



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 402/18

MINUTES for Wednesday December 19, 2018

Board Members

Adam Alsobrook
Lynda Collie
Brendan Donckers
Dean Kralios
Carol O'Donnell
Emily McIntosh
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Felicia Salcedo
Kianoush Curran

Chair Dean Kralios called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

121918.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 17, 2018

MM/SC/CO/AR

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

121918.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

121918.21 Bedford Hotel Building

1 Yesler Way

Ms. Nashem reported that the submitted and eligible costs were \$416,534.68. She said that work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. Interior work did not require a Certificate of Approval. Board members were provided photos to review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Pioneer Square Preservation Board recommend to the Landmarks Preservation Board to approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation Certification: Bedford Hotel, 1 Yesler Way; that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based on the findings at the meeting on December 19, 2018: that the property is a contributing building located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District; and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the Pioneer Square Preservation District; and has been substantially improved in the twenty-four month period ending October 3, 2018, that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board (Landmarks Preservation Board) as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

MM/SC/AA/AR 6:0:0 Motion carried.

121918.22 Theater Building
91 S Jackson St

Ms. Nashem explained that submitted and eligible rehabilitation costs were \$11,274,016. Work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by Pioneer Square Preservation Board. Interior work did not require a Certificate of Approval. Board members were provided photos to review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: The Theater building at 91 S Jackson St, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/AA/AR 6:0:0 Motion carried.

121918.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121918.21 Moses Building
D and E
314 2nd Ave S

Installation of signage

Mr. Donckers arrived at 9:10 am.

ARC report: Mr. Kralios said ARC reviewed the application drawings and renderings and thought that the dimensions of the blade sign comply with requirements and the

letters of both the blade sign and the door sign comply with the letter size requirements. They thought the sign was a compatible design and that it reused the existing attachment bolts. It was noted that the sign was already installed. The applicant noted that the sign maker was going to be out of town following the meeting so needed to install it prior to the meeting. ARC recommended approval and recommended an express review. He showed photo of new sign and went over attachment details. He said that it complies with District Rules.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of a blade sign and lettering on the door as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the *December 19, 2018* public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC 23.66.160 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)

A. Transparency Regulations

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.

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)

Sign Materials: Wood or wood products are the preferred materials for rigid hanging and projecting (blade) signs and individual signage letters applied to building facades. (7/99)

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.
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.
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)

Secretary of Interior's Standards

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/AA 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121918.22 **Theater Building**
95 S Jackson St

Installation of signage
Tabled.

121918.23 **Maynard Building**
119 1st Ave S

Repair and alterations to sandstone.

ARC report: Mr. Kralios said that ARC reviewed the plans and photos provided. The applicant showed a video of the inspection work. They found much more damage than expected. Much of the building where the sandstone has fallen off is being repaired with Jahns. They noted that the extent of work has been significantly more than the repairs they had anticipated and budgeted for. The applicant is requesting that they repair with an alternative design in the location above the entry door. They propose to modify the openings of the balustrade with simple curve rather than the detailed rose design that had been there. They proposed to replace the water table detail with a simple OG pattern located elsewhere on the building instead of the carved detail that had been there. The board asked for larger and more photos to better assess the existing conditions. They wanted a photo of the water table at other locations of the building. ARC was concerned that if this section was altered it would confuse the historical design of the building. The application said that leaving it in this condition would not be a good option. ARC suggested that there could be other options to explore for replacing the design detail. ARC did not make a recommendation pending the photos and further discussion.

Staff report: Ms. Nashem reported that the project was initially reviewed as in-kind maintenance. Because the project has grown and now includes a proposed alteration, staff determined that it needed to come to the Board for review and approval. She said she did a site visit and verified that the paint for the windows matched. She said she verified the colors of the painted rosettes; because the rosettes were multiple colors, she suggested simplifying it by doing the tan rosettes on the tan bricks and red rosettes on the red brick. She said she verified that the water pressure on the hose would be just tap pressure on the sandstone. She said she viewed some sandstone repairs and verified that the color matched and that the sealer did not change the appearance.

Applicant Comment:

Ralph Allen proposed replacing damaged sandstone section above entry door with a simple ogee trim; the rest is highly customized. He said there is some variation in condition. He proposed replacing balustrade with a simpler rolled quarter round into a flat cut instead of the rose elements.

