



The City of Seattle

# Pioneer Square Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

PSB 187/16

## MINUTES for Wednesday, July 6, 2016

### Board Members

Mark Astor  
Colleen Echohawk  
Ryan Hester, Chair  
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair  
Kyle Kiser  
Carol O'Donnell  
Alex Rolluda

### Staff

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

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

#### **070616.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

June 1, 2016

MM/SC/DK/CO

5:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Hester abstained.

June 15, 2016

MM/SC/CO/AR

4:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Kralios and Kiser abstained.

#### **070616.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### **070616.21 Pioneer Hotel**

77 Yesler Way

Replace existing Best Western sign

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the sign copy change and thought the overall size was similar and it would utilize the existing attachments; the new color

was compatible and the letter size was consistent with the rules. ARC recommended approval and an expedited review at the full Board.

The applicant had nothing further to add.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members noted it was straightforward and determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of a replacement sign per the drawing and renderings provided.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 6, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160 Signs

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

#### 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.

**Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation**

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

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

**070616.22**

**Squire Building**

On the Field.Com

901 Occidental Ave S

Installation of new sign copy for IP6s

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC thought the sign was similar to previous signs. The Applicant said the iPhone 6s is for sale in the physical store at On the Field.com. ARC recommended approval.

The applicant had nothing further to add.

Ms. Nashem explained that the sign is a legal non-conforming sign which means that it was established in court that an on-premise sign can remain because it had been in use before the code prohibiting this size of sign was adopted but the size of the sign cannot change and the location of the sign cannot change. The board evaluates the sign based on the other criteria in District Rules and the SMC23.66.160. The sign will still be required to comply with the on-premise sign permit through DPD and other city laws.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of new sign copy for IP6s on the south façade as presented. This consideration does not include any determination by the Board that the sign qualifies as an on-premise sign.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 6, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160 Signs

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

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)

Mr. Kralios made a friendly amendment that the sign is for the iPhone 6 on AT&T.

MM/SC/MA/DK 7:0:0 Motion carried as amended.

**070616.23**

**Squire Building**

On the Field.Com  
901 Occidental Ave S

Installation of new sign copy for Verizon on the north facade

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC thought that sign design was similar to previous designs and that it was short term. The applicant said that Verizon is available at the store on site. ARC recommended approval.

Ms. Nashem explained that the sign is a legal non-conforming sign which means that it was established in court that an on-premise sign can remain because it had been in use before the code prohibiting this size of sign was adopted but the size of the sign cannot change and the location of the sign cannot change. The board evaluates the sign based on the other criteria in District Rules and the SMC23.66.160. The sign will still be required to comply with the on-premise sign permit through DPD and other city laws.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of new sign copy for Verizon on the north façade. This consideration does not include any determination by the Board that the sign qualifies as an on-premise sign.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 6,, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160 Signs

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

#### 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)

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

**070616.24**

**Florentine**

Division Road

536 1<sup>st</sup> Ave S

Ms. O'Donnell recused herself.

Painting the storefront

Installation of new business signage

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings, renderings and color samples provided. The applicant proposed to paint the storefront Goldenrod, a color

already used and approved on the building. ARC thought the color was compatible. Rather than using vinyl for the blade signage, he wanted to use aluminum attached to the existing brackets. The applicant said that the window signage would be copper vinyl applied to the exterior of the windows because of anti-graffiti coating. He said it would be hard for someone to vandalize it. ARC thought the signage was attractive, complied with rules and code requirements, provided for transparency and was overall compatible. They thought all colors were compatible with the district and the building. ARC recommended approval and suggested an expedited review at full Board.

Joseph Pecarich explained he amended the sign attachment to minimize gaps and be more consistent with adjacent signage on the building. He said that on page 20, 2" gaps are showing on the blade sign and they will get the gap down to ½" between the top and bottom. He said the 3M copper vinyl sample is for the lettering for both the blade sign and the window signage.

Mr. Hester said the Goldenrod color is from the building's recommended exterior paint colors for storefronts.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for painting the storefront Goldenrod and installation of new business signage per the drawings and samples provided and the alternative attachment method.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 6, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160 Signs

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

A. Transparency Regulations

1. To provide street level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment and promotes public safety, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be obscured by tinting, frosting, etching, window coverings including but not limited to window film, draperies, shades, or screens, extensive signage, or other means. (8/93, 7/99, 7/03)

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.
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)

MM/SC/KK/AR                      6:0:1      Motion carried. Ms. O'Donnell recused herself.

**070616.24**

**Street Light**

215 S James St

Installation of a metering device

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings provided. The applicant explained that the device reads electrical meters in the area. It does not have anything to do with the pole. The devices can relay the information about the building or business power use back to the Seattle City Light for billing instead of a person having to come out to read the meter. ARC asked if the device affects the light spread and the

applicant said it did not. The applicant said that it could be painted to match the location on the pole. There were two possible locations one on the arm and the other on the pole. ARC thought that an attachment to this type of pole with the Aladdin arm was okay, rather than the historic three globe light fixtures. The location was high, out of range of pedestrian site, the device was small, it could be painted and the attachment was reversible. ARC recommended approval with the device painted to match.

