



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 246/07

DATE: September 19, 2007
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Alex Bennett
Ann Brown
Sonja Sokol Furesz
Doug Ito
John De Lanoy
Catherine Person
Lorne McConachie
Adam Hasson
Rick Friedhoff

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Joanne Walby

Absent:

David Strauss

Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:00am

091907.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Draft Minutes from Sept 5, 2007

Moved to approve the minutes as presented.

MM/SC/CP/LM 6:0:2 Minutes adopted. Messrs. Freidhoff and Hasson abstained.

091907.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

091907.21 **Modena**
600 Western Ave - Travelers Hotel

Lika Roberts

Application: Installation of new business signage

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the renderings, photo and samples of the window vinyl signage and found that the signs met District Rules and Seattle Municipal Code. The applicant explained that the little girl and kite is the Scavolini Company logo, a product they sell.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Staff Report: No Staff report.
Applicant Comment: There was no comment.
Board Questions/Discussion: There was no comment.
Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented per,

Code Citations:

District Rules-

XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

A. Transparency regulations

B. General signage regulations

C. Specific signage regulations

1. Letter size

MM/SC/AH/SSF 9:0:0 Motion carried.

091907.22

Interurban

Steve Bull

157 Yesler Way

Application: Alter two storefronts, alter the brick paving at entry and alter the south wall of the building to add four windows.

Change of Use for the mezzanine space in Suite 104 from restaurant to office.

Application postponed.

091907.23

Bites

Ada Grant

1028 First Ave S

Application: Façade alteration: Install an awning with business signage above the front entry door.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawing and samples provide. Ms. Grant said she also has umbrellas outside her business. ARC members said that they do not usually approve both awnings and umbrellas so the applicant may have to choose between the two. Staff read the District Rules applicable to awnings. Ms. Bellanca said she thought that the colors were more “bright” than “subdued” as called for in the District Rules, but said she would approve them. Mr. Strauss and Mr. Ito thought a blade sign would be more effective since Ms. Grant said her goal was to attract people going to the game. Mr. McConachie suggested the applicant make sure that the awning was inline with the shadow line so that it reacted to the architecture of the building. ARC would recommend approval pending clarification of the rules on projecting elements pertaining to awnings and umbrellas.

Staff Report: The Board should refer to District Rules E. 2. “*Awning colors shall be subdued to ensure compatibility with the character of the District.*” and SMC 23.66.180 C, “*All awnings shall be of a design compatible with the architecture of buildings in the area.*” The Board may have referred to District Rule XIII Sidewalk cafes: “*Free-standing and table umbrellas are permitted, however, the Board may limit their numbers and placement to ensure compatibility with transparency and signage regulations when reviewing previous projects where umbrellas and awnings were limited.*”

Applicant Comment: There was no comment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Bennett said he felt the awning was an unfortunate addition and did not believe it would enhance the building.

Mr. Hasson noted that the awning colors in the rendering may be brighter than they are in reality. He explained that this space tends to have trouble drumming up business.

Ms. Grant said she is attempting to reach the drive by customers or people staying in the nearby hotel. She said if they are not able to increase business soon they will have to close. She said the awning would be visible through the trees in front of the business.

Mr. Bennett asked if the red color in the awning would match the paint around the door. Ms. Grant said it would be brighter. Ms. Person suggested they use a darker red color in the awning that will still attract attention, but would be less bright. The applicant said the proposed colors match her business' logo and since they are on the edge of the square, they need this to heighten their visibility.

Mr. De Lanoy said he would support the application because in his opinion, this building's character is not in keeping with the District anyhow.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented per.

Code Citations:

District Rules – XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

A. Specific Signage Regulations 1. Letter Size,
3. Projecting elements.

E. Awnings and Canopies

SMC 23.66.180 C. Awnings

MM/SC/AH/JDL 5:4:0 Motion carried. Mss. Sokol Furesz and Person and Messrs. Bennett and Freidhoff opposed.

091907.24

Jimmy Johns

Caley Lents

108 First Ave- Libby Building

Application: Façade alteration: Install louvers in the transoms of the storefront

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings for the proposed louvers for the HVAC system and photographs of the existing conditions. ARC asked the applicant to clarify which green color the louvers would match. The applicant said he thought that they would match the green color on the panel. ARC asked the applicant to bring a mechanical drawing to confirm that there were not alternative locations for venting.

