



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 31/08

DATE: February 6, 2008
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Doug Ito
Ryan Hester
Adam Hasson
Lorne McConachie
Ann Brown
Catherine Person
John De Lanoy

Staff:

Sarah Sordt
Karen Gordon
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Rick Friedhoff
Alex Bennett
David Strauss

Doug Ito, Chair called the meeting to order at 9:03

Date: Wednesday, February 6, 2008
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: City Hall, 600 4th Ave.
Boards & Commissions Room, #L280

020608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Deferred to next meeting.

020608.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

020608.21 **1016 First Ave S** Ed Linardic

Install seismic bracing

ARC Report: ARC members reviewed three different bracing schemes. Mr. Disalvo, project engineer, explained that the cement walls are heavy and need lateral supports. He said moment frames are too flexible. He said that they are not able to move the bracing further back because it needs to be attached to the foundation. He confirmed that in the plans the bracing is set back four feet. After gaining an understanding of the bracing requirements, ARC members felt that the original plan number 4.0 was the most

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

appropriate plan because the symmetry of the design coordinated with the symmetry of the building. ARC recommends approval of the seismic bracing as drawn in plan 4.0.

Staff Report: No staff report

Ed Linardic presented a bracing plan based on the ARC recommendations.

There was no public comment.

Board Questions: Mr. Hester asked if the bracing would be painted. Mr. Linardic said that it would be painted a dark color to help it disappear.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval to install seismic bracing as presented per Code Citations:

- District Rules-
- III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction.
- XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
 - A. Transparency regulations
- SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design
- Secretary of Interior's Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10

MM/SC/LM/CP

7:0:0

Motion carried.

020608.22

Utilikilts

Christian Jacobson

620 First Ave

Install permanent signage,
Design changes to previously approved alterations to the storefront

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the material of the letters for the permanent sign. Some members questioned the durability and quality of the foam core and suggested the applicant explore more sturdy options such as Lexon. ARC did not make a recommendation about including the logo. Overall they said they thought the storefront seemed busy with all the signs but some members suggested it was the neon open sign that was out of place. Mr. Jacobson said that they had added the metal covering to the window frames at the suggestion of a former ARC member but would consider not applying the metal to the windows. ARC members asked the applicant to provide another rendering that uses metal only at the bulk head and the sign band for comparison. Mr. Jacobson said that the application of the metal is reversible. ARC confirmed that metal is allowed in the code but that they needed to determine if as used, it fits into the character of the district. Applicant will bring an alternative rendering to the Board meeting and additional photo showing the storefront in context of its surroundings. ARC did not make a recommendation at this time.

Staff Report: On October 18, 2006 PSPB approved a Certificate of Approval to remove the awning and replaced the non-original storefront with a new storefront. The wood bulkhead was to be applied with stucco and painted. On March 29 2007, Utilikilts was sent a letter stating that they needed to submit an application for the design of a storefront different than what was approved October 18, 2006 and the signage they had put up without a COA. They submitted an application which was reviewed at the

May 30, 2007 ARC meeting. At the time of review, the applicant indicated that they intended to submit an application for permanent signage that included more metal to the sign band. ARC suggested adding more detail to the storefront and incorporating the metal sign band in to the storefront design. ARC discussed the use of metal. Although ARC members acknowledged that the metal fascia was different than what traditionally has been used in Pioneer Square, that metal was an allowed material in the code. ARC, however, ask that the storefront alterations be tabled and the applicant bring back the storefront design incorporating their sign band and permanent sign plans so that it could be reviewed as a whole. On June 6, 2007 the Board approved a COA for the temporary signage only. The application meets District Rules for letter height. The Board should also consider SMC 23.66.160 Signs 4. for determining appropriate size and number of the signs.

Applicant Comments: Christian Jacobsen passed out an alternative plan. He said the ARC suggested Exhibit B; Board members agreed the design was too heavy if it included the vertical stanchions as well as the sign band at the top and the kick plate at the bottom. He said they scaled back the original design to just the sign band and kick plate of the bulkhead.

