



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 289/08

DATE: December 17, 2008
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Doug Ito
Lorne McConachie
Ryan Hester
Erin Doherty
Ann Brown
Catherine Person
Miriam Hinden
John DeLanoy
Adam Hasson

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Chair Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

121708.21 **Woven Art**
200 First Ave S

Installation of temporary banner and window signage

Applicant requested the application to be tabled.

121708.22 **505 First Ave S**

Summary of Application: Installation of building signage and lighting on new construction

Staff report: Ms. Nashem explained the application meets District Rules for letter size.

Applicant Comment:

Jeanne Iannucci brought materials and finishes so the Board could see what has been approved in the past. She went over the drawings and explained where the signs would be placed and how they would be attached to the building. She explained the lighting plan and said it would be on the main entry and the back entry on Railroad Avenue on

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

the canopies to direct people to the entries. The conduit and condulettes will be painted the same color as the structure.

Ms. Nashem explained the difference between the lighting on these canopies and the one approved at Carmine's restaurant compared to internally illuminated canopies as prohibited in the District Rules is that the canopy is a mechanism to hold the lights and the light is shining down to light the sidewalk compared to an internally illuminated awning where the light shines up and is meant to make the awning glow or to show the logo like an illuminated sign.

Board Questions:

In response to questions Ms. Iannucci stated she wasn't sure if the gray on the signage is the same as on the building. She would make a note that the gray should match the gray palette on the building and that signage will be securely attached.

Mr. Ito clarified the entrance was a rebuilt storefront; the façade was kept but there is new fenestration and doors and glass was removed to be reinstalled.

Ms. Iannucci said the original panes of glass were historic but some were badly damaged and they will be replaced in kind.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board determined it had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Building Signage and Lighting as amended to include that the rear alley signs be bolted to the façade and not glued.

Code Citations:

- III. District Rules: General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction
- XX. District Rules for transparency, signs, awnings and canopies
 - A Transparency
 - B General Signage
 - C Specific signage 1. Letter size
- SMC 23.66.160

MM/SC/LM/AB

7:0:0 Motion carried.

121708.23

219 S Washington

Summary of Application: Installation of gates

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem explained the applicable codes are District Rules IX for security gates and XX. for transparency as well as the Secretary of the Interior Standards for how the gates affect the character of the building.

Mr. DeLanoy arrived.

Applicant Comment:

Martin Kaplan explained that owner Bob Bloxom converted the upper space to a residence and the first floor remains available for commercial use. He said the front of the building is divided into two halves. He said the east part of the building has a “cage” that he assumes never came before this board for approval but has been there for decades and secures the emergency exit and access to the basement. He said he took the façade holistically and had been working with SDOT for the past two years to try to get them to approve reconfiguring the exit way and eliminating the cage from the street. SDOT has been reluctant to let him reconfigure the stairway because it would encroach on a street tree by 5”. He hopes that within the next year he will be able to get rid of the cage and finish off the façade.. At this time they are just requesting for approval of the security gate on the other half of the building.

Mr. Kaplan reasoned that since Mr. Bloxom lives there and uses that entry/exit he is often met in the morning by people sleeping there and conducting other personal tasks that create security and health issues. He thinks the security gate will prevent these activities. The actual enclosure is about 4’ deep and 6’ wide with an angle on it. The ground level space is commercial space which would be developed into a gallery or other business once the exiting issue is resolved with SDOT about the cage. The gates were designed to be open during business hours and are designed to fold back and disappear. The gate is divided in half and has been designed to swing both ways; SDOT permitted it to swing out over sidewalk. It has a self-closer so will not stay open blocking the sidewalk.

Mr. Kaplan explained the design of the gate took into consideration transparency and strength. They proposed to use a material with 50% transparency but would not dent if kicked or roughed up a bit. He said it is a steel gate designed to fit into existing opening and would be mounted seamlessly on the pavement. Mr. Kaplan said the 9’ wide x 6’ high frame is surrounded by two wood columns which will serve as anchorages for the steel frame of the gate.

Mr. Kaplan stated the materials are all powder coated steel: green, black and gray. He said they chose perforated steel that because it is real thick and will not be dented and provided samples for Board members. Mr. Kaplan provided photos of other gates and they want to do something that looks better and that would be more permanent. Mr. Kaplan explained the proposed steel is 1/8” thick.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hasson noted a lot of the gates in the neighborhood are made of wrought iron and asked why the applicant was proposing something non traditional.

Mr. Kaplan said the gate relates to the vocabulary of the building. He said the other gates with the vertical bars are off the shelf type of design. He decided since they are going to remodel the front façade they want there to be consistency on the front of the building. He said it is a security gate and they took the inspiration from the building itself and not to the solution next door at Union Gospel.

