



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 232/23

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, June 21, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Becca Pheasant-Rhys

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Acting Chair Roi Chang called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

### **062123.1**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

### **062123.2**

#### **MEETING MINUTES**

May 17, 2023

MM/SC/HW/IM

3:0:4 Minutes approved. Mmes. Caton, Chang and Pheasant-Reis abstained. Mr. Barnes was absent on May 17.

**062123.3      DESIGNATION**

*Mr. Slattery joined the meeting.*

062123.31      Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ  
(former Sephardic Bikur Holim Synagogue)  
1915 E Fir Street

Bishop Alvin Moore introduced himself as Bishop for the Washington State Jurisdiction of the Churches of God in Christ which has a total of 50 churches throughout Washington. He said the subject building is the second oldest. He said that much work has been put into the efforts to have this historical monument be recognized as such. Bishop Moore spoke of the intent to preserve this history in the city and within this church which has been home to a Jewish community and African American church. He noted the church values, history and culture, and passing on the legacy for future generations. He talked about redlining and how certain ethnicities, groups, races -specifically the Jewish and African American communities were segregated. He shared memories from his childhood about events at the church and said this was a family church where aunts and uncles were also members. He knew all the pastors except for the founding pastor. He said his role is to help Pastor Isabell and the church at large to keep this church alive, never to be torn down, never to be removed, and for it to be a historical landmark for people to remember from now until forever. He said so many peoples' lives have been changed, not just the facility, but the things that have taken place all the way from a Jewish community to an African American community, and to whoever has entered the doors for water baptisms and holy communion, and many other events including Jewish festivities and ceremonies that have taken place. He said there are still pioneers that are alive and remember this church, and they have had the opportunity to speak with them and to serve with them, and to now help their dreams to become a reality. He supported designation.

Pastor Kenneth Isabell said he has been a pastor in Seattle for 15 years and with Tolliver Temple since last year. He said he didn't know the founding pastor Bishop Lafayette Tolliver, but he served under Pastor Franklin James for 12 years and is familiar with the church and the events there. He said he is in awe of this church. He said there is lots happening in the Central Area. He said he wants to keep this church as a landmark and noted it has withstood changes over the years and he hopes that continues. He said this has been in the works for a while and he is coming in at the tail end. He said he was honored to do what he can. He said he is thankful, grateful, and blown away that it is happening. He thanked the staff for working with them through this process.

Sara Martin, SJM Cultural Resource Services said she has been a facilitator and liaison working with Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ leadership and the Landmarks staff. She said this place of worship originated as a synagogue that was erected in 1929 by Jewish immigrants from Turkey. Since 1963 it has served as the home of Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ, a predominantly African American

congregation. She said the building embodies layers of significance that are associated with two independent Seattle communities both of which originated and have deep roots in the Central Area.

Ms. Martin said people from both faith communities contributed to the nomination report and acknowledged: Rose Wallace-Croone, Jamie Merriman-Cohen, Stuart Eskenazi, and Edith Harrison who has been involved in this process from the start. She said a letter was sent to the board from Pastor Emeritus A. J. Jenkins who said that “he wholeheartedly supports this nomination and the designation of Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ to become a City of Seattle landmark. Life affords us so many golden memories which we treasure. This day is such an important occasion for which I am delighted to say thank you for the nomination and for what I hope is the eventual landmark designation. It’s been a long journey”. She said Pastor Jenkins retired in 2022 and provided photos exhibiting how important this building is to both his faith community, and the Jewish community. He welcomed the Jewish community back to the building recently in a gathering in 2021.

Ms. Martin provided context of the Central Area and noted nearby landmarks: Garfield High School, Douglass-Truth Library, Mt. Zion Baptist Church, William Grose Center (former Fire Station 6), and Washington Hall. She said the building has two stories on top of a basement with the sanctuary occupying much of the interior. The building is highly intact; it reflects simplified Romanesque style. She noted the Germanic round arch tradition which is different than the heavy masonry appearance of the Romanesque Revival. She said the building exhibits Art Deco at the entry bay and at the corners of the building. She said the building is a wood frame construction with brick veneer cladding and a concrete foundation. She said decorative elements reflect both of the faith communities that have worshipped here. On the east elevation is the cast stone Jewish Star of David above the center window. She said three stone plaques on the north façade reflect names of important figures associated with Tolliver Temple. The original stone plaques were removed and taken with the Jewish congregation and included originally the names of Jewish parishioners and donors who made the building possible. She noted the taller sanctuary windows and second story windows that look into the second-floor social hall.

