



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 19/09

DATE: January 7, 2009
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
Adam Hasson

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

John DeLanoy

010708.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes Dec 3
MM/SC/RH/LM 6:00 Minutes approved.
Minutes Dec 17 Deferred.

010708.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

010708.21 Woven Art
200 First Ave S

Installation of window signage

Mr. Ito stated ARC reviewed the photos of window signage and found it to meet the district rules for letter height and transparency. Applicant was asked if he has taken all the sale signs out of the window in addition to the banner. Mr. Mohageri said that he had. ARC recommends approval.

Applicant comment: Hassan Mohageri explained that the vertical "Sale" sign hangs 3 - 4" from the glass on the interior.

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

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Nashem noted the original signage application did not include the existing sandwich board sign and suggested Mr. Mohageri include that in his next signage application.

Ms. Person asked for clarification of what signage would remain. Mr. Mohageri stated that all yellow “sale” banners were gone and the only “sale” sign is in the interior.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Mohageri said the signage was tasteful.

Ms. Nashem read what is allowed in code which states signage relates to “anything meant to be seen in the window”. The applicant would still be required to request approval from the Board.

Mr. McConachie suggested approving the window signage in the application and then asking the applicant to come back for approval of sandwich and temporary sale signage.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for window signage placed in band at the bottom of the window as shown in the photos.

Code Citations:

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/ED/RH

8:0:0 Motion carried.

010708.22

Areaway 1301B

105 S Washington

Ms. Nashem introduced the application for street wall repair in the area way.

Mr. Ito explained ARC did not come to a recommendation. Three options were presented.

Applicant comment: Jeff Bertram, Richard Leung, Karl Gao from SDOT, and Samir Chukart, consultant engineer on areaways, and Mimi Sheridan, Historian, presented the application.

Mimi Sheridan, Historian, provided a report for Board review (in file). She said the oldest and historically most significant areaways are on First and Occidental near Yesler and most are in good condition. Although some work had previously been done, in 1998 the City did inspections and came up with the Areaways Hazard Mitigation Plan with Mr. Chukart providing the structural components and Ms. Sheridan the historic characteristics. Structural inspections were redone after the 2001 earthquake.

Ms. Sheridan noted that the Areaway 905, was the first one filled with a light weight, removable concrete. Since 2001 two areaways and sidewalks were reconstructed; nine have been partially filled and six completely filled. There is a great variety of areaways

in materials, size and different problems which need specific measure tailored for the structural needs and historical characteristics of each areaway. Most often the historic characteristics are in the building wall which is often brick with arches, doorways and windows into the basement as well as the barrel vaulted ceilings.

Ms. Sheridan explained two areaways were reconstructed one of which, the Sinking Ship Garage, had tile floor and curved arches. The ones that were full-filled either didn't have historic characteristics or there just wasn't any other way to do it.

Mr. Ito stated that both sides of this areaway are significant so fill is not a good option.

Mr. Bertram stated there are only a couple critical sidewalks and one critical street wall in Post Alley south of Columbia left to address. They took the ten lowest rated areaways and from those Mr. Chukart identified the top four with 1301 the best candidate based on condition, access and other factors.

Ms. Sheridan stated that most of this areaway is concrete. The historically significant features are focused in one 30' stretch: rubble wall, arches into the basement, brick arched ceiling, and the skylights which still have the glass prisms. She suggested the alternatives focus on preserving the 30' stretch and covering the rest of the street wall with concrete.

Mr. Bertram went over the options (see handout in file for details):

Board Questions:

Mr. Bertram explained some grouting was done in the largest cracks but it is a temporary fix.

Ms. Nashem asked if there other situations where standing water could be damaging areaways.

Mr. Chukart said yes, many have leaks at the curb sidewalk edge.

Ms. Person asked which of the three options is the safest from an earthquake standpoint.

Mr. Bertram stated they feel confident with option #3 which does a better job of supporting the sidewalk. Mr. Chukart voiced his support of this option as well.

