



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 238/11

MINUTES for Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Board Members

Mark Astor
Ann Brown
Erin Doherty, Vice Chair
Ryan Hester
Miriam Hinden
Lorne McConachie, Chair
Jessica Miller
Tija Petrovich

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Willie Parish

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

092111.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Minutes from Sept 7, 2011 Deferred.

092111.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

092111.21 **Scheuerman Block**
110 Cherry Street

Change of use from office to work only artist studios on the second floor

Staff Report: SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses says that all uses that are not prohibited are allowed. Artist studios are not prohibited uses. The street level uses do apply to the second floor.

Jane Richlovsky explained the space will be used for artists displaced from the Western building. She said that there will be minor floor plan changes. She said they will be on the 2nd floor; there will be no signage and windows will remain uncovered.

Mr. McConachie said that artist studio is not disallowed so would be an acceptable use.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Public Comment:

Lisa Dixon, Alliance for Pioneer Square supported the application.

Board members indicated support for the application.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for change of use from office to work only artist studios as presented per

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval Required

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses

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

092111.22

505 First Ave S

Ms. Petrovich recused herself because her business is in a building that shares the same owner.

Installation of signage

Chuck Johnson, SKG, explained that three stainless steel signs were proposed for new building tenant, EMC²: one each on the west, east and south facades. He explained that there would be minimal light – an LED strip light.

Ms. Hinden arrived at 9:06 a.m.

Mr. Johnson explained that the sign on the south facade would be installed on brick between windows. He said that attachment details were included in the packet. He said that sign sizes were below the maximum allowed in the signage code.

Ms. Nashem explained that the board approved a building signage plan as a condition of approving an extra large sign for the parking garage. Although this building has new owners this condition applies as long as the “park” sign is on the building and the new owners are aware of the condition. The signage plan indicated that a tenant sign will be on the east and west side of the addition. There was no indication for a sign on the south end of the building in the signage plan. Although the condition states that there will be a reduced signage plan, the plans did not address the size of the sign only the number and location in plan view.

Mr. Johnson said that EMC² will be the anchor tenant and will have naming rights for the building.

Mr. McConachie said that the signs met the threshold for size based on 10% of façade or 240 square feet calculation.

Responding to questions Mr. Johnson explained that the sign over the entry will not be attached to the historic façade but will anchor into the flashing material on the back of the parapet. He said that the sign would be centered over the entry. He said that he

wasn't sure if there was a concrete sheer wall behind the parapet. He explained that the letters are pan formed stainless steel.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McConachie cited 23.66.160 C 1 a and questioned if the signage on the sides of buildings was appropriate and/or precedent setting.

Ms. Doherty said the Board had reviewed a full sign package for the building and questioned if what was being proposed was in keeping with the reduced sign package.

Ms. Hinden said that the south elevation was not part of the previously approved sign package.

Ms. Miller said that there had been no discussion about height or size when the signage packet was proposed.

Gwen Weld, EMC², noted that they have naming rights for the building and will put no other name signs up. She said they will eventually take over the entire building.

Ms. Hinden said that the signage fits in with the scale of the building. She said that she appreciated the more modern look and noted that it relates to the character of the new building and is compatible with the district.

Ms. Doherty said that it is not appropriate to mount business signage on side of building but that this would be appropriate because they will be the anchor tenant and building name.

Mr. McConachie said that the signs on the west and south facades were not pedestrian-oriented. He noted that adjacent ING looked at different types of signage based on tenancy.

Ms. Weld said that this signage would act as the building name and that they would be foregoing anything else.

Ms. Hinden said that the building is a new larger building so the scale of the signage is appropriate; she said that this tenant is the anchor tenant of the building and noted that there are other precedents.

Ms. Doherty said that the board specifically approved a reduced signage package, the signs are within the allowable size, but the south sign was not included in that package but she thought the sign location suited the building better. Ms. Doherty suggested the south location was a better location than the original position on the west elevation, but she opposed allowing three signs, due to the originally approved package with two signs.

