



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 172/08

DATE: July 16, 2008
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Doug Ito
Ann Brown
Adam Hasson
David Strauss
Ryan Hester
Loren McConachie
Catherine Person

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

John DeLanoy

071608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: There were no minutes to review.

071608.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071608.21 **Murphy's Mix**
314 First Ave S

Summary of Application: Signage- Install applied letters in the sign band
Façade Alterations- paint the storefront

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the samples and drawings available. ARC suggested that all of the windows and panels be painted Coffee Black to unify the bottom half of the building instead of just the storefront area. The ARC also had concerns with how the Olive green would look with the existing Teal. ARC wanted to see a colored rendering of the painted building. ARC requested verification of the letter height for all letters on the sign as some appear larger than six inches. ARC recognized that the sign band had been altered but wondered if the original sign band was still there. ARC did not make a recommendation pending the information they requested.

Staff report: The maximum letter size in a sign band is 12 inches. The proposed sign is applied letters to the sign band as preferred in the District Rules. The rules do not address a sign extending out of the sign band so it would be up to the Board to determine if the sign is in keeping with the District.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Applicant Comment:

Cindy Riding, representing the owner, said they changed the color to better match the teal on the building. The black will stay consistent all the way through the sign band, on the two sides and the door. The sign will be black diebond. The letter size has the tallest letter at 13.5" which exceeds the limit; she provided an option that makes all the letters under 12" and they are hoping for an exception for larger letters.

Ms. Person asked if she considered doing the font in gold.

Ms. Riding replied it was not in the logo and they were trying to stay true to the logo.

Mr. Ito asked if the 13.5" was as it sits or if it was turned and justified horizontally.

Ms. Riding replied it is as it sits.

Mr. McConachie asked if there was an exception for a couple letters.

Ms. Nashem cited the relevant guideline which said exceptions to 10" height limitations will be considered in the business name subject to a limit of no more than three letters, only if the following conditions are satisfied: the exception is sought as a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business and the size of the letters for which an exception is requested is consistent with the scale and character of the building, the frontage of the business, the transparency requirements of the regulations and all other conditions under SMC 23.66.160.

Mr. Ito stated that five letters are above 10" and three are above 12"; he asked if other signage such as hours, lettering in the windows was planned.

Ms. Riding said an A-Board sign will be on the next agenda.

Mr. Hasson said going from what was there before, they are eliminating existing lettering.

Mr. Ito thought it didn't overpower the building; he would have been concerned had it overpowered the Nord Building sign which is in the sign band above.

Mr. McConachie thought the larger letters looked better in terms of scale; he thought the criteria is ultimately about fit so would argue for the larger letters.

Ms. Riding said for consistency they are proposing to change the address signs to silver.

Ms. Person asked if they planned any vinyl in the window.

Ms. Riding wasn't sure.

Mr. Ito thought the colors were more complementary to the existing building color; he confirmed the painting would go from the Nord Building signage on down.

Ms. Riding concurred.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for signage and for painting (*as amended*) per

Code Citations:

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

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations 2. Sign Bands

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

District Rules III. General Rules for Rehabilitation and New Construction

D. Color

SMC 23.66. 180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation Guidelines for the Treatment of Storefronts

MM/SC/LM/CP

7:0:0 Motion approved.

071608.22

New Orleans Cafe

Slawek Porowski

State Hotel

112 First Ave S

Sidewalk café: Install a wood platform with railings on the sidewalk

Applicant did not attend. Application tabled.

071608.23

Bornstein and Sons Warehouse

Sam Park

562 First Ave S

Summary of Application: Façade Alterations -Paint window frames and sill, paint all street level elements, in-fill bulkhead

Staff Report: During the Board meeting July 2, 2008 the Board requested to see a rendering with the proposed colors. They also asked the applicant to determine the material of the lower cornice. The District Rules say that unfinished surfaces such as stone and concrete should not be painted. The SOI's reinforce this.

Applicant Comment:

Sam Park stated the street level cornice is not terra cotta it is tin and wood; he thinks it is safe to paint. The client proposes it to be a chocolate brick which is a bit different tint from the Dark Wine. The column elements are proposed to be either a bright brick or a Dark Wine color. The upper window frames will be painted Dark Wine, the same as the storefront and the concrete sills would be unpainted. The metal and wood sills will be Chocolate Brick.

Mr. Ito was not in favor of the bright brick on the pilasters and asked if the Dark Wine could be the storefront with the recessed panels in the pillars being bright brick as an accent color and the double front doors and the bulkhead being the Bright Brick as well.