Mr. Ito said that the ARC also suggested keeping signage and bulkhead metal looking like it was an applied material that could be removed versus something that was all encompassing on the storefront. The Board discussed the logo along with the “Open” sign as being too busy; Ms. Person said she likes the sign and logo and thinks the silver will stand out; she recommended keeping the logo sign and getting rid of the “Open” sign. Mr. Jacobsen said they have display lighting behind the sign band that lights up the mannequins but if they just had a metal sign light that when open they would just shine a light on it. Mr. Hasson said the context is a distinctive and stark change to the facade but the color worked well with the neighborhood. Mr. McConachie said the context is understated relative to some of the others in the neighborhood.

There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval permanent business signage and design changes to the storefront with metal applied to the bulkhead and sign band per Code Citations:

- District Rules-
- III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction.
- XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
 - B. General Signage regulations
 - C. Specific Signage regulations
 - 1. Letter size
 - 2. Sign Bands
- SMC23.66.160 Signs C 1 and 4
- SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design
- Secretary of Interior’s Standards 2, 3, 9 and 10
- Guidelines for Treatment of Storefronts

MM/SC/AH/AB

7:0:0

020608.23

James Harris Gallery
312 Second Ave South

Tova Cubert

Install a wall with a glass ribbon behind the northern window box

ARC Report: ARC members reviewed the plans provided. ARC members requested additional floor plans as well as floor plans in the same scale to clearly show how the wall with the glass will affect transparency. The applicant said the wall is two feet from the front window where the window ledge ends and that the window starts about four feet off the ground. The applicant said that art on the wall would be visible through the window. The applicant said that he wanted the office space to be up front so that he could greet customers and still have a space for some privacy. Although some Board members thought that the design did not provide transparency, others felt it did. Most Board members wanted to review the additional drawings before making a determination. ARC did not make a recommendation.

Staff Report: The Board should determine if the wall with the glass meets transparency rules as follows: *“To provide street level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment and promotes public safety, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be obscured by tinting, frosting, etching, window coverings including but not limited to window film, draperies, shades, or screens, extensive signage, or other means.”*

Ms. Cubert brought a model and two new renderings with a view from the street at two different angles. Mr. Ito said that the Board does not normally approve putting an office in a storefront. Ms. Cubert referred to renderings and to a model which she referred to as a “box”; she said the wall is proposed to go right up against the window “box” on the northern bay in the storefront. Ms. Cubert said the window is counter height which creates a ribbon of windows that continues in the reception area. She pointed to the drawing showing what a pedestrian would view inside: glass, door, art hanging on the office wall, and the entry vestibule.

Mr. DeLanoy asked what the ARC recommendation was. Mr. Ito said ARC gave no recommendation and requested more information.

Ms. Person said that it is nice to bring this forward to board as another local gallery, Foster White, did not. Mr. Ito said the Foster White alteration was a non approved change to storefront.

Mr. DeLanoy said the guidelines say visibility must not be obscured and that we are not supposed to do this. He said that it seems like a stretch, like a lot of wall. Mr. McConachie said that he agrees and disagrees and it comes back to the notion of a jewelry case being a large display to focus on 3 small items and that is part of display. He said the Board must be careful of getting in the way of artistic manipulation of the way we view things and because there is a level of transparency, it is framed, focused and he thinks this is OK. Mr. Ito said he agrees but it is different from a jewelry store because there the eye is focused to something and here one is just looking into a room.

Ms. Cubert said they are creating a window: She said that it is Jim Harris’s gallery, his name and he is in the window and is accessible and part of the identity of the gallery. One can see the mechanism of running the gallery and see art moving around the space. The action is up front; one can see the commerce of the space and it is important to see

how he runs his gallery. Mr. Ito asked if “Jim Harris as performance art” is enough to pass the District Rules.

