



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 227/09

DATE: August 5, 2009  
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

#### Board Members Present:

Lorne McConachie  
Catherine Person  
Ryan Hester  
Ann Brown  
Adam Hasson  
Erin Doherty  
Miriam Hinden  
Jeremie Lipton

#### Staff:

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Doug Ito

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

#### **080509.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Draft Minutes from July 15, 2009

MM/SC/RH/JL

5:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. McConachie  
abstained.

#### **080509.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### **080509.21 Schoenfelds Interiors** 115 S Jackson Street

Installation of signage

Bob Schoenfeld provided drawings for Board review and explained they are reducing the size to 19.2 x 16 to meet the requirement. It will be in the same location with the same nickel brackets.

Ms. Nashem noted the lettering on the requested A-Board sign met size requirements.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Mr. Schoenfeld confirmed that the blade sign would be flat black vinyl with white vinyl letters. The façade is concrete; the method of attachment will be epoxy expansion bolts into the concrete. It would patch easily if removed. There will be one blade sign and the A-board sign.

Ms. Nashem noted she had the drawings from the previous sign approval.

Mr. Schoenfeld explained the previously approved “Fisher” sign that was to go at the top of the building was never put up.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for an 8 square foot blade sign and an A-board sign, with the A-Board sign to be placed at the curb edge or next to the building.

Code Citations:

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

B. General Signage regulations

C. Specific Signage regulations

1. Letter Size

3. Projecting elements

4. Blade signs

F. Sandwich Board Signs

MM/SC/RH/AB

7:0:0 Motion carried.

080509.22

**Café Vita/ Via Tribunali**

125 Prefontaine Ave

Installation of a venting for a pizza oven

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings and information provided. The applicant explained that Café Vita was taking over the space of All City Coffee and was installing a wood fired brick pizza oven. ARC members asked for more photos so they could better understand existing conditions. ARC asked the applicant to look into alternatives to having the vent on the exterior of a primary façade and the limitations on the venting the hard fuel oven. They asked for a summary the alternatives explored including if there are reasons the alternative is not viable. The applicant did say they had permission from the building owner to go through to the roof but the shaft would take space from the units. All units are occupied. ARC members expressed that they would really like to see an alternative found but that if they planned to pursue the outside vent to explore painting the vent rather than leaving it silver and seeing if it can go around the cornice rather than through it. However, ARC said they would rather that the exterior vent was not enclosed so it was clear it was an addition and not part of the architecture. ARC did not make a recommendation.

Brock Gavery, attorney for the owner, went over the history of the business and the plans to install a specialized brick wood burning oven to make pizza that would require venting. He noted the positive community and economic impacts on the area.

Cathryn Vandenbrink, building owner, presented the positive aspects of the building and its inhabitants. She supported venting up the side of the building because of the positive things Café Vita will bring to the area.

Amoreena Miller, project architect, passed out Photoshop images showing the various options: 1) vent up exterior (preferred option); 2) vent to Washington Street (not preferred – most visible façade and longer run for venting); 3) vent to North Façade (not preferred because there is already some exhausting at that site so there would be no way to run up the façade); 4) vent up through corridor space (not preferred – disruptive and negatively impacts space which has been built out to accommodate artists moving art and supplies in and out of building); 5) vent up through tenant space (not preferred – disruptive to tenants). Option 1, exterior vent is preferred. She went over the shaft and vent dimensions.

Mr. Gavery explained that the pricing they have obtained came to \$10,000 to do the exterior venting and \$60 – 75,000 to vent through the tenant spaces.

In response to Board questions, Ms. Miller noted the challenge of working on a building where all facades are primary. She explained that the duct comes only in galvanized or stainless steel which could be painted or brushed. She showed old photos of the building with outside venting.