Mr. Kralios noted that some areas are in better condition than others; he asked if they planned to remove it all.

Mr. Allen said they do because it would be a simpler design to have all round. He said some areas wear better; the balustrade is isolated and not connected to other elements. He appreciated getting information about the Special Tax program. He said these were just improvements.

Mr. Alsobrook said ARC discussed using carved cast stone or other material to reconstruct the balustrade.

Mr. Allen said it would be problematic to detail it so it would look good.

Mr. Kralios said he is not in favor of removing detailing that is in good condition. The differentiation of new and old is in keeping with the SOI standards. The SOI standards state it is better to repair than replace. He said there is enough extant material remaining to repair.

Ms. O'Donnell said SOI 9 talks about stabilization of historic features.

Mr. Alsobrook noted the varied deterioration. He said the proposed profile – ¼" round – might not be the best profile.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kralios went over SOI standards that if repaired, it should match. He said there is wiggle in the material – a substitute is allowed but it must match in color etc.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if there is another stone that could be used instead of sandstone.

Mr. Allen said not from a practicality standpoint. The mortar being used is the best; it provides solid bonding and is a long-term malleable product.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if it is possible to press material into a mold to get the design.

Mr. Allen said it is, but it gets into a means and methods construction; once created, how would they properly install and bond it.

Mr. Alsobrook said the top part of the decorative piece is underneath a cap was removed and will be recreated. He said just the square portions of balustrade will be done.

Mr. Kralios said they are committed to replicate the cornice to match existing; just the balustrade opening detail would be new. He said SOI pushes for replacement in-kind and there is no wiggle. He said the look to Special Tax, 4Culture and resources for additional funding.

Mr. Alsobrook said there is a lot of work that needs to get done and wondered if the motion could be split.

Ms. Nashem said everything else is in-kind.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Repair of sandstone water table with the original design. This approval does not include any alterations to the design of the balustrade.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the *December 19, 2018* 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

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99)

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

Secretary of Interior's Standards

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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.

Preservation Brief 16 Using Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/16-substitute-materials.htm>

MM/SC/AA/AR

7:0:0 Motion carried as amended.

121918.14

Travelers Hotel Building

Bisato

84 Yesler Way

Installation of signage

ARC report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and sample provided. ARC thought the mock up was very helpful in understanding the construction of the sign. The applicant had two alternatives for the sign lighting. One of the options that ARC thought was more similar to an internally lit sign that is prohibited. The other

option with lighting glowing around the sign they thought was more similar to the halo lit signs in the District. ARC discussed the proposed yellow LED and thought that white/clear lighting was in keeping with other lit non-neon signs. ARC also thought that is the LED yellow color didn't match it would detract from the otherwise compatible sign. The applicant agreed to white/clear lighting and will bring a revised drawing. ARC suggested that yellow painted on the background might be compatible if they wanted additional yellow surrounding the sign.

Staff report: Ms. Nashem explained that internally lit or back lit signs are prohibited. The Board has been consistent in not approving a sign that has internally lighting that lights up the front of the sign. These have usually been acrylic letters or other plastic facing. The Board has allowed halo sign siting the difference that the in that case the lighting is behind the sign and shine on the back ground of the sign. The letters are not lit.

Applicant Comment:

Hiroshi Matsubara showed materials for board review.

Mr. Kralios said the lighting is positioned so it is hitting the back so it looks like it is halo lit.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules. He said it is not a blade sign. It is in an exterior vestibule and will be attached to non-historic material.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of a sign as amended.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the *December 19, 2018* public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

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.

2. Wall signs painted on or affixed to a building shall not exceed ten percent of the total area of the façade or 240 square feet, whichever is less. Area of original building finish visible within the exterior dimensions of the sign (e.g., unpainted brick) shall not be considered when computing the sign's area.

4. When determining the appropriate size of a sign the Board and the Director of Neighborhoods shall also consider the function of the sign and the character and scale of buildings in the immediate vicinity, the character and scale of the building for which the sign is proposed, the proposed location of the sign on the building's exterior, and the total number and size of signs proposed or existing on the building.

