



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 90/10

MINUTES for Wednesday, April 7, 2010

Board Members

Ann Brown
Erin Doherty, Vice Chair
Ryan Hester
Jeremie Lipton
Lorne McConachie, Chair
Willie Parish
Catherine Person
Elizabeth Read

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Adam Hasson

Chair Lorne McConachie called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

040710.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
March 3, 2010
MM/SC/RH/AB5:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Lipton abstained.

Ms. Read arrived at 9:02 a.m.

March 17, 2010
MM/SC/ED/AB 5:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Mmes. Read, Brown
and Mr. Lipton abstained.

040710.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040710.21 **Seattle Steam**
619 Post Ave

Seismically retrofit the areaway and replace sidewalk

Tabled.

Ms. Person arrived at 9:04 a.m.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

040710.22

Triangle Pub

Triangle Hotel and Bar
533 First Ave S

Clean and tuck point building

Staff Report: Secretary of Interior Standards guides that the gentlest means possible should be used for cleaning, and Preservation Brief 1 specifies that pressure should be 100 psi – 400 psi to start with. The Board may want to recommend that a test be performed to see if a lower pressure will be sufficient.

Applicant Comment:

Les Tonkin said they proposed to tuck point. He said they proposed to clean the building, areas of water intrusion will be repaired, cleaned and sealed. He said there would be some minor repairs on the east side of the building where some brick was chipped when the other building was removed prior to construction of the Starbucks Building.

Mr. McConachie said that ARC recommended approval and that the products specified were excellent. He stressed to make sure the pressure used for cleaning is the minimal possible.

Mr. Tonkin said that CW&R – started by a former Pioneer Masonry worker – would do the work. The Enviro Clear 2010 will be tested in a small area before the work begins. He reported that most of the work is correcting damage and noted the type of mortar is soft. He said the work would take about two weeks.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Brown said she was glad to see the rehabilitation.

Mr. McConachie said he appreciated the stewardship of the building.

Ms. Doherty noted the strategy was appropriate.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for cleaning, sealing and tuck pointing the building. Any brick repair/replacement should be with matching brick. A cleaning test should occur and then proceed with the lowest pressure that is effective not to exceed 1800 -2200 psi and using a fan spray.

Code Citations:

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 7.

Guidelines for Masonry

Preservation Brief 1 Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent
Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings

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

040710.23

Pioneer Square Market

Fulton Building
320 Second Ave S

Change of Use from Retail to Food Service/Market

Installation of new window signage

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the sign drawings and renderings for the vinyl letters in the window and the neon “open” sign. ARC thought that the signage was appropriate for the character of the district and the building.

Applicant Comment:

James McClinton clarified the neon “Open” sign would be on a 16”h x 24” background with lettering that is 8”h x 4”w. A photo of the installed signage was provided showing the lettering affixed in four places.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester noted the prolific signage but said it was small and the vinyl applied lettering provided adequate transparency so he had no problem with the quantity.

Ms. Doherty appreciated that the signage was consistent with the character of the signage proposed for the adjacent space.

Ms. Nashem went over the request for change of use for the space from retail to grocery and said both are preferred uses and the square footage is within preferred use limits.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Person asked if the signage would also be put on the Jackson Street side of the building and Mr. McClinton said it would not because the main part of the store faces 2nd Avenue.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Change of Use from retail to Food Service and for signage as presented.

Code Citations:

Use-SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses
SMC 23.66.130 Street level Uses

Signage- District Rules XX Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
B. General Signage

C. Specific Signage
1. Letter size
SMC 23.66.160

MM/SC/ER/AB8:0:0 Motion carried.

040710.24

Wall sign
F and O building
1028 first Ave S

Copy change for legal non conforming wall sign size 14' x 48'

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings that were provided. Although there was some question as to if the color copy was a color proof, the applicant assured the ARC that the color was accurate. ARC recommended approval.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem reported that this is a legal non-conforming off-premise wall sign. The Lamar representative who was filling in for the regular applicant emailed to say that he said the sign was cable tension mounted to brackets in error. They are proposing an adhesive like past applications.

Korbe Palmer, Lamar, went over the signage detail and noted rendering was the proposed color. He said they would peel off the old sign and then apply the new sticky back vinyl sign. He said the patina of the sign goes with the nature of the historic neighborhood.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester commented that the sign was appropriate and the method of attachment, consistent.

Ms. Doherty said the color was a little edgy and noted the assurance that it would be no brighter than the rendering provided as a color sample.

Action: I move to approve copy change for a legal non conforming wall sign size 14' x 48' on adhesive vinyl.

Code Citations:
SMC 23.66.160.C.1

MM/SC/RH/CP8:0:0 Motion carried.