She said at the primary entrance on the north side there are four wood doors with Stars of David on each. Above semi-circular brick arches is a distinctive basketweave pattern in the brick. She noted the column capitals that support the entry archways and the four doors which lead into lobby and central corridor that bisects the building and accesses the sanctuary through swinging doors. The corridor includes two original light fixtures each with an Art Deco zigzag motif. She said the impressive sanctuary space is highly intact. A focal point is the proscenium arch, the opening is accented by gold painted trim and rope motif. She said that decorative accent carries throughout elements of the sanctuary. One of the obvious changes to the space is the addition of the pews which replaced theater-style seating a few decades ago. There is an open central staircase that connects the basement, the first and second floors. She said the primary space on the second floor is a multifunctional social hall which was recently rehabilitated.

Ms. Martin said that architect William Brust established his own architectural firm in 1927, just a few years before his contract with the Jewish congregation. Most of his religious buildings are extant, but the former synagogue is one of the more intact examples.

Ms. Martin said neighborhood settlement patterns in the early and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century were shaped by discriminatory housing policies of both the federal and local government as well as biased real estate practices. As a result, Jews, African Americans, Asian Americans and other racial and ethnic minorities had limited options on where they could own and rent property, and they were restricted to the Central Area. She said this meant that a very high percentage of the city's Jewish and Black populations lived in the Central Area for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. She said the earliest Jewish settlers in Seattle were Ashkenzai Jews who emigrated primarily from Central and Eastern Europe beginning in the 1860s. Sephardic Jews from Turkey and southern Europe first arrived in 1902. She said between 1898 and 1933 there were eight synagogues constructed in the Central Area and this was one of them. She said Bikur Holim organized in 1911 and they later met in a synagogue at 13<sup>th</sup> and Washington.

She said in 1924 the Sephardic community welcomed Rabbi Abraham Maimon who came from Turkey and was instrumental in the growth of this particular congregation. She said they organized and began to fund a new synagogue. She said the Ladies Auxiliary formed in part to aid in fundraising for the congregation and was also instrumental in helping to purchase this property. She said the auxiliary raised donations for the new building – all donations for the building were recorded on ledger books. Bikur Holim dedicated their new synagogue in September 1929; it was announced in local and national newspapers. Rabbi Maimon led the dedication ceremony. He died a few years later in 1931 but his family maintains deep roots with that congregation. She said his son, Solomon also led the congregation and significantly, he was the first person to earn Rabbinic ordination in the United States. She said the Jewish congregation thrived at this location and in 1963 they built a new synagogue in the Seward Park neighborhood where they remain today. She said they are one of two Sephardic Orthodox synagogues in Seattle. Today Seattle is home to the third largest Sephardic population in the United States with an estimated 4,000 people.

While Bikur Holim was transitioning to Seward Park, Bishop L. E. Tolliver was in search of a new worship space for his growing Church of God in Christ congregation. She said it was a tight knit, multigenerational, African American congregation and they had long worshipped out of a storefront Tolliver owned at 21<sup>st</sup> and Jefferson. When the nearby synagogue was vacated in 1963 it offered Tolliver and his group an opportunity to move into a bigger building within the same neighborhood, very close by, and without the expense and hassle of constructing a new facility. Ms. Martin introduced Rose Wallace-Croone, Executive Director and consultant for the African American Advocacy Group, and former member of Temple Church of God in Christ. She said that Mother Carey Reese had a prayer revival in her home and Bishop Tolliver said his life was changed; that helped start or jumpstart the Church

of God in Christ. In Washington this year, the Church of God and Christ turns 100 years old. It was incorporated in 1926 but the beginning was 1923 when Bishop Tolliver helped start the Madison Temple, but later turned it over to the National Church and started his own congregation. She said her grandparents and aunt came to Washington in 1941 like so many African Americans they came during the great migration from 1910 to 1917. She said her uncle was stationed in Fort Lawton and it was an excellent station for African Americans. She said there were a lot of segregated units, and they were going to Europe and various other parts fighting the war all over. She said her aunt wrote to her grandparents and told them the jobs are good and to come, so they did. She provided a photo and noted her grandfather next to Bishop Green, Bishop Lowe, Bishop Tolliver, and Reverend Bird. She said her grandfather was a pastor in the Church of God Christ in 1943.

