



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 37/09

DATE: February 4, 2009
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Doug Ito
Lorne McConachie
Ryan Hester
Ann Brown
Catherine Person
Miriam Hinden
Adam Hasson
Erin Doherty

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

John DeLanoy

Chair Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

020409.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes from January 7

MM/SC/AH/LM

7:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

Minutes from January 21

Minutes not ready.

020409.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

020409.21 Asphalt Arterial Concrete Project

2nd Ave, 2nd Ave Ext. S, 4th Ave and 4th Ave S

Summary of Application:

Concrete panels repair/replacement, ADA ramps construction/replacement, curb repair/replacement, signal loop replacement, roadway restriping, minor drainage improvements, utility adjustments, tree pit expansion, sidewalk repair.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans, samples and photos provided. ARC asked for more information on how the bulb-out, particularly on 2nd and James will affect traffic and if the restricted parking could be lifted. The applicant clarified that the tree grates will be removed and replaced with rock mulch. ARC requested more information on

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

how the tree pits are positioned with the areaway. The applicant clarified that the saw cut overruns will be filled with epoxy grout. ARC asked for detail drawings of the expanded tree pits as well as the locations where ramps are over areaways. SDOT discussed the work schedule which will remain flexible to accommodate an efficient work program but will have noise restriction hours, be constrained by Metro services and needs to be finish by the work moratorium in November 2010. They said the project will have a full time communications person. ARC recommended approval pending additional information.

Staff Report: Code and District Rules require paving and changes to the rights of way to be approved, however maintaining the areaways and preserving the granite curbs are specifically identified in District Rules.

Applicant Comment:

Bill Bovey, SDOT consultant, explained the project would be to do pavement maintenance and street rehabilitation on 2nd and 4th Avenue and said that from Jackson to Pike/Pine the work would likely begin mid-year pending funding and will last through the fall of 2010. Their primary focus is to fix the pavement between curb lines, rebuild curb ramps and bring up to ADA standards. He provided a rendering of curb bulb additions which will be installed for pedestrian safety. If areas of granite curbs come apart they will put back in kind; the City has a stockpile of the material. They will maintain the historic curb line. Mr. Bovey explained the tree pits be opened a bit to allow expansion room for the trees on 2nd Avenue between James and Cherry.

Board Questions:

Mr. McConachie asked if this work would be coordinated with the tree being removed in front of the Alaska Building. It was determined that tree had already been removed and will be replaced before the paving project will begin and will have the expanded tree pit. Mr. McConachie advised applicant to be sure to coordinate so there is a consistent look on the street.

Mr. Bovey went on to explain how traffic works with parking and a primary issue is the traffic going west on James in the morning. He said the width is for the afternoon peak hour right turners at 3rd Avenue because there is a high volume of pedestrians. He explained that large trucks can make the turn as determined by "turn templates". The bulbs will be located throughout the corridor and they will use care to avoid the areaways and utilities with the ramps.

Mr. Ito stated the need for clearly defined lane makers so drivers would know where they are supposed to be.

Mr. Bovey explained there would be two 10' lanes so if one car is stopped another could pass it. In response to clarifying questions he explained that drain problems in the area – and specifically noted James St. - would be fixed in the course of doing this work.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca asked if both streets would be happening concurrently. Mr. Bovey responded they would as it would be the same contractor.

Jessica Murphy, SDOT, added that not all of both streets would be under construction at the same time; the contractor chooses the schedule which is approved by SDOT. She

said in regard to pedestrian traffic that all standard specifications would apply: three crossings must be open at any location and there must be detour signs. If a curb ramp is pulled out it has to be back within 5 days. There can be no more than one block of detour at any given time. They have limited weekend work when there are events.

Mr. Bovey explained that the number of closed lanes is limited; and a lot of work will be done on weekends and at night. There is a short window in how long an intersection can be closed.

Sara Jane Bellanca asked how they will coordinate work with game days. She expressed concern about all the upcoming construction in the area and its impacts on the businesses and residents.

