



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 114/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, May 6, 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
Melinda Bloom

Absent

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

050615.11 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
March 18, 2015 Deferred.
April 1, 2015 Deferred.

050615.21 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

050615.21 **Emerald Building**
625 1st Ave S

Applicant Comment:

Change of use from retail to restaurant in 2900 square foot street level space and commissary kitchen in a 2085 square foot basement space

Shane Staley, Atelier Drome, explained the proposal to convert frame shop to new Cherry Street Coffee shop. He explained that downstairs is now parking and storage

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

and will be converted to production space/commercial kitchen to do their baking there. Coffee shop will be at street level.

Mr. Hester asked if retail was planned.

Henry Walters, Atelier Drome, said that one shelf would be used for t-shirts – less than 6' linear feet. He said that the basement space is access from Post Alley through existing door.

Mr. Hester asked if there will be venting needs.

Mr. Walters said there will be and they are working with the landlord; he said they don't anticipate louvers in the front. He said that the landlord also owns the parking lot and they can vent off side wall or off roof. He said they will come back for design review. He said the space used to be a restaurant and has assembly use.

Public Comment: Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square said they support the application. She said the activity will be great and will offset the 7-11 activities.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Use from retail to restaurant in 2900 square foot street level space and commissary kitchen in a 2085 square foot basement space per

Code Citation

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses

SMC 23.66.130 Street Level Uses

MM/SC/DK/AmB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050615.22

Post Hotel Building

Kraken Congee

88 Yesler Way

Installation of new business signage

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and photos provided. He said they thought the blade sign complied with the rules for signage. They thought that although the vinyl window sign was large because it was at the stair down to the space, it did not negatively affect transparency. ARC recommended approval.

Staff Report: The sign complies with the size and letter size regulations and is made of wood which is identified as the preferred material in the rules.

Applicant Comment:

Shane Robinson explained that white cut vinyl will be mounted to interior of window and wood sign will hang from existing bracket 24" off the building and 10' high. He said that black stain will be in the recessed areas of the wood. Responding to clarifying questions he explained that the existing bracket is black and is very sturdy; no new penetrations into the building are needed. He said that the hanging hardware will be black powder coated.

Ms. Brown asked if there would be a sandwich board.

Mr. Robinson said not at this time.

Public Comment: Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, supported the application and said it will help bring people to the block.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and Code.

Mr. Kralios cited the ARC report and supported the application.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of signage as presented per

Code Citations:

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

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.

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)

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

MM/SC/AmB/MA 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050615.23

Westland Building
100 S King Street

Installation of mechanical equipment and louver

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios ARC reviewed the plan and photos provided. Although mechanical equipment is preferred to be interior, or on the roof, ARC determined that this location was on a non-primary façade and in the location of other similar equipment. The new vent is being installed in a location that is in-fill CMU. ARC did recommend that the applicant provide a photo in which the existing louver that was visible.

Staff Report: The applicant will provide the photo requested. The location is on an alley but parallel to 1st Ave S, however there is an existing piece of equipment there already. It is unknown when it was installed or if it had approval.

Applicant Comment:

Kevin Alman explained the proposal to install an amenity area for occupants that will include bike storage, showers, fans – to take moisture out of building, conference rooms.

Mr. Hester asked about heat pump.

Mr. Alman said the heat pump is in the back where they will put in two condensers. He said they are very quiet units. He said the existing five ton air handler was replaced in kind and connects to front louver. He said that they will remove abandoned equipment and will sandblast to expose the original look.

Ms. Nashem explained that sandblasting is not appropriate for historic material and likely would not be approved.

Mr. Alman said it is a faux finish on the interior and they want it to look like original.

Mr. Hester asked about the new louver.

Mr. Alman said it will be painted to match the brick.

Ms. Nashem noted that it is CMU and not brick in the location proposed on the plans.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and Code.

Mr. Kralios said the new louver is in non-historic fabric and will be painted to match; he noted it is on the alley. He said the condenser units are on loading dock and there is already one there; he noted the precedent and that the equipment is quiet.

