



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 300/16

MINUTES for Wednesday, October 19, 2016

Board Members

Mark Astor
Ryan Hester, Chair
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Carol O'Donnell
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Colleen Echohawk

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

101916.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

September 21, 2016

MM/SC/CO/CM 2:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Hester and Astor abstained.

October 5, 2016

MM/SC/CM/MA 4:0:0 Minutes approved.

101916.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

101916.21 Nord and Pioneer Passage Alley

Alleys east of 1st Ave S, Jackson to Main and Washington to Yesler

Extension of Certificate of Approval PSB100/15 to pave the alleys

ARC Report: Project not reviewed at ARC

Staff Report: The project to pave the alleys was approved in April of 2015 with PSB10015; Certificate of Approval is valid for 18 months. For various reasons the actual restoration work has not started yet so the Certificate of Approval needs to be extended.

Liz Stenning, Alliance for Pioneer Square, explained that the coordinated effort with the City and utilities will test out design for alley paving. The design will use bricks salvaged from the alley on edges with brick and stone in the same dimension woven together in a pattern. She said they have been working on funding for the actual construction.

Mr. Rolluda arrived at 9:05 am.

Amanda Tse, SDOT, said they have gone through the design process and RFP process and hit some obstacles during the review process. She said Seattle City Light and Century Link have just completed their work in Nord Alley and have just started in Pioneer Passage.

Mr. Hester said to make sure to re-coordinate work with adjacent businesses / property owners.

Mr. Astor said he had no problem with the extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval extending PSB10015 for an additional 18 months. Alley surface restoration including utility upgrades and drainage improvements all per the drawing and renderings attached. Historic brick and cobble will be removed and stored. Brick will be reincorporated into the design as indicated on the plans

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 19, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC23.66.030 Certificates of Approval Required

G. Expiration of Certificates of Approval

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XIX. ALLEYS

A. Alley Paving

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, and 9
Guidelines for Setting

MM/SC/MA/CO 5:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.22

Metropolitan Building

Seattle Lighting

222 Second Ave Ext S

Installation of a flag pole

ARC Report: The applicant was not able to attend but asked that ARC review the application in his absence. ARC thought that the flag pole complied with set back and height regulation and that the corner placement was appropriate. ARC had questions about the method of waterproofing to ensure proper protection of the building and the proposed color of the flag pole.

Applicant Comment:

Shepard Matthews explained they proposed to put up a 30' flagpole; it will be sited 12' back from the parapet. He said they will set the mandrel mount through the roof of the building into the large beam of roof supporting structure.

Mr. Hester asked about waterproofing.

Mr. Matthews said that it is a TPO roof / swimming pool membrane. The mandrel will set on top and a roofer will put sealed tubing on top of the mandrel to waterproof it. He said the pole finish is brushed aluminum and the installation has been professionally engineered. Responding to clarifying questions he said they will fly a 5' x 8' American flag and the pole is engineered for a 6' x 10' flag. He said sometimes they will fly a '12' flag.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Nashem reported that while there is no history of a flag on this building but it was common to have a flag pole on the corner of a building, centered or symmetrical at both corners. Lightning rods were also common.

Mr. Hester noted the thoughtful placement, the engineered installation and connection, and it is waterproof. He said it meets District Rules.

Mr. Astor agreed with Mr. Hester.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of a flag pole with lighting for the purpose of flying the American flag and occasionally the 12' flag as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 19, 2016

public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.140 Height

4. Height limits for rooftop features

a. Religious symbols for religious institutions, smokestacks and flagpoles may extend up to 50 feet above the roof of the structure or the maximum height limit, whichever is less, except as regulated in [Chapter 23.64](#) of this Land Use Code, provided that they are a minimum of 10 feet from all lot lines.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the 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/MA/AR 5:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.23 Ace Hotel and Duppenthaler Building
Seattle's Union Gospel Mission
318 2nd Ave Ext and 211 S Washington St