Ms. Doherty asked how in option 3, the grid of steel behind the post would interface with the stone wall.

Mr. Gao said they will touch each other but there is no mechanical fastening or drilling. The load would transfer to the steel. With regard to painting, the steel would be primed with two overcoats.

There was discussion about setting a precedent that could be moved forward in every case. Ms. Nashem said that one precedent that has been set is looking to find the least visually disruptive option, but is still viable.

Mr. Bertram said in the corner inside room they planned to do the pin piles with the concrete wall on the inside. Ms. Sheridan supported this and said the area was small and had no special significance.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ito asked for comments on the 30' window in the street wall and which option members are leaning toward.

Mr. McConachie looked through the Secretary of Interior Standards and thought that both 2 and 3 met the standards. He read two points for the record: 1) recommended limiting any new excavations adjacent to historic foundations to avoid undermining the structural stability of the building or adjacent historic building and 2) correcting structural deficiencies in preparation for the new use in a manner that preserves the structural system and individual character defining features. He thought both were in line with trying to preserve the rubble wall without completely obliterating it.

Mr. Ito leaned toward option 2 at ARC but he appreciates that option 3 was visually clarified as a screen versus what was there before by removing the extra steel. He is open to either 2 (7) or 3 (8).

Ms. Doherty said that 7 (2) is the more pure solution. She expressed concern about the construction of 7 (2) and thought we might be accepting some risk of the historic fabric being damaged. She appreciated that option 8 was much more streamlined than the previous alternative. At ARC the majority agreed to concentrate efforts on preserving the 30 foot most significant portion of the areaway.

Mr. Hasson said from a historical preservation perspective the option that braced the wall from behind was the best solution. Other mitigating factors may be in place but he thought that is the baseline where we should be starting based our guidelines.

Mr. McConachie appreciated the options and the response to ARC feedback the applicant has shown. He expressed concern about a seismic event thought 8 (3) offers longer term structural stability.

Mr. Ito agreed with Mr. McConachie and noted 8 (3) is not a permanent attachment and is removable. The new structure would hold and support the rubble wall.

Ms. Hinden leaned toward option 8 (3) as it does a better job of preserving the historic character of the arches and rubble wall as well as providing better support in the case of an earthquake.

Ms. Brown leaned toward 8 (3).

Action: I move to approve Option 8 (3) with the steel cross frame per:

Code Citations:

District Rules XVIII Areaways

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, 6

MM/SC/CP/MH

7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Hasson opposed.

010708.23

Bicycle Alliance of Washington

Mottman Building
309A and 311 3rd Ave S

Mr. Hasson recused himself.

Ms. Nashem introduced the application for installation of business signage and painting.

Applicant Comment:

Julie Mercer explained where the signs would go using the photos and drawings presented. She provided a color chip for review. Both storefronts will have the same colors.

Mr. Ito observed that all letter sizes complied.

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 installation of signage and painting as indicated on the attached plans.

Code Citations:

District Rules:

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

D. Color

XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

A.1. Transparency

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. Letter size

MM/SC/CP/LM

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

010708.3

BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Nashem advised Board members according to the Ordinance that already exists, dog grooming does include the ability to have over night stays. According to DPD the complaints they have received have been during the day and not at night. The code also has a section that noise complaints have to be addressed. She asked if the Board wanted to recommend allowing doggie daycare in the District or just on the North Lot and if other services, such as veterinarian services should be an allowed use.

Ms. Hinden was supportive of having veterinary services for downtown residents.

Ms. Person agreed.

There was Board discussion about noise issues.

Mr. Hasson spoke as a property manager and said it would be difficult if a doggie daycare exists next to them because he is doubtful the sound regulations would be enforced.

Mr. Hester agreed that away from a residential environment might be better. He mentioned it could be useful if the Board could hear the experience offices around Seattle Canine Club

Ms. Nashem clarified the Board was in agreement to allow doggie day care in the North Lot and veterinarians anywhere in the district.

010708.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

010708.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227