Ms. Wallace-Croone said Bishop Tolliver was instrumental in the church and was significant in the leadership of the Central Area. She said he was a wealthy man coming from Mississippi and he acquired property. She said he was instrumental in helping the families that came here from down south to get established because it was a huge adjustment for them. She said some came with education, but many did not, so they had to adjust to the big city. She said they came from picking cotton or being domestics, to being in an industrialized middle-class city where they had to adjust.

She said that her uncle, Deacon Jones looked for a building because they had outgrown the little storefront. He and three others found Tolliver Temple Church of Christ in God, and Bishop Tolliver purchased it because he had the capital during that time. At that time many black churches could not get loans because of redlining. Bishop Tolliver purchased it outright and then deeded the property to the church. She said the property was owned by the membership and Tolliver did relinquish the deed to them which she thought was amazing. She said the church paid it back not within his lifetime but to his widow. She said there is so much history here. She said Tolliver later became a Bishop in the church enterprise and was appointed in Washington State as a jurisdictional overseer and then later, bishop of the Washington State Jurisdiction District. She said the church was now the largest church of the jurisdiction and convocations, district meetings and gatherings were held at Tolliver. She said Tolliver would say “they wouldn’t have a place to hold them”. She remembers when she was a child, thousands attended the convocations, and there were thousands of people standing outside, and people inside waiting to hear, and it was absolutely amazing. She said they ripped seats out to make more room. She indicated photos of Church of God in Christ planning convention in the Seattle Times, and in their historic souvenir book.

Ms. Wallace-Croone noted a 1969 photo of Elder Green, and Mother and Pastor F. L. James. She said Bishop Tolliver had passed away and Pastor F. L. James became the pastor. She said he did an amazing job. She said her mother went to Garfield High School and graduated in 1956. She said it was common then for Jewish families and Black families to live in the same neighborhood and attend the same schools. She said her mother and friend Regina went to school together and later worked together at Garfield. She said they forged a friendship. In 1995 they had both

retired and were talking about Tolliver Temple, and her mother invited Regina to church, and she would bring members of the synagogue – vans full of people would come. She said they would have fellowship and it was amazing. She said they continued fellowship for years. She said Elder James retired in 1998 and E. L. Jenkins became the pastor in 1999. She said the relationship between that Jewish synagogue and Tolliver Temple remains to this day. She said they still come out and they still visit, and that friendship her mother had with Regina was amazing.

Ms. Wallace-Croone said her mother passed away two years ago, and she was full to be able to honor the memory of so many. She said both her parents and the members that attended this church and blessed so many individuals that passed through the doors. She said so many African Americans fleeing the south looking for better jobs as families wrote to their family members saying, ‘come to Washington, life is better’. She said it was a beacon of light to so many because when they hit the door they became community. Before there were community centers or workforce centers, there were churches, synagogues and sanctuaries. Tolliver Temple was definitely a sanctuary and people would come and they could find housing and jobs and hope. She said they found Christ and they found love and they found community.

She said Bishop Tolliver offered all those things. Countless times the testimonies of people in church saying how Bishop Tolliver co-signed for them to purchase homes. They were able to purchase homes in the community and they were able to find jobs. They were able to open businesses and support their families and their loved ones down south and bring them here to find hope. She said Tolliver Temple was both a sanctuary for the Jewish community and the African American community, because they were able to do something that so many people can’t do today and that is bringing people together and offering them hope. She pointed out herself in Sunday school class 50 years ago, and her wedding 22 years ago. She said she was proud to say that her family was part of this and was blessed by this sanctuary.

Ms. Martin said the building meets all the criteria for designation:

Criteria A because it is associated with the broad discriminatory laws and real estate practices that have shaped the racial and cultural landscape of the Central Area, having a significant effect on these communities and the city.

Criterion B because it is associated with a few significant individuals including Rabbi Abraham Maimon, Rabbi Solomon Maimon, and Bishop Lafayette Tolliver who were significant leaders in their communities that went well beyond the religious sphere.

Criterion C because it is associated in a significant way with the spiritual, cultural and intellectual importance of the Sephardic Jewish community as well as the predominantly African American Church of God in Christ community.

Criterion D because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of the Germanic tradition of the Romanesque style as well as those Art Deco architectural influences.