Ms. Petrovich asked if the units will be painted.

Mr. Alman said no.

Mr. Hester said he appreciated the color match on the louver.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of mechanical equipment and louver as presented per:

Code Citations:

District Rules

VIII. MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

The preferred location for mechanical systems is in the building interior. In cases where locating systems in the interior is not possible, exterior mechanical systems equipment, including but not limited to air conditioning units, compressors, boilers, generators, ductwork, louvers, wiring and pipes, shall be installed on non-primary building facades and/or roof tops. Mechanical equipment shall be installed in such a manner that character-defining features of the building are not radically changed, damaged, obscured, or destroyed. Screening and/or painting of equipment may be required to diminish negative visual impacts. (7/99)

MM/SC/MP/AmB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050615.24

Squire Building – Wall sign

901 B Occidental Ave S

New sign copy for Redbull for the south wall sign

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the proposed signage. While some thought that the black background provided a stark contrast it was thought to be generally acceptable. Mr. Brown said that Redbull would be sold at On the Field.

Applicant Comment:

Nick Brown explained they would replace the existing copy with Redbull ad. He said that it will be sold at the store. He said that the change is for the vinyl only.

Mr. Hester clarified that the existing aluminum frame will remain and all that will be done will be to replace the existing vinyl copy with the new.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem explained that this 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. It is required to be an on-premise sign. I am asking the Board to not make a determination if they think the sign is an on-premise sign but to evaluate the sign based on the other criteria in our 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.

Mr. Hester went over board purview. He said he appreciated the reusable frame. He said that the overall colors are a stark departure from the red brick but noted there are no loud colors. He said it was okay.

Ms. Petrovich agreed and said it is not busy or flashy; she said it was acceptable.

Mr. Bennett said it was okay.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of new sign copy for Redbull for the south wall sign per

Code Citations:
SMC 23.66.160 Signs

MM/SC/AmB/TP 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050615.25

State Hotel

Damm the Weather
116 First Ave S

Sidewalk café with railing and a platform

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and photos provided. ARC thought that the slop of the sidewalk was such that a platform was needed. ARC thought the construction and materials of the sidewalk café were durable and attractive. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Adam Mann explained the sidewalk café details as in drawings (in DON file). He said that it will be 88 square feet. He said they will use 12" x 12" precast pavers, decking, powder coated tube steel railing.

Mr. Kralios clarified that there will be no umbrellas.

Mr. Mann said there won't be.

Mr. Hester asked about the rail attachment.

Mr. Mann said it does not attach to building. He went over details in plan. He said that the decking will be painted with a marine grade paint that has a five year life.

Mr. Hester asked if furniture will be taken in at night.

Mr. Mann said that it will.

Mr. Kralios asked about the rail height.

Responding to questioned about furniture Mr. Mann explained that it will be off the shelf and will be black.

Ms. Nashem noted that the areaway is filled.

Ms. Bennett asked what they will do with the planters.

Mr. Mann didn't know. He clarified that nothing will be attached to the building.

Public Comment: Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, said she supported the application and said it is a great addition and it is great to have a café there that is done right.

Ms. Brown said the new deck is attractive.

Mr. Hester went over board purview.

Ms. Nashem said that SDOT won't allow a platform unless there is a slope.

Mr. Hester said he appreciated the aesthetic and the investment in the Square. He said that the materials are durable and compatible and suitable. He said the furniture will be brought in every day. He said he appreciates there is no attachment to the building. He said the attachment to the sidewalk is minimal.

Mr. Aster agreed. He said the tubular steel is durable as specified in rules. He said it is an excellent addition to the building especially compared to what was there previously.

Ms. Brown asked about deck access.

Mr. Mann said there is exterior and interior access.

Ms. Petrovich said that the maximum rail height is 42" and they are counting from the finished deck surface up.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of a sidewalk café with railings and a platform as presented per:

Code Citations:

District Rules

XIII. SIDEWALK CAFES

Sidewalk cafes may not impede the flow of pedestrian traffic. Movable structural elements that can be brought back against the building wall or elements that can be removed when not in use will generally be required if some structural element is

necessary. No walls or roofs of any kind are permitted to enclose sidewalk cafes. Free-standing and table umbrellas are permitted, however, the Board may limit their number and placement to ensure compatibility with transparency and signage regulations. (7/03) Planter boxes are discouraged and will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances.

