



The City of Seattle

Pioneer Square Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

PSB 69/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Board Members

Mark Astor
Amanda Bennett
Ann Brown
Evan Bue
Ryan Hester, Chair
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Willie Parish
Marcus Pearson
Tija Petrovich

Staff

Genna Nashem

Absent

Chair Ryan Hester called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

031815.11 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
February 18, 2015 MM/SC/DK/MA 7:0:1 Minutes approved.

031815.2 DETERMINATION OF CONTRIBUTING STATUS

031815.21 **Furuya and Corgiat Building/ Pacific Commercial**
240 2nd Ave South

Ms. Nashem explained the process to assess contributing status of the building for the purpose of selling Transferable Development Rights (TDR) and determining Floor Area Ratio (FAR). This building is on the National Register as a contributing building to the district. She said the last time the National Register nomination was updated from 2004 through 2010.

Sarah Sodt said that some buildings might be contributing in a local district rather than national district. She said the program is an incentive to allow landmarked or contributing buildings to sell TDR and earn money from unused FAR.

Ms. Nashem said that downtown landmark buildings have been using this program for a while.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ian Morrison explained the intent to verify the building a contributing building in the district per 23.66.100. He said reconstruction work was done in 2009 and the building has been on the National Register since 1975.

Michael Sullivan, Artifacts, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON files). He provided context of the building and the district in relation to other districts: business district, International Special Review District and the direct connections via the street grid. He explained that the building was constructed in 1900 as a transformer substation for a private electric company. He said that space in the far north of the building was leased to Furuya Company, an enterprise owned by Masajiro Furuya. He said three more stories were later added to this building. He said that Furuya took over the building because of success of his business selling Japanese products. From 1910 – 1930s he ran and grew the Pacific Commercial Bank.

Mr. Sullivan noted the Johnson-Reed Act which was signed in the 1920s denied immigration, citizenship and property ownership rights to immigrants. He said that Furuya was dragged into the hearing and investigated. He said that the Depression hit in 1931. Furuya went back to Japan; he never recovered financially and died in 1938.

Mr. Sullivan said that the Corgiat Building was built by an Italian American in 1900. He said that during WWII the top two stories were demolished. He said that in 2009 a federal invested tax credit project for reconstruction was done; measurements were carefully taken, drawings redrawn, and the building rebuilt with attention to detail. He said that the building is significant and a contributing building in the local district and nationally.

Mr. Sullivan said that interior architectural features were all retained and have been reviewed by the National Parks Service. He said that the buildings meets the criteria as a contributing building in the district.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Sullivan said that the Furuya Building was designed by engineering folks rather than architect and below street level is a huge spread foundation. There is no architect on record for the addition.

Mr. Hester asked about the original intent of the Corgiat Building.

Mr. Sullivan explained that it was investor/real estate offices, commercial store fronts on Main Street and upper level SRO. He said that Furuya employees got room and board. He said that the partner in building the Corgiat Building spent time in jail for under building.

Ms. Petrovich asked about the top two floors of the Furuya Building.

Mr. Sullivan said that the top two floors were gone sometime between 1943 and 1946.

Paul Doppelganger said the top floors may have been lost in a fire.

Ms. Nashem explained that in reconstruction everything has to be exact as it was before. She noted that NPS does a detailed high level review.

Ms. Bennett asked if any unsympathetic features were added.

Mr. Sullivan said no. He noted that the bank vaults are still there as are embossed columns holding up the mezzanine.

Mr. Hester said it is a significant building culturally, commercially, economically and as related to city infrastructure. He said the reconstruction work done is sensitive to historic character inside and out.

Mr. Kralios said that the period of significance goes back to 1900 and said that the Romanesque Furuya building remains. He noted the building's association with the history of immigration and the immigrants' influence on the development of Pioneer Square and Seattle. He said that the historical patterns of use remain and the ground floor uses are returning.

Staff Report: The process to determine that a building is contributing to the local preservation district was established as part of the South downtown rezone when the historic TDR (Transfer of development Rights) and TDP (Transfer of Development Potential) program was expanded to include south downtown. The TDP and TDR incentive for Landmark structures has been available in Downtown and First Hill for some time. TDR and TDP provide an incentive for property owners to retain and maintain their existing historic structures by allowing the owners of historic buildings to sell the unused development potential on their lot to another property owner who needs to buy it to earn additional floor area in South downtown. The owners have to sign an agreement that they will maintain their building and continue to adhere to preservation regulations, before they can sell the TDP or TDR.

Determination of contributing status to the local district is just the first step to determine if a building is even eligible as a sending (selling) site. This is the only step that the Board is involved with. The rest of the TDR and TDP process goes through DPD.

As you will see we consider the National Register listing status in determining contributing status, but because it is the contribution of the building in the local district that makes the building eligible we have to make that determination on a case by case basis. The type of information reviewed is similar as the review for Landmark status. Instead of looking at if a building is significant to all of Seattle we are looking at its contribution to Pioneer Square specifically.

We can't rely on the National Register listing solely for several reasons:

- The nomination is only reviewed and updated occasionally, a building could have been altered without approval since the nomination was last reviewed and those issues may make the building ineligible or require compliance issues be addressed prior to it being determined contributing.
- Not all buildings in the Pioneer Square Preservation District are in the National Register District, these building in the local district could still be eligible to sell TDP and TDR.

- The National Register District nomination has a period of significance identified, there may be history of a building that is outside the period of significance that makes a building contributing to the Pioneer Square Preservation District that is not included in the National Register District nomination.