Repairs windows and upgrade window glazing, replace 7 non original windows

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the window survey provided, the drawing and material samples. The applicant explained that these buildings together make up the Union Gospel Mission. Generally most windows on the Ace Hotel building are original. The applicant explained that they are replacing non original aluminum windows with new aluminum windows that match the configuration of the original steel windows. Only two windows on the Duppenthaler building are original. They intend to just replace the glass on this building keeping the wood as is. They noted two windows on the Ace Hotel building that were removed on an emergency Certificate of Approval will be repaired and reinstalled. All windows to be repaired will be removed repaired in the shop and reinstalled. They will be installed with new ½ inch insulated glazing. ARC thought that they had done a thorough window survey and that their approach to repair where possible and replacement only where necessary and to replace with new windows matching the old was consistent with SOI standards. ARC suggest color coding the windows on the elevation so that it is easy to see which are original and which are not as well as which will be replaced. They also suggested a windows schedule. The applicant noted that the project budget is limited and therefore there might be a phased project or only a portion of the project may get done. ARC asked the applicant to spell out their

recommendation for prioritizing the project work. ARC expressed appreciation for the work being done to preserve the building. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Kim Demarest, Tiscareno Associates, provided context of the building. She said that the Ace Building is the older of the two; it was built in 1904. She said that on the west side of the Ace Building the sashes are from the 1930 façade and need to be restored; all glass is not original. She noted interior rot. On the South side there are steel and some wood windows. On the east side are 8' x 8' pivot windows – these are the most character-defining. She said that there are some smaller size casement windows. She said on the north are warped steel windows; there is sash and some sill damage. She said that new aluminum windows are proposed that are sympathetic to building character. She showed the options explored.

Mr. Kralios arrived at 9:25 am.

Mr. Astor asked the number of windows in the building and the number being replaced.

Ms. Demarest said there are 150 and seven non-historic will be full replacement.

Ms. Demarest said there are no original windows in the Duppenhaler Building. She went through the replacement process for both buildings and said that scaffolding will be installed. She said that on the west side they can do removal from interior. She said they will uninstall windows, put plywood in openings, and tape over for weather tightness. She said that frames will be repaired from outside; they will do five per day. She said that the east side is more involved; they will mount a swing stage from the roof and use a crane to move large pivot windows. She said there will be a 10-12 week restoration time; it will be phased and organized by floor. She said the buildings need to remain operational during the work.

Mr. Hester asked the applicant to walk the board through the documents.

Ms. Demarest walked the board through the renderings and explained which windows will be restored and which sympathetically replaced. She said they will match historic windows per historic photos.

Ms. O'Donnell asked about lead paint remediation.

Ms. Demarest said the removal of lead paint will be done off site. Responding to clarifying questions about replacement strategy she indicated the schedule is included in the packet. She explained that storefronts are the last priority.

Mr. Kralios said that the Certificate of Approval will be to replace all windows; if funding ran out they would have to come back for amendment / update.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kralios commended the applicant for a thorough and well-thought-out survey that is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards. He thanked the team for taking board feedback. He said the paint colors are compatible and they are repairing where possible consistent with District Rules.

Mr. Astor agreed and said that the removal and restoration are appropriate and will result in a great project. He said the colors are in keeping with the district and the building. He said he appreciated the limited number of replacement. He said it is a well put together package.

Mr. Hester agreed and said it closely complies with the Secretary of Interior Standards course of action – restore rather than replace. He appreciated the pictorial history.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for repairs windows and upgrade window glazing, replace seven windows as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 19, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.180 To complement and enhance the historic character of the District and to retain the quality and continuity of existing buildings, the following requirements shall apply to exterior building design:

A. Materials. Unless an alternative material is approved by the Department of Neighborhoods Director following Board review and recommendation, exterior building facades shall be brick, concrete tinted a subdued or earthen color, sandstone or similar stone facing material commonly used in the District. Aluminum, painted metal, wood and other materials may be used for signs, window and door sashes and trim, and for similar purposes when approved by the Department of Neighborhoods Director as compatible with adjacent or original uses, following Board review and recommendation.

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.

- A. Building materials. The most common facing materials are brick masonry and cut or rusticated sandstone, with limited use of terra cotta and tile. Wooden window sash, ornamental sheet metal, carved stone and wooden or cast iron storefronts are also typically used throughout the District. Synthetic stucco siding materials are generally not permitted. (7/99)
- B. Color. Building facades are primarily composed of varied tones of red brick masonry or gray sandstone. Unfinished brick, stone, or concrete masonry unit surfaces may not be painted. Painted color is typically applied to wooden window sash, sheet metal ornament and wooden or cast iron storefronts. Paint colors shall be appropriate to ensure compatibility within the District. (7/99)

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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.

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

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

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

- 101916.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**
- 101916.4 BOARD BUSINESS**
- 101916.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Ryan Hester, Chair
- 101916.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227