



The City of Seattle

Pioneer Square Preservation Board

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

PSB 316/10

MINUTES for Wednesday, December 1, 2010

Board Members

Ann Brown
Erin Doherty, Vice Chair
Adam Hasson
Ryan Hester
Lorne McConachie, Chair
Jessica Miller
Willie Parish
Catherine Person

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Chair Lorne McConachie called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

120110.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 3, 2010

MM/SC/RH/AB 5:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. McConachie abstained.

November 17, 2010

Postponed.

120110.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

120110.21 Cannery Workers ILWU/ Cascade Laundry

213 S Main St (225 Second Ave Ext S)

Repair to the brick work on the building

ARC Report: Mr. McConachie reported that ARC reviewed the work that had already been done. He said some recommendations on brick cleaning were provided. Mr. Amundson will provide the product information.

Ms. Person arrived at 9:07 a.m.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ron Amundson explained that the work was done resulting from a Notice of Violation for a hazard because the bricks had come loose in two locations. He said the original brick was put back in place.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Amundson explained that the cleaning method recommended is to use muriatic acid diluted 8-1 and apply it carefully. He said that he thought that what they were trying to remove is mortar haze. He said that they used a standard mortar to restore the bricks.

Ms. Doherty advised the cleaning to be done by hand and to use no more than 400 PSI pressure.

Mr. McConachie said pressure wash may not be needed – that scrubbing with the muriatic solution and then wiping it off may take care of the haze.

Ms. Nashem reminded the applicant that any future work needs to be reviewed and approved by this Board.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for repair of the brick after the fact as presented with the addition of hand cleaning the brick with muriatic acid solution and if needed no more than 400 PSI.

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 5 and 6

MM/SC/RH/JM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.22

Café Vita

125 Prefontaine Pl S

Installation of two neon blade signs, a window neon sign and window sign

Mr. Hasson arrived at 9:14 a.m.

Brock Gavery, representing the owner, explained that the business owner didn't understand the Board's approval is for specific locations and subsequently installed signs in other locations. He explained the value and necessity of appropriate signage and street appeal to the success of the business. He explained where the signage had been installed in different locations than approved and additional signage had been installed. He said that the District Guidelines allow one projecting element per address and noted that the owner's lease had two separate addresses.

Mr. Gavery proceeded to go over all the business signage. He noted that frosted window sign had been installed. He reported that the "Pizzeria" sign was supposed to

have been flat but was installed as a projecting element. The Café Vita sign was installed on the same side of the building as the projecting “Pizzeria” sign resulting in two projecting elements. He said the discovery of two addresses on the lease would solve the problem of the two projecting elements. He explained that the “Pizza Bar” neon sign flashes but could be made to be static.

Mr. Gavery explained that eventually they would like to add canopies but noting that they can’t have more projecting elements; they really need the signage. Umbrellas were suggested as an option but Mr. Gavery said he preferred canopies because of the ability to retract them when not in use.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Brown said that if the two businesses and two addresses can be justified it would be ok with the rules.

Mr. McConachie said in looking at the various regulations he was not concerned about over proliferation of signage and noted the abundance of transparency into the space.

Ms. Person said the signs are all tastefully done.

Mr. Hester commented that the “Pizza Bar” sign should not blink.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the additional vinyl window sign, and non-blinking neon window sign, and also the new location of the blade sign and that it is three sided. The neon pizza sign is approved as a blade sign.

Code Citations:

District Rules XX Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

- A. Transparency Regulation
- B. General Signage Regulations
- C. Specific Signage Regulations
 - 1. Letter Size
 - 3. Projecting Elements
 - 4. Blade Signs
- D. Neon Signs
- E. Awnings and Canopies

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

- C 1 a-g Attached or applied to structures

MM/SC/ED/AB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.23

Broderick Building
615 Second Ave S

Removal of non- historic gate and storefront and replace with new aluminum storefront system

ARC Report: Mr. McConachie said that the applicant had explained that the existing storefront was done in the 80's and that they looked to other buildings in the district for their design. He said that ARC thought that the design seemed too industrial for this building and asked for some alternatives that seem more related to this building. ARC requested a verification of materials already used in the building and did not make a recommendation.

