The City of Seattle

Pioneer Square Preservation Board

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

MINUTES OF MEETING PSB 243/08

DATE: October 8, 2008
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:
Doug Ito
Lorne McConachie
Ryan Hester
Catherine Person
Ann Brown
Adam Hasson
Erin Doherty

Staff:
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:
John DeLanoy

Chair Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

100808.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: Minutes from September 3, 2008 deferred.

100808.2 **APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

100808.21 **Medici Gallery**
Steam Supply and Rubber Building
125 S Jackson Street

Installation of new business signage

Steve Hintzke, Island Dog Signage, explained the signage program including a 3' x 2 ½' blade sign to hang above the front entrance of the building, the Medici logo in vinyl on an existing plaque on the corner of the building and an open/close sign.

Board Questions:

Mr. Ito stated ARC recommended approval and had no questions.

Mr. Hintzke said the blade sign mount is attached to a wood panel so there will be no drilling into brick or mortar.

Ms. Nashem stated the sign meets requirements for letter height and square footage.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for signage as presented.

Code Citations:
XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
B. General Signage Regulations
C. Specific Signage Regulations
1. Letter size
3. Projecting elements
4. Blade signs
SMC 23.66.160

MM/SC/LM/AB 7:0:0 Motion approved.

100808.22 **Stadium Lofts**
Seattle Plumbing Building
589 Occidental Ave S

Amendment to final design approval for renovation of existing building and new addition

Ms. Nashem asked the applicant to direct the Board to the updated drawings where substitutions have been made. She explained the application for changes to the existing building to include alterations to some window and door openings, re-establishing previous window and door openings and new openings for vents. A landscaped public deck will be located on the roof of the existing building.

New materials on the addition include highly glazed vinyl bays, hardipanel and metal screening. The roof of the addition will include mechanical equipment, stair penthouses and private decks with railings and trellises.

ARC Report: Mr. Ito stated ARC reviewed the project and renderings provided. There were concerns about new penetrations in the existing masonry for ventilation and ARC suggested they look at other ways of alleviating that problem by using existing openings or going to the roof. There were some alignment issues the garage door and the man door. The biggest issue on the upper portion of the building was the vinyl storefront/curtain wall. Vinyl has not ever been approved in the district and there are concerns about setting precedent.

Ms. Nashem stated with the two issues today the Board will need to look at the Secretary of the District rules, the Code, and the Secretary of Interior Standards relevant to materials. The ARC asked the applicant to present information on how the applicant feels the vinyl is compatible in the Historic District and the Board will need to make that determination and will need to express if they feel it is compatible, how. Looking at the General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction in the rules it talks about compatibility of materials; building materials, exterior design; it states the design is to complement and enhance the historic character of the District and to retain the quality and continuity of existing buildings. It does give the Board the ability to approve other

materials for windows, doors, sashes and trims, but it still has to be determined that those materials are compatible and retain the quality and continuity of existing buildings. The Secretary of Interior Guidelines for additions also states that even though a building is differentiated it still needs to be compatible in terms of mass, materials and relationships solids to voids and color.

Applicant Comment:

Leslie Bain, Weinstein AU, went over the landscape/streetscape plan and said it is almost identical to what was previously approved. Rock Rose is specified along Railroad Avenue where ground cover was approved under the previous plan. They have moved to a two-way garage which they believe is necessary for safety, but it is in an area where the brick has been reconfigured over time. Previously some relocated railroad tracks were put into the streetscape, but they thought that had a faux feel to it so are no longer including it.

Ms. Bain explained the plans and pointed out where the vaults, generators, fire pumps were. The building is technically a high rise so more is required of the building. The cores are in the wide part of the angle and there is also a smaller core added for exit stairs. She said they tried to bring as much activity to the street as possible with commercial spaces, restaurants along both Railroad and Occidental. There are two entries for residential units and they have tried to locate the program to accommodate existing openings in the building or openings that can be modified just slightly. She said they have taken the approach that the new will look new where the openings have been modified. They tried to use as much interior space, roof and existing openings for ventilation needs and pointed out openings that would ventilate the vault and the emergency generator area below. She pointed out they have eliminated the extra notch so the upper level was true to the geometry of the building below. There is a small gasket that is set back three feet to separate the new residential from the existing building. She showed the outdoor common recreation space for the building that also provides separation from the building next door. She pointed out the space will include: cast in place planter of Rock Rose, cast pavers, trellises and open space.