Mr. Park and other Board members concurred; Mr. Park will convey this to the client.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for in-fill of the bulkhead, removal of the awning and painting; Dark Wine at window frames, pilaster and bulkhead frames; Bright Brick at the infill panels on the pilaster and the bulkhead and the door; the Dark Wine window frames will extend up the full height of the building per

Code Citations:

District Rules III. General Rules for Rehabilitation and New Construction

C. Building Materials

D. Color

E. Building Base

SMC 23.66. 180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 4, and 9

Guidelines for the Treatment of Storefronts

MM/SC/LM/AB

7:0:0 Motion approved as amended.

Friendly amendment: the metal sill cornice above the transom windows will be painted a Chocolate Brick color.

071608.24

Metropole Building

Dave Heinen

423 Second Ave Ext

Summary of Application: Façade alteration

Repaint the exterior of the building

Replace storefronts with new wood storefronts

Replace upper floor windows with new aluminum clad wood windows except for the 4 original windows to be restored

Lower main building entry and replace entry

Install new mechanical equipment

Alter alley entrances

Repair sidewalk including areaway supports

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings and samples provided. Mr. Heinen said they have made changes as suggested by ARC from last review.

Mr. Heinen showed a sample of the revised windows with a wider profile as requested. He also said they are now proposing aluminum clad wood windows for the second and third story. He noted that all the windows had previously been replaced with a thin profile aluminum window and they were going for a profile more consistent with historic photos. He said the original windows on the Annex building would be repaired as would the alley windows. He said the storefront windows would be wood. He said per ARC request they changed the fenestration of the Annex building storefront windows to differentiate the building and be more consistent with the building lines as ARC had previously requested. ARC members preferred the doors on the annex to be reused rather than replaced. The applicants said that they would check on their condition. Mr. Murphy said that there is a grill panel above the sign band likening to the retracting awning pocket seen in historic photos.

The applicants explained that they are repairing the side walk with scores and 1 lb lamp black in two areas as needed for ADA accessibility. This will also require a beam to be installed under the areaway's vaulted ceiling with a post coming down in the Metropole

building. The area to be repaired in front of the Annex building will be removed and vaults installed with a new sidewalk poured. The applicants said this area had been rebuilt and currently has no historic features. ARC requested a photo of this areaway. Mr. Murphy said they are proposing the second floor windows to a more transom type instead of the double hung shown in the historic photo because the mullion would have been at eye level.

The applicants said that the building had been painted so they are proposing to repaint the building and matched the color to the original stone color. As ARC had previously requested they have made a color change on the annex building and the alley brick to differentiate the different material. The applicants showed a sample of the stone to be used along the base.

Mr. McConachie requested that they look into some options to give the new flashing more depth or a shadow line. Mr. Ito also suggested that it could be painted a different color than the stone. The applicants will bring back revisions.

Staff Report: Windows on the Annex are original but the windows and storefronts on the Metropole building have all been altered. The false arches and new storefront at Simba's were installed in 2000 and are not part of the historic building design. Included in the packet but not discussed at ARC is the proposed mechanical equipment. Existing mechanical equipment did not meet requirements but the new equipment meets setback and height requirements.

The drawings of the areaway support include drawings of a conduit which is not part of this proposal but will be part of a later proposal.

Ms. Nashem explained the false arches on the storefronts were approved as part of the new window system in 2000 and are not part of the historic design; all the windows have been replaced in the buildings. Although ARC did not discuss the mechanical equipment, it does meet the set back and height requirements. In the drawing of the areaway supports, conduit is included that is not part of this proposal but will be part of a later proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Dave Heinen, architect from Murphy Varey explained they would start with the upper level windows and work their way down. The coping on the new colored elevations will be painted to match the new window system and will use the same medium bronze they have used on the wood storefronts at grade level. They have extended the profile on the coping to give the building more of a cap for the building. He said this is an insurance company job and the insurance company would not go back and restore the full historic coping to the building so they are trying to address the concerns. On the Yesler and 2nd Avenue extension sides of the building they proposed to use a Marvin aluminum clad wood system; they will add some of the profile systems with about a 4 – 4 ¼” projection. At the center lines the units will be ganged together with a capped plate where the mullions are. It will provide a thicker profile and gets close to representing the girth and profile that would have been on the building originally.

On the three-story “Annex Building” on 2nd Avenue and Yesler, the windows are original and they will leave them in place, restore and repaint them leaving the decorative transoms above. On the back alley side of the Metropole Building they will leave the existing aluminum frames and replace the glazing. On the alley side of the Annex Building the windows will be retained and repainted. On the main street front façade, the historic doors in the south building are salvageable; they will restore and

replace them in a new storefront system. They are proposing a site built wood storefront system for the rest of 2nd and Yesler. The doors will be stained mahogany. The entire storefront under the arch will be stained; the inset doors in the rest of the storefront system will also be stained. There are 1' high louvers at the top of the storefront that are needed for mechanical system; some are active and some are there to maintain the look.