You are not considering the project that the TDR or TDP gets sold to or in any way agreeing to a project that may want to buy the TDP or TDR. You are only making a decision on if the subject building is a contributing structure to the Pioneer Square Preservation District or if in the case that there were repairs needed that those repairs need to be done prior to making the final determination.

Action:

I move to recommend The Furuya Building as contributing to the Pioneer Square Preservation District per the following:

- **Historic Significance.** The building at the pinnacle of its importance, served as the headquarters of an international business and financial empire. The building supports the unique characteristic of Pioneer Square as an industrial site for an electric substation, and then as a prominent business that supported Pioneer Square's role as a commercial center. The building was built in 1900 and 1903-1904.
- **Architectural Significance.** The building's intact, character-defining features contribute to the distinct architectural character of Pioneer Square.
- **Social Diversity.** The building is significantly associated with the life of Masajiro Furuya, cited often as the most successful and prominent business of Japanese ancestry in the Pacific Northwest. The building is associated in a significant way with the experience of Japanese immigrants to the Pacific Northwest. It is the most important building in the district related to Asian commercial development and the experiences of Japanese immigrants to the Pacific Northwest.
- **Business Environment.** The building continues to support ground floor, pedestrian-oriented businesses with professional offices on the upper floors that support and enhance the District's economic climate.
- **Educational Value.** Reconstruction of the missing upper two floors has returned the building to its historic character and directly informs an understanding of the District's character prior to loss of and damage to upper stories from earthquakes. Because of its prominence of location at Second Avenue South and South Main Street, coupled with the 2012 restoration of the missing upper floors the building is an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood and contributes to the distinctive quality of the Pioneer Square neighborhood.
- **Geographic Location.** The building resides within the Pioneer Square Preservation District.

The Corgiat Building is recommended as contributing to the Pioneer Square Preservation District per the following:

- **Historic Significance.** The building supports the unique characteristic of Pioneer Square as a former single-room-occupancy hotel providing an important residential function. The building was built in 1900.
- **Architectural Significance.** The building's intact, character-defining features contribute to the distinct architectural character of Pioneer Square. The building embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of the single-room-occupancy hotel with ground floor retail space that was once common within the district. The building is an excellent, intact example of Seattle architect Robert L. Robertson.

- **Social Diversity.** As a former single-room-occupancy hotel, the building provides a unique example of former residential levels that historically proliferated throughout the district.
- **Business Environment.** The building continues to support ground floor, pedestrian-oriented businesses with professional offices on the upper floors that support and enhance the District's economic climate.
- **Educational Value.** Due to the high level of integrity and age, the building is an easily identifiable visual feature of the Pioneer Square neighborhood and contributes to the distinctive quality of the neighborhood.
- **Geographic Location.** The building resides within the boundaries of the Pioneer Square Preservation District.

Code Citations:

23.66.032 - Contributing structures; determination of architectural or historic significance

A.

The owner of a lot in the Pioneer Square Preservation District or the International Special Review District may apply to the Director of Neighborhoods for a determination that a structure on the lot contributes, and is expected to continue to contribute, to the architectural and/or historic character of the District. A structure for which that determination is made is considered a contributing structure for purposes of this [Section 23.66.032](#) and for purposes of the eligibility of the lot to send South Downtown Historic TDR or South Downtown Historic TDP pursuant to Sections [23.49.014](#) and [23.58A.042](#). The determination is made by the Director of Neighborhoods, after recommendation by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board or the International Special Review District Board. A structure for which an application for demolition approval has been granted or is pending is not eligible for a determination under this [Section 23.66.032](#). The Director of Neighborhoods may defer consideration of an application under this [Section 23.66.032](#) until final action is taken on any application for a certificate of approval, and any appeals have been resolved.

B.

In making a recommendation and decision under subsection 23.66.032.A, the relevant Board and the Director of Neighborhoods shall take into account the reasons for designating the District as set forth in [Section 23.66.100](#) and how they apply to the structure; whether the structure was identified as historic or as contributing, or both, for purposes of listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the local special review district; and the state of historic integrity, repair, maintenance, and useful life of the structure. The Director of Neighborhoods and the relevant Board may rely on information submitted by the owner, information provided by members of the public, other information available in public records, and site visits. The Director of Neighborhoods may determine that the structure is contributing; that it cannot be contributing; or that it will be contributing conditioned upon specific rehabilitation or maintenance work.

C.

If the Director of Neighborhoods determines that the structure will be contributing conditioned upon rehabilitation or maintenance work, then the owner shall not be

entitled to a final determination, and the structure shall not be considered contributing for purposes of this [Title 23](#), until either (1) the work is completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Neighborhoods, or (2) a certificate of approval for the work is issued and the owner provides a bond or other security acceptable to the Director of Neighborhoods for the completion of the work.

D.

The owner shall submit to the Director of Neighborhoods, in support of a request for a determination under this [Section 23.66.032](#), a historic resource report prepared by a historic preservation consultant approved by the Director of Neighborhoods. The historic resource report shall include the information described in this subsection 23.66.032.D, except that the Director of Neighborhoods may allow the omission of information not necessary for a particular application:

1. History of the structure, including significant historical events, persons and uses associated with the structure;
2. Ownership history;
3. Construction history, including original plans and subsequent alterations to the exterior; a chronology of historical documentation; site work, references to craftsmen, builders, and architects associated with the structure; early views, photographs, and other materials showing appearance at different periods; and results of physical investigation;
4. Architectural evaluation, including an assessment of all exterior features and finishes and identification of those architectural features, materials, finishes and construction techniques that are character-defining.
5. An analysis of existing conditions, damage, structural problems, and materials deterioration.
6. Bibliography and references.