Ms. Hinden agreed with Ms. Doherty and said that including the south sign was beyond the approved reduced signage package, but that it was the more appropriate (than the west) side for signage.

Mr. Hester agreed and said that of the three the one on the west was more viaduct-gearred. He suggested removing the west sign and shifting it to the south side.

Ms. Miller said that the signs as designed and scaled were appropriate for a new building but noted that the approved sign package for this building should be adhered to.

Mr. McConachie said that in order to get a larger “parking” sign Starbucks diminished the rest of their signs.

Mr. Johnson said they would seek approval for the east and south signs only.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of signage east and south side of the building only per

Code citations:

District Rules XX Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
B General Regulations
C Specific Regulations
 8 Wall Sign
SMC 23.66.160 C.1, 2 and 4

MM/SC/RH/JM 7:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Petrovich abstained.

092111.23

Conduit Installation

First Ave and King St to First Ave and Jackson Street

Applicant Comment:

Ron Desmet explained the need to relocate utilities from the viaduct to conduit along First Avenue from Jackson to King streets. He provided a drawing showing where the work would take place and said that a small area was missed in the First Ave duct bank project and will be done in Phase 2.

Ms. Nashem said she talked with Bob Hanson who said that Seattle City Light will be doing the final restoration (repaving and ADA ramps) of First Ave through the S King Street intersection. Originally they had planned the work to occur in 2012 but as SDOT is coordinating all the construction happening in the area it will likely be held off to 2013.

Mr. McConachie said that conduit had just been run through the district. He noted that the work was happening in a sequential rather than coordinated manner that is eating up the street. He said a good conversation with SDOT is needed; he expressed concern that there seemed to be no coordination of the work.

Mr. Desmet went over the details of the project noting that at the southwest corner of King and First streets they will set a vault and will head up to Jackson to an existing Comcast vault. He said that from that point Comcast has existing conduit. He said the

work would have no impacts to the historic areaway. He said that ADA ramps will be replaced/retrofitted but are not part of this submittal; that work will be done on another phase. He said that the work won't affect any granite curbs.

Mr. McConachie advised the applicant that original brick roadway surface bricks are stored.

Public Comment:

Ron Wright reported that he is also working with this client and said that the sidewalk is failing in the area around the Schwabacher Building and the areaway there will have to be rebuilt.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of conduit as presented per:

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval Required

SMC 23.66.180 Streets and Sidewalks

All granite curbs will be replaced or repaired in kind and any pavers will be given to SDOT for storage.

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

Mr. McConachie questioned how to get SDOT's attention regarding coordination of work. It was suggested that SDOT come to the Board to discuss coordination efforts.

092111.24

Café Vita

Tashiro Kaplan Building
125 Prefontaine Pl

Change to previously approve vent pipe to avoid smoke disturbances

Brock Gavery, representing the owner, explained the proposal to extend the exhaust pipe another 6' in hopes of eliminating smoke infiltration to residential units.

Options were discussed and the applicant decided to table the application and would come back with more detailed information e.g. anchoring system, guide wires, as well as the engineer they have been working with.

092111.25

Western Building

619 Western

Mr. McConachie recused himself because he works in a building owned by the same owner as the Western Building.

Removal of the fire escape and standpipe

Installation of temporary painted wood walls to fill the first floor bays for security

ARC Report: Mr. Hester reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and photos provided and recommended that the temporary plywood panels be painted with art. The property manager said that the building superintendant would inspect the building daily and Cleanscapes will remove graffiti. ARC agreed with the need to prevent vandalism. Mr. Wright explained that the fire escape is not required for egress and that the fire department prefers the stand pipe access in the stairwell. ARC discussed the removal of the fire escape. Although there was some reservation about removal of the fire escape because they are character defining features of the District, it was thought that because of its location on a primary façade, the concern for vandalism, and that the district rules say fire escapes are particularly important to alleyscapes, approval was recommended.