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)

Sign Materials: Wood or wood products are the preferred materials for rigid hanging and projecting (blade) signs and individual signage letters applied to building facades. (7/99)

C. Specific Signage Regulations

2. 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.

Secretary of Interior's Standards

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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

121918.15 Occidental Park

Installation of a play structure

ARC report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and samples provided. The applicant noted that they were taking care to protect the trees and to provide for water drainage. The applicant identified the locations where they would remove bricks for foundations and noted the bricks would be stored by Parks in case of reinstallation. ARC appreciated the salvage of the bricks, while not historic material the bricks could be hard to source. They discussed that they are testing coating to remove vandalism and there would be 15% wood in stock for immediate repairs if needed. ARC discussed how to clean the Forever Lawn product and its installation method. ARC

thought that the artificial grass was a better option than vibrant colored play tiles. It was thought that the design and material was compatible with the District and ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Beth Purcell explained they have funding to do the project and it has been a partnership between Alliance for Pioneer Square, Downtown Seattle, Seattle Parks and Recreation.

Jonathan Worley, Berger, explained the design was inspired by curves and flow lines, design of Native Art and the timber industry. He said the equipment is more linear with many play options for kids but with visibility through. He went over site and context and noted tree protection plans. He said a temporary fence will be up during work. He said they will take out pavers to install footings; they will minimize excavation while removing pavers. He said pavers will be salvaged and stored. He said the project will be ADA compliant and barrier-free. He said there is a fall zone perimeter around the play equipment. He said the bench provides horizontal seating with a back sitting attached to galvanized, open saddle style legs. He said the wood surface will weather over time. He said they don't have shop drawings yet. He said the play equipment has posts and netting, opportunities for climbing. He said they are coordinating drainage with DOPAR and utilities above and below ground.

Ms. Purcell said they hope for March construction.

Mr. Kralios asked if the back slats are beveled to shed water.

Mr. Worley said there is a 30° angle and an angle to the top piece. He said they have been working with an ADA expert.

Public Comment:

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, supported the project and said it is an asset for kids and will make the park more welcoming for kids. She said this is the right location and design.

Jen Cassius, Downtown Seattle Association (DSA), said it is positive activation of the park and will make it much more welcoming.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules.

Ms. Nashem said benches referred to in the District Rules were removed years ago. She asked the board to consider pedestrian flow, durability of materials, and compatibility of materials such as the use of artificial grass.

Mr. Kralios said it is a unique application. Occidental Park is not a landmark but is in a historic district. He said what is proposed is an intervention with no damage to historic material. He said they will preserve and salvage pavers. He said that kids in district and now need to be considered. He said the design references back to history of lumber industry. He said it is a well-thought-out intervention. He said they are aware of CPTED, safety, security issues and are working with DSA and Parks to monitor. He said the materials are compatible, durable, the play structure is abstract and allows visibility. He said the surface – as a play surface, he doesn't want to see in district. He said in this situation, a resilient fall zone is needed, and the artificial grass is more compatible than a more vivid rubber.

Ms. O'Donnell said DOPAR has rubber tiles in Westlake and recommended grass here. She said the artificial grass should be limited to the use in this park situation but nowhere else.

Mr. Alsobrook said it is important that the grass be used for this location only and there should be a very specific care and sanitation regimen. He said it cannot be guaranteed elsewhere and there should be no proliferation of it.

Mr. Rolluda agreed there should be a maintenance regimen.

Ms. Purcell said the maintenance will be performed by Parks along with DSA. She said Forever Lawn is the only material that works here; there are limited options for resilient play area surfaces. She said they got away from rubber materials.

Ms. Cassius said they have used this product elsewhere; they clean with enzyme cleaner, power wash on site. She said it is all natural and kills bacteria. She said there will be 'no dogs' signage.

Mr. Donckers asked about environmental safety of the product.

Ms. Purcell said it is used in stadiums and play areas. She said Parks has conducted studies. She said this is different from a sportsfield. She said it has foam underneath.

Mr. Kralios asked if it has pulverized rubber.

Mr. Donckers noted proximity to Puget Sound, drainage and if any product would make its way into system.

Ms. Purcell said there are no granular elements and the product is specifically for play areas. She said it is safe for environment.