E.

There is no administrative appeal of the decision of the Director of Neighborhoods. Any judicial review must be commenced as provided by state law.

23.66.100 - Creation of district, legislative findings and purpose

A.

During the City of Seattle's relatively brief history, it has had little time in which to develop areas of consistent historical or architectural character. It is recognized that the Pioneer Square area of Seattle contains many of these rare attributes and consequently is an area of great historical and cultural significance. Further, the regional sports stadiums, constructed in and near the Pioneer Square area, and the traffic and activities that they generate have resulted in adverse impacts upon the social, cultural, historic and ethnic values of the Pioneer Square area. To preserve, protect, and enhance the historic character of the Pioneer Square area and the buildings therein; to return unproductive structures to useful purposes; to attract visitors to the City; to avoid a proliferation of vehicular parking and vehicular-oriented uses; to provide regulations for existing on-street and off-street parking; to stabilize existing housing, and encourage a variety of new and rehabilitated housing types for all income groups; to encourage the use of transportation modes other than the private automobile; to protect existing commercial vehicle access; to improve visual and urban relationships between existing and future buildings and structures,

parking spaces and public improvements within the area; and to encourage pedestrian uses, there is established as a special review district, the Pioneer Square Preservation District. The boundaries of the District are shown on Map A for [23.66.100](#) and on the Official Land Use Map.

B.

The District is depicted on Map A for [23.66.100](#). All property in the entire District shall be developed and used in accordance with the use and development standards established in this [Chapter 23.66](#) and the use and development standards for the underlying zone in which the property is located. In the event of irreconcilable differences between the use and development standards of this [Chapter 23.66](#) and other provisions of this Land Use Code, this [Chapter 23.66](#) applies, except that nothing in this [Chapter 23.66](#) shall permit any use or development on a lot from which TDR or TDP are transferred that is inconsistent with the restrictions applicable as a result of such transfer pursuant to [Chapter 23.49](#) or [Chapter 23.58A](#)

C .

Reasons for Designating the Pioneer Square Preservation District.

1. Historic Significance. The Pioneer Square Preservation District is unique because it is the site of the beginning of The City of Seattle. The area also retains much of the original architecture and artifacts of its early history. The District has played a significant role in the development of Seattle, the Puget Sound region and The State of Washington. It was the first location of industry, business and homes in early Seattle and the focus of commerce and transportation for more than a half century.

2. Architectural Significance. As a collection of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century buildings of similar materials, construction techniques and architectural style, the District is unique, not only to the City but to the country as well. Most of the buildings within the District embody the distinctive characteristics of the Late Victorian style. Many buildings are the work of one architect, Elmer H. Fisher. For these and other reasons, the buildings combine to create an outstanding example of an area that is distinguishable in style, form, character and construction representative of its era.

3. Social Diversity. The District represents an area of unique social diversity where people from many income levels and social strata live, shop and work. It is an area in which social services, including missions, low-income housing and service agencies exist.

4. Business Environment. The District is an area of remarkable business diversity. The street level of the area north of S. King Street is pedestrian-oriented, with its storefronts occupied primarily by specialty retail shops, art galleries, restaurants and taverns. The upper floors of buildings in the historic core are occupied by professional offices, various types of light manufacturing, and housing for persons of many income groups. The area south of S. King Street includes the stadium's north parking lot, a number of structures occupied by light manufacturing and warehousing use, and several structures converted to office, residential and mixed use. The stadium's north parking lot may be redeveloped to accommodate a mix of uses, including a substantial amount of housing. The ongoing restoration and sensitive rehabilitation of many District structures, combined with proposed compatible new construction, will continue to enhance the District's economic climate.

5.Educational Value. The restoration and preservation of the District will yield information of educational significance regarding the way of life and the architecture of the late nineteenth-century as well as adding interest and color to the City. Restoration of the District will preserve the environment that was characteristic of an important era of Seattle's history.

6.Geographic Location. The District is uniquely situated adjacent to Seattle's waterfront, the central business district, the International District, and sports stadium and exhibition center facilities.

MM/SC/AmB/TP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.3 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031815.31 Del Mar Building

Ecig Express
118 1st Ave S

Installation of neon window sign

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported the applicant explained that they included the black background to hide the transformer but reduced its size by routing it to the shape of the letters. ARC discussed that the district rules say a clear backing is preferred. Because the purpose is to hide the transformer, other alternatives were ruled out, and because the backing was minimized by having it routed to the shape of the letters, the sign does not reduce transparency and it is the only sign in addition to the existing non-illuminated blade sign, ARC recommended approval of the sign as proposed.

Staff Report: The sign meets requirements for letter size, number of colors and number of neon signs as there is only one.

Applicant Comment:

Glorene George explained the proposed neon window sign; she went over the drawing and provided material samples.

Ray Murr went through material samples.

Ms. George said that ARC discussed the black background the desire to have less than 1" around the neon tubing. She provided a photo of the location with and without signage and examples of area signage. She said the sign will be hung inside the windows from chains and fastened to the wood window frame. She provided a profile of the attachment.

Ms. Brown asked for clarification on color and asked if light would flash.

Mr. Murr said the red shows up as yellow on photos but that the actual color samples were provided for review. He said that the light is a steady on and does not flash.

