



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 9609

DATE: April 15, 2009
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

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

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

John DeLanoy
Catherine Person

Chair Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

041509.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Draft minutes of April 1, 2009 were postponed.

041509.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Mr. Ito asked that Board members announced any need for recusal on any of the applications. Ms. Hinden recused herself from the Palmer Court; Mr. Hasson from Elliott Bay Café; and Mr. Ito recused himself from King County Courthouse.

041509.21 219 S Washington

Withdrawn

041509.26 Daily Journal of Commerce Building

83 Columbia St

Summary of Application: Change of Use from retail to office

Ms. Nashem introduced Carolyn Geise and Henry Walters, architects and explained the application for Change of Use from retail to office and for alterations to the storefronts including new windows and structural supports.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Mr. Ito said there was a lot of discussion at ARC about the Change of Use which were all for valid reasons for either keeping it retail/commercial or changing it to office. Mr. Ito reported ARC requested a sample of the glass to see the tinting and a sample similar to the windows to remain for comparison.

Applicant Comment:

Carolyn Geise explained that the main floor currently has three tenant spaces; two are offices and one that is empty they want to lease as an office. They want to establish uses of the spaces and thinks they will have more potential to lease space as office space. She said they understand the transparency requirement.

Ms. Nashem said the 6,567 square foot office space is 18% of the block and explained that office space over 3,000 square feet is a discouraged use. The Board can approve a discouraged use if they think it will be compatible with uses preferred at street level but the Board can do that only if the proposed use is less than 50% of the street frontage and confirmed the street frontage is less than 50%.

Ms. Geise stated that she did not think the neighborhood was pedestrian-oriented with the viaduct on one side, a garage on another, and a big store on the other which makes it difficult to lease to retail.

Mr. Ito asked if the print shop is an established use.

Mr. Walter said it was; it has been there for over 100 years. The Ikon Development space is currently used as office.

Ms. Geise clarified the office use is not established for that space.

Ms. Nashem explained that technically this would be an establishment of use rather than a change.

Mr. Ito clarified that the applicant wanted use established at 79 Columbia Street and 85 Columbia Street as office; Ikon Development at 622 Western as office; and leave the DJC Printing Presses as is. It would be a permanent change of use but if they get a retail tenant they would change the use back to retail.

Mr. Hasson said discouraged use can be allowed if it is compatible with uses nearby.

Mr. Ito noted the steam plant nearby.

She thought if retail came here it would be a larger furniture store but didn't think that would happen any time soon.

Ms. Nashem said where temporary use has been done before it has been at the request of the applicant because they planned to be in the location temporarily and it is difficult for this Board to impose "temporary" on the application if they are not requesting it.

Discussion ensued about "temporary use" and it was suggested this use be tied to the tenant.

Ms. Geise said that when the market changes there would be incentive to go back to retail. She said the owner would be amenable to tying the use to the tenant.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca understood the request and thought the viaduct coming down would impact them. As long as the process for re-establishing retail is there, these times require a bit of leeway.

Board Comment:

Ms. Doherty said the use isn't incompatible. Having a tenant in the space is positive.

Mr. Ito concurred with Ms. Doherty and said having the space occupied until better times happen or the viaduct comes down is preferred and the office use isn't necessarily incompatible.

Mr. McConachie said that he would prefer to see office there then nothing.

Ms. Nashem stated it would be in the minutes that the applicant said the owner agreed to link the request for office use for the life of the tenant.

Ms. Geise asked if it was three different tenants, it would be for the life of each one.

Ms. Nashem concurred.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for change of use from retail to office in the locations as designated on drawing A1.0 per

Code Citations:

SMC23.66.130 C.2 and D.1

with the caveat that three spaces referenced on the drawing shall be office use for the term of the primary tenancy of each space or the combined spaces.

MM/SC/LM/AB

7:0:0 Motion carried.

Applicant Comment:

Summary of Application: Alterations to the storefronts including new windows and structural supports

Mr. Ito explained ARC asked for a display board in order to clearly understand what was being replaced and removed on the elevations; the applicant has done that.