Melonie Corey Ferrini explained the proposed application to replace an existing gate and non-historic entry with a new "more retail" design. She said this change would allow them more flexibility in who they lease to and also in doing maintenance. She said aluminum storefront was proposed because not only were they already installed on adjacent buildings but the aluminum was more indestructible than wood.

Mr. Hasson asked if all the other store fronts are wood and this would be the only metal one on this facade.

Mr. Corey Ferrini agreed but noted the windows are more similar to those on Cherry Street and that is what they are trying to match. She said the existing storefront and gate are from a 1980s renovation. She said the space is currently empty and they are hoping to lease it. She said the lower mesh part is to tie into the Polson Building. She said the building inside is beautiful and they would be increasing transparency into the space so it would be visible. Responding to clarifying questions she said the new storefront would step back 18" or so. It won't attach to historic stone.

Mr. Hasson asked how the metal mesh would match the historic character of the building and if any historic photos were used in developing the design.

Ms. Corey Ferrini said it will be powder-coated the bronze color and would add texture to the storefront. She pointed out what was done on the Polson Building as an example. She said they did not look at historic photos.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Brown said the removal of the gates increased transparency into the storefront.

Ms. Doherty expressed concern that the overall character of what is being proposed is more industrial and noted that the Polson Building – which had been cited by the applicant - is more industrial in character. Ms. Doherty commented that this building is Romanesque – high style architecture – and what they are proposing is not compatible in this context.

Mr. Hester agreed with Mr. Doherty and added that he didn't think the storefront assembly is industrial but that the mesh adds that characteristic. He said the mesh is more appropriate on the Polson Building than this one.

Mr. Hasson liked the consistency of bringing the storefront out to the street. He said it is important to keep the rhythm with the same materials and suggested staying with historic materials – wood - and design. He pointed out the importance of the building to

the district. He felt that the design needed to match the Broderick building and not the neighboring Butler building.

Ms. Corey Ferrini amended her plan to paint the aluminum storefront blue to match the existing paint and to remove the metal mesh.

Board members discussed aluminum versus wood storefront systems and that even with painting it blue to match others it still wouldn't match the rhythm of the existing façade.

Mr. Hasson said he thought the compatibility was also about materials not just color.

Ms. Person asked if the proposed bronze anodized aluminum matched anything on the street.

Ms. Corey Ferrini said that color was pulled from the adjacent Butler Building.

Mr. McConachie noted the color is not on this building.

Ms. Doherty stated the aluminum storefront is not appropriate for this building and noted she thought the color being blue was appropriate.

Mr. McConachie clarified that what was proposed was blue aluminum store front with wood panels.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the storefront design with blue aluminum storefront, blue lower wood panels without the mesh per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 5 and 6

MM/SC/RH/JM 4:4:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Person and Doherty, Messrs, McConachie and Hasson opposed.

Mr. McConachie said the motion failed and summarized the Board's comments indicated a preference for wood rather than aluminum.

120110.24

Seattle Tixx

Provident Building

568 First Ave S

Installation of a wall sign

Kris Names provided photos of the building, orienting board members to where the proposed 30' x 8' wall sign will be installed. He provided attachment details noting how the four corner steel plates will be anchored and explained that the sign will be held off the wall 2".

Mr. McConachie reported that ARC found the sign appropriate.

Ms. Nashem advised that the sign will be easily changeable but cannot be changed without coming back to the Board. She said that what can be advertised on this sign is regulated by Code.

Mr. Hester asked about the hardware.

Mr. Names said the hardware will be hilti galvanized steel and will attach into the concrete. The colors will be the same as the signage in currently in the windows.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hasson said that the ARC determined that this signage material wouldn't be appropriate at street level.

Ms. Doherty said that the nylon mesh material appears to be a consistent solid high up and would not be appropriate at street level. She said that ARC said the painting the building or adhering directly to the building is not desired.

Mr. McConachie said the sign is only about the business located in the building and that there can't be more of these signs on the building.