Mr. Hester noted the sign is 8" high and 3'9" long. He said that the red color is "Clear Red" and white color is "6500 White". He asked for the length of the storefront.

Mr. Murr said it is about 12' across.

Ms. Bennett asked if this same company had a blade sign reviewed last year and if they have come before the board for a sandwich board.

Mr. Murr said the blade was reviewed but they have not come for sandwich board review.

Ms. Petrovich asked if this sign is replacing existing sign.

Ms. George said they weren't aware of the blade sign as they did not permit that for the owner. She thinks this sign will be in addition to what is there.

Ms. Petrovich asked if the logo was the same on each sign.

Ms. Nashem said ARC reviewed it and it is very similar only there is a flame on top of the blade sign.

Ms. George said it is similar and the owner tries to stay consistent.

Ms. Petrovich asked about limitation to signage.

Ms. Nashem said there is not but that the board can use its judgment about over-proliferation of signage. Responding to clarifying questions she said that the approval did not include the sandwich board and that can be mentioned in the motion.

Mr. Hester asked about interior attachment to the wood mullion.

Ms. George said there will be small standoff feet that will lean up to the interior of the window.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and Codes.

Mr. Kralios said ARC felt that size and letter height were consistent with District Rules. He said there was discussion about the black background and given other alternatives discussed what is presented is the best option. He said that the sign doesn't impact transparency into the space and as long as the black background is limited to the 1" profile beyond the neon letters that it wasn't overly large or cumbersome.

Mr. Hester agreed and said the colors selected are appropriate with district. Attachment is not damaging any historic or ornamental features of the building and it is easily repairable. He said the height of mounting and style of sign don't negatively impact transparency. He noted the applicant did a good job of explaining how the opaque background tightly cut and routed to the letters is minimal and impact to transparency is minimal while clear is preferred. In general it complies with District Rules.

Mr. Kralios asked board members if they wanted to condition approval on removal or approval of A-board sign. There was general agreement.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of a neon sign conditioned upon either removal or approval of the A-frame sign and additional window signage at this business per

Code Citations:

District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

A. Transparency Regulations

MM/SC/DK/AB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.32

City Club Building

McCarthy Holthus

108 1st Ave S suite 200

Installation of a non-illuminated blade sign

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the revised plans provided which include a sign plan. The applicant indicated that they are going to further revise the application to be vinyl letters instead of raised letters on the sign but still in the same color and font. The applicant will bring the revised drawings to the full Board. Mr. Astor said he was still concerned that this was an upper floor sign prohibited by the district rules and that while this sign was a better location than the original proposal is still cluttered the building distracting from the existing retail signs. He said he could not think of another example were there was a blade sign for an upper floor office. Mr. Kralios read the intent of signage regulations. Mr. Pearson said that the only signs he could think of were signs for a retail business that is in the basement accessed as street level.

Mr. Astor thought they were different because they were pedestrian oriented signs to attract customers off the streets. Mr. Pearson thought that attorneys needed to advertise. While some members thought that the sign complied with letter height, sign size and attachment method regulations there was not agreement on if the sign complied with the regulation for upper floor signage.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem reported that Historic Preservation staff agreed that the history and intent of the District Rule X.C.6 Upper Floor Signage. Upper floor signage is not permitted, except for temporary signage as per SMC 23.66.160D or when it is proposed as part of an overall integrated sign plan for the building. (7/99) When permitted, the preferred location for temporary signs is in windows, rather than attached to the building. (8/93) was intended to avoid over proliferation of signage on the upper stories of the building and refers to the location of the sign. Other regulations apply.

Applicant Comment:

Morgan Beers explained that her client, McCarthy Holthus is also the owner of the building. She explained that they want a street level projecting sign to give them street level presence. She said there are several tenants in the building and that the owner has signage rights. She said a blade sign at street level is allowed and showed examples of other blade signs in the area. The Board noted that all these were street level businesses. Responding to clarifying questions she explained that McCarthy Holthus is on the 2nd floor; another tenant, Quality Loan, is owned by McCarthy Holthus. She sited the proposed double sided perpendicular sign location on the plan and said there would be nothing on the door.

Ms. Petrovich asked about what would happen if McCarthy Holthus were to move and rent out the space to someone else.

Ms. Beers said that the site plan specifically says that the address is owner of blade sign.

Ms. Petrovich clarified that the board would be approving business and not building sign; a different tenant would have to come back.

Mr. Astor said it would add to proliferation of signs at the retail level. He said that there are two prominent signband signs. He said that window, door, awning signs are for retail level tenants.

Ms. Bennett said that the building owner stated this will be the only three signs on the building.

Ms. Brown said that this becomes a sign package.

Ms. Bennett said it is three signs based on the letter.

Ms. Beers said that no other signage is allowed in this sign plan.

Mr. Hester clarified that that if verbiage in lease change this document will still bind the signage and any changes would have to come back to board.

Public Comment:

Liz Stenning stated her fear of proliferation of signage in the District and did not support upper floor tenants having ground floor signage.

Board members discussed concerns about proliferation of signage, the definition of 'one address', business versus building signage. Responding to question about Capital One and EMC signage Ms. Nashem said they are building name signs and are part of sign packages for the buildings. She said that this application is being reviewed as a business sign. She said there are three building numbers for this building: 108, 110 and 112. She said that suite number is not considered a separate address when suites are accessed through one door, so one address.

Mr. Astor said that that the client has no physical presence on retail level so this sign would contribute to sign clutter. He said that this relates to the entrance to the building and not the building.