Mr. Ito stated Mr. Kaplan has provided a good explanation of why they want the gate but asked for the applicant to explain how the gates relate to the historic character of the building. He noted that as this is an historic district changes must be compatible.

Mr. Kaplan directed Board members to page A5 of the drawing set and explained the green is structural with 2 x 2 steel frames while the framework of the door itself is 2 x 3. He said the gate is divided into a transom above and the gate itself is 7' because of weight. He said the transom will continue to the left eventually as they fill in that area. He said rather than having a jail type of look they wanted to pick up some of the horizontality of the differentiation between the base of the building and the top. He said there are three distinct parts of the building. He the addition which is not real visible, is more contemporary solution but it picks up the rhythm of the building. He said the historical brick area is above and then the base of the building is just wood panel and open window. He said he picked up elements – creating as much transparency as possible and horizontal movement.

Ms. Doherty appreciated the applicant wanting to relate to the proportions of the building and suggested it could be studied a bit further related to the proportion of the pilasters which show up in the photographs but not on the drawings and maybe the character of the historic entrance that they are trying to maintain visual access to. She thought the current character of the gate is a bit in conflict with the historic nature and proportion of the building and entrance.

Mr. Kaplan stated it is not an easy task because of the pilaster and the base and the top where there is a relief. He said he took the approach that the gate should respect the building, but not try to pick up every one of the lines and try to reflect it in the design.

Ms. Doherty stated she was not suggesting that the applicant mimic what is there but that there are too many divisions and things going on in the gate itself that don't relate to the proportions of what is beyond it and what is adjacent to it.

Mr. Kaplan asked her to relate that so he could understand what she means to the gate next door and use that as some kind of comparison as to why it does or does not work.

Mr. Ito advised not looking at other gates in the neighborhood and to look at this building on its own. How the gate relates to this building is what is important. There may be a successful gate in the neighborhood that the applicant might want to take reference from but the Board is looking at just the relationship of this gate on this building.

Ms. Doherty suggested simplification; the goal is to maintain as much transparency as possible so the entrance is visible and to also relate to the proportion of the storefront.

Mr. McConachie stated the goal is to provide security while being least obtrusive to the building. He said it is a new feature but shouldn't take away from the building. He asked about the heavy transom.

Mr. Ito said the transom that was drawn on the storefront drawing didn't show up in other photos.

Mr. Kaplan stated it is just a reflection so he could tell the Board what the intent would be moving forward.

Mr. McConachie asked if it is new fenestration.

Mr. Kaplan noted there is nothing there but the grill.

Mr. McConachie clarified that the intent is to eventually infill the recessed stair and place a new façade window at the street face.

Mr. Kaplan explained it would be a grill with a gate in it that would match; the gate itself would be a good 30” lower at that façade because there is a stairway that projects out into the sidewalk. The idea is to repeat whatever is done graphically on the gate on the other side.

Ms. Nashem asked if what is shown on the drawing is neither what exists nor what is proposed.

Mr. Kaplan stated A4 is existing; he inadvertently included the drawing with the transom. He appreciated it being pointed out; he thought that he put the door into the drawing on A4.

Mr. Ito stated the door on A4 is drawn incorrectly as there is a sidelight adjacent to it. He said the existing historic door and window and base in the storefront area is a completely different proportion than the proposed gate. The problem is the proposed gate looks more like a paired door than a gate just by language. There are wrought iron systems - artist-made options– that would read as a gate rather than a door. He said it is a beautiful historic storefront that would be covered up; although a little transparency, it would be hard to see. He stated that whatever the final proposal, attachment details will be needed.

Ms. Doherty expressed concern that even when the gates are open during the day there will be a portion that is not consistent with the rest of the elevation and covers architectural detail.

Mr. Hasson stated the overall look of the door is very heavy and doesn’t have much transparency. This building has a lot of delicate features on it and is an interesting building. To have a section of it covered over to that extent doesn’t go with the flavor of the building.

Ms. Hinden preferred more transparency; she also preferred a full gate rather than have a fixed transom.

Mr. DeLanoy asked if there were other examples of this type door that have been approved.

Ms. Nashem stated the last gate approved was the Palmer Building and it included bars with decorative circle elements taken from the architecture of the building. She thought the one before might have been the artist gate on the new King County Building.

Mr. Ito stated they are gates that read as gates and are on simpler storefronts that have less character.

Mr. Hasson added gates are often on the backs of buildings to provide security.

Mr. DeLanoy said his concern is that there is a consistent look in the District; the few other gates aside that, do consist of iron bars. He appreciated what Mr. Kaplan has done but he preferred a more consistent look.