040710.25

Wall Sign
Squire Building
901 Occidental Ave

Copy change for a legal non-conforming on premise wall sign

ARC Report: Mr. McConachie said that ARC reviewed the proposal which included a mechanical number box applied on top of the previously approved copy change. The plan in the previous application was to change the number with a vinyl overlay but now the applicant proposed adding a mechanical device that will change the number after the lottery drawings twice a week. He said the committee discussed if this constituted a “sign in motion” or not. He said ARC did not have a recommendation for the full board.

Ms. Doherty added that Code prohibits electrical signs per SMC 23.66.160A.

Ms. Nashem provided the definition of electric sign as defined by the Code: “*Signs, electric*” means any sign containing electrical wiring, but not including signs illuminated by an exterior light source”. She said this proposal is something that is powered by electricity.

Mr. McConachie noted that would make this proposal illegal.

Applicant Comment:

Aaron Nauman explained the intent to do a sign that fits into the district and be stable without the need to come back repeatedly. He explained the different options explored such as manually changing the numbers, using a solar powered unit, but that they determined the preferred option was electrical. He proposed running a small cable to power the sign. He said the sign would not project light and the number would change two times a week.

Ms. Nashem advised that solar power created electricity so would fall under the definition of “electric” sign.

Mr. Hester asked about the weight of the mechanical box and the method of attachment.

Mr. Nauman said it weighed about 700 pounds and would be attached to the building with 10 additional anchors into the brick.

Ms. Hester expressed concern with the 700 pounds on the brick and asked what structural steps were planned to make sure the brick would not pull off. He asked if the brick was adequately tied into the building.

Ms. Doherty commented that the plans show the attachment is only an inch and a half.

Mr. Nauman said Commercial Water Proofing inspected the brick and said the weight would be spread over a large area and that he could provide documentation.

Board members expressed concern about the load of the equipment on the building. Mr. Hester noted the engineering calculations only addressed the strength of the anchor in the grout and not the integrity of the wall itself.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Nashem advised that previously the sign was approved with the numbers overlaid with vinyl and that would remain approved regardless of the decision today.

Mr. McConachie commented the question was “is it acceptable to have an electric powered device” and if it is then “is the method of attachment acceptable”.

Ms. Nashem read two codes one of which prohibits electric signs and the other which says that signs in motion are not recommended.

Mr. Hester expressed concern the original sign was a painted sign, and noted the Board allowed the change to vinyl on a bracket because it was better for the preservation of the building. He thought that adding this mechanical box created a 3-dimensional effect that is characteristically different than the original flat painted wall sign. He also noted his concern for the seismic affect the weight of the sign could have on the building. He said electronic signs are prohibited. He further commented that if the applicant thought their previously approved sign had safety issues, then the applicant might want to apply for a different sign.

Ms. Doherty expressed general agreement with Mr. Hester’s comments.

Action: I move to deny a certificate of approval for the proposed change to install a tall digit mechanical display on top of the previously approved copy change to a Washington State Lottery billboard per

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.160.A, C.1, and 6

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

Mr. Nauman asked why the electrical was being denied.

Mr. Hester reiterated his comments.

Ms. Nashem said the decision had been made and she would send the Letter of Denial.

040710.26

Courtyard by Marriott

Alaska Building
618 Second Ave

Installation of business signage a neon blade sign and two neon window signs

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the revised drawings. Mr. Lindstrom explained that he proposed to have the bracket match the building in the lighter color. ARC agreed that painting the bracket the same color as the sign would be beneficial towards simplifying the sign. ARC thought the blade sign design had evolved to be compatible with the building and the district. ARC discussed the window neon signs and that the colors were intense and bright while the district rules calls for subdued colors. Clarification was needed if the blue color shown in the key was on the sign and if so it was noted the district rules limit neon to three colors. ARC agreed that the sign on 2nd Ave appeared too large for the window and recommended reducing the sign to be more in proportion to the window.

Staff Report: Ms Nashem said the blade sign meets the requirements for number of projecting elements.

She said the District rules say blade signs with neon (LED) are not permitted unless conditions are met including:

it is part of a reduces sign package, two wall signs have been approved, this application includes one blade sign and two window signs for the café,

it is limited to 6 square feet this sign is proposed at 99 square feet,

the blade sign meet rules for number of neon sign and colors, the application is for three signs, the maximum number could be 17 based on the linear feet of the store building front,

sign meets installation requirements, this sign is proposed to be installed in the mortar, blade signs are typically to be installed below the intermediate cornice however in this case doing so would hide, damage or obscure architectural features so the proposed location may be more appropriate for this building,

and the sign is consistent with scale and character of the building.

The Board has approved other signs that were larger than 6 square feet when the entire building has been for one business however the largest of these was 27 square feet.

The Board can also look to SMC 23.66.160 for direction on size of signage.

Window sign

The backing of the sign has been changed to be clear. The letter size meets requirements however, the signs have four colors and only three are allowed. In addition the District Rules say that the colors shall be subdued.