Ms. Bennett said there are three entrances and three signs per this package.

Ms. Nashem said that a common door is used.

Mr. Astor said that one entrance is used for multiple upper floor tenants. He commented that the historic hotel sign/element on the J & M Building is not a true business sign. It is now a historic architectural feature. He said that there is no other example of office signage on the retail level.

Mr. Kralios said that there is nothing forbidding this and that it doesn't seem like over-proliferation with clarification that it is per street address.

Mr. Astor said the criteria is subjective that sets precedent and what flows from that precedent. He said this is an office sign at retail level without presence of business and leads to proliferation; it is a bad precedent to set.

Ms. Petrovich said it is not over-proliferation because of the sign package and there is no possibility for other signage on the building.

Mr. Kralios agreed with Ms. Petrovich,

Ms. Brown said that EMC allowed the “Park” sign.

Ms. Petrovich said that is a larger building.

Mr. Hester said it was a specific decision related to that building consideration.

Ms. Nashem said that a decision on this proposal based on current language doesn't prohibit the Board from defining sign rules in the future; this project is based on current rules and the location of the sign being considered.

Sarah Sodt explained that City Preservation Officer Karen Gordon was consulted. The intent of this Rule was to prevent over proliferation above the first floor. She said that it is specific to its location, specific to the building; everything is reviewed on a case by case basis. She said the board looks at if the sign appropriate; if it is appropriate for this location; if it relates to the building; and, if there is proliferation.

Mr. Astor said the pedestrian environment is the retail level.

Mr. Hester said there is one per street address. He questioned if this plan warrants concern about horizontal proliferation.

Ms. Bennett said that it is not over-proliferation; there are three signs and no other signage. She said three is appropriate.

Mr. Hester said he considers this a strict proscriptive sign package and any more signs would have to be very convincing.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Installation of a non-illuminated blade sign as presented:

Code Citations:

District Rules XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS
AND CANOPIES

B. General Signage Regulations

All signs on or hanging from buildings, in windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. (8/93) Locations for signs shall be in accordance with all other regulations for signage. (12/94)

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs not hide, damage or obscure the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than signs. (8/93)

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. **Letter Size.** Letter size in windows, awnings and hanging signs shall be consistent with the scale of the architectural elements of the building (as per SMC 23.66.160), but shall not exceed a maximum height of 10 inches unless an exception has been approved as set forth in this paragraph. Exceptions to the 10-inch height limitation will be considered for individual letters in the business name (subject to a limit of no more than three letters) only if both of the following conditions are satisfied: a) the exception is sought as part of a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business; and b) the size of the letters for which an exception is requested is consistent with the scale and character of the building, the frontage of the business, the transparency requirements of the regulations, and all other conditions under SMC 23.66.160. An overall sign package or plan will be considered reduced for purposes of the exception if it calls for approval of signage that is substantially less than what would otherwise be allowable under the regulations. (12/94)

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

B.To ensure that flags, banners and signs are of a scale, color, shape and type compatible with the Pioneer Square Preservation District objectives stated in [Section 23.66.100](#) and with the character of the District and the buildings in the District, to reduce driver distraction and visual blight, to ensure that the messages of signs are not lost through undue proliferation, and to enhance views and sight lines into and down streets, the overall design of a sign, flag, or banner, including size, shape, typeface, texture, method of attachment, color, graphics and lighting, and the number and location of signs, flags, and banners, shall be reviewed by the Board and are regulated as set out in this [Section 23.66.160](#). Building owners are encouraged to develop an overall signage plan for their buildings.

C.In determining the appropriateness of signs, including flags and banners used as signs as defined in [Section 23.84A.036](#), the Preservation Board shall consider the following:

- 1.Signs Attached or Applied to Structures.

- a. The relationship of the shape of the proposed sign to the architecture of the building and with the shape of other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - b. The relationship of the texture of the proposed sign to the building for which it is proposed, and with other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - c. The possibility of physical damage to the structure and the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure desirable architectural features or details of the structure (the method of attachment shall be approved by the Director);
 - d. The relationship of the proposed colors and graphics with the colors of the building and with other approved signs on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - e. The relationship of the proposed sign with existing lights and lighting standards, and with the architectural and design motifs of the building;
 - f. Whether the proposed sign lighting will detract from the character of the building; and
 - g. The compatibility of the colors and graphics of the proposed sign with the character of the District.
6. Projecting signs and neon signs may be recommended only if the Preservation Board determines that all other criteria for permitted signs have been met and that historic precedent, locational or visibility concerns of the business for which the signing is proposed warrant such signing.

Secretary of Interior's Standards

2 The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

MM/SC/DK/AmB 7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Astor opposed.

031815.33

Corgiat Building/ Pacific Commercial

240 2nd Ave S Suite 103

ARC: Mr. Kralios said ARC reviewed and neon blade sign is permitted as part of overall reduced sign package and that is what is proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Applicant adjusted the proposal per ARC recommendation to attach into the mortar lines and not the sandstone. He said that the blade sign will be at the entry – Elm Coffee. He said the logo will be neon and the text will be non-illuminated. He said there is pre-existing access hole from previous sign so they won't have j-box or conduit on surface.

Mr. Astor said that ARC stated that the sign and window sign should remain and the A-board go away.

Applicant said that he was okay with the blade sign and vinyl on door but less okay with the A-board. He said that ARC reviewed as a reduced sign package.

Mr. Astor said that the neon as exception makes the A-board redundant.

