration.

**Our historic small businesses are at risk.** Commercial rents in most neighborhoods are doubling and tripling, and otherwise healthy businesses that act as anchors for our commercial corridors are being closed down for good. Business closures are up over 800% from 25 years ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b)</th>
<th><strong>Purpose.</strong> San Francisco’s Cultural Districts program seeks to formalize a collaborative partnership between the City and communities and bring resources in order to stabilize vulnerable communities facing or at risk of displacement or gentrification, and to preserve, strengthen and promote our cultural assets and diverse communities, so that individuals, families, businesses that serve and employ them, nonprofit organizations, community arts, and educational institutions are able to live, work and prosper within the City.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| (c) | **Goals.** The City creates Cultural Districts to advance the following goals:  
1. *preserving, maintaining and developing unique cultural and historic assets*;  
2. preserving and promoting significant assets such as buildings, business, organizations, traditions, practices, events, including their venues or outdoor special events and their geographic footprints, works of art, and public facing physical elements or characteristics that have contributed to the history or cultural heritage of San Francisco and its people or are associated with the lives of persons important to San Francisco history;  
3. *stopping the displacement of residents of Cultural Districts who are members of ethnic or other vulnerable communities that define those Districts, and promoting affordable housing*  
Both tangible and intangible heritage is addressed by Cultural Districts. People are also considered as valuable “assets” to the district. |
opportunities and home ownership within the Districts while also developing and strengthening new tools to prevent displacement;

(4) attracting and supporting artists, creative entrepreneurs, cultural enterprises and people that embody and promote the cultural heritage of the District, especially those that have been displaced;

(5) promoting tourism to stabilize and strengthen the identity of the district while contributing to the district’s economy;

(6) celebrating, strengthening, and sharing the unique cultural and ethnic identity of vulnerable communities, and providing opportunities for community neighbors, supporters, and advocates to participate;

(7) creating appropriate City regulations, tools, and programs such as zoning and land use controls to promote and protect businesses and industries that advance the culture and history of Cultural Districts;

(8) promoting employment and economic opportunities for residents of Cultural Districts;

(9) promoting cultural competency and education by diversifying our historic narrative on the history of San Francisco’s many diverse cultural and ethnic communities, with an emphasis on those who have been previously marginalized and misrepresented in dominant narratives;

(10) promoting culturally competent and culturally appropriate City services and policies that encourage the health and safety of the community, culture, or ethnic groups in Cultural Districts;

(11) slowing down gentrification and mitigating its effects on vulnerable, minority communities; and

(12) promoting and strengthening collaboration between the City and communities to maximize cultural competency and pursue social equity within some of the City’s most vulnerable communities.

107.3. List of established cultural districts.

(a) **Japantown.** Each district describes its boundaries in this section.
| (b) | **Calle 24 (Veinticuatro) Latino Cultural District.** |
| (c) | **SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural Heritage District.** |
| (d) | **Compton’s Transgender Cultural District.** |
| (e) | **Leather and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Cultural District.** |
| (f) | **African American Arts and Cultural District.** |
| (g) | **Castro Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) Cultural District.** |
| (h) | **American Indian Cultural District.** |
| (i) | **Sunset Chinese Cultural District.** |

107.4. Process for establishment of cultural districts.

(a) **Introduction of Ordinance Establishing Cultural District.** Any Supervisor, the Mayor, or a City department may introduce an ordinance proposing to establish a Cultural District that meets the goals and purpose that have been outlined in this ordinance.

(b) **Content of Ordinance.** It is the intent of the Board that each ordinance establishing a Cultural District shall:

1. Name the Cultural District, and describe its geographic boundaries. The boundaries of newly established Cultural Districts should be contiguous and should not overlap with other Cultural Districts. The Board may adopt subsequent ordinances changing the geographic boundaries after considering the **Cultural History, Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategy (CHHESS) Report** described in subsection (b)(7).

2. **Describe the cultural values and contributions that the establishment of the Cultural District would help to preserve, and a description of how the establishment of a Cultural District would address the goals and purpose established in Section 107.2.**

3. Require the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development to engage in a competitive solicitation process no later than one year.

6. The Planning Department may be involved in providing input. In this way, it is possible for preservation goals to be implemented.
after the effective date of the ordinance to enter a contract or grant with a community-based organization to hire a district manager or executive director.

(4) Depending on the needs of the Cultural District, possibly establish a Cultural District Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee, a five-member advisory body to monitor and provide advice on the distribution of funds, with members nominated by the Supervisor in whose Supervisorial district the Cultural District is primarily located, and appointed by the Board of Supervisors to advise the Board, the Mayor, and the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development regarding strategies to support and preserve the Cultural District. The ordinance should set qualifications for each seat on the advisory body, and designate the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development to provide administrative support to the advisory body.

