



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 163/16

MINUTES for Wednesday, June 15, 2016

Board Members

Mark Astor
Colleen Echohawk
Ryan Hester, Chair
Carol O'Donnell
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Kyle Kiser

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

061516.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
May 18, 2016
MM/SC/CO/MA 3:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Echohawk abstained.

061516.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

061516.21 Pioneer Building
600 1st Ave

Change of use from retail to office in the basement 5,055 square foot space

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem explained that this proposal was reviewed at the Board meeting of May 4, 2016 and was tabled along with the proposal for the street level space. The applicant wants to move forward with a decision on the basement level change of use. She said she didn't think that the approval of the use would prevent the office amenity space to be located in the basement in the future if the applicant chose that option.

Paul Grundhoffer said office will be on the first floor as well as in the basement for multiple tenants. He said there will be no impacts to the exterior, no HVAC. He said that they will come back with any signage request.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules,

Mr. Astor said he had no issue.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Change of use from retail to office in the basement 5,055 square foot space per the plans attached.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 15, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.120 Permitted uses

- A. All uses are permitted outright except those that are specifically prohibited by Section 23.66.122 and those that are subject to special review as provided in Section 23.66.124.

MM/SC/MA/CO 4:0:0 Motion carried.

061516.22 Johnson/ Seattle Plumbing building

Gridiron Condos
589 Occidental Ave S

Installation of for sale signage

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans drawings and samples provided. ARC thought that the colors and letter size complied with the District Rules. ARC noted the confusing language of the code that says the sign can be (24) square feet per sixty (60) linear feet of street frontage and then in a later part of the code it says it can only be 12 square feet. ARC thought that it may apply to another part of the code or that the sections were in conflict with each other. While the proposed sign would cover architectural features, because the windows will be removed for the rehab ARC thought the size and location to be acceptable. Based on this interpretation of the code the ARC recommended approval with the limit on the time that the sign could be installed to end of construction or a year but with the ability to submit an application to extend the time or amend the sign if the building is still in construction.

Applicant Comment:

Bob Ellis explained the 192 square foot marketing banner will be up for about one year during construction. It will be attached into the mortar with anchors and they will repair / retuck when removed. He said that the banner will wrap around the end of the building; it is wider than the Chinn Construction sign. It will be on two faces of the building. He said per Rules signs are not to exceed 24' per 60' street frontage. He said this building has 280' on Railroad Way and 241' on Occidental.

Ms. Nashem said she studied the code 23.66.160. D. noting that both sections 1 and 2 give aggregate square footage. This implies that the building could have more than one sign for that square footage but that no sign is to be more than 12 square feet. Signs identifying the architect, engineer or contractor for work currently under construction would all count toward the aggregate square footage but none of these are being applied for. Because of the size of the building up to 192 square feet (Sixteen 12 foot square signs) could be allowed but 23.66.160.D, the Board could site 23.66.160B, C.1 and C.4 to avoid over proliferation of signage and limit the number of signs. The applicant has been made aware of this.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Aster asked if the windows would be covered by banner.

Mr. Ellis said one window will during but during construction the window will be pulled out for repair. He said visibility for banner is mostly from 1st Avenue.

District Rules and Code were cited and board discussion ensued about what is allowed per the District Rules and Code. They determined the proposed banner is not in compliance. The banner is exceedingly large – 192 square feet – and temporary signs are limited to 12 square feet each; aggregating signs into one sign is not permitted. Three 12 square foot signs was suggested as an alternative that was approvable.

Mr. Ellis said he would go with the three individual 12 square feet signs.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of three 'for sale' signs - not to exceed 12 square feet per sign, to be attached in the mortar joints during construction of the building up to one year. If construction is not complete the application can apply for an extension or apply for new signs.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160

- A. 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.

D. Temporary Signs.

1. The following signs are permitted at all times:

a. Real estate "for sale," "for rent" and "open house" signs, and signs identifying the architect, engineer or contractor for work currently under construction. The total area for these types of signs in the aggregate shall not exceed twenty-four (24) square feet per sixty (60) linear feet of street frontage, provided that the design, location, shape, size, color and graphics are approved by the Department of Neighborhoods Director after review and recommendation by the Preservation Board, and provided further that the Director may approve up to thirty-six (36) square feet if there is more than one user of real estate signs or if the building abuts more than two (2) streets; and

3. All temporary signs authorized by this section are subject to the following:

b. No individual sign shall exceed twelve (12) square feet.

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. 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.

6. Upper Floor Signage. Upper floor signage is not permitted, except for temporary signage as per SMC 23.66.160D or when it is proposed as part of an overall integrated sign plan for the building. (7/99) When permitted, the preferred location for temporary signs is in windows, rather than attached to the building. (8/93)

MM/SC/MA/CO 4:0:0 Motion carried.

061516.23 Occidental Park

Temporary installation of poles with art work banners

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the revised application. Jennifer Lobsenz, Path with Art presented a preferred option to remove the display panels on the existing historic displays temporarily, and add taller poles to attach the art banner to. ARC asked for a site plan that showed the location and number of these displays. ARC also reviewed the alternative option for installing the art banners by ropes strung across between two trees. ARC discussed a need to consider wind and durability in this location but supported the alternative of stringing between the trees if the preferred option was not viable. The applicant was informed that they needed to get Parks approval for the installation. ARC recommended approval.

Staff Report: The applicants determined the cost to do so was out of budget so will be proposing the alternative to install the banners strung between the trees.