Mr. Hasson said the model exaggerates how much is obscured but looking at the floor plan it is set back. He said it won’t be as impactful once it is built because of the set back; it is an exciting change and that mixing display with business is not meant to obscure but to encourage people to look at it. Ms. Cubert said seeing people inside is much more inviting. Mr. DeLanoy said he thinks it is interesting and aesthetically pleasing but that it is not consistent with the guidelines.

Mr. Hester said that he appreciates the location of the office and the integration of art with office space but even art is going to be obscured with window head and the jambs. He said the design would be improved if it were only a partial height wall and if the office wasn’t fully enclosed; it would drastically change the feel of the entrance of the gallery but also the transparency from the street. Ms. Cubert said the art in the office isn’t meant to be part of a show; people would come into the gallery to see a show.

Mr. DeLanoy asked about alternative locations for the office. Ms. Cubert said that if the office were in the back they would need to push the reception up which would be similar to this configuration. She said the office being in the back changes the dynamic of how Jim operates his business. She said she understands transparency and feels like this plan is an attempt to compromise so that there is some privacy and yet he is part of the front.

Mr. Ito said there was a graphic discrepancy in the drawings; the elevation has height but no length and they need that. In one elevation it looks large and in the other it looks smaller so one of the drawings is wrong. Ms. Cubert said the drawings were done quickly and showed the model as being “true” and that the drawings show a perspective that is off.

Mr. Ito asked what the exact size of the piece of glass was, as it isn’t on the drawing. Ms. Brown offered a measuring tape and the wall was measured. Mr. McConachie said using 1/4” scale the wall is roughly 3’ 3”. Ms. Cubert said it is 42” tall. Mr. McConachie said it is out of the 5’ opening, 3’3” is the piece of glass. Mr. Ito asked Ms. Cubert to add the dimensions to the drawings. Ms. Cubert amended the drawings to show correct size of glass.

There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval to install a wall with clear glass behind the window box per Code Citations:

- District Rules-
- III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction.
- XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
 - A. Transparency regulations
- SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design
- Secretary of Interior’s Standards 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10
- Guidelines for Treatment of Storefronts

MM/SC/CP/AB

4:3:0 (Messrs. DeLanoy, Ito, and Hester opposed)

020608.24

Wall Sign

Robert James

South side of 1020 First Ave S – F and O Building

Install new sign copy with 14' X 48' direct application vinyl

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the rendering of the sign and recommended approval.

Staff Report: The wall sign is “grandfathered” or would not be allowed by code today. The Board reviews the sign colors but not content and reviews to assure that it remains 14' X 42' in size.

There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the wall sign per

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

MM/SC/JD/LM

7:0:0 Motion carried.

020608.25

Earth Class Mail

Jessica Grimes

93 S Jackson – Merrill Place

Install signage

ARC Report: ARC reviewed drawings and renderings. ARC members thought the vinyl signage in the transom windows obscures the transom windows as an architectural feature and recommended the applicant remove the transom signage from their proposal. ARC suggested that the “.COM” could be moved to the signage in the window below. The applicant will prepare a new rendering omitting the signage in the transom windows. ARC recommends approval if revised to omit the transom window signage.

Staff Report: If the revised application still includes the signage in the transom windows the Board should consider SMC 23.66.160 Signs 1 “the relationship of the shape of the proposed sign to the architecture of the building.” The Board should also consider SMC 23.66.160 Signs 4 for determining appropriate size of the sign. The sign’s letter height meets District Rules.

Mr. Ito said the ARC recommended approval if the transom signage were removed. He told the applicant that sandwich board signage needs to go through the ARC.

Ms. Grimes said that the Post Office next door has raised letters on brick; since they no longer have the upper signage they will be doing an application to do that as well.

There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for signage as amended per Code

Citations:

District Rules-

XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

B. Transparency regulations

C. General Signage regulations

D. Specific Signage regulations

1. Letter size
SMC 23.66.160 Signs 1 and 4

MM/SC/RH/JD

7:0 Motion carried.