Ms. Murphy stated there would be no work during the rush hour or during events. They will not be able to open up additional lane capacity during events because there will be a big hole in the ground – they will be reconstructing and not just repaving. The contractor can work there but they can't come and go or further impede traffic.

Ms. Bellanca requested that SDOT attend a PARC meeting (parking and access review for both stadiums and the neighborhoods – Pioneer Square, International District and Sodo).

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hasson asked about noise impacts and asked what provisions have been put into the contract. There are many area residents who will be impacted and contractors need to be informed of such.

Ms. Murphy explained they do adhere to the City's noise ordinance and at night have a noise variance. They have permission to perform some activities at night with mitigation for example, no beeping on trucks, no jack hammering or breaking of pavement, no two-way radio or yelling, no equipment idling and no sawcut joints to pavement.

Mr. Bovey explained they have a community communications person who would deal with the public and that more communication would be going on. The PSPB is on the list of contacts.

Mr. Ito asked that the community contact person be available at night and will be answering their phone. Ms. Murphy and Mr. Bovey said that is part of the requirement and the contractor has to hold an open house before the work begins so there is an opportunity for the public to talk to the contractor.

Mr. Hasson asked if they had gotten a blanket noise variance. Ms. Murphy said the variances are for 14-day increments and they will obtain 10 – 15 of them. It does require notifying residents of the work a minimum of 72 hours in advance. The contract states what work has to be done at night.

Mr. Ito explained that as the project is large geographically so the noise will not affect one building for 100% of the time. Mr. Murphy added that they will progress through the area in a logical manner.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval the project as presented per:

Code Citations:

District Rules:

II. Certificates of Approval for Use, Design and Demolition

A. General Requirements

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

G. Street Paving

H. Curbs

XVII Sidewalk Treatment

A Standards

SMC23.66.190 Streets and Sidewalks

MM/SC/LM/CP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

020409.22

Fourpoints Specialties

901 Occidental Ave S Suite 102

Summary of Application:

Change of Use from office to retail in 477 square foot space on the ground floor.

Ms. Nashem summarized the application and stated retail is a preferred ground floor use.

Applicant Comment:

Dave Pigeon explained the request to change the space from marketing office to a convenience store. In response to clarifying questions from a Board member he said there will be a intercom sign although the landlord does not allow additional signs on the building. The store will be open during all major events and there will be a sandwich board out front. They will also have a 24/7 website where people can order food and then pick it up. Game day events they will get a lot of foot traffic.

Mr. Ito stated that currently they are selling nothing but plan to sell numerous items when the change of use happens. He asked if carbonated beverages would be sold on the website.

Mr. Pigeon concurred and said they are stocked already and have a beer and wine license with the website geared specifically to beer and wine. He said the ability for someone to order online exists.

Mr. Ito asked if there was intent to have street vending as part of what the store supplies outside on Occidental.

Mr. Pigeon said they may be applying for a banquet permit where you can sit outside.

Mr. McConachie said it is an interesting retail concept and asked if it was happening at other places.

Mr. Pigeon said there are other specialty wine and beer shops around Seattle where you order online and then pick up.

Mr. McConachie clarified that this will be a little convenience store that is only open for big events - not daily - with longer extended hours on game days when there is foot traffic. He further clarified that the applicant would be applying for a street vending

permit for game days. He asked if there was a hook between this store and the large sign that is above.

Mr. Pigeon said it is going to be open 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. weekdays. Pick ups can be made when the store is open weekdays from 10:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. or by appointment. He concurred the sign would be up on both sides of the building.

Mr. McConachie stated that they need to sell on premise whatever the sign is advertising.

Mr. Pigeon confirmed.

Mr. McConachie said the store expands the variety of signs as long as it is carried in this enterprise.

Mr. Pigeon said correct. He reiterated the retail space supports the online entity.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca stated she never heard of anything like this before.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hasson stated the store exists just for the sign and that they wouldn't have the store if they weren't representing Pepsi and thought it odd to choose this site to be retail. He asked the applicant if they would have the retail store if they weren't selling Pepsi.