Ms. Geise explained to access the masonry to support the arches, it requires taking out some storefronts. They are leaving the ones that appear to be original where structural support is not necessary and they wanted to bring the building back to its historic appearance. She said they propose to use insulated glass windows. On existing windows they propose to replace the film with a newer non-reflective film.

Mr. Walters explained the film matches well with the low E-glass.

Mr. Ito clarified it was for the heat gain and light glare.

Ms. Geise concurred and said the issue of shades will come up separately if someone needs a sun shade.

Mr. Walters said they wanted to make the building more energy compliant and the tint they showed is the typical low-E coating.

Mr. Ito stated clear glass is desired in the storefronts rather than tinted. It currently has film that was probably not approved.

Mr. Walters asked if insulated glass was not a requirement in historic buildings and if plate glass could be used.

Mr. Ito said the Board could help by stating the glass has historic merit. This Board has pushed for clear glass and even single pane.

Mr. McConachie asked about the doors and adjacent relites – if the applicant knew what the original doors were.

Mr. Walters stated the old photos are not clear. Mr. Walters stated the drawing was incorrect and that openings 2 and 6 should have matching panels. He said that they assume the door at opening 8 is original.

Ms. Doherty asked about the structure repairs made to the stone headers.

Mr. Walters said there had been some emergency shoring. A structural engineer saw a crack at the beam seat and temporary shoring had been installed while they sought approval of the permanent repairs. He said the grout on the arches in bays 1 – 8 is deteriorated and is crumbling; they need to pick it out and re-grout the arches.

Mr. McConachie clarified they will be doing tuck pointing in the lintels of all the openings – except for bay 9.

Mr. Walters concurred. He said the grout would match existing in color and the structural engineer would spec an appropriately hard one.

Ms. Geise said the structural engineer is Ira Gross who is knowledgeable but if the Board wanted to provide any specific instructions to let her know.

Mr. McConachie said a real hard mortar acts differently and over time can not move the way the old mortar did.

Mr. Ito said that a cut sheet on the grout to be used should be brought to ARC for approval before the work was done.

Mr. Hester asked if the bracing is visible from outside.

Mr. Walters directed members to the drawings and said some cutting has to occur at the concrete beam seat. He explained that he did not expect the cement to show but if it did it could be painted to match the stone.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca asked for clarification on the glass.

Mr. Ito said they have proposed a tinted low-E glass storefront with film for the balance of the work that is not being replaced.

Ms. Bellanca stated that from where she was sitting the glass looked green.

Board Comment:

Ms. Doherty said the Polson Building provides some sun blockage and asked if there was a heat gain issue on the west side.

Ms. Geise said there is some afternoon sun but the really hot late afternoon sun does not get in.

The Board discussed the use of film on the windows. Ms. Geise said awnings have not been considered. This project came out of an emergency repair that has grown.

Mr. Ito said prefers clear no tint glass.

Mr. Hasson said the code is clear: clear glass with no tint, no film covering and single pane is preferred.

Ms. Hinden concurred with Mr. Hasson.

Board members concurred that the paint color is compatible with the neighborhood and building.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of structural supports, new window with windows to be clear glass and painting per

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction
D. Color

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 6, 9, and 10
Guidelines for Treatment of Storefronts

Brief 11: Rehabilitating Historic Storefronts

with the condition the applicant brings back grout specifications and details to ARC.

MM/SC/LM/AB

7:0:0 Motion carried.

041509.22

Elliot Bay Café

Globe Building
101 S Main Street

Mr. Hasson recused himself.

Installation of business signage

Ms. Nashem explained the application is for installation of business signage.

Mr. Ito said ARC asked the applicant to submit drawings that showed the new proposal. ARC discussed that this is not exactly a valance sign because the awning does not have a valance however if it did the signage would be permitted. ARC also asked for a photo of the A Board so that it could also be reviewed.

Applicant Comment:

Tamara Murphy, restaurant owner, didn't have the photo of the A-Board sign but said it is exactly 47" tall.

Mr. Ito said she would have to come back for the A-Board sign because the Board needs to see it in order to make a decision. Mr. Ito said ARC recommended approval of the sign on the awning.