Mr. DeLanoy left at 9:50 a.m.

020608.3 BOARD BUSINESS

011608.31 **Briefing regarding the Livable South Downtown Planning Study-** Susan McLain

Staff Report:

Briefings to the PSPB were held August 18, 2004, Oct 11, 2006, Dec 20, 2006, Jan 3, 2007, Nov 21, 2007, and Feb, 6 2008.

Summary of previous briefings:

August 18, 2004

Comments:

The Board wanted to encourage economic development, and especially residential development, but not at the expense of the historic district.

Oct 11, 2006

Recommendations:

Address the elevator penthouse issue. Look at 201 Yesler. Current height is not sufficient.

Don't put redevelopment pressure on historic buildings through increases in allowable height for those buildings.

Address problem of parking located at the street level. Solutions may include lower height limits for properties below a particular elevation (in and near the tidal zone), or require that parking be located off-site if a developer wants height above the minimum.

Do not necessarily retain 75% housing provision, particularly for historic buildings. Goal of the TDR program should be preservation, not housing.

Questions or outstanding issues:

The Board wanted to see analysis of costs for heights by using data/ feedback from mid-size developers.

TDR options, including the problem of City not funding the program downtown.

12/20/06

Comments:

The Board supported encouraging development of vacant sites by allowing some heights. No specific height was suggested.

Discourage "demolition by neglect" on sites where height limits have been increased because owners may want to demolish an existing structure and rebuild a taller structure.

Recommendations:

Consider the context of the lot rather than uniform heights in Pioneer Square. The Board agreed that assigning site specific heights would be politically difficult.

01/03/07

Comments:

The Board said they would be in favor of incentives to build on vacant property but wanted to make sure that there would be no incentives that directly or indirectly incentivize demolition of historic properties.

Recommendations:

The Board preferred a lower height limit on First Ave if raising height limits in other areas of Pioneer Square.

The board discussed the possibility of having “block by block” or “area by area” re-zoning so that each building proposal is considered in its own context.

Removing the variable “no building shall exceed by more than 15 feet the height of the tallest adjacent structure” may encourage development.

The Board was supportive of limiting the increase of height to non-contributing properties.

Questions or outstanding issues:

Some Board members were distracted with details of the sample building rather than looking at the building image as sample for bulk and scale and recommended the images be wire frame rather than photo images.

11/21/07

Recommendations:

Consider the impact of increase transportation demands, especially if transportation increases demand more Metro layovers or further restricts on street parking.

Questions or outstanding issues:

A Board member thought that the three approaches seemed to be a “blanket” approach and thought that they should look at the context of different sites. During the briefing on Oct 11, 2006 the Board saw images of some sample potential developments in context of the site’s location. The Board asked to see samples for the preferred alternative.

The Board wanted more information about how TDRs would actually work in order to comment if they would provide adequate incentives. One Board member suggested that TDRs be enhanced to be incentive for more developers than just those providing low income housing.

Items the Board should consider in providing comments to guide toward a preferred alternative during the 2/6/08 briefing:

Have all the outstanding questions from previous briefings been addressed?

All alternatives remove the provision for getting extra height for providing 75% housing. This was recommended in the October 11, 2006 briefing.

All alternatives remove the “not 15 feet taller than the adjacent buildings” condition. This was recommended January 3, 2007.

As recommended in several previous briefings the height increase would only be applicable to non-contributing properties.

Each of the alternatives identifies area with different heights, considering each of the alternatives and the sites possible for development, which heights seem most appropriate? Why? (Alt. 2 is broken down to more areas but also includes some of the tallest heights)

Alt 2 would decrease heights along First Ave from 85' to 100.' There is only one potential site in that area, is that breakdown necessary?

If a combination of alternatives was developed, which areas would you include?