Ms. Bain explained there are three stacks of lofts above one level of flats. She said there are two stairs needed for exiting purposes; one is in the wide part of the wedge and the other is at the prow. The stairs are enclosed with metal siding. She showed a site line study that shows the roof is minimally visible. She said they have removed some of the roof decks and none are visible from the street.

Ms. Person asked why the decks were minimized.

Ms. Bain responded the private roof decks were not worth the dollars to build them. They could be added later though they will plan for four or five.

Ms. Nashem asked if the applicant had provided four updated sets of roof plan drawings to the Board.

Ms. Bain confirmed that the large drawing was updated and they could make more copies if desired. She said she thought the only thing that changed was the roof decks.

Ms. Nashem advised she had to have drawings that reflected exactly what they are doing.

Ms. Bain explained the changes and that they had taken Board suggestions to bring ventilation out underneath the windows in the gasket level and said it would be a big help. She showed the windows shown in tan were all intact and would remain as they are. Some are fully glazed while some have broken windows; they will keep the glass where there is glass and restore the windows and add single pane glazing where the glass is broken on all windows shown on the drawing as tan.

Mr. McConachie confirmed that the existing wood sash is being kept and refurbished and replacing glass where broken in all the windows shown in the tan colors.

Ms. Bain concurred. She said a lot of the brick has been bricked over in the life time of the building. The windows will be similar in profile and glazing to the existing windows. They believe they are in existing locations and there may even be existing windows behind some of the gypboard.

Mr. McConachie asked exactly what Ms. Bain meant by "similar profile" and asked if the old windows would be matched; would a new window be used that is of similar detail but not quite exact. He asked if they would be custom milled windows.

Ms. Bain confirmed they would be exact

Mr. Hasson asked if the materials would be wood.

Ms. Bain replied they would be wood. She explained the green colored areas on the plan show where there is a large service opening. She pointed out the roll up door on Occidental which would be replaced with a more refined roll up door and the in fill will be from salvaged brick. She said the spandrel glass on the windows is to cover the floor line of the garage levels behind.

Mr. McConachie asked if the spandrel windows were fixed.

Ms. Bain agreed. She said some window openings will be used for ventilation and she pointed out which ones. They have tried to minimize those and in those cases the wood frame would come out and the ventilation put in where the glass was. On an earlier drawing many openings for ventilation were put in at the parapet level and they have now managed to consolidate those below the glass at the gasket unit; now they are down to just two on one side. On the Railroad Avenue side of the building, the tan colored windows on the plan will be restored and broken glass replaced. The green colored openings are new; one being a new entry to the lobby and another being a new commercial entry but these are within existing or previously existing openings. She showed the garage door and said the brick there has been changed dramatically over time. Other windows shown on the plan are located in previous openings; if the window exists they will do their best to fix it unless it is in really bad condition. These windows will be the same profile and glazing as the existing. The blue colored opening is an aluminum door. She said they had a discussion about new versus old and the direction they've chosen to go with is to say "if it is new, it looks new; if it is old, we will refurbish what is there".

Ms. Person asked if the aluminum would be painted or be silver.

Ms. Bain said it would be aluminum.

Tejal Pastakia added it would be silver anodized aluminum as on the sample board and explained that the garage door would be a grill so that air can pass through.

Mr. Hasson asked if the retail windows would be wood.

Ms. Bain said the windows would be wood in any of the punched openings.

Mr. McConachie asked what the finish would be in existing opening with new grill - the color of the sash and the finish of the new grill.