Mr. Hester said the A-board tips them to over-proliferation. He said that they revised the baseplate and will avoid penetration into the sandstone will use existing penetration for electrical.

Applicant said that the aluminum brackets will be painted to match storefront color.

There was clarification that the sign package is for this business and not the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester went over board purview.

Mr. Kralios commented on over-proliferation and reduced sign package. He said the neon sign and window vinyl meet the Rules but not the A-board.

Ms. Petrovich agreed with Mr. Kralios.

Applicant said that the client was happy to make the tradeoff of the neon blade sign for the A-board.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Installation of a neon blade sign as part of reduced sign package with removal of A-board sign

Code Citations:

District Rules XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

B. General Signage Regulations

All signs on or hanging from buildings, in windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. (8/93) Locations for signs shall be in accordance with all other regulations for signage. (12/94)

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs not hide, damage or obscure the

architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than signs. (8/93)

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. Letter Size. Letter size in windows, awnings and hanging signs shall be consistent with the scale of the architectural elements of the building (as per SMC 23.66.160), but shall not exceed a maximum height of 10 inches unless an exception has been approved as set forth in this paragraph. Exceptions to the 10-inch height limitation will be considered for individual letters in the business name (subject to a limit of no more than three letters) only if both of the following conditions are satisfied: a) the exception is sought as part of a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business; and b) the size of the letters for which an exception is requested is consistent with the scale and character of the building, the frontage of the business, the transparency requirements of the regulations, and all other conditions under SMC 23.66.160. An overall sign package or plan will be considered reduced for purposes of the exception if it calls for approval of signage that is substantially less than what would otherwise be allowable under the regulations. (12/94)
3. Projecting Elements (e.g. blade signs, banners, flags and awnings). There shall be a limit of one projecting element, e.g. a blade sign, banner, or awning per address. If a business chooses awnings for its projecting element, it may not also have a blade sign, flag, or banner, and no additional signage may be hung below awnings. (6/03) Exceptions may be made for businesses on corners, in which case one projecting element per facade may be permitted. (12/94)
4. Blade signs (signs hanging perpendicular to the building). Blade signs shall be installed below the intermediate cornice or second floor of the building, and in such a manner that they do not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. Typically, non-illuminated blade signs will be limited to eight (8) square feet. (12/94)

Blade signs incorporating neon of any kind shall not be permitted unless all of the following conditions are met: a) the neon blade sign is sought as part of a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business; b) neon blade signs shall be limited to six (6) square feet in dimension with letters not to exceed eight (8) inches in height; c) the sign meets the requirements of Neon Signs - Paragraph 3 for the number and type of colors of neon; d) the sign meets the requirements of Signs - Paragraph 5 (above) for installation of a blade sign; e) electrical connection from exterior walls to the blade sign shall be made using rigid, paintable electrical tubing painted to match the building facade and all bends shall closely follow the support structure; f) all signage supports shall be fastened to the exterior wall by the use of

metal anchors at existing grout joints only; and g) the sign taken as a whole is consistent with the scale and character of the building, the transparency requirements of the regulations, and all other conditions under SMC 23.66.160. An overall sign package or plan will be considered reduced for purposes of the exception if it calls for approval of signage that is substantially less than what would otherwise be allowable under regulations. (5/96)

D. NEON SIGNS

1. The number of neon signs shall be limited to one for each 10 linear feet of business frontage for the first forty feet of business, and one for each additional 15 feet of frontage for businesses over forty feet. For a business that has transom windows beginning at ten (10) feet above the sidewalk, one additional neon sign to be located within the transom windows would be permitted for every 30 feet of frontage. Signs need not be spaced one per ten feet, but may be clustered, provided the maximum number of approved signs is not exceeded and the grouping does not obscure visibility into the business. Permitted neon signs may be located in transom windows, according to the guidelines contained in this section. (12/94)
3. No more than three colors, including neon tubes and any backing materials, shall be used on any neon sign. Transparent backing materials are preferred. Neon colors shall be subdued. (8/93, 7/03)

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

B.To ensure that flags, banners and signs are of a scale, color, shape and type compatible with the Pioneer Square Preservation District objectives stated in [Section 23.66.100](#) and with the character of the District and the buildings in the District, to reduce driver distraction and visual blight, to ensure that the messages of signs are not lost through undue proliferation, and to enhance views and sight lines into and down streets, the overall design of a sign, flag, or banner, including size, shape, typeface, texture, method of attachment, color, graphics and lighting, and the number and location of signs, flags, and banners, shall be reviewed by the Board and are regulated as set out in this [Section 23.66.160](#). Building owners are encouraged to develop an overall signage plan for their buildings.

C.In determining the appropriateness of signs, including flags and banners used as signs as defined in [Section 23.84A.036](#), the Preservation Board shall consider the following:

1.Signs Attached or Applied to Structures.

- a.The relationship of the shape of the proposed sign to the architecture of the building and with the shape of other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
- b.The relationship of the texture of the proposed sign to the building for which it is proposed, and with other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;

- c. The possibility of physical damage to the structure and the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure desirable architectural features or details of the structure (the method of attachment shall be approved by the Director);
 - d. The relationship of the proposed colors and graphics with the colors of the building and with other approved signs on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - e. The relationship of the proposed sign with existing lights and lighting standards, and with the architectural and design motifs of the building;
 - f. Whether the proposed sign lighting will detract from the character of the building; and
 - g. The compatibility of the colors and graphics of the proposed sign with the character of the District.
6. Projecting signs and neon signs may be recommended only if the Preservation Board determines that all other criteria for permitted signs have been met and that historic precedent, locational or visibility concerns of the business for which the signing is proposed warrant such signing.