(5) Require the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development to design and coordinate a community engagement process with the Cultural District residents, small businesses, workers, and other individuals who regularly spend time in the proposed District in order to develop the strategies and plans that will preserve and enhance the live culture of the district.

(6) Require three or more specified City departments to provide input to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development about their areas of expertise related to the cultural district within six months following the effective date of the ordinance establishing the Cultural District. The departments’ input to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development should contain an assessment of relevant assets and needs, recommendations on programs, policies, and funding sources that could benefit the Cultural District, and other recommendations that could serve the Cultural District to advance its goals. Each department should seek the input of the community engaged with the Cultural District when compiling the information relevant for the reports and when deciding on recommendations. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
Development should use information received from departments in the CHHESS report it creates as specified in section 107.4(b)(7). The ordinance may require reports from any departments, including but not limited to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Public Works, Arts Commission, Entertainment Commission, Planning Department, and Municipal Transportation Agency.

(7) **Require the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development to work with other departments when appropriate to prepare a Cultural, History, Housing, and Economic Sustainability Strategy Report or CHHESS Report for the Cultural District based on the reports required by subsection (b)(6), and to submit the Report to the Board of Supervisors for adoption by resolution. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development should submit the CHHESS Report to the Board within one year of the effective date of the ordinance, unless the Board extends the deadline by resolution. The CHHESS Report should include a demographic and economic profile of the Cultural District, including past, current, and future trends; analyze and record the tangible and intangible elements of the Cultural District’s cultural heritage; identify areas of concern that could inhibit the preservation of the Cultural District’s unique culture; and propose legislative, economic and other solutions and strategies to support the Cultural District.**

(8) **Require the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development to provide a progress report on the strategies outlined in the CHHESS once every three years and to work with the Cultural District to re-assess and update the CHHESS Report at least once every six years based on input from community-based organizations and the departments consulted in the initial preparation of the CHHESS report.**

(c) **Further Board Actions.** After receiving the CHHESS Report from the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, the Board may hold additional hearings or take additional actions in its discretion as it deems appropriate.
Chapter 107 includes appendices for additional information regarding specific cultural districts. The Historic Preservation Commission is mentioned in these parts in relation to the preparation of the CHHESS Report, and requesting the Commission’s assistance in providing “an assessment of relevant assets and needs in the district, recommendations on programs, policies, and funding sources that could benefit the District, and other recommendations that could serve the District to advance its goals.” The quoted statement above is repeated in 3 of the appendices.

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
### Policy/Ordinance Review

**Spokane, Washington** – Spokane Municipal Code Title 17D City-wide Standards, Chapter 17D.100 Historic Preservation

Document version was viewed on 7/25/2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17D.100.010 Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The City recognizes that the maintenance and preservation of historic landmarks and historic districts benefits all people in Spokane, and provides a general benefit to the public by <em>preserving our City’s history and unique culture</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>By creating standards for the designation and protection of historic landmarks and historic districts, the City intends to recognize, protect, enhance and preserve those buildings, districts, objects, sites and structures which serve as visible reminders of the historical, archaeological, architectural, educational and <em>cultural heritage</em> of the City and County as a <em>public necessity</em>. The intent of this ordinance is to keep qualifying historic buildings in use through their listing on the Spokane Register of Historic Places; incentivize rehabilitation; review changes to historic properties; and promote preservation in all neighborhoods, in balance with property rights protections under Washington law.</td>
<td>I wonder if this statement also upholds the traditional cultural use of a site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17D.100.020 Historic Landmarks and Districts – Designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Generally a building, structure, object, site or district which is more than fifty (50) years old or determined to be <em>exceptionally significant in an architectural, historical or a cultural manner</em> may be designated an historic landmark or historic district if it has significant character, interest, or value as a part of the development, heritage or <em>cultural characteristics</em> of the city, county, state or nation. The property must also possess <em>integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship and association</em> and must fall into one or more of the following categories:</td>
<td>Integrity criterion. Feeling is missing as one of the aspects, though that is one of the harder ones to capture/evaluate. Association is there though, as well as location, which should help for sites lacking physical integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.</td>
<td>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the city, county, state or nation; or</td>
<td>Cultural significance could fall under this, too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.</td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in the history of the city, county, state or nation; or</td>
<td>Cultural significance could also fall under this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.</td>
<td>Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction;</td>
<td>Architecture/design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4.</td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history; or</td>
<td>Archeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5.</td>
<td>A property that represents the culture and heritage of the city of Spokane in ways not adequately addressed in the other criteria, as in its visual prominence, reference to intangible heritage, or any range of cultural practices.</td>
<td>Cultural significance main (aka Criterion E). According to Megan Duvall, this has only been used for one property and it hasn’t undergone a design review yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17D.100.030 Historic Landmarks and Historic Districts – Submittal Process