Mr. Heinen explained that on the back side of the building, they will add a new recessed door exiting out of the deli space as is required by code. A door off of Yesler will be maintained as is. He said at the location of an existing wood infilled opening; they will insert a door but about 2' of masonry will have to be removed. The heavy stone masonry portion of the masonry will be painted very close to what the original color of the stone was. The brick masonry at the alley side and the south Annex Building will be a slightly lighter color to differentiate the material but keeping color close enough so they come off as a unified series of buildings. They will do a stone tile under the new storefronts; it will be a smooth face limestone that will go on the wall between grade and the glass on the building. The stone will be sealed with an anti-graffiti coat. The red tile stairs are not original to the building and will be removed for ADA access.

Mr. Heinen said the main entry is not original to the building and it sustained damage during the fire. The entry door to the south Annex has great beveled glass.

Mr. Hester asked about the sidewalk topography as the lower entry has a substantial slope.

Dave Murphy, architect from Murphy Varey stated they are working on trying to extend the sidewalk. The entry at Simbas has a block of concrete that sticks out; they propose to pull that back in.

Mr. Heinen explained their intent it to keep it level as possible. He said the sidewalk has been patched over the years so they will start where there is strong scoring at the south end and will carry that through. The granite curb will remain. There are two separate buildings and two separate areaway configurations. Below the Metropole is a brick arched structure; replacing the sidewalk will just be a topical treatment to that structure.

Mr. Heinen said the areaway at the south building has been replaced at some point in the past. They must provide an access opening to the areaway for transformer.

Mr. Ito thought the south building area should be a separate project.

Ms. Doherty asked if the windows are all fixed sashes.

Mr. Heinen concurred.

There was discussion about the type of windows proposed and that early photos showing the original windows should provide a guideline. The center windows above the door could maintain the vertical patterning.

Mr. McConachie suggested if a double hung look is desired throughout, the center window should also align

Mr. Heinen stated the current windows are thin frames with no mullions.

Ms. Doherty asked if the deeper profile framed the entire opening; and then clarified that it would read like a storefront element, recessed and divided which she didn't think was beneficial.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented with amended changes to the cornice as discussed and the Annex doors are being refurbished per

Code Citations:

District Rules:

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction. B. Design, C. Building Materials, d. Color, E. Building Base

VII. Mechanical Systems

SMC23.66.140 Height C and C.5

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior's Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10

Guidelines for treatment of Storefronts

Guidelines for treatment of Windows

MM/SC/CP/LM

7:0:0 Motion approved.

Mr. Hasson added a friendly amendment that the location of the horizontal mullions on the 2nd floor be reviewed by ARC.

070908.14

Imperial Parking

Ed Danyluk

112 Occidental Ave S

Signage: Install new business signage

Applicant did not attend. Application tabled

071608.3

BOARD BUSINESS

South Downtown Livability Report Comments - Height changes

Ms. Nashem provided the Pioneer Square version of the plan and the revised letter; both will be referred to throughout this discussion (see file for complete documents). She said that with the variable height the accuracy is only about 80% because it depends on the building and its adjacency. The plan shows the proposed heights and the potentially buildable lots.

Concern was expressed by various Board members about skinny tall buildings that would have blank facades with no windows on the party wall and thought that this issue should be addressed in the plan. Board members wanted clarification on if a building were to fall down in an earthquake, is destroyed by fire etc. would the site become available for maximum height. There is concern that this would encourage demolition by neglect. Ms. Nashem stated the TDR is meant to balance that out.

Ms. Nashem explained the paragraphs that were added since the last Board discussion: 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th paragraphs. She had a conversation with Susan McLain who suggested the Board be more specific on the King Street Station and how we want the prominence protected. In the Board letter, Ms. Nashem stated it should be left to Board purview but expressed do to differing opinions between the many parties involved it is likely to be included in the code.

Mr. Ito suggested adding in the last paragraph after the sentence "...specific ideas appendices are not reviewed by the Board and are likely not compatible" that "this Board would support all sustainable ideals, LEED, etc. however these are all things that need to be looked at while they are incorporated into the District".

Ms. Person agreed with the draft that stated the building at 200 Occidental seemed too big for the site and would overwhelm the park. She expressed concern that views of Smith Tower would be impacted.

Mr. Ito stated the Florence Building is not a contributing building so it is possible a 130' tall building could be constructed adjacent to the Smith Tower.

Ms. Nashem stated that DPD received approval for the expenditures to get the requested images for the Board to look at so the Board can see what it will look like before it goes to Code. At this point the Board can say this needs further study and specific comments can be made after the images have been provided.

Ms. Doherty thought it could potentially be confusing if one had to take into account adjacent property heights when calculating an opportunity to build, but thought it is no different that the zoning code now that addresses setbacks and other things that you have to account for.