Ms. McIntosh appreciated the design process, that they took history of the site into consideration.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of a play area as presented. Artificial turf is approved for this application and at this location only.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the *December 19, 2018* 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

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99)

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

New construction must be visually compatible with the predominant architectural styles, building materials and inherent historic character of the District. (7/99) Although new projects need not attempt to duplicate original facades, the design process ought to involve serious consideration of the typical historic building character and detail within the District.

XI. STREET FURNITURE

~~The cast iron and wood benches located in Pioneer Place Park and Occidental Park are the standard for the District.~~ Approval to install benches will be determined by need and availability. All other elements of street furniture will be reviewed by the Board as to their specific compatibility within the Preservation District. This review will be extended to all bus shelters, bollards, signal boxes, mailboxes, pay phones, trash receptacles, newspaper stands, and vending carts which are both permanent and mobile. Pay phones, mail boxes, trash receptacles, and newspaper stands shall be located in the sidewalk zone adjacent to the curb, in line with street trees and light standards to reduce impediments to pedestrian flow and to avoid obscuring visibility into street level retail storefronts. (7/99, 7/03)

Secretary of Interior's Standards

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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

121918.3 PRELIMINARY DESIGN BRIEFINGS

121918.31 60 Yesler Way

Briefing regarding new construction
Art installation

Case Creal, Gensler, presented via PowerPoint (materials in DON file). Following is an overview with board and public questions and comments. He proposed a simple material palette, mostly brick, with metal canopies with wood on the underside. He noted the brick coursing and said vertical soldier course will be used immediately above lintels for texture. He said they look to enliven Western Avenue façade with vertical stacked bond in blank areas, louvers. He said they are still looking at a west entry. He said they wanted a darker brick, but the board said not to use black brick; he went over options explored and chose the grey with iron spot and onyx mortar. He said the building will be a suitable complement and way to end the block. He said bricks will be in two finishes – running bond and soldier course; a lighter colored mortar is proposed. He said the metal canopies will be painted steel with matte finish with Western Red Cedar wood on the underside. He provided detailed views of materials study.

Mr. Creal said the cornice condition will conceal height of parapet and will have recessed break in metal as a relief.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if the bricks will be used in a true random pattern as shown in the renderings.

Mr. Creal said it will be a complete random mix. He said the spandrel portion of glazing will be at 36". He said there will be a small mullion that won't be seen from inside. He said it will be rendered like any other sill joint.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if there will be a spacer for IG.

Mr. Creal said there is not sparkle against it.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if frit is exposed and what long-term durability would be. He asked if frit will be used at all guest room windows.

Mr. Creal said it will be used at guest rooms. He said there is no concern with scratching into frit.

He said that the cedar under the canopy will likely be tongue and groove with no slot between slats. He provided a sample of the proposed louver and said it will be matte black. He said bird / insect screen will attach at back.

Art

Tamar Benzikry, 4Culture, presented the proposed art selection process (materials in DON file). She explained the diversity of practice and response to place, mission, site specific work and bringing a poetic gesture to the site. She went over their goals: Permanent, Integrated, contract to manage, related to the city, sight and people, history and future, gateway, and have \$100,000 budget. The Board clarified they thought it should be integrated in the architecture, that it would be a gateway from Pioneer Square to the waterfront that is should be specific to Pioneer Square rather than generally the city. They thought it should "authentic." Ms. Benzikry went over how they conduct community outreach, and the selection panel.

Citizen M said the art will be permanent and integrated with building. He said they will contract with 4Culture to manage, select artist, and design development. He said a local artist will be sought, art will be about Seattle, its history and future. He said the art will be installed at 27' x 74' recess on building. He said they will build on the legacy of context-sensitive public art in terms of content. He said they will relate material, text and colors to historic context of Pioneer Square which will relate to the Citizen M ethos. He said there will be no neon or illuminated element, nor will it function as signage.

Mr. Kralios said the art should be integrated and not be an afterthought; it should be specific to its location. He said the art will be facing Pioneer Square and will be at a gateway from Pioneer Square to the Waterfront rather than the other way around. He said the art should be specific to Pioneer Square, not Seattle. He said Pioneer Square has a long history and multicultural components, some that predate European settlers.

Mr. Alsobrook said regarding pre-contact history, what is the definition of local, native art and to look at the entire spectrum.