| C. | In the case of historic districts, the HPO will submit (i) proposed management and design standards for the district as a whole; and (ii) the nomination document which delineates all contributing resources and non-contributing resources within the district, to the owners of property within the boundaries of the proposed historic district for their consideration and review for a sixty (60) day period. If the requisite number of consents are received according to SMC 17D.100.100, the HPO schedules the application for a hearing before the commission. | Proposed management and design standards for a district, through communication and collaboration with property owners, could potentially be more sensitive towards the cultural significance of the place, and put less emphasis on the physical integrity. |

17D.100.060 Procedure – Notification of Results

| A. | The commission shall, within five (5) days of the preliminary designation, provide notice to the owner(s), and City and County agencies, of the following: 1. The designation decision and the reasons therefor; 2. the necessity, once the designation becomes final, of applying for a certificate of appropriateness for any action which would alter the property(ies); 3. any responsibilities the owner(s) may have in regard to certificates of appropriateness; and 4. any incentives which may be available for the maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of the property. |  |
### 17D.100.070 Procedure - Council or Board Action

| A. | Once a preliminary designation is made, the owner and the HPO shall negotiate a management standards agreement for the property. Upon agreement, the management agreement is forwarded to the council or board, as appropriate for consideration. |
| B. | The council or the board, as appropriate, must act on the recommendation of the commission within thirty (30) days of receiving a copy of the agreed management standards. A final designation decision may be deferred for consideration at another public hearing. Once a final decision is made, the city clerk, board clerk, or their designee, notifies the commission, property owner(s) and affected City and County agencies. |

### 17D.100.100 Property Management and Design Standards – Agreement

| 1. | In the case of individual properties, in order for the preliminary designation to become final and the property to be designated as an historic landmark, the owner(s) must enter into appropriate management standards as recommended by the commission for the property under consideration. If the owner does not enter into a management agreement, the preliminary designation does not become final and the property is not listed on the Spokane historic register. |
| 2. | In the case of a historic district, the proposed design standards and guidelines shall only be effective if a majority of the owners of properties located within the boundaries of the proposed historic district sign a petition, on a form prescribed by the HPO, seeking the formation of the proposed historic district, under the management standards applicable to the district as a whole, within the sixty (60) day consideration period. Following the expiration of the sixty (60) day consideration period, the HPO shall report to the commission concerning the number of properties within the proposed district and the number of signatures contained on the petition. If the HPO determines that the petition contains the requisite number of signatures, the commission shall set the property management and design standards for the district. For purposes of this requirement, “owners of property” includes owners of units within a condominium association. |

I don't know if this is the case in every city/county, but it is interesting to note that the owner must agree to the standards for the property to be listed. This also allows them to have more say in how a property is preserved.
3. If the commission finds that both the requisite number of signatures are present on the petition and that the design standards and guidelines should be set for the district, the historic district shall be designated as such on the official City zoning map by the use of an historic district overlay zone. The Commission shall, pursuant to SMC 17D.100.050, forward its findings to the City Council for adoption of the appropriate legislation to adopt the historic district overlay zone as part of the official zoning map. Non-contributing resources within the overlay zone are subject to administrative or commission review for significant alterations and demolition, including the resulting replacement structures, consistent with the requirements of the design standards and guidelines. No less than every five (5) years, the commission shall review and consider amendments to the design standards and guidelines for each district established under this section and forward its findings and recommendations to the City Council for adoption.

Guidelines and design standards for a district is revisited at least every 5 years.