Materials for any structural elements on the sidewalk should be of durable, weatherproof, and vandal-proof quality. The Board will consider the compatibility of the color and design of structural elements with the building facade and the character of the District. The maximum allowable height of structural elements, including fencing, is 42". (7/03)

MM/SC/MP/DK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050615.26

Smith Tower
506 2nd Ave

Alterations to add decks to the roof at the 22nd floor and install building lighting

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and photos provided. ARC thought that the alterations were minimal and much of the items on the deck would be minimally visible. ARC appreciated that one of windows to be removed would be used to fix a broken window. Staff suggested that the Board require the other window to be salvaged and stored incase other window repairs are needed. The windows are unique bronze windows. ARC thought that the new lighting was appropriate and appreciated that they avoided penetrations to the terra cotta. The applicant clarified that they are asking for approval of both the preferred more expensive material as well as their second choice. ARC general thought that both were appropriate.

Staff Report: The location is on the 22nd floor and the applicant has provided sight line drawings from 300 feet to show that it is minimally visible.

Applicant Comment:

Becky Dail explained the proposal to convert roof space to amenity decks and to convert mechanical roof decks to occupant lounge space. She said they will add rails, and glass. She said the posts for rails will be finished to match building terracotta. She said that they will provide ADA access to deck. New door will be put in; terracotta sill and windows at proposed door location will be salvaged and stored on site. She said that one damaged window will be repaired. She said that they will add a new trellis canopy to screen the mechanical equipment; it will be tube steel painted white. She said the existing stair enclosure will be extended to meet exit requirements. Responding to questions she went through the materials board and said the window systems will match as close as possible. She said that lights will replace existing fixtures and will match the anodized aluminum window frames. She said that there is existing gas in building and gas to fireplace will run through existing chase that runs through the building. She said the LED flood light will put out a narrow beam and there will not be a lot of spill.

Mr. Kralios asked about the height of the stair enclosure extension.

Ms. Dail said it will match the existing stair and will be of the same construction.

Mr. Astor asked about the glass – chain link wall.

Ms. Dail said it will be similar dimension only with clear glass; it will be all new.

Mr. Hester said that visibility at the pedestrian level begins at 300' back. He asked for a summary of the attachment of new structure.

Ms. Dail said the post will span down through roof materials to structure. She said they will add new roofing. She said nothing will go through ornamental features.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester went over board purview. He said it is a great repurposing of interior/exterior space. He said it is appropriate for the location and building. He said that it is minimally visible and matched to building as best as possible. He said the materials are suitable and he appreciates the attachment of new with minimal penetrations. He supported both deck options.

Ms. Bennett appreciated the care to maintain existing material and to make this sensitive to building.

Mr. Kralios said the railing is an improvement and more transparent. He said he agreed with Mr. Hester that it is compatible.

Mr. Hester noted the window and terracotta will be salvaged and stored on site.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for alterations to add decks to the roof at the 22nd floor and install building lighting as presented with any material removed be salvaged and stored on site.

Code Citations:

District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

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.

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

A. Materials

MM/SC/MP/DK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050615.2

PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

J and M Building

201 1st Ave S

Slawek Porowski, architect for the project, provided historic overview of the building which was built in 1889 (detailed report in DON file). He said that the building is in a state of disrepair. He said they want to turn it back into a hotel but with 12 rooms per floor. He noted the proposal to convert the basement to a fine performance venue, speakeasy and place for meetings. He noted the addition of a stairway that will act as a beacon to that side of the building. He said they would change the storefront to reflect the original frontage and move the entry to the north elevation with a ramp.

Mr. Astor clarified the division line between the two buildings and said that the annex is historically contributing and it sounds like they plan to demolish it. He said it is listed on the National Register as *historic, contributing*. He said that we should start by discussing if demolition is even necessary before we talk about how the new building will look like. He asked for them to explain why they plan to demolish the building.