Public Comment: There was no public comment:

Board discussion:

Ms. Brown thought it was a good idea to encourage use of this location; she supported the application.

Ms. Doherty said ARC was mostly in agreement that graphically and from a color standpoint it was consistent with the District and the building. It complies with signage criteria other than it was difficult to define – it is not a valance and it is not a blade.

Mr. McConachie said it is important to have on record that this is an exceptional place because it is down below so this is not a precedent for all signs but considers the particular location for this particular enterprise.

Mr. Ito concurred.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for signage as presented per
Code Citations:
District Rules XXX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
B General Sign Regulations
C 1Letter Size, 3 Projecting Elements
SMC23.66.160 C 5

MM/SC/RH/MH

6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Hasson abstained.

041509.23

Globe Building
101 S Main Street

Installation of bike rack

Ms. Nashem explained the application is for installation of a bike rack.

Mr. Ito said ARC recommended approval. There was some question about the size but the majority agreed that the size was acceptable and wanted to encourage bike riding in the neighborhood.

Ms. Nashem pointed out the recessed area where the rack would go.

Rosemary Rice, building manager explained the rack would be attached to the concrete with bolts.

Mr. Ito stated the applicant had already talked to the Fire Department and there is plenty of room to put the rack in without blocking the emergency door.

Ms. Rice concurred.

Mr. Hester supported the rack but was concerned the size of the rack would fill the vestibule.

Mr. Ito said ARC requested that bike racks be policed regularly and abandoned bicycles and other items be removed.

Ms. Rice agreed and said they police the building daily.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Mr. Hasson said adding the rack was good and activates the vestibule and discourages other uses of the vestibule. The rack is off the sidewalk and functional and provides a good amenity.

Mr. Hester stated it was covered storage for bikes.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the bike rack as presented per Code Citations:
District Rules XI Street Furniture
Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9, and 10

MM/SC/ED/AH

6:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Hester opposed.

041509.24

Yick Keong Building
Modern Design Sofa
210 S Washington St

No show.

041509.25

Palmer Court
1000 First Ave S

Ms. Hinden recused herself.

Ms. Nashem explained the application for cleaning and sealing of the building; installation of new light fixtures and removal of non-original exit door, ramp and railing and infilling with brick

Mr. Ito explained that ARC recommended approval and applicant clarified they were only cleaning the first floor of the 1st Avenue side and the entire Occidental façade. Applicants explained they did test patches and said water was the method that was most acceptable. ARC recommended the light fixtures be black to match other building features like the fire escape.

Ms. Nashem said the proposed sealing and cleaning meets the Secretary of Interiors guideline; the least abrasive means is recommended and they will be using water. The doorway is not original and though there is not a building there now the Board has been briefed and there is active project application for a new building that would cover the patch.

Mr. Ito stated the infill would not be woven brick it would just be infill.

Brenda Barnes, Clark Design Group, went through the photos and explained what would be cleaned, the globe fixtures to be replaced.

Ms. Hinden, Clark Design Group, showed photos of the test panels where water and scrub brush were used and effectively cleaned the dirt and grime.

Ms. Barnes explained that the infill will be covered by future construction.

Ms. Hinden provided a cut sheet for the light fixture proposed for the east façade. She showed the existing but not original light fixtures – which will be replaced. The light fixtures will have a black finish to complement the gate and the handrails.

Board Questions:

In response to clarifying questions Ms. Barnes said the light above the infill door will be removed. There are two cut sheets for proposed light fixtures: one for the light fixtures on the east façade, loading dock, one for the light fixtures at the parking lot.

Mr. Hester stated the current lighting is more compatible than what is proposed and asked why they made the choice they did.

Ms. Barnes said the existing is from the 1970s so are faux historic. Functionally the building is changing and they want to use the terrace for outdoor seating for the restaurant and want lighting that would throw lighting up and down and not in to people's faces.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca said she loved the building.

Board Discussion;

Mr. Hasson noted the lights do a nice job of accenting the building's features and are compatible.

Mr. Hester said all the other proposed work meets requirements and noted how good the building looks just being cleaned with water.