Ms. Doherty clarified that this type of signage is to be informative, building identification, or business identification and not about products. She said that is a wall sign and not a grandfathered billboard.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of signage as proposed under the condition that the sign does not change without a receiving a new Certificate of Approval.

Code Citations:

District Rules XX Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

C 1a-g Attached or applied to structures

C2. Wall Signs

C4. Size of Signs

MM/SC/CP/RH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.25

Burke State Building

308-316 Occidental Ave S

Installation of seismic moment frames and in-fill of four alley façade windows

ARC Report: Mr. McConachie said that ARC reviewed the plans provided. ARC congratulated the applicants on the minimum intervention for seismic upgrades. He said that ARC thought the inset brick was an appropriate approach for the infill. There was discussion on what color the front beams should be painted.

Ryan Smith explained they would be doing voluntary seismic improvements for Occidental Mall and noted that some work had been done in the 1980s. Proposed work to be done has been scaled back due to visual and cost impacts; Mr. Smith said the scope is affordable and appropriate to the building. He said that new plywood floor diaphragms have been installed inside.

Mr. Smith explained proposed exterior work on the alley (east) side would include infill of four windows and on the west side, installation of moment frames and they would add new footings in the basement. He said that they will add a concrete shear wall and footing to tie into the new steel.

Johan Fredrickson noted they moved the infill location further away from Jackson Street because the doorway has venting. He said the infill would be recessed about 1 – 3” back to preserve consistency; infill will help to structurally stiffen the back wall. He said behind the brick is concrete shear wall and that bricks would be anchored into that. He said the moment frames on the west side will look like part of the transom and will attach to steel channels behind the beam that were installed in the mid 1980s renovation. The steel beam finish will match tenant space interior.

Board Questions:

Mr. McConachie concurred with the proposal to paint beams to match tenant space.

Ms. Doherty commented that the proposal is appropriate and the renderings show that the moment frames are not that visible from the exterior.

Mr. Hester asked if new brick would be used for the infill.

Mr. Fredrickson said that they will use a couple different types – blended colors – and that the mason would lay them out to match what is there; they will also match existing mortar. The coursing of the brick will be consistent with what is around.

Mr. McConachie commented that it will clearly read as infill of what was there; the window is still there and can always be re-opened.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester said it is a wonderful long term improvement and the materials are appropriate and the solution that has taken tremendous thought.

Ms. Doherty commented that leaving the window openings respects the building and the historic fabric and noted that it will still be apparent where the windows were.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation
Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 5 and 6

MM/SC/ED/RH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.26

Pratt Fine Art Center

Burke State Building
155 S Main Street

Installation of signage

Scott Walden explained the proposal to install posters on the interior of the windows to advertise their art sale December 1 – 11, 2010. He said there are three locations proposed and that the “Lease” signs would be moved up to make room for the posters. He said this will be a temporary location for this event and noted that the sale would be happening within this space.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said the signs are attractive.

Mr. Hester said there is a tremendous amount of transparency at this location and noted that the posters are temporary. He said the poster is beautiful and the letter size appropriate.

Mr. McConachie said they are bringing vitality to a closed storefront which is positive.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented

Code Citations:

District Rules XX Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

A. Transparency Regulation

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. Letter Size

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

C 1 a-g Attached or applied to structures

MM/SW/CP/AB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Parish left at 10:20 a.m.

120110.27

Alaskan Way S and S King Street utilities

Installation of utilities conduit ductbanks vaults and a pole near the intersection of Alaskan Way S and S King Street

Matt Preedy explained the proposal for utility work at King and Alaskan Way in December and noted that they had received an exemption from the moratorium. He explained they would trench into the existing vault. He said there would be two vaults – one is already there; one is a power vault and the other for communications which will provide space for DoIt and Integra. Mr. Preedy said the only visible part of this work is

the timber pole that needs to be replaced; it will be replaced with one with a slightly larger diameter that will be in better condition. He said that there are no granite curbs, areaways or street furniture impacted in this project.

Board Questions:

Ms. Nashem pointed out that at the briefing concern had been raised about the proximity of the new vault to a building.