Mr. Pigeon said the only connection would be whatever is available in the store is open to the on premise signage guidelines that exist. The sign was grandfathered in years ago and is the only on premise sign in the City that is that large. He stated that other businesses in the building sell game products and those items could be advertised on the building now.

Mr. Hasson said that working for a property owner they have been approached regarding advertising signage and were told to “just sell the item in the building” in order to get approval for the sign. He asked Board members if the use should be changed “willy-nilly” to accommodate a request such as this – if we say “its retail” does that make it retail? It may not be up to the Board to make the determination, the sign ordinance will have more to say over how this works but it seems odd.

Ms. Nashem explained that when the sign inspector does inspect they will determine if it is a legitimate business or not.

Mr. Pigeon stated that while other businesses may occupy a building for the sole purpose of having signage on the building, they are not doing so. He said their business would be there for a long time. One reason the location was chosen was because of the ability to advertise on the building and also in an urban environment people are more likely to order on the web.

Mr. Ito asked Ms. Nashem if the sign inspector would verify that the business is still in existence and is a viable retail operation. Ms. Nashem confirmed that was correct.

Board members expressed concern that the store was being created in an effort to have the sign on the building. When asked if the web site was up and running the applicant

stated it was but they were still finishing it; he didn't think any orders had gone through the website yet.

Mr. McConachie clarified that when Mr. Pigeon stated that "the facility is stocked" he meant that beer and wine are stored somewhere in the building.

Mr. Pigeon said yes that there was a full office space but there was a cooler full of product, wine and beer.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for a change of use from office to retail in 477 square foot space as identified on the plans:

Code Citations:

II. Certificates of Approval for Use, Design and Demolition

B. Use Approval

SMC 23.66.130 Street Level Approval

B Preferred Street Level Uses

MM/SC/RH/AB 5:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Person and Mr. Hasson opposed.

020409.23

Wall Sign

Squire Center Building

901 Occidental Ave S

Summary of Application:

Remove existing vinyl signage, clean masonry, seal masonry and paint masonry
Install new signage copy on the North wall

ARC Report: ARC members reviewed the plans, renderings and specs provided. ARC members thought the pink back ground color was too bright and incompatible with the district especially as combined with the large graphic letters and thought they might not approve it on a regular conforming business sign either if it were proposed. Board requested to see alternative colors or shades and to see the actual color on the proposed mesh. ARC requested they provide the mesh they plan to use in the color they plan to use, as they did not plan to use the vinyl they submitted. ARC members expressed that size of the sign would catch attention so therefore the color could be more subtle. The applicants said the proposed sign would be up for six months.

Genna Nashem reported that the removing of the old sign, cleaning, sealing and painting as well as installation of the sign frame had already been done. The applicant said that they used Palmolive as a cleanser and did it by hand. ARC members said that they were not familiar with the sealing product used. The spec sheet provided did not say that it was recommended on brick. ARC members were concerned that the product contained silica and questioned if it was breathable. ARC requested more information about the product used.

The applicants said the glue from the previous sign had corroded the brick. ARC expressed concern that painting it could have exacerbated the problem and requested an analysis from a masonry expert on how the brick should be treated.

Mr. Pigeon passed out information on the sealer and information he had received from Fairweather Masonry.

Ms. Nashem stated the work had been done without approval; if the method was not appropriate the Board can require it be redone.

Ms Hinden expressed concern about the sealer used, that nothing states that the product is actually breathable. She said the Ultra Proof data sheet the applicant provided stated the product is a permanent waterproof barrier; the Park Service Preservation Brief states that waterproof coating should never be applied to historic masonry.

Mr. Pigeon stated that Fairweather (Masonry) approved it and he got an online review of Ultra Proof that used brick as an example. He said it is a water based product.

Ms. Person asked if there was a differentiation between new brick and historic brick.