Ms. Nashem said when looking at reconstructing two floors on the Furiya Building the original two floors were taller than what was originally calculated as the verible height for that location. DPD allowed them to use the building behind them as adjacent so they could build to the original height.

Mr. Ito said now it is set up a specific way to get a height so he would like more leeway/control to the Board.

Mr. Hasson thought the more discretion the Board has, the more applicants are able to get around the Board so it is double edged.

Mr. Ito said if they wanted to do that they would have to provide a much more complete package.

Mr. Hasson said that not being higher than 15' above the adjacent building may sound like a bizarre rule but in the District huge height variations are not seen next to buildings and you don't see huge blank walls with no windows for 50 – 70'. He expressed concern for a 120' building next to a 20' building.

Mr. Ito said the Board should keep in mind that 10 years ago an applicant would have said coming to the Board is an onerous amount of work to do to get a building done. Now, if you look at a design review package for height, bulk and scale for any building being constructed in Seattle the packages are so complex and onerous that it makes this

Board's presentations look tiny and easy. The Board shouldn't be concerned about asking people to jump through hoops.

Ms. Nashem asked the Board if it wanted to stick with variable height and if so would more than 15' variation be acceptable? She cautioned that there is a lot of push for eliminating the variable height and suggested they also look at an alternative recommendation.

Mr. Hasson said we now have variable height with a 100' height maximum. He asked if the variable height was retained would it be a maximum height of 130'.

Mr. Ito said if it is 30' above an adjacent building no one will really notice; if it is 80' above an adjacent building, it will be very noticeable.

Mr. Ito suggested taking an average of buildings around the block to come up with height limit.

Ms. Nashem said there was an economic study included in the EIS that shows after 100' the profit margin for a developer is larger.

Mr. Hasson wondered if design review or lot size would prevent a small lot from having a tall pencil building but on a larger lot the height, bulk and scale would work better.

Mr. Ito said having two design review boards wouldn't make much sense but if the Board can put more up front controls the height, bulk and scale portion the Board can request more information before it is approved and the Board can have more teeth. Mr. Ito said the Board would have leeway to allow extra height but would not automatically grant it.

Mr. Hasson clarified that the extra 30' would be subject to a review of height, bulk and scale.

Mr. Ito said an historic review.

Ms. Nashem asked if they were asking for a compatibility study to be required? The Board could and should ask for that now.

Mr. Ito said it might be allowed by the Board if all the things that were requested by the Board were met for example they need to show what building will look like etc.

Ms. Nashem said one of the reasons the Board has the preliminary design approval and then the final design approval is that they need the preliminary design approval in order to get their MUP through.

Mr. Hasson said the more specific the Board can be what its criteria is for either allowing or not allowing extra height, the better. He asked if a property purchased the air rights of a building next door would they be able to put windows on the property line.

Mr. McConachie preferred saying 15' or 30' above adjacent is the way to go. Whatever height is written into the code then that is what everyone will do.

Mr. Ito added that now it is not 100' but 115' because of the code amendment to allow the enclosed common recreation space on the roof.

Ms. Nashem said she would add to the letter the height of the building should be in proportion to the lot size.

Mr. McConachie thought that perhaps spot zoning be looked at; he thought it would disincentive someone from letting their building deteriorate.

Ms. Nashem said because there are so few lots that it may be possible to look at them one by one.

Ms. Doherty said the consensus is the Board doesn't like taking away the balancing measure. She wondered how the different criteria in different areas came about.

Ms. Nashem stated the Board had been really clear about its preference with lower heights on First Avenue with higher heights around the perimeters. She asked the Board for clarification if they were saying the proposed heights were too high.

The consensus was that it is site specific.

Ms. Nashem asked if the Board had specifics to add to the paragraph about protecting the King Street tower.

Mr. Ito said language could be added about doing extensive view studies from the street. When the North Lot came through with their preliminary study, they were looking at preserving the King Street Station view from the Stadium; it is the public view corridor to King Street Station that would be the appropriate one to look at.

Public Comment:

Chris Gibbs, Toshiro Kaplan, said he talked to the owner of the Panama Hotel in the International District; they fear having a wall of tall buildings between the International District and Pioneer Square. He asked the Board to think about the interface between Pioneer Square and the International District.

Mr. McConachie was concerned about what he is not seeing, about what might be missed in reviewing the proposal. He wondered if the Board should have a retreat where the City planners come in and show place by place what the options are.

Mr. Ito wanted to charette the worst designs possible for these lots so we could see what the code would allow.

Ms. Doherty said perhaps Pioneer Square and the ID should be looked at collectively.

Ms. Nashem said she would revise the letter for review at the next meeting.

071608.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

071608.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem

Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227