If the height increase is for the non-contributing properties, what would be the height limit for contributing properties? If the height for contributing properties was its "historic height" would that limit pressure on those buildings. Could it also be a hindrance?

Do you understand how the TDR would work? Are there certain provisions you want to see included?

What do you think of taller heights in the "over the tracks locations?" How does that effect the transition to the ID?

What specific recommendations do you have to transportation and parking?

The alternative discussed in the EIS can be reviewed at the link below.

http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/South_Downtown/Environmental_Impact_Statement/default.asp

Briefing:

Ms. McLain said that Ms. Nashem had developed a summary of key issues for discussion. Ms. McLain said she would provide an overview with where they are headed and address Ms. Nashem's questions. She said she has issued the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and has received comments and they are preparing the response. She expects to publish the final EIS in March and that will include a preferred alternative for zoning and land use regulations. It will include some plan level discussion as well as description of specific zoning and land use changes and programmatic changes such as TDR. They are expecting a public meeting to ask for formal feedback and move toward final recommendations and then to submit to City Council mid-year.

Ms. McLain said they had four alternatives in the Draft EIS; Ms. Nashem summarized in the staff report commentary the Board has offered in past. Ms. McLain said that Ms. Nashem addressed items the board should consider and provide comments to guide toward a preferred alternative.

Ms. McLain said there are three main zoning areas: the Pioneer Square Mix 100, the 100-120 height with a higher concentration of residential, and the PSN 85/120 in the southern portion that covers the stadium north lot and area just west of stadium so a project can get to 120' in height with 75% residential use in the building. She talked about varied height limits with the intention of being familiar or similar height to adjacent historic properties. She said most of the area is close to 100' in height. She said an alternative to explore is the possibility of more standard height limitation in the middle part of Pioneer Square – around 100 feet. For properties that are not

contributing to the National Historic Register District they are exploring the possibility of allowing an additional 30 feet height up to 130 feet if they choose to participate in the public amenities bonus type program that is being developed for south downtown area. There is a resolution going through council to standardize some aspects of the bonus program so that at least 60% of those bonus dollars would be directed toward affordable workforce housing, 80 – 100% of median income range. She said the other percentage could be gained through other programs. She said there has been a lot of interest in a TDR program that applies to historic buildings in south downtown. She said open space TDR is another option a developer could choose for a non-housing portion.

Mr. Ito said that when you label it “public amenities” the implication is the public will be able to use that amenity. What that amenity is needs to be very clear: “For public good” and “For the public” are two very different things especially when you say “public space”.

Ms. McLain said she is consulting with the law department about this because “public open space” is a tricky issue. At this point if they can show direct impact of development on publicly accessible open space opportunities then it might be possible they can require public access open space. If green street open space TDR can have certain provisions that allow the property owner to control that open space, it might be adjacent to the street.

Mr. Ito said we need to be clear on maximum height limit. Ms. McLain said 130 feet. In the code there are provisions for roof top features for elevator penthouses and other rooftop features but it would be dealt with separately.

Mr. Ito said he wants it to be very clear in the code what governs, if maximum zone governs then that needs to be clear in the code and that we need to be very clear in language.

Mr. McConachie said we need to be careful that the TDRs are not transferred out of Pioneer Square neighborhood. Mr. Hasson said one could buy historic tax credits so buildings in Pioneer Square could be rehabilitated. Ms. McLain said they are working closely with Ms Gordon on TDRs.

There was discussion about the need to be careful to not put undo pressure to cause properties fall in disrepair then be torn down. The Board thought to prevent “facadectomy” and demolition by neglect the TDR project dollars would need to be applied toward renovation of buildings pending approval by the Board. In general the Board wants to retain a lower height limit; with buildings along First Avenue corridor being the lowest. Ms. McLain said the Board has authority to deny demolition and has ultimate review authority as to how buildings are changed and there is a certain level of satisfaction that the review process is strong enough to prevent “facadectomy” and demolition by neglect.