Applicant Comment:

Ron Wright explained that they would be doing permanent interior seismic improvements and temporary improvements in preparation for the tunneling. He said the building will be vacated by October 1; until March 1 it will be a vacant building with no activity. He proposed to put plywood façade on the fronts of all storefronts and have Urban Artworks do an installation of art on them. He said that the historic windows will not be removed although one window sash would be removed for the stand pipe. He said that the fire escape is a security issue. He said they propose to place a temporary stand pipe on the interior of the building to provide access for fire department; currently there is a standpipe outside. He said that although they are still planning rehabilitation but this is considered the front door. He said that he thought that removing the floors and steps make the fire escape more dangerous.

Ms. Hinden said that although fire escapes are important character-defining features she didn't think the fire escape being removed temporarily for 5 months in the life of a 100-year old building was problematic.

Mr. Wright pointed out that it is a safety/security issue but that it has been maintained and is functional. He said they don't want people climbing on the fire escape or trying to gain access to the building.

Public Comment:

Adam Hasson said he shared the experience of people climbing into a building and said that there would be no harm to removing the fire escape. He said that he didn't like the idea of boarding up the building because it would send a bad message to the neighborhood.

Responding to questions, Mr. Wright said that the full time property manager in the adjacent Polson Building would assess the building once a day.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hinden said she appreciated aesthetics but that fire escapes are an important character defining feature and that she didn't support the permanent removal of the fire escape.

Ms. Doherty agreed and said the fire escape is original to the building and is in good conditions. She said that modifications could be made to render it unusable. She said

that it would be unfortunate to cover the street frontage and said that the best security measure is transparency.

Ms. Hinden said that having the ground floor boarded up would change the character of the ground floor.

Ms. Miller agreed and said there are other ways to solve the problem.

Mr. Astor said that Mr. Hasson brought up issues about the boarding of the storefront he had not previously considered.

Ms. Petrovich said that she would approve the boarding of the storefront but would like to see a compromise resolution for the fire escape.

Ms. Doherty said that she understands the complete rehabilitation plans for the building.

Ms. Brown left at 10:50 a.m.

A straw poll was taken and six board members did not support removing the fire escape. The applicants decided to table the fire escape portion of the application.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of temporary painted wood walls to fill the first floor bays for security including installation of artwork during construction.

Code Citations:

District Rules

III General Rules for Rehabilitation and New Construction

X Fire Escapes

MM/SC/MH/TP 4:2:1 Motion carried. Ms. Doherty and Mr. Astor opposed and Mr. McConachie recused himself.

Ms. Doherty left at 11:05 a.m.

092111.26

Alaskan Way Viaduct Bents 97 and 106

Alaskan Way S between S Jackson Street and Yesler Way

Installation of noise monitors

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the application drawings and photos. ARC found that no historic resources were affected and recommended approval.

Staff Report: There are additional noise monitors on various rooftops but they are set back and not visible and therefore a Certificate of Approval is not required.

Matt Preedy, WSDOT, explained that noise monitoring equipment would be installed on the eastern bents facing west. He said there would be up for six years. He said that there will be no disruption of ground surface and electronic feed will come off the lighting. He said that the unit will be a utility box with antenna with conduit feeds.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester said that the work was necessary and straightforward.

Board members commented that the work was temporary.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of noise monitors per

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval Required

MM/SC/TP/MH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

092111.3 BOARD BUSINESS

092111.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Lorne McConachie, Chair

092111.5 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

081711.6 WORK SESSION - District Rules

The Board will review the Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules. Ms. Nashem set up a work session – next Board meeting Oct 5.

Ryan Kennedy, APS said they will start working on the format and will have it ready at the next meeting.

Ms. Nashem suggested discussing details about signage.

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227