Applicant Comment: The applicant explained that they can't put the ventilation on the back before there is a tenant hallway there. Mr. Lents said this business is a deli, so there would be no fryers in the kitchen.

Board Questions:

Mr. McConachie said the drawings were unclear, but he would support the application if one could assume that the louvers would be placed in the panel door as presented in the elevation drawing.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Mr. Hasson suggested they paint the louvers black so they wouldn't be so noticeable. Mr. McConachie suggested that a darker green color would help it "disappear". Mr. Hasson noted that this would disturb the pattern on that elevation. The applicant said a darker green could be acceptable to him.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project with the amendment that the louvers be painted out dark green and under the condition that the a new application for storefront alterations be submitted if elevation drawing #2 was not the correct elevation for the exhaust duct work, per:

Code Citations:

District Rules-

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

B. Design

SMC23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 9, 10

Guidelines for the Treatment of Storefronts

MM/SC/LM/AB

5:0:0 Motion carried.

091907.25

Wayfinding signage

Barbara Grey, Christine Alar

Various locations

Install way finding signage and kiosk in the right of way

Application postponed.

091907.3

PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

091907.31

North Lot

David Yuan

Briefing on possible new construction on the North Lot

David Yuan, architect with NBBJ introduced Kevin Daniels and Alan Cornell from Nitze Stagen; P.J. Santos from Opus Northwest; Jose Sama and Andrew Molchany, from NBBJ; Blaine Weber, Dan Flotz and Wolf Saar from Weber Thompson; and Ryan Durkan from Hillis Clark Martin Petersen.

Mr. Yuan said he would review their ideas for the urban/neighborhood context and the land covenants between Nitze Stagen, OPUS and the County, related to this development.

Kevin Daniels, President of Nitze Stagen Daniels Development, said they will include 500 to 1000 mixed income housing in the development, including apartments and row-houses. He said there would be retail on the ground level and potential office use above. He said five parties agreed to covenants in 1998-99 that limit the scope of development on the lot. He said they need to keep in mind the transit easement on Second and Third

Avenue, an odor control facility easement on Weller Street bridge and the fiber optic line easement that will be in place along eastern side of the north lot. He said the development is required to have 250,000 gross square feet of housing, with a minimum of 400 housing units, 100 of which would be affordable. Also, he said they would have to replace 491 parking stalls at the stadium, provide 71 additional parking stalls at King Street station and maintain the view corridor down Second Avenue from the stadium. He said they are “required to take all reasonable steps to commence development by July 1, 2008.”

Mr. Yuan said the development site is bounded by Qwest Stadium, the Florentine Apartments, King Street Station and the King Street Center. He said the offset at King and Occidental streets could be a natural focal point in the area. He said Second Avenue could also extend into the south lot. He noted that once they build to the street edge along King Street the stadium’s proximity will be diminished and the King Street clock tower made more prominent. He said they also want to provide vehicular access to the south lot and a turn-around for parking. He said there may also be potential to bring in a large grocery store.

Board Questions/Comments:

Mr. Brown asked what the height elevation would be in this area. Mr. Yuan said the City may increase height in south downtown pending land use legislation.

Mr. Hasson suggested a balance between street level uses and noted that it may be difficult for retail along Occidental and King to survive on non-game days.

Mr. Ito expressed concern that a developer/owner of row houses on King Street would not be able to control activity on this street. He also said that historically, there have been no row houses in Pioneer Square.

Mr. McConachie said that he believed the row house idea was intriguing but they should think through how to keep the street safe and active. He asked how they would control the extension of Second Avenue.

Mr. Daniels said the Public Stadium Authority has an easement to allow access to the property from a Second Avenue Extension. Mr. McConachie asked how the extension would terminate and suggested it stop in a well designed public space.

Ms. Brown asked what the “load zone’ opposite the Florentine refers to. Mr. Yuan said it would be a recycle/trash area for the new building.

Mr. Bennett said he likes the Occidental terminus and the King Street revitalization idea, but worried about the Second Avenue extension. He asked if there would be two levels of parking. Mr. Yuan said since they have a shallow water table, they could dig half a floor down and build up several floors. He said they want to make the street frontage “gracious.”

Mr. McConachie said this development project could be an opportunity to integrate sustainable strategies into the character of the district.

Public Comment:

Curtis Bigelow said he was very pleased to hear that the “scale of the neighborhood” is a point of discussion.

Mr. Yuan said they are honored to be a part of this project and will be sure to keep the Board abreast of their plans and ask their input through the process.