Mr. Ito stated that historic brick may be constructed differently and is more porous and brittle as well as older and that in general you don't want a seal on any brick because you don't want to trap moisture in the brick. The brick should be permeable because there is vapor in the building that needs to move through the wall and out. Old brick had no sealer; drafts coming through the wall would dry up any moisture.

When asked why sealer was applied Mr. Pigeon stated his understanding is that it was going to help strengthen the brick and the wall face.

Mr. McConachie expressed concern about when the brick starts spalling; when it fails it is a problem. The center of bricks is not baked as hard as the finished exterior shell.

Mr. Ito stated brick is like a tooth and the outer baked shell is like the enamel; once the outside is destroyed it will just destroy the inner core of the brick. There is some logic to sealing if the brick has been sandblasted and that outer shell removed.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca said that there is a possibility that the brick on the side and back are not face brick. She said it is a pretty building and it is too bad.

Board Discussion:

The Board determined they had enough information.

Staff Report: This is a non-conforming legal on-premises wall sign. Board can review for color compatibility to the District.

DPD makes the final determination as to if the business is a legitimate business and the sign meets the definition of on- premises signage.

Mr. Ito explained ARC had asked for additional colors. Mr. Pigeon said got other colors from other campaigns but did not bring them. He said the sign is only up through the end of June and Spring and Summer are colorful times of year. He said the alternative color that has been used in other parts of the country is a "brick-esque" red. The color is tied to the campaign and branding. He showed the color proof.

Ms. Nashem said that the applicant was supposed to bring a sample on the mesh.

Mr. Pigeon said everything appears faded on mesh because of the light coming through the back.

Mr. Ito advised that if the sign inspector takes this “approved” sign rendering and puts it up to the sign and it is not the same color it will have to be removed because it would not be approved. He asked the applicant if he confirmed that to be the actual color.

Mr. Pigeon confirmed it is the color.

Mr. Hester said the Board needs a true sample or a sample from the actual printer to eliminate error. SMC Standards state that “the relationship of the proposed sign should be compatible with the colors of the building and other approved signs in the area.” He said the pink is definitely out and that the red, although bolder than any brick red one would see, it would be more compatible by comparison.

Mr. Pigeon asked about a digital sign on the side of Qwest Field that was allowed. Ms. Nashem responded that it was not in this District.

Mr. Hester further cited the SMC Standards and said “the color in the graphic should be compatible with the character of the District.” He clarified “the District” being Pioneer Square. Comparatively speaking he was more comfortable with this sign than the previous proposal.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ito reminded the applicant that if the sign inspector brings the color sample provided up to the sign and it doesn’t match it would have to be removed.

Mr. Hester suggested the applicant could provide a true sample.

Mr. Pigeon said true samples cost \$5000.00.

Mr. Ito reiterated that the color, if put up next to the wall, should match.

Ms. Person wanted the color number or name.

Mr. Ito stated that CMYK info is referenced on the sheet but it wasn’t readable.

Ms. Nashem asked if Pepsi would be sold in the store.

Mr. Pigeon said yes.

Mr. Ito asked if it would be sold on the web.

Mr. Pigeon didn’t know.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the removal of existing signage, cleaning, sealing and painting on the North wall and for the installation of new on-premises wall sign copy on the North wall as amended with the revised red-ish coloring according to the provided sample. The application included installation of a new galvanized sign frame mounted in the mortar. The sign will be installed for a period of 6 months. All per: as presented per

Code Citations:

II. Certificates of Approval for Use, Design and Demolition

B.General Requirements

SMC 23.66.160 Signs C.1 d. and g.
Secretary of Interior Standards 7 and 9
Guidelines for the Treatment of Masonry
Preservation Brief 1: Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments
for Historic Masonry Buildings
Preservation Brief 6: Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic
Buildings

MM/SC/RH/AB

4:3:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Brown, Person and
Hinden opposed.

020409.3 BOARD BUSINESS

020409.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Doug Ito, Chair

020409.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227