Carl Lindstrom explained he would just seek approval for the blade sign as they were not ready to request approval for the window signs. He provided renderings and elevations showing details. He said the bracket supporting the sign will match the perimeter louver color MZG Gray. He said “Courtyard” will be green on the gold background and “Marriott” will be in red and be placed on gold background. He said the louver color ties into the rest of the building. He explained that everything shown in tan on page 12 would be the dark gray.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said she had expressed concern about the architectural character of the sign and that now the sign was more consistent with the character of the building. She said that this design was quieter and did not fight with the building. She said the scale was more appropriate for the size of the building and noted that for every sign review the building as a whole is looked at and how the sign relates to the building. She said that with a single occupant building it was appropriate to allow a larger sign.

Ms. Person asked if more signage was proposed.

Mr. Lindstrom said that they would resubmit for signage to be placed behind the glass.

Mr. Hester commented on the development of the design noting it had come a long way. He said it was a sharp design and said the colors were compatible and it was appropriate.

He complimented the applicant on trying to accentuate the base of the building. He said the size was appropriate to the size of the building façade.

Mr. McConachie thanked the applicant for working with the board – for supporting not only his client but also the District.

Ms. Nashem asked for Board comment on the location of the sign above the intermediate cornice.

Ms. Doherty commented that locating the sign above the intermediate cornice it did not compete with the architecture and did not damage the tile or terracotta. She said it attached to a simple brick face through mortar joints. The proportion of where it was sited on the building was appropriate and it was consistent with the height of the building. She preferred the proposed location noting there were no visual barriers from the street and sidewalk and doesn't obscure views of other buildings.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for a blade sign with LED. The Board had determined that the other criteria have been met and that the location and visibility concerns warrant such a sign.

Code Citations:

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

B. General Signage

C. Specific Signage

3. Projecting Elements

D. Neon Signs

SMC 23.66.160

Ms. Doherty made a friendly amendment to add that the Board recommends approval of a larger sign because the size of the sign is compatible with the scale and height of the building, the number of signs is reduced and the building has a single use. The sign is allowed to be installed in the mortar joints above the intermediate cornice so that it does not hide, damage or obscure architectural features of the lower portion of the building.

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

040710.27

J and M Café

201 First Ave S

Installation of signage including neon window signs, and A-Board

Tabled.

040710.3

BOARD BUSINESS

040710.31

Mobile Vending

Briefing regarding potential code changes to expand mobile food vending

Gary Johnson, DPD, went over the City's intent to encourage mobile food vending (handout provided by Mr. Johnson is in DON file) by amending the Seattle Municipal Code. He explained the current barriers to this due to current codes and said they are working with the Health Department and have explored how food carts work in other cities. He said currently hot dog vendors can operate on sidewalks

with the permission of SDOT and the building owner but that they propose to eliminate the requirement for building owner approval.

Brian de Place, SDOT, said they propose required setbacks of 50' from brick and mortar restaurants.

Mr. Johnson said with regard to street use there is a limit on cart size now and that they propose to defer to the County. He said that as with sidewalk cafes there would be a need for clear path of travel and that SDOT would review to make sure the minimum is met.

Board members raised concerns about setbacks from restaurants that face Occidental park as well as potential density issues with too many vendors being located there. Mr. Johnson commented that Parks Department would determine what happens in the park.

Mr. de Place said that sometimes having a couple vendors is good and that flexibility would be allowed for SDOT to make an assessment.

Asked if sites would be designated for this use Mr. Johnson said that any place that fits the criteria would be allowed. Mr. Johnson said that the Health Department has requirements that any cart or truck must return to an approved commissary every night so would not be parked and left. He said that currently taco trucks were not legal in the right of way but that they propose to designate a handful of places where one could vend from the street to the sidewalk but that this must not compete for sidewalk space. He said that the Health Department would consider Portland's model to allow a truck to service the carts.

Ms. Steel said that currently that applies more to private property than to the rights of way.

Victoria Schoenburg, Parks, said in Occidental Park carts would be set up closer to the east side of the park which would be a good 200 feet from Grand Central.

Mr. McConachie asked about permitting and permanency of place.

Ms. Steel said stadium event permits are monthly permits but they propose it to become annual permits with re-application required; if more than one vendor applies for the same spot a lottery would be held. If an applicant is an adjacent business owner, preference would be given to them for that space.

Mr. Johnson noted the Board's purview in the district for design and issuing Certificates of Approval.

Mr. McConachie said it was important for the Board to review.

Mr. Johnson said that would be a fundamental difference from other areas and added they didn't want to be overly proscriptive.

Ms. Steel went over some of the sidewalk requirements – 6’ clear path of travel, add on another 5’; 2’ from curb, set back from parking pay station. She said it would have to be at least a 10 – 12’ sidewalk.