Ms. Bain said the ventilation will be painted out the same color as the window trim. She said they would like to keep the glazing for the windows similar to what is there now which is single glaze and would appreciate Board support because there would be conflict with the energy code. She introduced Ed Weinstein who would talk about windows on the upper floors. She said they have worked hard to come up with a high quality window system up on the elevations and referred to the perspective in the booklets. She said it is a system they fell in love at the outset, that they felt let the building be what the building is which is a wonderful piece of Pioneer Square and that the residences above were never going to be a historically correct look so they went with the old is old and the new is new. They went to a lot of work to get a good window system that is high quality that is different, non punched kind of look.

Mr. Weinstein said the concept behind the addition to the building was to let the new be the new and to use the gasket to separate from the fabric of the existing building. At the time when they first presented he indicated that they thought of the new loft units as glazed lanterns that would be very distinct from the masonry base of the building. He said they have been seduced by that image and it has resonated with the Board and the marketplace. He said they have tried to have fidelity by putting in a kind of a code of a left-hand unit and a right-hand unit that would look more residential than an office building. He said their interest was trying to do a break-up that would glaze these lanterns in as minimal a fashion as possible and make them distinct from an office building. He said their first assumption was this would be an aluminum window wall thinking that it was a material that would probably be acceptable to this Committee, certainly it was the first thing they looked at, but they wanted to be able to go from ceiling to floor and from the demising wall out to the corner to make it as minimal as possible. They discovered the aluminum curtain wall had thermal challenges and that they could not get the glazing they wanted out of aluminum because there was too much of a thermal loss. If they were using a window wall system rather than a curtain wall system they were limited to 15' in height and had very small breakups possible with the standard window wall. They performed the analysis for their owner/client to try to show the comparison between the more common aluminum window wall system that necessitated a large spandrel to cover not only the concrete slabs but also to go up another two feet because they had to shorten the height and they needed to pack the spandrel with insulation in order to be able to achieve the energy code requirements. They felt that was a significant diminishment of the idea behind the building in terms of the lanterns so they were flummoxed and didn't know where to go to find glazing that would achieve their concept so started to think about vinyl.

Mr. Weinstein said they looked at the Innotech system which was very limited in terms of its spans and very limiting in terms of the actual glass sizing. He said that although it was cost effective it was not the direction they wanted to pursue because it started to

dumb down the ambition for the façade. Through research they found the Thermomax system which is a composite window system. He said it was truly not a vinyl system because every one of its cells is reinforced with steel. He said that is the only way they were able to get to this infill from floor to ceiling and from demising wall to the corner. He said all of their verticals will be relatively thin and showed on the sample what will be a horizontal mullion. They were able to achieve their energy code compliance and the floor to ceiling to get the glazing they were hoping for. He pointed out the perspective shown was not correct in terms of the corner unit; they were able to get the corner build up of both the sash and the corner steel reinforced unit to be just 5" overall. It is their opinion after going through the research that this system is the only way they can reasonably get to the glazing patterning configuration to the extent they first showed the Board and comply with the energy code. He said therein is the conundrum that they believe this is the right system for the building and that they need to find a way collectively to be able to approve it in the context of the Guidelines without setting an onerous precedent. He said it clearly is a window wall and is very distinct from conventional vinyl windows that you would see in an infill punched opening. He said it is a legitimate window wall the same that you would see in an aluminum window wall excepting they do have the steel reinforcing.