#### Public Comment:

Chris Gibbs, resident manager of the Tashiro Kaplan Building, spoke in support of the project and noted the importance of keeping businesses in the downtown area and said it will add to the liveliness of the building and area. He noted the rooftop gas pump shown in an old photo.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester said he appreciated the extent to which all the options had been investigated and noted it was a difficult challenge from the standpoint of venting. He stated he was confident this is the only option especially from the standpoint of cost. He said he didn't think this degrades the building – it adds a slight blemish but it can be performed and still maintain the character of the building. He said he was interested in what kind of finishes/colors could be added to minimize the appearance of the duct. He agreed that the addition of the business to the district is important.

Mr. McConachie noted the application was challenging – it is a leading façade and it is not in keeping with the normal pathways usually taken. He said there have been presentations that have said that Pioneer Square is not a pure architectural place but a working village and how does that balance that with the more bourgeois sense of what it is today as compared to back in the 1890s.

Ms. Doherty said that for the historic portion of the building - which is the base of the building - she didn't think the historic fabric would be impacted. She expressed concern about the pedestrian experience on Prefontaine and considered this to be aesthetically inappropriate. She expressed the desire to find a solution because she wanted to see this business operating here. With regard to Option 4 she wondered if the shaft could be smaller maintaining 2" of clearance on either side. She said she thought the clearance in the hallway could be increased by about 6" which would be similar to the large door openings. She said placing the vent inside the building is preferred. She didn't like Option 5 because it was inside someone's unit and she didn't think it appropriate to disturb the residents to make this happen. She reiterated that she thought Option 4 was the best option; it impacts two units on each floor but necking down the hallway width is no difference than a door width that they would pass through.

Mr. Hasson preferred Option 5 and agreed with Ms. Doherty about the historic quality of the neighborhood and the aesthetics of the neighborhood. He said it was tough but he liked the building and wanted it to be successful. He said if it was an application coming for a new building an exterior shaft would never be approved and it wouldn't be approved on any other historic primary facades. He expressed concern that incrementalism would slowly degrade the neighborhood. He said he would like to take a longer term view and find a spot inside the building. He noted that in the Scientific Building a shaft was installed for \$25,000. He reiterated that an exterior vent wouldn't fit with the historic character of the District.

Ms. Person said she thought painting it would help minimize the vent. She asked if pizza was a deal breaker for Café Vita coming in and if another kind of oven could be used that would not require the venting.

Mr. Gavery said it potentially could be a deal breaker and to keep the Via Tribunali brand they have to use a solid fuel burning oven.

Ms. Doherty said that galvanized steel can be primed and painted any color it needs to be.

Ms. Brown cited District Rule VIII which states that the preferred location for mechanical systems is on the building interior but in cases where that is not possible it should go on non-primary facades and/or roof tops but should not damage, diminish or radically change character defining features. She said she thought it could support approval.

Mr. Lipton asked for more information about why locating the equipment on the interior is not possible. He asked if it was not possible or not preferable.

Mr. Gavery said it is possible.

Ms. Vandenbrink explained the building is comprised of the existing 3-story building with three new stories sitting on top. The new portion sits atop an extra thick concrete slab that would have to be bored through.

Mr. Lipton asked if they would have the clearance to run the ducting up through the residences above.

Ms. Vandenbrink said the existing ducts don't have space for it. She explained that when the building was done there was no money to pay for work in the commercial spaces and that the businesses had invested a lot of money in building out their spaces. She thought it would be difficult to get the tenants to foot the bill. She expressed concern about the impact on the resident spaces within the building.

Mr. McConachie said the Ordinance talks about installing these if there are no options on the interior and he said there are options on the interior but they happen to be more expensive and more intrusive. He said the ordinance talks about not putting new duct work on primary facades but there are no non-primary facades here and he noted the difficulty of applying that ordinance to this building. He noted that one of the defining characters of this ordinance is "how do we keep a vital urban neighborhood in Pioneer Square" and that there is a balancing act.