Mr. McConachie said the fixtures are of their time and are not trying to replicate historic character.

Mr. Ito agreed with Mr. Hasson and Mr. McConachie on the lights. He said was okay with the infill of the door, and removing the ramp and rail.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for cleaning and sealing of the building, installation of new light fixtures in black and removal of a non-original exist door, ramp and railing and infilling with brick as presented per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 7, 9, and 10

Guidelines for Treatment of Masonry

Brief #1: Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings

MM/SC/ED/AB

6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Hinden recused herself.

041509.3

PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

041509.31

King County Courthouse

Briefing regarding proposed design to re-establish the south entry

Mr. Ito recused himself and left the room.

Ms. Nashem stated the building is also King County landmark so the County has purview. The briefing is as a courtesy and part of their public outreach plan.

Mr. Abelsen, SMR Architects, architect for the project provided photos from archives and current photos. He reviewed the changes that had been made to the building over time and noted a seismic upgrade completed in 2005 which included an historic renovation of the first floor lobby area. He said the County plans to re-open the south entry which is the original historic entry. He said the proposal includes add landscaping and benches; much of the existing mechanical will be moved, lowered or incorporated into the design. He said this work ends at the south property line and there is an on-going discussion regarding a partnership agreement between Seattle City Parks and the County about the redevelopment of the park and re-opening of the South entry. He explained that his firm is tasked with design development only and was not sure when it would be implemented. He provided drawing boards showing the context of the building and said the 3rd and 4th floor doors will be for egress only with the south being the primary entrance. He said the County is still trying to work out the delivery and service access and they may use the tunnel or have to ferry deliveries from tunnels connecting from other buildings. The south entry used to be the grand entry; the curved stairs and marble were all removed in the 1960s. The new door may be a revolving door at the center. He said they think the upper leg of the stairs is still there but are not sure if there is any marble left. He said there is no intended change to the façade on 3rd Ave with the exception of one or two of the doors may be fixed shut. He reviewed the plan showing the concrete deck that has some wear on the waterproofing membrane underneath and the intent is to remove the topping slab, remove the membrane, install a new membrane and topping slab; it would then be paved or topped with concrete pavers. Low lying planters and benches are shown, one of which will be integrated with the HVAC system to allow air movement. He pointed out equipment and ductwork and said that it would not be visible. Windows at the floor 1 and floor 1A level that currently have louvers might be changed to glass.

Mr. Abelsen said some type of cover is being considered for people as they wait to get in to the building, the goal for it to be contemporary but compatible. Twenty to forty people may queue up at a time. He explained a proposed option – a metal structure with vaulted glass ceilings that would not be connected to the building. An alternative would be to build out a vestibule that would either not touch the building or do so very lightly. He went on to explain the elevation showing the two paired doors and center revolving door.

Ms. Hinden left at 10:30 a.m.

Board members expressed strong support of the re-establishment of the south entry.

Mr. McConachie noted that the County needs to get a handle on the service/delivery area. He said he is in support of the restoration of this major entry to the building and the impact it will have on the park. He noted the Park-Building relationship and stressed that we should not naively pretend that service to a major building is going to go away.

Ms. Doherty echoed Mr. McConachie's concern. She said she liked the entry but preferred it without the pergola but understands it may be an issue of managing disgruntled people.

Mr. McConachie said it is a very recessive entrance to a large building and is unusual in that sense.

Although the Board understood the need for the overhead canopy, they thought that more options should be explored. They thought it should be modern in character but contextual and compatible. The Board recommended that it be as small as possible and light as possible. A Board member also referred to the British Museum's approach to creating covered space as an atrium/covered plaza type area although he expressed that it might not be the right solution here, but could inspire further solutions.

Ms. Doherty noted the higher the cover is, the less likely it will protect from wind and rain.

Mr. McConachie noted the Library in the Round – a completely enclosed courtyard and the new Berlin legislative building that has done something similar and that some powerful additions have been made that set off the character of the old cornice lines and tabletures etc.

041509.4 BOARD BUSINESS

041509.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Doug Ito, Chair

041509.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227