Criterion E because it is an outstanding work of architect William Brust and his only design of a Jewish synagogue.

Criterion F because of its prominence of spatial location and age and scale as well as being an easily identifiable visual feature of the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and wealth of information provided in support of designating this building. She noted pictures of upstairs area showed construction and asked if that was ongoing.

Ms. Martin provided a newer photo of the space. She said the other photo was taken during the pandemic when some interior work was being done in the community dining room.

Bishop Moore explained that updates were made to furniture and kitchen and there were no structural changes.

Ms. Doherty said she thought plaster had been repaired or a skim coat applied.

Pastor Isabell concurred and said it was just cosmetic with new furniture.

Ms. Chang asked if the stone tablet above the entrance is still there.

Pastor Isabell said it is still there. He said the only thing removed was a sign they put up in 1963 – Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ. He said the Ten Commandments at the top has not been altered.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked what features were requested to designate.

Ms. Doherty said the board nominated the whole site, exterior, and interior of the sanctuary space. Anything liturgical in nature the board would not control, and that is consistent with religious properties. She said this is based on freedom of religion, and how the building is operated. She said the board can refine what is designated and make the list smaller but can't add to it at this point.

Mr. Macleod said Brust did a lot of work after the war; he noted this was the most ornate. He asked why the original theater-style seating was removed.

Ms. Wallace-Croone said the church population declined to 200 members from 600; 900 theatre seats, many empty were removed and replaced with pews which were more comfortable and functional. She said her cousin, Fritz Pezzullo replaced the old theater seats with those that are currently in the balcony. She said her family has been in the Central Area for 80 years. She said Temple Tolliver is a community church and noted all churches in the Central Area fellowshiped together and were inclusive of everyone. She said she remembers being a little girl moving amongst churches. She said Tolliver Temple was like home base because it was one of the larger churches in the Central Area, as was Mt. Zion and First AME. She said the larger churches and facilities were the ones used for funerals and musicals. She said

the pastors understood the importance of community and she noted it is something she doesn't see now in the Central Area – the inclusion of everyone. She said she hopes that in the future Tolliver Temple will remain where all can feel safe. She said Tolliver Temple was / is a safe place; people came with nothing but hopes and dreams.

Bishop Moore said that in the one year he was interim pastor, after Pastor Jenkins retired and before they had selected Pastor Isabell, he can't remember the number of inquiries he had for funerals, weddings, celebrations even toward the end of Covid. He said his mother's funeral – 'homegoing' – was held at Tolliver Temple as were his brother's, aunt's and uncle's. He shared that recently Pastor Isabell's son's homegoing was there; the community was engaged, there was media and cameras, the balcony was full, and people filled the hallway. He said this is a place that people reflect back to their families and communities – Temple Tolliver is a safe place and a place to call home. He said it is deeper than he can express and listening to the report and discussion, it is resurrecting some thoughts within himself.

Mr. Barnes asked why the temple was sold in 1963.

Ms. Wallace-Croone said Bikur Holim outgrew the space and built a new synagogue in Seward Park where they still are.

Mr. Barnes said Dr. McKinney's comments at the nomination meeting resonated with him. He said he read the notes and comments that Dr. McKinney had on the church, and it resonated with him because he has been mostly in the Central Area since the early 1970s and Temple Tolliver was a prominent church at that time. He said he is glad it is being recognized for the longevity of the church. He noted so many black churches are leaving the Central Area, it is good this building is still there and prospering.

Mr. Macleod said it is moving to hear personal stories about the importance of the building to such a wide community. He said it felt as though this discussion shouldn't be happening without Dr. McKinney in attendance, knowing her connection. He supported designation under all the criteria which is a real rarity and a treat to be able to do. He said it is an honor to have a building not only nominated so enthusiastically by its owner, but also to see an ecclesiastical building nominated while it is still functioning as a church. He said the architecture is unique and it is an outstanding work by this architect. He said the real gem about this building is the community that has been built around it, that is living history. He said that making the connection between the time we live in today and the history of the past is why we believe in preservation. The building is really deserving of designation.

Ms. Wasserman said this is why we are here, exactly what the board should be doing. She noted churches, specifically the ones in the University District where they were sold and torn down to be redeveloped. She said it is wonderful to see this being preserved and hearing all of its history. She said the presentation was wonderfully done. It is unusual to see something meet all six criteria which this does. She supported designation under all six criteria.