Ms. Hinden cited the Ordinance which states that the preferred location is on the interior; she said it sounds like it is possible to locate it on the interior but financially not-feasible. She reiterated the concern that it would be located on a primary façade which changes the nature of the district and the historic feel of the street and the building. She expressed concern about setting precedent for future projects for other tenants who might want to do similar venting.

Mr. Lipton said he is not sure it is possible to locate it on the interior because of potential impacts to tenants above the space. He said there is some information that indicates it might not be possible.

Ms. Doherty said Option 5 impacts to residents. She reiterated her preference for Option 4 and said that although it reduced the width of the corridor she was confident that the shaft could be made smaller - specifically the depth of the framing for the shaft could be a fraction of what is there. She said it appears the doors are about 4' wide and that the 2' length of corridor that is being impacted on those three floors could neck down and essentially be 4' wide like the door they will be passing through. She said while not ideal, as a compromise it is a better solution than putting it on the exterior.

Mr. Hester asked if the existing duct runs parallel with the corridor.

Ms. Vandenbrink responded that the ducting for the community room comes out through the façade and that there was no way to get through the existing duct. She noted the head room would not be code.

Mr. Hasson asked if the residential windows were operable and noted a building where a system above the garage was a Type 1 hood that vents out to the street but you can't have operable windows above it. He noted it is a type of system that scrubs the air without having to vent all the way to the roof.

Ms. Miller said because it is a solid fuel that isn't an option because of how it has to be vented vertically.

Ms. Person asked if the vent is the smallest it can be or if there is some leeway.

Ms. Miller said the smallest it can be is 11” and the width of the pass through is 2’. She said it is 8” coming out of the oven and it needs to be a bit insulated.

Mr. Gavery said that having no secondary façade is unique that he thought it was a low risk for setting precedent.

Mr. Hester asked about the possibility of linking the vent to this tenancy because the vent would be necessary for the operation of this business and not for one in the future.

Ms. Nashem said it is a condition that could be set in the motion.

Mr. McConachie expressed concern that a subsequent tenant may not have the money to remove the vent and that it would be left.

Board members discussed the possibility of linking the vent to this tenant but concern was raised about enforcement of the removal of the vent and repair work to the cornice.

Mr. Hasson asked if sight-line requirements for rooftop mechanical equipment were looked at. He noted that rooftop mechanical may need to be moved back so it is not visible from the street.

Ms. Nashem said that in this case the Board would be clearly making an exception for set-backs knowing that it is visible.

Mr. Hasson noted the importance of taking a long term view and cited Salumi which has a hood. He said it is exterior ventilation, on a non-primary façade set back and it goes deeper into the roof so the vent isn’t visible and has less of a “chimney” look. He said that with going through the cornice above etc. it is visually not compatible with the district and if by chance it was approved it should at least be set back from the street.

Ms. Hinden said if the Board mandates that the duct has to be removed when the tenant leaves the cornice penetration would have to be repaired at that time as well.

Ms. Nashem noted the Option being put forward was the original option (Option 1). She said the Board could table the application if more information is needed. .

Ms. Doherty noted that Option 4 is not considered viable by the applicant.

Ms. Nashem said if the Board were to deny it the applicant would be able to come back with a different option.

**Action:** I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the installation of the venting as presented to be painted a like color of the building; if the restaurant goes away it is to be removed, the non-historic cornice is to be repaired per:

Code Citations:

District Rules VIII. Mechanical Systems  
Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Mr. Hasson made a friendly amendment that the vent at the top meet code citations for visibility from the street.

Mr. Lipton made a friendly amendment that the vent be painted to match the color (color to be approved at ARC).

MM/SC/AB/RH

4:4:0 Motion failed. Ms. Doherty, Ms. Hinden and Messrs. McConachie, Hasson opposed.

Mr. McConachie asked for comments from Board members to guide the applicant if they were to submit another application.