Mr. Weinstein stated they were submitting for Board consideration a composite window wall system because it includes PVC (Polyvinyl chloride), aluminum and steel which they think from both aesthetic and performance point of view is significantly different from a vinyl window. He said that their consultants tell them that they think the exterior film, which is the preferred coloration of the system, has a long life, 30-40 years. The same matching color in paint would be applied to all of the aluminum closure strips that are on the outside. They believe that in terms of the pedestrians who view this, the closest they can get to it is 60 feet and more than likely they will be looking at it from hundreds of feet away, that its reflective quality and coloration will be the same as if it were aluminum. Going back to Ms. Bain's comment, they want all their new insertions down below and the new addition above to read as aluminum and they believe this will do that. He said in summary they believe they have achieved the intent of the Guidelines to differentiate and to utilize a system that is appropriate for the new additions; it so happens that it is composite PVC and steel system and hope that the Board could craft its approval around this composite system that they believe will become increasingly more popular in this type of application because of the advantages of its thermal performance and its strength. They think it is something to consider now because the options are becoming so limited for architects. They did not want to go to fiberglass because of the quality and they had the issues with aluminum and this seems like a magic bullet that they could find that looked like aluminum system, performed better than the aluminum system and was priced in a similar fashion.

Board Questions:

Ms. Doherty asked if the finish is warranteed.

Mr. Weinstein said he is trying to get that a warranty. He said neither Ms. Barrientos nor the architects are interested in spec'ing a product that has a liability. He said this is a condominium with a homeowners association so just as the Board will be concerned about the long life span of the finish system, they are equally concerned because they have significant exposure.

Ms. Bain stated it is one of those materials one can say has been used in Europe for 25 years without problem.

Ms. Doherty asked exactly what is it because it doesn't appear to be metal.

Mr. Weinstein said it is a film that is chemically applied that matches in terms of its pigmentation to the paint that will be applied to the aluminum on the outside.

Ms. Doherty asked the applicant what happens when this is installed and it is all scratched up.

Mr. Weinstein noted there is a touch-up kit that goes with it.

Ms. Doherty expressed concern about what touch-ups look like.

Mr. Weinstein explained that when scratched it looks like a raised bead but at the distance from which it would be perceived they were not as concerned. This would be on all exterior windows.

Ms. Doherty asked for clarification on what the interior window cladding would be.

Mr. Weinstein stated it would be white and the opening would be trimmed out in some fashion. He said that all aluminum would be painted and all the exterior surfaces will have the film attached at the factory. Thermomax is a window fabricator in Reno but all the pieces come a manufacturer in Europe. He said all the pieces are tried and true for 20 – 25 years in Europe and it is purely the issue of making sure that the details the fabricator is using are consistent with the catalog, which has occurred. He said they are confident enough as the development team to say that this is appropriate solution for condominium.

Ms. Person asked how this would be repaired if it bubbled in 30 - 40 years.

Mr. Weinstein said in all likelihood it would be painted; and he said they will ask that question of the manufacture. He said any window system will need significant remedial actions that have to be taken; aluminum can get pitted or it can fade if it has a painted finish and if it was anodized it would probably have to be retrofitted by painting if it got too faded. He said at the minimum it has to perform equally as well as the standard aluminum window wall.

Mr. McConachie said he assumed the comparison with the aluminum sash was thermally broken as well and have structural mullion as necessary to do spans and even within that the limitations were as discussed.

Mr. Weinstein concurred and said the maximum of 15' height and then each manufacturer had a different sash that they were willing to commit to but the bigger issue was that no one, even using high quality insulated glass, were not able to achieve the thermal performance they needed so that this spandrel panel was necessitated by the requirement for additional insulation. He said this was perplexing to them because they thought that as a loft unit all the glazing is on one side; it is a significant amount of glazing but not as related to the overall floor area because it has only one exposure. He said it appeared to be the perfect answer to the structural and insulation challenges; its appearance is acceptable to them. The individual mullions in snap together stick built

window wall system might be 2 ½ or 3"; because of wind loading they still had need for steel at the outside corner so the corners would have been the same probably in the 5" – 6" range. The only issue is that in the window wall system they were looking at ones that were about 3" so they actually have a couple more inches everywhere. They have tried to represent that accurately; it is not a problem to them because, he said, it does feel appropriately scaled and it is so high off the ground. He said in the end they thought it was a better appearance than looking more like an office building.

Ms. Person asked if the windows were single glazed.

Mr. Weinstein said they are insulated windows.

Ms. Person asked about the horizontal bands above and below the windows.