Applicant Comment:

Kathleen Clark said she was able to get a color match to the oxidized finish – ‘Network Gray’. She said the meter will be installed by Seattle City Light crew. She said they do not as yet have final installation standard regarding safety – it will be mounted to pole or arm up in the air. Installation will be with steel banding on top of the light or on the back of the pole. The installation will be temporary in that it can be removed for maintenance or adjustment. She said power will be via photo cell and the cable can be painted to match.

Ms. Nashem said it is an Aladdin pole with Chief Seattle base; rules have not been established specifically for these fixtures only the three globe and the Chief Seattle base, therefore the Board would be reviewing for general compatibility.

Mr. Hester said it is an ornamental street light but the fixture appears non-historic.

Mr. Kralios said the attachment won’t cause damage and is removable.

Mr. Hester said ARC had no preference for mounting location; attachment will be tight against the pole with conduit zip tied so it doesn’t dangle.

Ms. Nashem said the District Rules don’t provide much guidance in this area and that the Board should make clear the reasons for approval. She said she gets a lot of inquiries for mounting items as such for commercial use to the poles including the three globes. This is the first application for such a device. This approval could set a precedent for where it is appropriate and where it is not appropriate.

Ms. O’Donnell said she wouldn’t approve on a historic three-globe fixture.

Mr. Hester agreed. He said that with color match it won’t detract on this pole but that he thought on a historic pole it would.

Mr. Astor agreed but this is a small intervention – it is new technology and is a City of Seattle utility – and doing it on a utility pole makes sense and is appropriate. He said approving it on a case by case basis for each location and making a determination on each one is appropriate.

Mr. Kralios agreed. He said for this application and this location on this pole it is OK; it will cause no damage and is reversible.

Mr. Astor noted that technology changes and that this can be removed.



Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules. He said it is a minor installation and he appreciated the color match and method of installation.

Mr. Astor agreed.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of a metering device for Seattle City Light under the condition that it is painted to match the color of the location to which it is mounted.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 6,, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XV. STREET LIGHTING

The three-globe Chief Seattle bronze base light fixture currently used in the District will be the approved street lighting standard. Additional alternative lighting standards and fixtures that are compatible with the historic character of the District may be approved by the Board for installation in conjunction with three-globe fixtures as needed to improve pedestrian-level lighting and public safety. (7/03)

**Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation**

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/CO/MA 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**070616.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**

**070616.31 Manufacturers Building  
419 Occidental**

Briefing regarding the rehabilitation of the building and alterations

Mr. Hester disclosed that his employer, Sellen contacted to submit RFP for this project. He said there is no involvement yet but they plan to submit RFP; and will recuse when that happens.

Greg Schiffler introduced the design and development team.

Representing the ownership, Urban Villages, John Buerge explained this is their first project in Seattle. He said they plan to be a long term holder and to be part of the community. He said Pioneer Square is a special historic neighborhood. He said they intend to keep historic fabric intact. He said they have much experience with adaptive reuse and they propose to modernize the building while retaining its historic character.

Thomas Schaer presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). He provided historic and spatial context of the building. He said this project will contribute to the alley network project. He said the 7<sup>th</sup> floor was added in 1937; there are no windows on the primary façade for this floor and a doorway was carved through the corbel for the fire escape. He said a full retrofit is proposed including a full seismic retrofit. See report for proposed design changes; following are Board comments and questions.

Mr. Astor asked how the stair tower aligns with property lines – if a vacation was needed.

Mr. Schaer said that it is private property and always has been although they are holding the stairwell 6” off the adjacent building. Details are shown on page 35.

Ms. Nashem asked the applicant to discuss fire rating requirements.

Mr. Shiffler said the north wall will be two hour rated and completely opaque since it will be facing another property.

Mr. Kralios said the face perpendicular to property line can be un-rated.

Mr. Hester asked about the underside clearance of the stair tower.

Mr. Schiffler said it is 18’; he noted it will also have fire rating issues – maybe one hour. He said the main floor of the building base mezzanine is also 18’.

Mr. Astor asked where penetrations are on original building.

Mr. Schiffler said they are not proposing any new penetrations on the existing 7<sup>th</sup> floor wall; the north and east are generously glazed now.

Mr. Hester asked about the north building wall elevation and the ghost sign.

Mr. Schiffler said there are parts that are legible and they will take as light a touch as possible there.

Mr. Kralios noted the placement of the stair tower does not intersect windows. He said for future review it will be helpful to see detailed elevation – which openings will be altered or created or obscured.

Mr. Astor noted the historic clerestory windows and the proposed modern storefronts and asked the applicants to take a closer look at the Secretary of Interior Standards and provide a rationale for what they are doing.

Mr. Schaer said they are presenting bulk and scale and zoning conformance today and will come back with more detail later.

Mr. Astor said bulk and scale would apply to requirement for more exhibits – how what is proposed will interact with historic structure.

Mr. Kralios said he wants to see that as well.

Ms. Nashem said that today is only a briefing and that they need to submit the MUP, SEPA needs to be published and the board will review the Certificate of Approval. She said there is still time to examine how the stair tower addition will affect the building in future briefings.