The Board members said that they valued the building, the tenancy and the opportunity for this business but the Ordinance states that "in cases where locating systems in the interior is not possible" and they were not convinced it was not possible. They suggested that they more fully explore the interior options and to more thoroughly explain why the options are not possible including more exploration of costs and feasibility, especially around limitations of operations of the building or tenant leases.

080509.23

**T and T Hair Salon and Spa**

Pioneer Square Hotel  
83 Yesler Way

A-Board sign

Owner Thanh-Truc Nguyen had no comment.

Ms. Nashem noted the letter size meets the rules.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for an A-board sign to be placed at the curb edge or next to the building.

Code Citations:

District Rules XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies  
F. Sandwich Board Signs

MM/SC/AH/CP

8:0:0 Motion carried.

080509.24

**King Street Station**

303 S Jackson St

Building Cleaning

Trevina Wang went over the products to be used in the cleaning and that in tests, different products worked more effectively on different surfaces. She provided MSDS sheets on the products and explained which product would be used on which surface. She noted that the granite on the first floor had been cleaned during Phase I of this project. She provided photos showing the test cleaning on the various materials. She explained that Bio-wash is proposed to clean up the organic material in the cracks and doesn't change the appearance of the façade. Sure clean 600 is proposed to be used to clean the new grout lines because they intend to redo some of the grout between the bricks. They proposed to use Bio-Clean Safe Restorer to clean the terracotta. The light duty restoration cleaner will be used for the granite. She said the brick will be cleaned with 600 degree hot water only; grout lines will be cleaned and re-grouted. She provided before/after photos of materials that had been cleaned.

Mr. McConachie noted that ARC reviewed the application and found the products and the applicator to be of high quality and recommended approval.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hinden looked at preservation briefs from the National Parks Service which indicates that cleaners that contain ammonium bifluoride should not be used on historic masonry. In looking at the photos it looks ok and it doesn't appear to have left residue or discoloration.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for cleaning of the building as proposed per

Code Citations:

District Rules II. Certificates of Approval for Use, Design and Demolition,  
A. General Requirements.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Guidelines for the treatment of Masonry  
Preservation Briefs 1 and 6

Ms. Doherty added a friendly amendment that the brick be cleaned using only hot water and that the Safe Restorer Sure Clean is for use on the terracotta and granite.

MM/SC/RH/AB

7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. McConachie  
recused himself.

080509.25

**Sake Nomi**

76 S Washington St

A-Board sign

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the sign and found it to be in compliant with size and letter size and the design to be compatible with the district. The applicant explained that the other business is open earlier and then closes when his business opens so they do not want to have both businesses on the sign at the same time as it would direct customers to the business that is not open. ARC thought that the intention of the rule was for there to be only one sign on the corner and that this seemed like a practical solution as long as there really is only one sign on the corner at a time.

Ms. Nashem said the District Rules state that shared signage on the corner is allowed; she noted the A-Board on the corner will be shared with Planet Java with whom Sake Nomi will alternate times.

Mr. McConachie noted that ARC was supportive of the application.

Johnnie Stroud, owner, said the intent of the A-Board is to attract traffic from the corner.

Ms. Nashem said the applicant already has an A-Board in front of the shop and that this one was for the corner. She cited the District Rules which state that only one A-Board is allowed per address and the one on the corner has to be shared by all businesses on the block.

Mr. McConachie clarified that if another business wanted to join in on the A-Board the applicant would be amenable. The applicant indicated he would be.

Mr. Hester agreed with the placement and thought the colors were compatible with the District and said the design is nice.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for an A-board sign to be placed at the corner of First and Washington to be shared with Planet Java. When the Sake Nomi sign is placed out at 2:00 the Planet Java sign will be brought in so that only one sign will be on the corner at a time.

Code Citations:  
District Rules XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies  
F. Sandwich Board Signs

Mr. Hasson made a friendly amendment to the motion that “any future business on that street to be accommodated on the sign”.

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

**080509.3 BOARD BUSINESS**

**080509.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

**080509.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

10:15 a.m. Meeting adjourned.

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227