Mr. Ito said that the stronger language the better. Ms. McLain said she tried to craft overall package that addresses different aspects. She questioned the percent of residential above base height. Mr. Hasson said in the Pioneer Square historic core there is no requirement for buildings to be 75% residential. Ms. McLain said the board has been studying whether change would add additional height to non-

contributing buildings and if it should have resident use preference for upper floors or just allow whatever comes along, commercial, mixed over other use.

Mr. McConachie asked how that will manifest itself, if it is stated requirement of development if height limits are exceeded or are there additional bonuses that come with that. He said Pioneer Square needs more residents but it also needs more vitality; he doesn't want to lose other vibrant businesses.

Ms. McLain said a mechanism in the current zoning is, if you want to access bonus, it must be 75% residential. Another option could be that if one wants to access the bonus height, then equivalent of the floor area above the base needs to be a percentage in residential use. Another option would be more of a laissez-faire attitude to allow height but require participation in the bonus program.

There was discussion about how this zoning works in other historic districts. Mr. Clowers said that San Diego, Denver and San Francisco favored strong intensive mix of uses that includes residential near ballparks and it seems successful; none of them are as constrained by a historic district as this area is.

Mr. Hasson asked how much land we are talking about; if it is just a few parcels why put a lot of constraints on them.

Mr. Clowers said during certain periods there are more demands for commercial and at other times more demands for residential. Mr. Ito agrees that office use also brings its own vitality of life so Pioneer Square should be a mix. He said if the intent is to encourage infill we don't want to foreclose on any viable options. South of King Street on the east side of First Avenue they are not looking at changing the 85/120 zone.

The Board discussed the area at the east edge of the neighborhood. Ms. McLain said there is an interest by a developer in developing the area over the tracks. She said it brings up many issues about height, bulk and scale and what kind of uses might be most appropriate and there might be an option for a planned community development.

Mr. Hasson said planned community development allows the City more latitude and opportunity to define public priorities and asked about heights in that area.

Ms. McLain said the tunnel entry has been identified as a historic contributing site and that we need a survey on historic resources. She said they want to look at the area within 50 feet of King Street tower to make sure heights are low to bring focus to the tower. When talking to the Board in the past she said what they'd heard was on the edges of Pioneer Square take a look at incentives for redevelopment and height. They have been exploring the northern portion of the over tracks area (which is in Pioneer Square mix zoning) for the possibility of 150 feet in height in that area. In this area Burlington Northern wants sixty feet open space over tracks for emergency access. She said they are also looking at up to 180 feet in height in the southern portion as well.

Mr. Ito said it is hard to comprehend what that looks like and said it would be nice to have a more detailed look at this section. Ms. McLain said it has a different set of priorities akin to North Lot.

Mr. Clower said it was represented in some of the public view section of the EIS where they showed a highest case scenario.

Mr. Hasson said the City is heading toward tall and skinny; he is concerned about too much bulk because we are creating a box that is 180 or 150 and not allowing that box to shrink in exchange for a little more height. He wants to make sure we are not proscriptively saying it has to be a big box when the rest of the city is going in a different direction and asked do we want to wall off our community with boxes. He said if the code is written so everyone has to build a box then that is what they will build, or if code is written so they have to build 150 but you can have a tower that is 300, that would be a different code, which is where the city is heading.

Ms. McLain said this is a tough area because the site is constrained with unique technological issues and in order to get a pretty decent floor size it is tough to figure out how that will work. She said they will put forward some proposed bulk controls in plan so early discussions can happen.

Mr. Hasson asked where they were headed in the International District, specifically the hill behind Pioneer Square. Ms. McLain said they are looking at a couple different zones: a residentially focused IDR zone and ID mix 100' base up to 200' with strict build controls retaining basically the same heights and increased set backs east-west along Washington and Main Streets to allow views.

Ms. Gordon asked that board see preferred alternatives prior to submission.

There was no public comment.

020608.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair
No report

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227