Mr. Porowski said they will remove fabric from the 1940s and the 1980s that is not historic. He provided photos of portions of elevations. He continued with the presentation and noted the mix of materials used.

Mr. Hester said that full elevation photos are needed.

Mr. Astor said he was disappointed that they are using age of alterations as a basis to demolish the annex.

Mr. Porowski provided photos and said the walls are bulging out on the annex; he said there is horizontal and lateral drift and that the wall is only brick.

Mr. Astor said the wall is currently standing.

Mr. Porowski said it is standing by the grace of God. He said they want to demolish it for safety.

Mr. Hester asked if they had looked into retrofitting the building.

Mr. Porowski said they had with the main building but that there is no way to fix the annex.

Mr. Astor said they needed to provide clear and more specific information about the condition of the building.

Kurt Fisher, owner, said the building is a significant one for the City and in the last 20 – 30 years it has been desecrated and stripped of everything. He said they don't want to demolish it – they want to rebuild it structurally sound and energy efficient. He said the amount of capital necessary to recreate the building is excessive because it needs everything done. He said that you can put your hand through the gap between the two buildings. He said that the annex structure is built differently than

the main building and their intent is to preserve it by deconstructing and reconstructing.

Ms. Bennett said the Secretary of Interior Standards provide information on exactly what is needed for reconstruction.

Mr. Fisher said they are going for federal tax credits and they have been working with Nick Vann, DAHP. He said some revision may be needed.

Mr. Hester explained the importance of retaining the contributing status of the buildings and asked about details of his conversations with Mr. Vann. He asked if by “reconstructing” they mean brick by brick?

Mr. Fisher said the main building will remain.

Mr. Hester asked about the annex.

Mr. Fisher said the annex is falling down.

Mr. Hester said it is a contributing structure in the district and noted some amount of alteration to the annex is reasonable without jeopardizing its contributing status.

Mr. Fisher said they are driven by tax credits.

Mr. Astor said that it does not appear to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. He said what was shown did appear to be reconstruction, but new construction and he would need to see documentation of the reconstruction.

Mr. Fisher said their vision is to reuse the materials.

Mr. Astor said that they mention the bricks but not the same layout and fenestration.

Mr. Kralios said he is not seeing the existing condition drawings – that would be helpful. He said that archival photos of the annex building would be helpful to understand the original context. He said the applicants have jumped too far ahead and the board needs to understand existing conditions of the annex structure. He said there have been other existing buildings in Pioneer Square that were in comparable condition to the annex that have been rehabilitated using tax credits. He said they should get a pre-assessment from SHPO about tax credits and what they want to do.

Mr. Pearson agreed. He said the board needs historic context of the building and to know the applicants were having conversations with SHPO if the proposed work would jeopardize the status of contributing structures.

Mr. Kralios said the intent to bring the J and M back into use is admirable and the board is behind rehabbing but wanted the applicant to understand the implications of demolition of a contributing building. He said in his experience what they are proposing would disqualify them from tax credit so urged them to meet with DAHP.

Ms. Bennett said the plan to reconstruct is viable and the board needs to understand all options possible. For reconstruction she said they would have to match original plans and have the structure remain contributing.

Mr. Astor said the work needs to meet SOI standards and the code. He said the board is reluctant to offer approval of demolition. He said he can understand challenges and goals. He said the board is guardian of historic district and looks at if work would jeopardize contributing status; contributing buildings allow the district to exist. He said that removing the annex could be detrimental; it is and has been contributing. He said the building had the alteration to the front when it was listed on the nomination.

Mr. Porowski said it has pulled out and is not part of the original structure. He said he is not saying it is not possible.

Mr. Astor said the onus is on the applicants to provide a full packet of information.

Ms. Bennett said that if you say it is not historic the board needs to understand on what basis you say that.

Mr. Porowski said just because it is not.

Mr. Hester said that it could have attained significance in its own right.

Mr. Porowski said he thought that their goals and the Board's goals are at odds.