Mr. Schmitt said it is a privilege to vote on this and to hear the stories and to be able to make sure they stay a part of the fabric of Seattle going forward. He said he wholeheartedly supported designation under all the criteria.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he fully supported designation under all six criteria. He appreciated the presentation.

Ms. Caton supported designation, and said it is one that is easy and why the board exists – to pass our understanding of the past to the future. She said there is so much change in the Central Area; it is exciting to be able to do this as a board member.

Mr. Slattery supported designation. He said he loves the window that adds the rich history of the building. He said so much has changed in this location. He said it is a special designation. He appreciated the presentation and said it was an honor to be part of it.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis appreciated the report and said the history was fantastic, and she appreciated knowing it is going to be making more history as it moves into the future. She supported designation under all criteria.

Mr. Barnes said he agreed with other board members. He noted his life experience living in the Central Area. He said his first housing was there. He said he was familiar with the community churches. He noted Dr. McKinney's comments at the nomination meeting about how the black community supported black churches, and how there was a lot of interaction amongst those churches. He said he was happy to see this church getting the opportunity to be recognized the same way First AME and Mt. Zion have been. He said he is thankful all six criteria are met.

Ms. Chang said she supported designation of Tolliver Temple and said she appreciated the thought and energy and community that came together to make this happen. She said she has driven by this church many times and recalled a fundraiser carwash there. She said she has eaten there as well at a summer cookout. She appreciated the presentation that outlined a beautiful simple building that is well preserved both inside and out. The building is clearly able to convey its significance. She said it is rare to see a building like this that meets all six standards.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Tolliver Temple Church of God in Christ at 1915 E Fir Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards A, B, C, D, E, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the building; the interior of the sanctuary; and exempting all elements of the building and site that are liturgical in nature.

MM/SC/HW/IM            9:0:0    Motion carried.

**062123.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

062123.41 University Heights Community Center  
5031 University Way NE  
Proposed select interior alterations

Anjali Grant, Anjali Grant Design provided context of proposed community kitchen that would be used for the preschool and some community use. She proposed modifying the former cloak room and provided photos of existing conditions which include a mixture of conditions. She provided detailed views of proposed interventions and noted casework in the kitchenette would attach above the wainscot, a Dutch door would be installed to match existing Fir and wainscoting will continue around; she noted there is some salvaged wainscoting on site. She proposed a new wall separating the kitchen from the hallway and noted they would disturb the trim as little as possible. Mechanical exhaust penetrations would be on roof to preserve exterior siding. Black vent caps will be used, and one existing vent location will be reused. She proposed finishes that will match existing woodwork, yellow will be painted over to match warm white of existing wallpaper. She said click-lock flooring would be put down; no glue would be used. Proposed cabinets are pale green Formica.

Ms. Doherty said this was not reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee as there was no time; she noted the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday and said the next full board meeting is July 19. She said given the small scale of this project she decided to bring it directly to the board.

Ms. Chang disclosed that Ms. Grant is a client of hers not related to this project but if board members had concerns, she would recuse herself.

Mr. Macleod asked if there were concerns about her participation. There were none.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he would recuse himself. His firm has a relationship with the building owner.

Mr. Macleod asked if the window would remain.

Ms. Grant said it would. She said all wainscoting and trim will be left in place. Upper cabinets would be attached to wall, not wainscot. Click lock flooring, not glue down, will be installed so it is easily reversible.

Mr. Macleod asked about the possible need for a backsplash.

Ms. Grant said the varnished wainscot is sufficient, but a backsplash could be added if there is concern.

Mr. Macleod said it sounds like the applicant has thought through about preserving the materials which is always a concern in a high use space like a kitchen. He said a backsplash would be a good idea to protect the materials from heat and moisture.

Ms. Doherty said that the applicant could get back to her with a plan for a proposed backsplash if desired, and she could review administratively if that makes sense for the board. No one expressed a concern.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if venting goes up to roof.

Ms. Grant said there is an existing vent shaft in that corner that will be reused for both vents. When it gets to the attic, there is lots of room. She said the existing lighting will remain.

Ms. Wasserman said she is familiar with the building and appreciated the care that has gone into planning. She supported the application.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about equipment potentially overlapping the door as shown on elevation 3.