Messrs. Bennett and De Lanoy left at 10:00 am

091907.4 BOARD BUSINESS

Code amendments

Possible code amendments for new construction including sustainability features

Jay Janette of Mithun Architects submitted a memo with the requested changes to the property code amendments from the previous meeting. According to the proposed code language, building owners would submit a report on the operational efficiency of the sustainable features of the building. He said the sustainable rooftop features driven solely by performance requirements rather than LEED Criteria.

Gary Johnson of DPD said the Seattle Green Factor regulations do not have long term maintenance requirements or enforcement mechanism so he recommended a report be added to this code amendment. The Board discussed this and noted that if the requirements are not met, there is still no enforcement mechanism. Ms. Nashem said the Board does not have enforcement capability for this and that DPD handles enforcement in other situations. Mr. McConachie questioned whether it would be wise to create an enforcement bureaucracy for this matter. Mr. Johnson said he would consult with others at DPD and see if there is a way to track that sustainable features meet operational requirements. The applicant noted that LEED program requires that a building be designed to meet benchmarks in sustainability but not into perpetuity. Mr. Johnson asked Peter Dobrovolny, Seattle Green Building Team, if buildings owners tend to allow their sustainable features to fall into disrepair. Mr. Dobrovolny said it's possible, especially if the tenants pay the bills themselves, but usually it is in the owner's interest to get the most cost savings out it. However, he said Standard 189 proposed by the US Green Building Council would require buildings to be re-commissioned every five years, but does not specify who completes these assessments.

Mr. Janette said additional changes to the code language include having the minimum renewable energy requirement increased from 1% to 2%, and that no "commercial, residential, or industrial use" be allowed for common recreation area. He said this was included so the common recreation area does not later become lease-able space. Lastly, he said the elevator overrun and safety railing height language was amended in the Sustainable Rooftop Features section in order to avoid confusion. This leaves the elevator overrun issue when dealing with non sustainable features to still be resolved.

Ms. Nashem asked about the rooftop features language and the phrase "below the height limit)". She noted that Mr. Kofoed has suggested new language. Mr. Johnson said Mr. Kofoed suggested adding 3' to the height limit because that would apply to either the 15 feet set back or the 30 foot set back. He presented an email discussion on this issue and additional language on SMC 23.66.140 A.4.b. Mr. Jannette noted that the 15' height would not get an elevator to the roof. Mr. Ito said it should have an elevator stop and overrun, rather than using the phrase "penthouse" so that one would account for the height of the elevator cab. Mr. Johnson stated that he believed Mr. Kofoed preferred "penthouse" and have this language under the "new structures" section and leave the elevators in the Rooftop Features section to be revised if needed as a separate issue.

Mr. Hasson questioned why these incentives for “green” roofs and common recreation area couldn’t be made available for existing buildings that would breach the height limit in order to add these features. Mr. Johnson said this proposal was created by the owners of a new building. Mr. McConachie said they may want to allow similar exemptions for existing buildings, but he added that they wouldn’t necessarily want to encourage the construction of additions to historic buildings in the District. Mr. Johnson read D1, which mentioned the Board’s discretion to approve this code amendment on a case-by-case basis elsewhere.

Mr. Ito asked if DPD could do code amendments for Sustainable Features to historic buildings. Mr. Johnson said he would ask and report back.

Messrs. Freidhoff and Hasson left at 10:15am

Public Comment:

Curtis Bigelow read section D.1.B, *Common Recreation Area* and said the setback should be 30’ from property lines, rather than 30’ from Street property lines. He asked if this meant no other buildings could have these features.

Mr. Janette said that “street” should be used instead of “property”. Mr. McConachie noted that this could not apply to narrow buildings. Mr. Johnson said it is consistent with sign controls issues, but he said he would ask DPD to review this.

Mr. Janette proposed to revise the language to state that the set back be 30’ from street property line and 10’ from the alley property line, so other projects have options and set backs on common wall lines be reviewed by the Board to be consistent with SMC 23.66.140 C4.

There was a discussion about the two different interpretations of the existing code language about “which ever is less”. Mr. Ito said this language should be clarified in the new code language. Mr. Johnson said in the New Structures section it was clear that the structures were allowed above the height limit. Ms. Nashem concurred.

091907.5 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair
There was no report.

091907.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem
There was no report.

Meeting adjourned at 10:37am

Issued: October 3, 2007

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227