Mr. Hester said not necessarily, the board is telling them more information is needed.

Mr. Porowski said they structural engineering report says the annex building will fall down.

Mr. Astor said the engineer works on behalf of the applicant. If framed as "how can I save the building" you might get a different answer from the engineer.

Mr. Porowski said it is they objective to help save the building. He said he has practiced architecture for a long time and has worked with old buildings. He said sometimes you have to remove things. He said the Cadillac Building fell down and was repaired.

Mr. Kralios said he worked on it and the settlement there was worse than this. He said it had settled 2 – 3" over 100 years.

Mr. Porowski said this drift is 6" on the entire foundation line.

Mr. Kralios urged the applicants to take a step back and to look for solutions, get more background, and talk to SHPO to inform their decisions.

Mr. Fisher said he would have more formal discussion for tax credits with documentation on what Mr. Vann thinks. He said that assuming SHPO says their proposal is okay, he expressed concern that they will still get resistance from the board.

Ms. Nashem said she would send him the Guidelines for Reconstruction so they would all be on the same page. She noted that it is a very defined process.

Mr. Fisher said they are not trying to push the envelope.

Mr. Astor asked if they planned to add height or rebuild it just the same.

Mr. Porowski said they could build annex to height of existing hotel. He said the height is different between the building and the annex. He said they would be taking it 14' passed where it had been and they will use original material as possible. He said old brick is available. He said he is from Poland and that buildings were reconstructed after WWII beautifully and to code.

Mr. Parish left at 10:40 am.

Mr. Astor said the board needs a full analysis of what is there and what current plans and intentions are.

Mr. Porowski said they can do a separate analysis of the annex.

Mr. Hester went over what would be needed for the next review.
Thorough discussion of existing building and detail.
Conditional assessment of the building
Comparison of existing and proposed making it clear what is new.
Summary of intent to reuse existing – what, how, where
Historic photos and full 270° view of every component of existing buildings.
Structural engineer report and alternatives for retaining the building.
Commercial social significance in Seattle
Summary of SHPO guidance on how alternatives comply with SOI in terms of maintaining contributing status and of eligibility for tax credits.
Clear representation of if the proposal is reconstruction or new construction.

Mr. Astor said the massing is important at this point if additions are going on.

Mr. Hester said part of that relates to SHPO conversations.

Mr. Fisher said that they will do what will get tax credits. If it is not salvageable have to go another direction.

Ms. Bennett said federal tax credits aside she was concerned about contributing status of the annex. Put a packet together and take it to SHPO and ask if this is something that will remain contributing. If not – ask what you can do to keep contributing status. The annex is small but all buildings are held equally valuable.

Mr. Kralios said it is important to maintain the integrity of the district.

Mr. Porowski said if the annex is secondary – SHPO versus board.

Mr. Kralios said that each originally is their own primary structure; it is not just an addition to the J and M.

Mr. Astor said they are listed independently. He said the board looks to SHPO for how they apply the standards but is not bound by their decisions. He said the board looks to that as guidance on how to relate to SOI.

Mr. Pearson said to assess SOI and present to board the way you plan to adhere to standards.

Ms. Bennett said there is differentiation between rehabilitation and reconstruction and there are different standards for both.

Ms. Nashem said that if it doesn't meet SOI for reconstruction then it would be new construction.

Mr. Porowski said the main structure is interior changes so it not an object of interest; the board is concerned with exterior of hotel. He said they would be replacing the windows.

Mr. Astor said it is not confined to a set of sentences and noted the guidelines, SMC and SOI. He said to take it one step at a time and look at what is permissible.

Mr. Fisher said they are not doing anything with the principal structure and most of the work is off the alley. He said they will figure the right way to do it with SHPO. He said they want to do it the right way.

Mr. Astor said he appreciated the manner in which he has taken the criticism and input. He said the board has seen many proposals for this building and is well versed in what is allowed.

Mr. Fisher said they will get back to the board. He said they will discuss with SHPO.
Required for reconstruction
Engineering report for back part important

050615.3 BOARD BUSINESS

050615.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

050615.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227