Ms. Grant said the door would stop short and would be open above to allow daylight in to light the hall. Responding to questions she said it is possible under cabinet lighting could be added.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said it sounds like the door isn't going to function.

Ms. Grant said that it is open above the door. The existing doors are not being used and they don't need to be used for egress, now it just backs into the cloak room.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for select interior alterations and roof equipment at the former University Heights Elementary School, 5031 University Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

## **EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS**

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 125216.*
  - a. The proposed enclosure and casework will change the appearance of the former coat room and visibility into the space, but a number of other former coat rooms have been changed in similar ways.
  - b. The new partition and casework can be removed in the future, and the visibility restored.
  - c. The location and dark color of the roof vent minimizes its appearance.

2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
  - a. Other alternatives are limited, that will allow for increased storage, and security of the programmatic space.
4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.
5. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

*Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

MM/SC/DB/HW            8:0:1    Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself.

062123.42

Seattle Tower  
1218 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Proposed relief vents and removal of medallion lintels

James Ramil and Stephen Heckman, Evolution introduced themselves.

Ms. Sodt said that the vents only would be presented and noted the applicants had not yet provided the requested information by staff regarding the medallions.

Mr. Heckman said columns run on all elevations and contain steam pips that carry steam to all levels of the building. He said there is interior damage at steam pipe location at the stepped back parapets. He said the building is undergoing a conversion to a new heating system that eventually will not utilize the pipes. He said they tore into walls and found interior damage – heat and moisture infiltration and many areas where plaster is flaking off. He proposed installing vents to eliminate the amount of interior damage and said the venting would be effective in reducing humidity. He proposed removal of one brick to install a flangeless vent, tuck point into the masonry: one below floor slab and one above floor slab. He indicated where the proposed vents would be placed and said it is consistent with where they have seen damage. He showed finish options to match the existing brick.

Ms. Wasserman asked how they would match the existing brick.

Mr. Heckman said they can do a color match for closer match.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if the color is consistent throughout out the building.

Mr. Heckman said the color changes and showed images of varied color on the building.

Ms. Sodt said it is her understanding the color changes going up the building as part of the original design. She said it got lighter moving up the building and is an important design element. She said if brick is removed, to catalog it carefully to reinstall in the exact place as removed.

Mr. Heckman said they would. He said most interior brick is clay and is not the same as exterior brick. He said exterior is masonry, not veneer. He said they want to install the vents on each side of the column returns.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the intention is to replace the removed bricks when the new HVAC is up and running.

Mr. Heckman said yes. He said once the new HVAC is installed at all levels the steam will be turned of and vents will no longer be needed. He said the original bricks will be reinstalled.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if approval could require the original bricks to return.

Ms. Sodt said the board can strongly encourage, not require. She said if there is concern about the approach to express that now.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said there is no guarantee.

Ms. Sodt said the board can require removed brick be catalogued and retained for future potential reinstallation.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said that is important.

Mr. Macleod concurred and said catalog and retention is important.

Ms. Chang said the proposed color match seems vague and asked that the proposed brick color be color matched.

Ms. Sodt said the board should discuss that.

Mr. Slattery said it won't make a difference if color matched.

Ms. Doherty said each location would need to be color matched; a field assessment would be needed.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked to see proposed location of vents on building elevation.

Mr. Heckman showed a rendering.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if the building would be cleaned.

Mr. Heckman said he didn't know and said lintel repair is ongoing.

Ms. Chang asked if tuck pointing was being done.

Mr. Heckman said yes. He said that other surrounding masonry will need to be removed and reinstalled with mortar to match.

Ms. Wasserman said the building color lightens as it goes up and using a consistent color might be reasonable.

Mr. Ramil said cleaning the building is not in their scope.

Ms. Doherty said multiple wythes of brick will be impacted and she asked if they would core drill to remove multiple bricks and if any are weight-bearing.

Mr. Heckman said they are working with a contractor, and it varies – some two wythes, some three.

Ms. Caton asked the size of the proposed vents, if they are one brick size or the size of the large green squares on the plan.

Mr. Heckman said they are brick size.

Ms. Sodt asked for clarification and said it seemed the proposal has changed since ARC. She asked applicants if they are absolutely sure this plan will play out. She said it sounds like there is still exploration.