Mr. Hasson stated thought the cage is an interesting feature historically and he knows there is a vocabulary to that and perhaps the applicant was trying to match that to the door with the solid mesh. The purposes of those two openings are different so he would not gravitate toward the same feel whether it is staying or going. He wouldn't want to copy the mesh on the cage.

Mr. Kaplan stated they are not trying to copy the mesh and were trying to do the opposite. He thought that the mesh is 180° different from the perforated steel. It provides security but it has a much different quality to it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Before the Board began discussion Mr. Kaplan asked when they come back with a revised design will they have a fair audience if they bring something back without bars.

Mr. Ito stated it is a design problem with or without bars. The Board would have to see what is designed.

Mr. Kaplan said he thought there is overwhelming agreement that there is precedent for vertical bars in the district and this is not that. He wanted to be clear on what he could tell Mr. Bloxom.

Ms. Doherty explained the goal is the Board wants it to read more like a gate than a door; they would like it to be lighter in appearance, more transparent and for the proportions to be more consistent with or sympathetic to historic storefront and door beyond and was more strongly related to the architecture of the building. How that is achieved the Board is open to hearing what solution the applicant comes up with.

Ms. Brown stated the transom blocks wonderful architectural elements.

Ms. Doherty added she preferred the full leaf be full height. If the whole gate is lighter there shouldn't be too many challenges with the weight.

Mr. Ito stated the application could be voted on but he didn't think it sounded like it would pass or it could be tabled until the applicant could provide an alternative proposal.

Mr. Kaplan wanted to table it.

Action: **Tabled.**

Code Citations:

District Rules:

IX. Security Bars and Gates

XX. Rules for transparency, signs, awnings and canopies

A Transparency

Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, 9

121708.24

King Street Station
303 S Jackson St

Ms. Nashem explained the application to replace the clock face glass with new glass and replace broken finial with new fiberglass finial

Peter Watson explained they discovered there were more cracked panes than they originally thought and there was asbestos mastic in the compound that adhered the glass to frames and that there were several section where the glass had previously been replaced with plastic. The clear glass at the perimeters of the clock face was intended to remain but while removing the asbestos mastic it was impossible to do without cracking; they proposed to replace with clear glass to match existing as close as possible. He provided samples of existing and proposed new glass for Board review.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hasson asked about the full scope of the project.

Mr. Watson said the clock mechanism is being repaired, electrical service is being upgraded, and numerals and arms are being painted. The top 3' – 4' of the terracotta finial has broken off and repair with a cementitious product seemed tenuous; they propose to replace a 4'6" tall portion with fiberglass. The shape will be made from a mold similar to how boat work is done. It will have the profile of the existing shape and will be colored to match the existing terracotta. In response to a Board question about the use of GFRC Mr. Watson stated the fiberglass would be simpler to manufacture. It will be glazed to replicate a granite look to match existing. The crack beneath the top finial will be pinned; in some cases will be grouted and in others an acrylic seal will be used. Typically tenemic paints are used with an epoxy base.

Mr. Ito requested a sample of the product.

Mr. Watson stated it will be screwed onto a rod that goes through the lower portion. When working with terracotta there is always concern about damage but Mr. Watson stated they are working with a contractor who is comfortable working with terracotta.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ito requested the sample be brought to ARC.

Mr. McConachie determined he needed to recuse himself as his firm is doing other work on King Street Station.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented with the caveat that a sample of the fiberglass and paint to ARC.

Code Citations:

Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 6

Preservation Brief 16 *The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors*

MM/SC/JD/AB

6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. McConachie recused himself.

Mr. DeLanoy left at 10:17 a.m.

121708.3

BOARD BUSINESS

121708.31

South Downtown Code Amendment

Susan McLain

Briefing regarding possible code text amendment concerning new construction in Pioneer Square including height and bonus programs.

Mr. Ito asked Board members to indicate if they were in approval for the code amendments for the North Lot; the Board was unanimously in favor.

Susan McLain and Gordon Clowers from DPD provided handouts of the proposed changes to Downtown Code 23.66 and went over the handout with the Board (complete handout in file). She explained how 23.66 relates to 23.49 and that where there are conflicts 23.66 will apply. She wondered if pet grooming should be removed from the prohibited list from all of Pioneer Square or just in the North Lot.

Various Board members had questions about whether doggie day care facilities could be allowed as a needed service for the increasing number of residents with dogs. Grooming is currently allowed but overnight and long term care is not. The Board recommended that daily housing of dogs would be allowed but overnight kenneling not; Ms. McLain will make the changes in the permitted and prohibited use lists.

Ms. McLain reviewed the three environmental standards that would apply. Mr. McConachie expressed concern that a green roof adds a loading factor on existing framing. He cautioned against a code that would push toward replacement of windows since glazing and fenestration is often a character defining feature of historic buildings and that the most sustainable building is one you already have.