Mr. Weinstein explained that is a steel fabrication; it will be steel or aluminum – they have finely detailed that but the notion is that it looks like a structural shape like a channel. It will be integrated color wise.

Ms. Doherty asked if it was fairly clear.

Ms. Bain said it had a slight tint to it; the color is Solar Band 60. She said the color is back not forward.

Ms. Person asked if one is clear and one is tinted.

Ms. Bain explained there are layers and in this window layer 2 gets the tint. She proceeded to talk about colors and finishes and said between the lanterns there is an inset; there is a rain screen and some ventilation for the washer/dryers so they have put in a hardi-panel painted the darker color and then a matching paint to a perforated metal that covers up where it is breathing.

Mr. Weinstein added that the most unfortunate part of the current economics of multi family housing is the need to be able to punch through the side wall with all the horizontal ductwork for bath fans, dryer vents, and kitchen range hoods. One of the things they were trying to do was to control all that and make it very refined so they are hiding them in this cavity. The "perf" metal panel will be painted the same so that it will look very monolithic and very abstract and won't have all the punctuation of all the vents within it.

Ms. Bain said the recessed area is a darker charcoal color to make the recess more pronounced. The north wall, which is a hardi panel wall, will be a lighter tone

Mr. Ito asked at what was proposed as the gasket if the same window type is being proposed. He asked how the gasket is expressed architecturally. He said when he looks at the elevations he sees the glass line comes down to the existing building. Even though there are bays that express the gasket there is a vertical expression of glass, solid, glass, solid etc versus this glassy box on top of sort of a gasket over the old building. He asked the applicant to explain.

Mr. Weinstein pointed out the demising wall between the two units is the center line and showed the column behind and the cladding that separates the two which comes all the way down and rests on the slab just behind the parapet. He said it was important to

them that it went all the way down. He pointed out the underside of the slab and said they would infill with similar glazing underneath so as seen in perspective this plane is back 3' from the parapet and doesn't have any other solid elements that would compete with the pier that comes down.

Mr. McConachie asked about the color to the window in the recessed glass plane.

Mr. Weinstein said it would have the same silver color. They are not trying to emphasize this as a separate color; they are trying to emphasize it by the shadow. He said if they were to paint it a different color, it would be too strong of a statement about it.

Mr. Hester asked the height of the parapet because the window continues beyond the parapet.

Mr. Weinstein said it varies anywhere from 18" to 3'. He said from a pedestrian point of view you really won't be aware of this elevation; you would have to be back very far to even recognize it. You will get light emitting at night but he didn't think that would be part of the composition from the pedestrian point of view.

Ms. Bain provided information about the masonry restoration and said the intent is to do a gentle cleaning. They want to remove any graffiti and don't intend to take the sign away. They propose to use hot water - 180º to clean and restoration chemicals for graffiti. They are looking at Prosoco Enviroclean Safe Restorer. They estimate about 20% of the east façade and 15% of the west façade to be tuck pointed.

Mr. Ito stated the Board will need to know the exact pressure for cleaning.

Ms. Doherty asked that the type of mortar that is used for tuck pointing is consistent with existing.

Ms. Bain talked about the common recreation space and said they intended to not go for the waiver, but once they started to figure out what would happen in the recreation space they ran out of things they thought would be useful to the residents. They are providing 999 square feet of street level which can have exercise equipment and accommodate parties. On the fifth floor where the existing roof is now there would be the common roof terrace which would give them a combination of 3,160 square feet. 3,588 square feet would be required so they would be looking for a waiver from 728 square feet. The previous projects had an approval for just under 2,000 square feet. They have "upped" it and think it is very useful but would rather give some of the ground at the street to commercial uses. The fifth floor is the outdoor space and has 2,160 square feet and they think it will be a well used space.

Ms. Person asked about the ground floor space.

Ms. Bain explained it would have a TV, pool table and a kitchenette, bathroom for residential use.

Mr. Ito clarified the condo association would probably decided what they wanted to do with it.

Ms. Bain concurred.