Mr. Heckman said the number of vents needed are less certain. He said that some areas have more damage than others and they would discover more as they do the work. He said they would do scanning to understand where the hot spots are and said some areas might not need vents.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the elevation shows the maximum number of vents or if there were a potential for more.

Mr. Heckman said the most damage is at the column caps and parapets.

Mr. Ramil said the work will be where it is least visible.

Ms. Sodt said the best approach is to do a full building survey before the board takes action.

Mr. Heckman said a full survey is not feasible with the scope of repair to do a full building scan.

Ms. Doherty asked how and when they would decide if more vents were needed.

Mr. Heckman said he wasn't sure but definitely at the column caps at the upper levels. He said the steam is off now and there isn't much they can do with the steam off. He said they could eventually do an IR scan.

Mr. Macleod asked if there are seasonal requirements or limitations when work can be done.

Mr. Heckman said no, it is ongoing now and there are swing stages there.

Ms. Caton reiterated her question about the green rectangles representing the maximum vents needed.

Mr. Heckman said it is the best plan now, but they might need more, they might need less.

Ms. Doherty asked if they contemplated 150 vents.

Mr. Heckman said there are 30 columns with 12 vents per column. He said it could be reduced with less damage.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if they are doing the work while continuing investigation.

Mr. Heckman said yes.

Mr. Macleod noted the time constraint with scaffold on site now. He asked if work were not done now if scaffolding would have to be installed again.

Mr. Heckman said yes.

Mr. Ramil said the proposed work is for repair and would not change the look of the building.

Mr. Macleod noted the emergency repair and said his concern was the applicants do not have a firm grasp on the scope. He said it is difficult to approve work without a full understanding of the full scope of work.

Ms. Doherty said more penetration may not be a good way to keep moisture out and asked if other strategies have been explored.

Mr. Ramil said they are working with a water intrusion company, and they understand what is happening. They are not doing work on interior so had to do exterior and add vents.

Ms. Sodt said she understands there is interior damage.

Mr. Ramil said it is steam pipes that can't be changed. In the future the steam will be turned off and vents won't be necessary. He said there is not an opportunity to do that now because all tenants would have to move out.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked why vents couldn't be put on the inside.

Mr. Ramil said they are weatherproofing the skin of the building. The best solution to solve the existing problem is the vent; data says vent will work. He said to work inside they would have to go floor by floor from the inside and floors would have to be empty. He said they can't do that.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if there were any studies about interior venting.

Mr. Ramil said no.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said it would be nice to know if doing work from the interior is an option.

Mr. Ramil said they can't because the building is occupied.

Ms. Sodt said the applicants haven't explored what that would look like.

Mr. Ramil said it isn't an option they can do.

Ms. Sodt said the plan seems to be evolving on the go and there isn't a drawing showing exactly where vents would go.

Ms. Doherty said the board is used to seeing alternatives, to see what has been explored and why it will or will not work. She said the interior of the building is not controlled like the exterior is and a vent at the interior wall may not be as invasive.

Mr. Macleod agreed and said he needs to see why this might be the best option. He said he is interested in what is beyond the applicant firm's scope and said there are missing pieces. He said he wants to see a wall section to better understand the interior. He said the principle makes sense, but he has no understanding of the full scope and mitigation options. He said he wants to see a clearer plan to understand the full wall assembly and other options. He wanted to see the lightest touch.

Mr. Ramil said he didn't know how to get to the next step.

Ms. Sodt said at minimum the board needs to know exactly where vents would go now.

Mr. Ramil said the green areas can locate the exact bricks and that the mortar is not drawn. He said it is just a representation.



Ms. Doherty clarified that each green rectangle is two vents or returns – twice the quantity that is shown.

Mr. Heckman said yes, on both sides.

Ms. Chang asked for further clarification on what the green rectangle represents.

Ms. Wasserman expressed concern with the expansion of the project. She said she could approve the concept and scope, but the applicants should come back because of future unknowns.

Mr. Schmitt agreed and requested a narrowed scope, clearly defined, catalog system and updated language.

Mr. Ramil said there would be a maximum of 20 per column.

Mr. Macleod said the vents are concentrated on caps and returns and asked what that means.

Mr. Heckman said the column caps are where the most damage has occurred, and vents are needed. He said they are prioritizing those areas with one on each return, one below and one above the slab.