Secretary of Interior's Standards

2 The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

MM/SC/AmB/AB 7:0:0

031815.4 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

031815.41 Yesler Bridge
Fourth Ave and Yesler Way

Briefing regarding the retrofit of the bridge and associated sidewalk, street, and stairway alterations

PowerPoint in file (see report in DON file for details). Following are board questions and comments.

Amanda Tsa, SDOT said they would preserve key character defining elements of the bridge. She said they would present permanent changes to bridge and surrounding area. She said they will be to 90% of design in early April and plan for approval in July.

Lex Hummer presented.

Mr. Hester asked for clarification on Mr. Hummer's comment on removing reconstruct wall at the Prefontaine Building.

Mr. Hummer said it is all part of the entry way and the how the west abutment wall will be extended to the building face; the door will move north about two feet.

Ms. Nashem asked if the column that is part of the building will not be touched.

Mr. Hummer said it is coming later. He said that the existing stairway comes down to sidewalk slab and it is all supported by the bridge. The idea is to get rid of the private stairway connection to the bridge and make them separate. He said that at some point the stairway was connected to the column; they are just going to re-establish the connection with triangular piece to hold stairway up similar to way stairs are connected to building at platform above. He said they will repave the driveway at the northwest stair area in the same configuration. He said south portion of the King County driveway will be paved in the same configuration as will ADA ramps; they will reconstruct the stairwell landing shifting it to the west. He said they proposed to provide better lighting in the area and have three options; illumination will be cast downward. He noted structural cracks and settling issues in the northwest area. He said they propose to raise the sidewalk to compensate for raising structure in the northwest. He said they will install a metal style picket fence on top of the brick rail to meet current building code.

He said they will reduce the skew on the alignment at the Yesler Terrace intersection. He said that steel tube railing will replace the 1974 barriers. He said they will reconstruct the sidewalk concrete parapet and ADA ramps and bulb-outs make the intersection safer for pedestrians. He noted the loss of four parking spots at the McCray parking garage.

Ms. Nashem clarified that the parking garage is not in the local district.

Mr. Hummer said they also need to plan ahead for the four trolley pulls that will be part of a future King County rubber tire trolley system.

Mr. Hester asked for clarification.

Mr. Hummer said that each of the trolley pulls is where a current 3-bulb light pole is located. He said they will put a new foundation in and put a two-globe fixture in place of the three-globe. He said the pole in the northeast corner will be cut off at the base for future pole to be installed because there is another three-globe really close to it that will remain for the time being.

Mr. Hester asked if the three-globe fixtures are historic.

Mr. Hummer said he didn't know

Ms. Nashem said that regardless of being historic or not the 3 globe lights are part of the district and they are required/standard for Pioneer Square. Removing them or altering them requires an exception from the Board.

Mr. Hester asked about the two-globe fixtures.

Mr. Hummer said they are brand new – similar to those located on Prefontaine Place and showed a photo.

Mimi Sheridan continued to present the PowerPoint. She said that it is an unusual areaway under Yesler next to the Prefontaine – there is a door going into it from 4th Avenue. She went over areaway information. She said that there are four prism light panels that will not be affected.

Ms. Bennett asked about relocation of the door two feet to the left per the photo.

Ms. Sheridan said that it is for the stairway.

Mr. Hummer said it will be moved because there will be a column support that is right where door is now. He said that part of the column support will be to hold up the sidewalk.

Ms. Sheridan said they want to get the stairway off of the bridge structure.

Ms. Bennett asked if a column would be visible inside the areaway.

Mr. Hummer said he would get back regarding its appearance.

Ms. Sheridan said she is not clear on why the door or the fan are there.

Ms. Bennett asked if the girders on either side of the bridge are going to be kept and moved up 18"? She asked if the four posts on each side will be retained and raised 18" by adding some to the bottom for an extra 18" length.

Ms. Sheridan said they will be removed and refurbished.

Mr. Hummer said they will then be installed in the same location.

Ms. Brown asked about the decorative arches.

Mr. Hummer said that the fencing is so a small child can't

Ms. Nashem said that the board had asked if six are necessary to get the 4” gap and at that time it hadn’t been. She asked how many lines are actually necessary.

Mr. Hummer said he didn’t have an answer but that he thought that six were required to get the 4” sphere.

Ms. Petrovich asked where the wires go – in front? Through? Behind?

Mr. Hummer said they are on the back side so that if walking down Terrace Street, it is the outside of the pedestrian way.

Ms. Petrovich asked if they were drilling through anything to add the wires.

Mr. Hummer said no.

Mr. Kralios asked if the rail is compliant in terms of height.

Mr. Hummer said yes; the pedestrian guard rails are fine.

Mr. Hester asked as relates to realignment and structural modifications to the bridge – the bridge will still be a contributing structure. He said it is on the National Register district. He asked if these alterations are considered serious alterations that could jeopardize that status or if these changes can all be made to the bridge without impact the long term contributing status.

Ms. Sheridan said they talked to Nick Vann, DAHP, about that because he was at the previous meeting last year. She said that it is her understanding that these are within – and would not affect the contributing status.

Mr. Hester and Ms. Bennett each commented they had concerns about the bridge becoming non-contributing because of too many alterations.

Ms. Sheridan said that is why they are keeping the major features.

Mr. Hester clarified it as the ornamental features.

Ms. Sheridan said yes.