Ms. McLain explained that LEED Silver would apply to bonus floor area; it is unlikely that this would apply to historic structures.

Mr. Clowers noted for smaller projects less than 100,000 square feet, which would include renovation and tenant improvements in existing building, they are recommending the applicant and/or their design team be required to meet at least once with City Light conservation staff so options for conservation can be talked about.

Ms. McLain advised they have been talking with City light and exploring the possibility of an energy standard that would be higher in south downtown. They have an energy conservation program and staff dedicated to working with developers to integrate conservation strategies into their equipment choices and building designs.

Karen Gordon explained that Historic Preservation would meet with City Light staff. She said there is a possibility that an HP coordinator would be involved in those meetings with developers/applicants as well.

Mr. Ito asked if the green factor would be triggered if an historic building went through a renovation and was told by Ms. McLain that it would. He suggested that half of the green factor could be met by being historic but was informed the way it is written it is only applicable to new construction and is not applicable to renovations.

In response to questions Ms. McLain explained a green wall offers a cooling effect and drainage benefit and is accomplished by vegetation draping over a wall or having pockets in the wall that are planted. Board members discussed that with buildings going to the property line then we are just talking about a green roof and raised concern that the maintenance (of plantings) could be an issue; Ms. McLain said it has been successful this far.

Ms. McLain went on to review the Green Streets plan; Mr. McConachie advised it needs to be worked in with the pedestrian ambience without trumping the historic presence of the district.

Mr. Ito reminded that the design would have to come before the Board. Ms. McLain noted that Occidental is complex for pedestrians in terms of introducing more green elements but also trucks and stadium event traffic.

Ms. Gordon explained they are applying 23.66.032d (what is required for a report) to 23.66.115 (demolition provision). The level of information provided varies from applicant to applicant. By setting a standard in the code; it would require preservation consultants to be thorough and provide needed information. For TDP and TDR she talked about making the distinction when talking about what is eligible (she referred to b); it is very different than when someone is coming in for demolition. You can't apply the standard of what it would look like if they renovated it. It is important to make that distinction – people want the benefit and they are making a commitment to renovate the building.

Mr. McConachie asked if a project runs out of money or fails to be completed would they not get the TDR.

Ms. Gordon agreed and said the City does agreements apart from the Code language with all developers when there is a TDR or TDP. One of the conditions of transfer development rights is you have to preserve the building from which they were transferred for the life of the building to which the TDR were transferred. The TDR for downtown is the template for the new TDR. The Board has to make a recommendation to the Director; if eligibility has been demonstrated through a document similar to a historic structures report. She referred to "C" that TDR would not be given until the work is done. It will be important for the Board to make the distinction in terms of renovation; you can't apply those criteria to someone coming in for demolition; you have to make determination based on current conditions.

In response to a Board member's question about roof top features as mentioned on page 4, Ms. McLain replied the intent is that it is total for each and "total" would be added for clarification.

There was discussion about elevator penthouses and the possibility of having waivers for historic buildings. It was suggested that whether to give a waiver be the Board's decision.

In response to a question about the height of the trolley barn Ms. McLain stated that in that zoning area they are proposing up to 120. The Board has done much review of this area and height and those provisions would only apply to that one site. 23.66.150 has area A and area B where setbacks are identified; she suggested adding area C which is

around Occidental Park. In that area a setback is required at 100' for 15'. Board recommendation may allow a smaller or larger setback.

Mr. Ito asked the definition of "publicly owned open space" be defined so there is no confusion. There is "private open space" and "public open space" and then "neighborhood open space" is used on page 9.

Ms. McLain returned to reviewing the handout.

Ms. Gordon noted that if someone had a building adjoining a lot so it would become larger than 7200 square feet, in order to get any of the bonuses, they would have to keep the building.

Mr. Ito cited page 9, Green Street setback; and said unless the entire street is going to do a green street setback, it can be odd if there are pieces that set back and some aren't. Ms. McLain stated they wouldn't be able to use it because it was written in such a way to not allow that to happen.

Mr. Ito referred to the first page of the handout and read the 3rd Objective down, "Provide incentives for redevelopment of vacant and underdeveloped parcels" and suggested the wording be changed to "non-contributing underdeveloped parcels". On feedback from Preservation Board section he noted: "Avoid decisions that provide an incentive to demolish or adversely modify historic structure". He said the prominence of Smith tower should be included.

The line around Smith Tower represents existing zoning - only the base was rezoned – and it doesn't take in the Florence Building.

Mr. Ito asked if the Board was in agreement with what was discussed and shown today, knowing they will keep in contact with DON Historic Preservation. The vote was unanimous by voting members; Mr. Hasson abstained.

121708.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

121708.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227