Ms. Chang suggested specific language to move this forward:

- maximum number of vents per column at green location shown; if more are needed applicants must come back to board.
- Clear documentation / cataloging of bricks removed
- Color match as close as possible

Mr. Inpanbutr agreed and said only if this is the maximum number of vents and to narrow the range of colors for vents.

Ms. Sodt said she is not comfortable with reviewing further iterations – they would have to come back to the board.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis wished there were a wall section and said she has a hard time not knowing exactly what the vents are punching into. She asked if there is a way to put a light in first penetration to see conditions.

Mr. Heckman said it is a possibility where there is a clear opening between floors.

Ms. Sodt said the board could note the preferred approach.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said every possible effort should be made to reduce the number of openings and that she was leaning toward approval. She said she didn't know if she needed a color match for every single location and suggested coming up with a few colors to account for the variation.

Mr. Schmitt said because these are on the returns, is it something that could be reviewed / approved by staff in terms of the color matching because 20 color options is not feasible.

Ms. Sodt supported that and finding five different color options to logically reduce the number.

Ms. Wasserman said she had no idea what the best color would be and said human eyes are needed on the sample.

Ms. Sodt agreed.

Ms. Chang said it sounds like board members are moving towards being comfortable with approval of a maximum number of openings for the columns which in her opinion should be 20; and with the caveat that every possible effort be made to reduce the number as they are going through the process of evaluating; close the color match range to adjust for the variation within the height may be a maximum of four or five with staff approvals of samples being acceptable; survey and catalog each removed brick for future reinstallation.

Ms. Sodt said in the proposed motion she clarified that this doesn't include approval to modify other features of the building so board can add stipulations to the motion.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of single bricks and replacement with brick-sized vent units in select exterior column locations at the Seattle Tower, 1212 Third Avenue, as per the attached submittal. This approval does not include approval to modify any other exterior features of the building. This approval is conditional upon the following: that the maximum number of precise vents are as shown in the attached, that the color of the vents be reviewed by staff and be as close to the existing brick as possible with no more than five color variations used throughout the height of the building, and that upon removal of the existing face brick that brick be catalogued for their exact location and retained for future installation; a maximum of 20 vents per column and trying to minimize the number of vents in every way possible.

#### **EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS**

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 125836.*
  - a. The proposed physical changes to the building exterior are minor and can be reversed in the future.
2. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 B, C, D and E are not applicable.

3. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

MM/SC/MI/HW            9:0:0    Motion carried.

Ms. Sodt said that the other features they are proposing to alter documentation should be submitted to staff before board briefing.

Ms. Chang said it sounds good and would be helpful to the board.

Mr. Inpanbutr concurred and appreciated staff's suggestion.

Ms. Sodt said she would work with the applicant to try to figure out the next steps. She said to keep the vent portion moving it might be best to separate out the application in the portal so that they are bifurcated. She said to keep the conversation moving on what the applicants are calling the medallions she will follow up with the applicants.

*Mr. Slattery left the meeting at 6:20pm.*

**062123.5            CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

062123.51        Cettolin House  
4022 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three-month extension and noted she is actively working with owners on the agreement.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Cettolin House, 4022 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW for three months.

MM/SC/MI/TC        8:0:0            Motion carried.

062123.52        The Showbox  
1426 First Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary explained the request for extension to November 1, 2023. He noted market change due to pandemic and the need to update their economics.

Ms. Sodt said she was supportive of the extension.

Mr. Macleod and Ms. Chang were supportive of the extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for The Showbox, 1426 First Avenue until November 1, 2023.

MM/SC/IM/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

062123.53

White Garage  
1915 Third Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary explained the request for extension to November 1, 2023. He said the garage building is in good shape, is being maintained and is actively being used as a storage facility. He said the owner of the adjacent property died and the property is now in probate; he noted complexities of that and the need to reassess the project which originally involved both properties.

Ms. Sodt was supportive of the extension and noted she is working on scheduling a briefing.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Garage, 1915 Third Avenue until November 1, 2023.

MM/SC/IM/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

*Ms. Caton left the meeting at 6:35pm.*

062123.54

Donahoe Building / Bergman Luggage  
1901-1911 3rd Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the property owner died and the estate is in probate. She noted the desire to keep this property on the same schedule as the White Garage and requested extension until November 1, 2023.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Donahoe Building / Bergman Luggage, 1901-1922 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue until November 1, 2023.

MM/SC/IM/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**062123.6**

**BOARD BUSINESS**