Mr. Preedy said the new communications vault is adjacent to a parking lot and will be 3 – 3 ½' from the side of the building. He said the 3 – 4' excavation won't be too deep – they will saw cut out the sidewalk and dig straight down.

Mr. McConachie said the foundation for the wall is probably 18" down so it shouldn't undermine the corner of the building.

Ms. Doherty commented that the building will be monitored.

Mr. Preedy said the sidewalk will be replaced in-kind.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty advised the applicant if brick is found it is to be replaced.

Responding to Board questions Mr. Preedy work would last two to four weeks. He said they will use a City standard pole because the area has potential for redesigned elements during the Viaduct project. He said it makes most sense to put in wood at this time.

Mr. McConachie said that if the area is likely to be redesigned he was okay with the use of wood but would like the redesign to include the Chief Seattle pole.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval

SMC 23.66.190 Streets and Sidewalks

MM/SC/RH/Ed 7:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.3 BOARD BUSINESS

120110.31 Briefing on the proposed Central Waterfront plan and Seawall Replacement

Jennifer Wieland, SDOT, and Jim Brennan, J. A. Brennan Associates, presented a PowerPoint (full PowerPoint in DON file). What follows are Board comments and questions.

Mr. McConachie asked if there were any plans to revitalize the boat landing area as a doorway to Seattle and suggested the project as a vehicle for considering how to reinterpret or reclaim history.

Ms. Wieland said that every design maintains the boat landing. She explained that the building that was at Pier 48 had been demolished and the space was being used for construction staging for the Viaduct project.

Ms. Doherty commented on Concept A and said putting the boat landing on land is incongruent. She said that an opportunity is missed if it is not used as originally used.

Mr. McConachie agreed with Mr. Doherty. He said is important is the boat landing's connection to the water. He said that storm drainage should be resolved in the plans. He said it would be good to revitalize the historic piers and elements to a use somewhat as originally intended.

Mr. Brennan said that they are looking at many alternatives.

Ms. Miller asked how the beach concept fits into the category of "replacement in-kind"

Ms. Wieland said In-kind refers to the location of the sea wall but that all concepts include habitat restoration.

Ms. Person asked how much the seawall would be moved back.

Ms. Wieland said in some places the seawall could be moved back 20 to 40 feet. She said that in Concept C the wall would be moved out toward the water in locations.

Mr. McConachie noted the value of having historical documentation of what the boat landing looked like in 1922. He commented on an image he saw of canoes pulled up on the beach with the emergent City in the background and noted the value of telling and weaving together the urban – ecological – historical story.

Ms. Nashem noted that any movement of the boat landing would need to be approved by the board and said ideally it would remain in its current location and not be moved. She advised that it is important to look at the Secretary of Interior Standards and the associated guidelines for setting and site to determine what is appropriate.

Ms. Doherty asked if the applicants have talked with DAHP about options.

Ms. Wieland said that they have not begun the formal process.

Ms. Nashem expressed concern that any changes to the site of boat landing could jeopardize its National Registry listing.

Mimi Sheridan, architectural historian, reported that she is a consultant on the Seawall and Central Waterfront projects and has been involved with for ten years. She said that the Boat Landing is a National Registry property and that it has to be in the same relationship to water that it is now. She said that the purpose of the landing was for merchant mariners to take little boats in to go to Pioneer Square. She said that it was used as a police station to police the waterfront - the Harbor Master station. She

explained that the docks – a gangway and a float – that were attached to the Boat landing more recently were installed by Parks and not part of the historic Boat Landing.

Mr. Hasson expressed a desire for the pavilion to be used for something and not just a decorative element.

Ms. Miller encouraged the use of the Secretary of Interior Standards as guideposts.

Mr. McConachie asked if there had been any discussion about landmarking the wall.

Ms. Sheridan said that the wall is National Register eligible but that she wasn't sure there is interest. She said that there are unresolved issues about the concrete railing.

Mr. McConachie expressed interest in the idea of some wall and rail showing up in a couple places.

120110.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Lorne McConachie, Chair

120110.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227