5. **Local historic district design standards and guidelines are intended to provide guidance for decision making by both the property owner when undertaking work within a local historic district and the historic preservation officer and commission when issuing certificates of appropriateness in the district.** Local historic district design standards and guidelines are not development regulations but are instead used to assist the HPO and commission making decisions in accordance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Final decisions of the HPO or the commission are based on the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation (Department of Interior regulations, 36 CFR 67). The Standards for Rehabilitation pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior, related landscape features and the building’s site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards for Rehabilitation are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, **taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.**

The Secretary of Interior Standards are used to base final decisions of the HPO/commission. I think that’s fine for significance based on architecture and design, but might fall short for places that have been heavily altered over time. It does take into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

17D.100.200 Certificates of Appropriateness – When Required

There is not much different here from what can be seen in other cities’ codes (just noting for section reference). The certificate
**17D.100.210 Certificates of Appropriateness – Procedure**

| 4.2. | In making a decision on an application, the commission uses the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, historic district design standards and other general guidelines established and adopted by the commission. In adopting and using standards, the commission does not limit new construction to any one architectural style but seeks to preserve the character and integrity of the landmark or the historic district through contemporary compatible designs. | “Seeks to preserve the character and integrity of the landmark or the historic district.” There is some flexibility in terms of compatible design. |

| 4.5. | Commission review. | |

1. The HPO makes a written report regarding the application to the commission, ensures that the application is sent to appropriate other City departments, coordinates their review of the application and assembles their comments and remarks for inclusion in the report to the commission as appropriate. The report of the HPO contains a description of the proposal, a summary of the pertinent Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, findings and conclusions relating to those standards and a recommendation. If the recommendation is for approval with conditions, the report also identifies appropriate conditions of approval. At least ten (10) days prior to the scheduled public hearing, the report is filed with the commission as appropriate and copies are mailed to the applicant and the applicant’s representative. Copies of the report are also made available to any interested person for the cost of reproduction. If a report is not made available as provided in this subsection, commission may reschedule or continue the hearing, or make a decision without regard to any report. |

Note: Words are italicized and put in bold by Danele Alampay for emphasis.
Appendix D – Letters from the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington
Dear Landmarks Preservation Board,

Thank you for your interest in the Japanese Language School site. In preparation for your visit and the Designation Hearing, we would like to offer additional information about the Japanese Cultural Center Project.

The Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington was formed to share and promote Japanese and Japanese American culture and heritage. Our group, in partnership with the Japanese Language School, is in the process of developing the Japanese Community and Cultural Center with the vision of remembering our heritage and providing an exceptional gift to the future.

The Japanese Language School’s current enrollment has decreased significantly making status quo operations no longer a viable option for the School. The Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington is acutely aware of the significance of the Japanese Language School site and the meaning it holds for our community as well as to the legacy of Japanese Americans in the US. The Japanese Cultural Center Project is the Japanese American community’s effort to preserve this historic site as a community gathering place where Japanese language classes can continue by being supplemented with other cultural activities, such as martial arts, taiko and performances to help financially stabilize and sustain its operations. The Center will also serve as a resource center for children and adults interested in learning more about Japanese culture and about the history of the Japanese American Community in Seattle.

Through collaboration with the Japanese Language School, our goal is to develop the existing facility into a sustainable model that our community can take pride in and utilize for generations to come. We want the Cultural Center to be a true destination place for the entire region.

Our goal of offering the community a wide array of programming hinges on our project having as much flexibility in landmarks designation as possible. Due to the economic constraints and limitations of fundraising, we are searching for ways to maximize the current facility while still paying homage to the pioneering Issel of Seattle, King County and Washington State.

In order to ensure the maximum flexibility for our programming and project goals we are seeking no internal designations. Likewise, we request that Building 3 be excluded from the designation in order to allow us to potentially reorient and expand the structure to accommodate a dojo and other future programs. Designating interiors of the current buildings would greatly reduce our ability to provide for our program goals and objectives, and may impact the overall feasibility of our project.

We believe the southern facing profile façade of Buildings 1 and 2 is the signature image that helps us tell the story of the individuals and organizations which made this site possible more than 100 years ago. It is our hope to see the designation focus on this attribute.
In order to have this site remain with the Japanese American community and continue to be utilized by the community, it must achieve a level of sustainability and safety. By upgrading and redeveloping the existing buildings to include unique facilities, such as a regional martial arts facility including a dojo, as well as, a great hall/performance venue, we hope to preserve the site and ensure its continuation as a community resource and gathering place for significant cultural events and other community activities.

Thank you again for your interest in our project. We look forward to your site visit and the upcoming Designation Hearing.

Sincerely,

Steve Woo, Building Committee Co-Chair, Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington

Andy Moniz, Building Committee Co-Chair, Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington

cc
Ron Mamiya
Kip Tokuda
Lori Matsukawa
Ann Kawasaki-Romero
Bif Brigman
June 6, 2006

Beth Chave, Coordinator
Seattle Landmarks Board
Department of Neighborhoods, Historic Preservation Program
Seattle Municipal tower
(700 Fifth Av. Suite 1700)
PO Box 94649
Seattle, WA 98124-4649

RE: Japanese Language School – Seattle Landmarks Nomination

Dear Beth,

On behalf of the Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington, and the property owners, the Japanese Language School, we are submitting for your review a revision to our Nomination Application for the Japanese Language School for consideration as a Seattle Landmark. Enclosed are additional historical photographs and the revision to the Nomination Application you requested.

The Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington is working with the Japanese Language School on an adaptive reuse of the current site to accommodate the continuing operation of the Japanese Language School programs, and to establish a new Japanese Community and Cultural Center, a long sought goal for the Japanese community in the Seattle/King County region.

We have been working with Les Tonkin of Tonkin Hoyne Lokan and Kate Krafft on a review of this site and in the preparation of this nomination application.

We would appreciate meeting with you to discuss this nomination and our plans to work with the Japanese Language School to preserve and expand the cultural outreach of the site with the development of the proposed cultural and community center to serve the changing needs of the Japanese community today.

In addition to the information submitted in the Nomination Application for the Japanese Language School, we wanted to provide further information regarding the current plans for the Japanese Language School, and their collaboration with the Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington in establishing a Japanese Cultural and Community Center at this location.

Feel free to contact us if you have any questions or need additional information. To contact us, feel free to contact Ken Katahira (206) 624-1802.

Sincerely,

Ron Mamiya, President, Board of Directors
Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington

ENCLOSURE

cc. Les Tonkin, Tonkin Hoyne Lokan

dd. Kate Krafft, Krafft & Krafft Architecture/CRM
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Japanese Language School Nomination

Anticipated Future Use of the School Site

The development of newer public and private institutions offering similar services has impacted enrollment at the Seattle Japanese Language School and has hindered the School’s ability to compete with these modern institutions. Consequently, the School’s historic role in providing language classes for the past 94 years is in jeopardy and the need to address its future operations has become crucial.

In 2004, the Nikkei Heritage Association of Washington (NHAW), a grassroots organization made up of a broad spectrum of community members began working collaboratively with the Japanese Language School. The word “Nikkei” means those of Japanese American ancestry; however the group represents a diverse group of interests from a variety of multi-cultural, multi-generational, multi-denominational and multi-socio-economic backgrounds. The Nikkei Heritage Association was specifically formed to come together in partnership and collaboration to design, construct and operate a modern and self-supporting facility that will preserve and celebrate Japanese and Japanese American culture and activities; building a stronger sense of community for all generations.

The Japanese Language School (JLS) responded to the Nikkei Heritage Association’s solicitation of sites to consider for the location of a new Japanese Cultural and Community Center. In assessing its future ability to continue operations, the JLS saw a new Japanese Cultural Center as its way to sustain its programs and operations into the future in the same location. Given the ongoing and deferred maintenance costs, increasing operating costs, limited income generation from its programs and competition from newer public and private institutions, the JLS was faced with financial uncertainty. As a result, the JLS is negotiating a long-term agreement with NHAW to allow them to redevelop the property, to include a new Japanese Cultural and Community Center in which the Japanese Language School will be able to continue teaching Japanese. In the event the Cultural Center did not come to pass, and challenged with the difficulties of financially sustaining its operations, the Japanese Language School might be faced with closure, and the eventual sale of the property for another use. The loss of this cultural heritage resource would be significant.

NHAW is currently working with the Japanese Language School to develop new programming, offering new and unique heritage projects, educational trainings and cultural projects about the Japanese American community. By undertaking joint programming and planning for a new Japanese Cultural and Community Center at this historic location, it is hoped that the Japanese Language School will continue to provide the language training to new generations of the community interested in sustaining its cultural heritage. A new Japanese Cultural and Community Center will enhance the appreciation and understanding of Japanese culture and the Nikkei community in Washington State.

A new cultural center is the logical extension of the original vision of the Japanese Language School founders who served, of necessity, a new immigrant community. It will provide new programs, outreach and community to the diverse interests of their succeeding generations of
Nikkei in Washington State. It is hoped this community-wide effort will transform an uncertain future for the Japanese Language School itself, into an enduring legacy for the Nikkei and broader community.
Appendix E – Online Resources: Design Guidelines, Nomination Applications, and Designation Reports

Five Points Historic Cultural District Design Standards & Guidelines: https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/646/documents/landmark/design_guidelines/Five_Points_Historic_Cultural_District_DSG.pdf.


Sister Mary Corita’s Art Studio Agenda Packet: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/c0b587b2-2b44-4154-a45e-2c8555ef0f8b/CHC-2020-5630-HCM_SisterMaryCorita_(12-17).pdf.