Mr. de Place said they would have to set back 10’ from the entrance to a business.

Board members had questions about trash collection and Mr. Johnson stated that would be managed through permitting. He said an effective enforcement mechanism is important. He said that much of the current street food scene is late at night and noted there was not strong enforcement on the late night vending carts.

Mr. de Place said that SDOT would ensure there would be adequate space for carts and added that there was no size limit on trucks.

Ms. Person commented that many district stores are small businesses and having a vendor in front of the business would obscure the store. She noted that many different types of carts had come before the Board – some were tidy and beautiful and others that were disastrous. She said that the board should review requests for street vending.

Ms. Steel responded to questions about seating and noted that if seating were provided then a restroom would be required. She said the 3 x 6 cart would be allowed some accessory units – coolers, table etc.

Mr. Hester noted the importance of color choice and cleanliness in Pioneer Square. He said there should be specific language to limit accessories; unit should be self-contained; should be specific about clutter and allowed square footage; table cloth to conceal stuff stowed beneath; a standard for trash receptacle; and assertive enforcement was important.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca, resident, said she hoped the Pioneer Square Preservation Board would keep the maximum oversight. She said that in Portland and New York City, vending carts were concentrated in the downtown commercial core and she didn’t see Pioneer Square as fitting into that. She hoped that the “no vending” beyond Railroad Avenue rule would remain noting that it was a big deal for residents in the area. She said that already the sidewalks are clogged especially on game nights where people end up walking in the streets. She expressed concern about a business not having business/property owner approval to open a cart noting that many of the brick and mortar businesses operate during games. She said it is a great idea but that there has been no enforcement over the past couple years and asked that more thought be put into this. She said that for Pioneer Square this would be a mistake.

Ms. Steel said that stadium vending would remain a no vending zone and went on to describe the idea to create pre-designated “stalls”. She said the designation process would allow comment from business owners.

Ms. Bellanca said that doesn’t require that the businesses give approval.

Ms. Person said that if a business didn't want vending in front of them it shouldn't be allowed. She said that business is difficult already and this would make it more so. She reiterated that these are small independent business owners and they should be allowed a say.

Ms. Schoenburg went over Parks' process for vending carts and said requests for proposals are sent out the beginning of each year; a panel reviews using set criteria and vendors are chosen. She said they have a tighter review process. She said that vendors have always had the ability to be in the park noting that the numbers may increase as the Health Department allows more. She said she couldn't imagine allowing more than two vendors operate in Occidental Park.

Responding to board comments Mr. Johnson said that with regard to private property (parking lots) they weren't there yet with details.

Mr. Parish was in support of independent business owners having input noting it would be disrespectful and discourteous not to allow them that. He said they work to earn a living and give back to the community and it would not be fair to not allow them a say.

Mr. McConachie suggested taking the Pioneer Square regulations into consideration while crafting processes.

Mr. Johnson said they would be giving a briefing to the full City Council on April 26 between 10:00 and 11:00 a.m.

040710.32

Trails to Treasures Project

Briefing regarding historical interpretation project

Lisa Dixon went over plans for an interpretative project through Pioneer Square and noted they should have a draft out in a couple weeks; will take public comment and the final would come out in August. She went over the packet provided to the Board: Overview of concept and goals, map of the original shoreline – which is one of the elements they want to call out through the process, and one of their newsletters. The project would be more a web of trails rather a linear one with different entry points to different sites in Pioneer Square. She said that there is a story to tell and a way to engage people; a consultant will be retained to help in how that is implemented. She said the project would be implemented in stages perhaps beginning with an audio tour. She said they are applying for grants to hire a person to design the master plan and a historian to write all the stories so they have those as a base. She said they propose an event to call out where the shoreline used to be. She noted their extensive advisory committee and said there are 45 organizations on board – Parks Museum, MOHAI, nautical groups among others. She commented on the intention to connect to other neighborhoods – the Duwamish Long House and the experience of the Native Americans, Washington St. boat landing, International District tying in the experience of Chinese Americans.

Mr. Hester said the overall concept was excellent.

Ms. Dixon noted that Don Felts, from the Waterlines Project, had marked out the correct position of the shorelines.

Mr. McConachie said supportive of the project and noted to stay within the guidelines.

Ms. Person left at 10:40 a.m.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty had attended an extended presentation and commented on the many exciting ideas. She advised to be sure that what is implemented fits within the district. She expressed concern about marking on the buildings and noted the need to respect the buildings.

Ms. Dixon said they want to show not only where the shoreline was but the elevation changes and where grading and cuts were done. She said they were looking to use manhole covers and other existing elements to mark locations.

Ms. Doherty advised to think about what is being added given that there are already wayfinding items that don't fit – and to make sure that everything fits into the district.

040710.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Lorne McConachie, Chair

040710.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227