Mr. Hester asked if that has been confirmed or if it is still in limbo. He said none of the details matter if that is not okay.

Mr. Hummer said it wasn’t Nick but someone at DAHP responded to their email request about that and they said it would not affect the landmark status. He said that currently the cultural resources report identifying all the adverse

impacts including the bridge are being reviewed by DAHP currently. He said they are within their 30-day time period now.

Mr. Hester asked if they would issue constraints.

Mr. Hummer said he wasn't sure how they are going to respond; he said they will either say 'yes these are all adverse impacts' and they may also have some conditions that they have to meet.

Mr. Hester asked if at that time they would come back with those results. He asked if that is when they would begin their design development.

Mr. Hummer said that this is already at 90% design level.

Mr. Hester said that they didn't know if the changes are going to impact the contributing status yet.

Mr. Hummer said that DAHP told them in an email that it would not be based on their saving the character defining features.

Mr. Hester asked if there was a formal statement to that effect.

Ms. Nashem said that there probably will be by the time this is an application.

Ms. Sheridan said that if they do agree that it is adverse impact that there would be some mitigation.

Ms. Nashem said that this will also go through a Section 106 process.

Mr. Hummer said they are at the end of Section 106 process and said that DHAP's review of the cultural resources assessment report and either agreeing or disagreeing with what we've said were adverse impacts sort of ends the process but because they are adverse impacts they are going to have to do one more thing which is an MOA.

Ms. Nashem said that usually in Section 106 process there is stakeholder participation and she wasn't aware that the Section 106 process had even started.

Mr. Hummer said that part of all the discussions they have had with the preservation board and other over the years have been that stakeholder process.

Ms. Sheridan said that FHWA sometimes does things differently.

Mr. Hester asked about the reconstructed masonry wall – are they planning to remove the door and sawcut a new one or tearing down the entire wall into the areaway and restacking that block.

Mr. Hummer said the whole CMU wall is going to be part of the west abutment wall in the future; it will not be a CMU wall.

Mr. Hester asked if it will attach to the existing building column.

Mr. Hummer said that it is not going to be physically attached to it but will abut it.

Ms. Nashem clarified that the whole retaining wall will be replaced.

Mr. Hummer said yes; it will be removed in entirety and new cast in place concrete poured.

Ms. Sheridan said it isn't clear when it was built considering it is CMU.

Mr. Hester said he wants to understand what the finished product will be – if it will be patchwork or full CMU or concrete wall.

Ms. Bennett asked about the historic story behind the stairwell on the Prefontaine Building and asked if it is an historic feature.

Ms. Sheridan said it is but that it has been changed. She said there is evidence that connections have been changed so it will end up being better than it is now. She said it will be separate from the bridge.

Ms. Bennett asked if the stair will be accessible from the building.

Ms. Sheridan said it will perform the same function that it does now.

Ms. Nashem suggested coming back with a briefing showing exactly what that change will be with drawings, renderings. She asked if the road is going to be raised 18" would the sidewalk on the south side will be raised as well.

Mr. Hummer said no because the south curb line is going to stay right where it is at today. He said that they are matching into the south curbline. He said they are also matching into the south curbline on Terrace Street.

Mr. Astor asked if it was because they didn't need elevation change at that particular spot.

Mr. Hummer concurred and said that the big difference is that on Yesler there is a crowned roadway and on Terrace there is a crowned roadway; in the new roadway it will all be sloping to the south.

Mr. Hester asked about new vehicle barriers above and if they are at 90% design level on that.

Mr. Hummer said that in the sketch there is a sketch of what it will look like – they are at 90% design drawings. He said it will be similar to two tube railings seen in other parts of Pioneer Square.

Ms. Nashem asked for clarification on the difference between two examples shown.

Mr. Hummer said the single tube rail was constructed in the mid-1970s and he didn't think they went through any kind of analysis to meet traffic codes etc. He said the codes have gotten more complicated since then.

Mr. Astor asked if it was in how a car functions with them.

Mr. Hummer said with regard to a car hitting and going off the bridge.

Ms. Nashem said when presented earlier they said it was more historically or aesthetically appropriate and asked how they think the design achieves that.

Mr. Hummer said that wouldn't be a correct characterization but that this style not only meets current codes but it is similar to traffic railings as seen all over Pioneer Square and other locations such as 4th Ave. between Airport Way and Main or S. Jackson St.

Board members asked that examples of those locations be brought to the next briefing.

Mr. Hester asked about proposed lighting.

Mr. Hummer said that currently the stairwell is lit by a huge flood light. He said they propose inset lights below handrail.

Mr. Kralios said that this is the preferred fixture and has the least visible impact. He said another fixture proposed was faux historic.

Ms. Bennett asked if the brick at the garage entrance ramp is original.

Ms. Nashem explained that they will need to provide a match to the original brick for board approval.

Responding to questions Mr. Hummer said that the concrete stair will be reconstructed. He said that they will put one handrail in on the left side wall going up.

Ms. Nashem said there are still a lot of questions and suggested another briefing be scheduled.

Mr. Hummer said they will pull off the lanterns, refurbish, and reinstall the lights on the north side.

Ms. Petrovich asked if signage is planned.

Ms. Kennedy said that the picket fence change is needed because the existing rail is too low for code and the chain is not functional.

Mr. Hester suggested this also be discussed at the next briefing. He requested that feedback and a formal statement from the DAHP office about the bridge be provided to the board.

031815.5 BOARD BUSINESS

031815.6 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

031815.7 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227