Mr. Hasson asked if the type of /colorization of paving is called out.

Ms. Bain stated it would be standard City of Seattle spec.

Mr. Ito advised they should look at the standard of Pioneer Square for concrete. He said one thing that was left in the sidewalk during the previous approval were the railroad tracks that were in the sidewalk and entered the building.

Ms. Bain explained they were harvested from the street and relocated. If they were original they would be happy to leave them.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester asked if the addition would be extension concrete slab on concrete walls or will there be bracing.

Mr. Weinstein said it is all concrete.

Ms. Nashem explained the Board would be voting on this and one thing she has not heard the Board discuss is how the vinyl is compatible to the Historic District.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McConachie congratulated the applicant on doing a good job in coming back and looking at the historic brick facades and appreciated the challenge of all the new holes. He said in his opinion, the treatment of the historic facades is appropriate; they are making new holes where old holes existed; they are restoring existing fabric of the windows; new penetrations in terms of vents are largely aligned and the three or four new penetrations don't try to mimic the penetrations of the historic character. He said as he looks at the Secretary of Interior Standards, that is what it directs the Board to think about. In terms of the vinyl, he said he is actually surprising himself in saying he is supporting it and wanted to use his terminology carefully. It is a composite system; he heard there is steel, vinyl cladding and aluminum facing materials. He said it is a challenge to Pioneer Square and the Board has to be very careful in terms of precedent and some of the issues that have been touched on. He cited the Secretary of Interior Standards' discussion of windows and said the first and critical thing is identifying, retaining and preserving existing windows which is why he asked about reusing existing sash and actually replicating existing sash where it has to be replaced. Had that not been done he might have been talking from a different perspective. Again he cited the Secretary of Interior Standards he said what is not recommended is "…creating false historical appearance because the replaced window is based on insufficient historical, pictorial or physical documentation…." He said clearly design intent as expressed is to do a good job restoring the existing base of this building and letting the new addition be clearly different – a juxtaposition of the historic character rather than a continuation. Mr. McConachie said that opens the door for a new way of thinking about fenestration and the whole façade of the building. Part of what he finds powerful about the design is that it is forthright in carrying on that juxtaposed and more modern character. He said the last "not recommended" aspect of the Secretary of Interior Standards is "…installing new windows including frames, sash and muntin configurations that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage or destroy character defining features…" He said that none of the new windows/cladding is about destroying,

obscuring or damaging character defining features. He said by the juxtaposition they reinforce the nature of the old masonry building with its punched windows versus the more modernist piece above which is a glassier façade. He also discussed the notion of "incompatible with building's historic appearance" and said in his mind this is a very compatible addition because of the setting off the historic character of the base and not trying to water down or muddy the inter-relationship of the two buildings. He said he would have a much different attitude toward the PVC composite fenestration if it was sort of the left hand side or back side of a building or if is was somehow joined in a more direct manner to historic fabric. He said he thought it was because of the juxtaposition is why he can rationalize and believe it actually fits the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. Ito stated in fact the vinyl PFC storefront window as vinyl acts as a new piece. If this system had muntins that replicated the historic systems then there would be some problems because there isn't an honesty in what the material is. Even though it is vinyl it does have an honesty into itself in that it is a new system sitting on the old building. He agreed with Mr. McConachie on all those points. He said if it is painted silver there is a materiality issue of honesty of material and that it is trying to replicate aluminum however, it is vinyl which is something that is sort of this new artificial material anyway and does it matter if it is silver or if it is white.

Ms. Person asked if the manufacturer had plans to manufacture it in silver; she expressed concern about the film.

Mr. Weinstein said the industry standard is white because there are manufacturing issues with this and they can't technologically. The film is the response to the marketplace to be able to provide an array of colors other than the beige or white.

Ms. Bain said the film actually protects the window and keeps the UV from degrading the vinyl.

Mr. Weinstein said they didn't want white and because they were using aluminum for the new insertion down below that this probably would be correct. It is not perfect or pure intellectually because they are transforming it but they came to the same conclusion that vinyl is intended to be an armature to hang other color on it and it is to be modified.