Mr. Kralios asked if they have to have a water tank.

Mr. Schaer said no but that they do have to have fire pump and pressurization and bring the building up to modern life safety standards.

Mr. Kralios said that is another key piece to show. He said the stair is a big design idea and it seems to be consistent with the SOI – it is on a tertiary façade, it is set back, reversible – but he wants to see how it connects. He said he wants to see how existing openings will be impacted by stair tower.

Mr. Hester asked about balcony potential that was referred to in the alley presentation.

Mr. Schiffler said they would like to add them and said they would use a fire escape type material; it would require modification of windows to lower the sill. He said they need engineer input but it may be just a Juliet-type balcony.

Mr. Hester asked if the windows are original to the building.

Mr. Schaer said they are. He said you can see the story of changes to buildings over time in the historic material.

Mr. Schiffler said they will do a window survey.

Mr. Astor said it would be immense destruction of historic fabric. He said a faux balcony could be done or French door windows used without destruction of a large

percentage of the elevation's historic material. He said if we start touching every elevation there is a lot of change and a lot of destruction to the character of the building.

Mr. Kralios said they should look at the extent to which historic fabric is irrevocably damaged. He said there are some life-safety requirements but when changes are more arbitrary, or design-focused there will be more push back.

Mr. Astor said the impetus for change is driven by this market – on a building that is 100 years old. He said this is relative now but maybe not so in the future. He said this is a temporary current design on a 100 year old building that is workable for today's use.

Mr. Kralios noted the value of continue life of the building but said it should be maintained in current condition as much as possible.

Mr. Rolluda said it is better to restore than repair, to repair than replace.

Mr. Hester asked if they have done a utility survey to ascertain demand can be satisfied.

Mr. Schiffler said they haven't done a full survey of required loads but that Seattle City Light told them it is sufficient. He said it needs further assessment especially on vaults. He said the building probably needs a new gas meter.

Mr. Hester said these issues may impact areaway.

Ms. Nashem said the areaway here is highly altered. She said they are required to retain and replace the prisms and suggested they look at how this was done at Merrill Place.

Mr. Schiffler asked if the board reviews use for the areaway.

Ms. Nashem said it does and noted the Furuya basement areaway use; she said there is no preferred use in the basement.

Mr. Schaer said there will be structural concrete for seismic brace frame.

Mr. Schiffler said it will close off the area and they need input on that.

Ms. Nashem said there is a lack of historic material there but it needs more thought.

Mr. Kralios asked if they are planning infrastructure – such as hoods – for future tenants.

Mr. Schaer asked if they could do alley exposed ducts.

Mr. Kralios said that they have been allowed on tertiary non-primary facades when it has been difficult to create a pathway within a building. He said that here substantial alteration is being done so this should be located within the building interior.

Mr. Hester agreed and said that District Rule #8 mandates that preference is to locate within building interior.

Mr. Astor said it would further exacerbate changes to alley and modifications should be minimized as much as possible.

Mr. Kralios said a louver on a tertiary façade could be OK.

Mr. Astor said the size of the stair tower relative to the building is a smaller addition. He said to preserve the character of the building and to not overwhelm the structure.

Mr. Kiser said the stair tower looks to be of its time.

Mr. Astor said the penthouse etc. seems to comply with Code and setback requirements on historic building. He said he didn't see any deal breakers.

Mr. Hester said the placement of the stair tower impacts the ghost sign which is an ornamental feature on the building.

Mr. Astor said it should be discussed / reviewed as well as the impact to window openings. He said it isn't a 'done deal' but they could still provide input on bulk mass and scale.

Mr. Kralios said he would like a diagram showing the proposed interventions in the each façade.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester said to identify opening impacts, do a window survey, color code / identify proposed /planned demolition; what changes are planned and why; what is historic and what is not.

Mr. Kralios asked if there are any tracks in the alley and said they tell the story of the area. He said they should be saved along with any unit pavers found.

Mr. Schiffler said there are.

Mr. Schaer said they have a clear understanding and better framing for what is needed.

Mr. Kralios said there is overall support but that the board needs more detail. He would like a diagram showing the proposed interventions in the each façade.

Mr. Kiser said their goals are laudable.

Applicable Code and District Rules:

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

23.66.120 - Permitted uses

23.66.122 - Prohibited uses

23.66.130 - Street-level uses

23.66.140 – Height

23.66.180 - Exterior building design

A. Materials.

B. Scale.

C. Awnings.

### **Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules**

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

A. Design.

B. Building materials.

C. Color.

VIII. MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

XVIII. ALLEYS

A. Alley Paving.

### **Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation**

[Preservation Brief 14 Additions](#)

[Preservation Brief 41 Seismic Retrofit](#)

[Guidelines for Storefronts](#)

[Preservation Brief 3 Increasing Energy Efficiency](#)

Preservation Brief 9 Repair of Wooden windows

[Interpreting the Standard Bulletins 14 and 21 for new openings](#)

**070616.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

**070616.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Ryan Hester, Chair

**070616.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem

Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator

206.684.0227