Mr. Donckers said post-settler context includes Chinese Exclusion, Japanese incarceration, Cannery workers. He said there is a complex web of stories in the district.

Mr. Kralios noted that no one single piece could address it all.

Ms. Benzikry said it speaks to cultural history as a repository of possibilities. She said there is a broad cultural history and the artwork can relate to that.

Mr. Donckers said he was on the panel for Colman Dock and they selected a product that acknowledges many influences.

Ms. Benzikry said the process will be invitational; the panel will review the shortlist and three will be brought to the client. She went over methodology and proposed design review by selected panel in June.

Ms. McIntosh asked about opportunity for public comment.

Ms. Benzikry said they typically don't involve public in process, but it will be open to public review.

Mr. Alsobrook said there will be public review at this meeting and to make sure the artists knows that.

Public Comment:

Karen True said Pioneer Square has a wealth of artists and experts and suggested including a couple on the selection committee.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, said they have a good framework and will engage public early. He said this is just process overview to make sure the board is comfortable.

Mr. Kralios said it is a good process; this proposal is an anomaly, it is a big component for the building.

Ms. O'Donnell was concerned about size and is pleased the 4Culture is involved and thinks will provide direction for a process that will result in compatible artwork.

Mr. Morrison said the timeline is inter-related with the art and the two processes will run parallel. He said they wanted to get feedback from board with process.

Mr. Kralios said there is no Certificate of Approval without approval of final art.

Ms. O'Donnell and Mr. Alsobrook disagreed and noted the processes are separate.

Mr. Donckers said it is a close call, but he agreed with Mr. Kralios. He said the board should tread carefully, the Code is silent, and it could set up a precedent. He noted the timeline would be parallel.

Mr. Kralios said it is hard to separate the two.

Ms. O'Donnell said the building could move ahead without the art.

Mr. Kralios said it could, but it creates a blank façade.

Ms. Nashem questioned what would result if art didn't happen.

Mr. Morrison said the art is integral part of the process. He said they are open to a Certificate of Approval with conditions to get the building moving. He said art is the last part. He said they want to keep the building moving ahead.

Mr. Rolluda pointed out that they haven't restricted the artists and art could be 3-D. He said that the building is a frame for art and architecture may need to respond to that.

Ms. Benzikry said they would only review /select art appropriate for the agreed-upon space for art.

Mr. Morrison said they will have more conversations.

Ms. Nashem said the approval could be conditioned that something has to go on blank wall, and it could be enforced. She said they would have to come back and revise if it didn't.

Citizen M said there is no way they would not do art, it is core to who they are. He said they want to do it well and do it right.

Mr. Alsobrook said it is a permanent work of art but what if the artwork were to be removed from the building.

Mr. Kralios said it could be written into motion.

Material

Mr. Kralios said he is not a fan of dark brick, SMC calls for red brick, masonry, sandstone. He said dark gray makes the building seem more massive. The dark mortar makes it look more monolithic. He preferred seeing them break it down to a more granular, human scale possibly with another color mortar. He said he has concern with scale and proportion of the window without further breakdown. He said the solid frit glass is a departure from windows compatible with district.

Ms. McIntosh agreed with Mr. Kralios about the brick color. She appreciated warmth and encouraged more warmth noting it would be more in character with District Rules and SMC.

Mr. Alsobrook said he echoed his colleagues' comments on brick color. He said the building to the north could be repainted in the future and this would stand out even more. He said grey is a current trend. He echoed comments on the windows and said it changes the aperture of windows.

Mr. Donckers said to think of the Weyerhaeuser Building – whether good or bad to have two with similar colors of their time.

Mr. Alsobrook said Weyerhaeuser is in its own context of the park and voids, this site is close to the steam plant building. It is contextually different from Occidental Park. He said this building is next door to painted concrete.

Mr. Rolluda wanted to see alternatives. He said it could be subtle with red brick at three bays in crosses and cap.

Ms. McIntosh said art on large façade and materiality should be tied.

Mr. Kralios said the streetscape should be inviting and vibrant with transparency. He said how the storefront is addressed should relate to the district. He said to look at breakdown of glazing.

121918.3 BOARD BUSINESS

121918.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Dean Kralios, Chair

121918.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227