Mr. Ito said similar to wood; stained or painted it is still wood. Vinyl, whether oozed on with color is still vinyl.

Ms. Doherty said she didn't believe by approving this system the Board compromises its attitude about replacement windows that are vinyl.

Mr. Ito said the one place it might come up again is the North Lot or other infill lots. The problem is if it is not designed well.

Mr. McConachie said another point that has been made and he would argue why this is a reasonable choice is there are four stories in terms of the way the applicant is using the space but roughly a two story building that is a contributing building of masonry construction that is the base, the pedestrian presence. He said he thought there would be another discussion if this composite window system was coming down to the ground in a bunch of different ways. He said because there is so much coherence to the base, the historic character, even the new materials used in a couple of the punched openings are

consistent with saying "here is historic fabric, here is new" and that is what the Secretary of Interior Standards tell us is the pathway.

Mr. Hasson stated the Board decided early on that we were all in favor of a juxtaposition and said when you do a juxtaposition the question comes up is "did you go to far?" and "is it still compatible with the district?" He said you just can't go with new because it is new and say "because new is good". If it was white, in terms of color it would not be compatible. The material, being vinyl is in his opinion not compatible with the District. In this case some good arguments have been made about this being for residential use, the value of it, how far it is from the street and there are a whole bunch of mitigating factors that barely get him over the edge on the material.

Ms. Doherty said the challenge many times with vinyl is portion of the make up of the system and here it is not meant to replicate a small sash window so that is not an issue. She said there is also the problem with color and the future and the longevity of the material and she is concerned with how this will last, what it will look like when it is actually completed because it will need to be touched up. She noted to make sure there is a guarantee that it either can be refinished in place or that it will last for 25 years.

Mr. Ito reiterated Mr. McConachie's comments about the punched openings and thanked the applicant for taking a hard look at the openings. The other previous iteration became much too dominant feature on the existing building and now although there are a few openings it is definitely a subsidiary thing and sort of go with the façade.

Ms. Doherty noted that the Board should support the applicant's plan to use single glazed glass in talking with the mechanical folks at DPD. She said it looks like the majority is semi-conditioned or unconditioned space because it is parking.

Mr. McConachie stated that in terms of cleaning the painted parapet he advised to be careful with the ghosted sign and said gentler is better. He likes the idea of the perforated grill as a means of cleaning up the openings.

Mr. Hester appreciated the preservation of the base and said with regard to the windows on the oblique face of the building, as walking along the west elevation the mullion is a dominant profile and it will be seen obliquely through the window; he asked if there was a way to wrap that mullion.

Mr. Weinstein said it seems to be something they don't do and said if Mr. Hester is concerned that if looking obliquely he would see silver and then the white, it is something that is mitigated to a certain extent by the pane of glass in between it.

Ms. Brown stated she was looking at the Design Guidelines for the North Lot since this is close by and they say "creative interpretation of materials and architectural elements can be used for new construction on the site" and she said this has been termed "new construction". She said it is fine and she thinks it is a wonderful looking building.

Ms. Doherty stated a request had been made to approve the reduction in common recreation area.

Mr. Ito stated he had no problem with it and it was actually an increase from the previous design.

Action: I move for approval for renovation of the existing building and the addition with a waiver for common recreation areas and recommend the maintenance of single glazing at the historic facades per:

Code Citations:

District Rules

III. General Rules for Rehab and New Construction

B Design

C. Building Material

D. Color

VI. Height Limits-Area 3

VIII. Mechanical Systems

SMT 23.66.140 Height

C. Rooftop Features

2. Railings, planters

4. Feature height and set back

SMT 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

A. Materials

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10

Guidelines for Additions

Brief #14

Guidelines for Mechanical Systems

MM/SC/LM/RH 7:0:0 Motion approved.

100808.3 BOARD BUSINESS

100808.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Doug Ito, Chair

100808.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227