Applicant Comment:

Teresa McCann said they will start with five banners and will add up to 10; banners are 31" wide.

Regarding wind load Jennifer Lobsenz said that their consultant advised use of seam technique attachment rather than grommets. She said the banners are 31 x 72 and are made from an outdoor canvas banner material that is very durable.

Ms. McCann said the color will hold up. She said they figured out the load and bought appropriate rope; they will wrap rubber material around the trees to protect them.

Ms. Echohawk said it looks great.

Ms. O'Donnell said using black rope will provide more transparency.

Ms. Lobsenz said all banners are in the same color scheme; backs will be red.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Nashem clarified that this is art work and not signage.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for temporary installation of art work banners strung between the trees as presented. The art work will be up through September, 2016.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 15, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required
Secretary of Interior Standards 5, 9 and 10

MM/SC/CO/MA 4:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Rolluda arrived at 9:40 am.

061516.24

The Florentine

526 First Ave S

Ms. O'Donnell recused herself.

Installation of new roof shingle
Replacing EIFS with Hardy panel on dormers
Replacing light fixtures
Replacing gutters
Replacing windows

ARC Report: Mr. Hester reported that the applicant clarified they are not installing new windows but will be re-installing the existing windows however if the building decides to install new windows in the future they will submit an application at that time. They are also not installing new light fixtures but reinstalling the existing junction boxes as existing. The applicant showed an example of the Hardy Board with the color and texture. Being the Hardy Board comes prefinished they asked the applicant to provide a photo of the panel against the existing paint color to determine how close the match is. ARC thought that the Hardy was a durable product.

ARC discussed the composition roofing material. ARC agreed that the material was vastly different in appearance, character and quality than the existing tile. They thought that the proposed composition shingles were not compatible with the character of the historic district or an urban setting. They noted that they only building that they could think of with visible roofs were the King Street Station with ceramic tiles and the Lowman Building with concrete tiles. ARC thought that the roof is now very prominent and reflects on the character of the building, although now non-contributing, the character of the District. ARC thought that there should a compatible solution that provided the kind of texture that a tile roof does but that is not a composition shingle which is more associated with a single family residential setting. ARC asked for the following information:

- Condition of the existing concrete tiles to further understand why they can't be re-installed after the roof is repaired properly,

- Photos of the expanse of the roof taken from a distance such as the North Lot, 4th Ave or from the south on 1st Ave.
- Better photos that show the appearance of the existing tiles,
- An alternative roofing material.

Applicant Comment:

Sandy Smith, representing the condo association, reported that she has been in the building since 1990 and provided an overview of the roof leak history. She said there were challenges with the roof and cracked tiles. In 1998 they replaced the roof as well as the underlayment and put the original concrete tiles back on; in five years the leaks started again. She said the concrete tiles cracked as workers repairing the roof walked on them. She said they have tried various methods and have determined that the tiles are inappropriate material for this application; she said the roof flexes and moss gathers between the tiles. She said ARC noted that the board doesn't consider financial implications in making decisions. She said they want material and as well as installation guaranteed. She said the roof is not real visible except from upper floors in Nolo or Merrill Place or 505.

Mr. Astor said it is visible from the North Lot.

Ms. Smith said they have an alternative but it would be another \$200,000.

Mr. Hester said he understood why they didn't want to use the tile again and asked if there might be another material considered that would replicate modular tile.

Mr. Kessler said there is – slate and stone. He said that there is concern that in areas of water collection freeze and thaw would cause spalling.

Mr. Kessler said that synthetic materials are twice the costs. He said what is proposed is 1/5 the cost and the life span of the material is 30 years on labor, materials and installation. He said the polymeric products are guaranteed 40 years on product only. He said that what is proposed provides some depth profile similar to the tile.

Ms. Echohawk left at 9:55 am.

Mr. Astor clarified that cost is not the primary consideration for the board but that the decision process is not arbitrary. He noted the exploration of alternatives the applicant had done.

Ms. Smith said they have explored many sources and gotten pricing from three different vendors on slate, symphony and other composites.

Mr. Astor said there are very few locations where the roof is visible especially from the pedestrian experience. He said that the roofing as proposed is not as much a detriment to the historic character as it appeared in drawings at ARC. He said that he has come to understand that the roof material won't be discernable here. He said he is less rigid in his decision now. He said the roof history was helpful.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and said that decisions are ground in the District Rules and Code Sections. He cited SOI 9. He said the whole roof is not historic and asphalt is OK.

Mr. Aster noted the dearth of similar roofs in the district and that roofs typically are not visible because they are hidden behind a parapet. He said it is hard to discern the material and he cited the SOI 9 and said it doesn't harm the gabled roof or dormer appearance. He said he has laid the groundwork for not setting precedent here.

Messrs. Rolluda and Hester agreed.

Mr. Kessler explained the proposal to use fiber cement panel with stucco pattern on dormer walls; it will be placed over rain screen with weather resistant barrier. He said it has a baked on enamel finish and has a 15 year color fade warranty. He said the useful life is 50 years. He said the trim will be Hardi, they will add flashing and will keep existing windows.

Mr. Hester questioned if the Hardi were considered synthetic stucco.

Mr. Astor said the Dryvit system is a fake cementitious material; the hardy panel is as durable as stone and cement.

Mr. Kessler said all cut-ins are primed to match the color.

Mr. Astor said he had no problem for the Hardy to be used at this elevation away from pedestrian view and noted it is a non-historic addition.

Mr. Kessler said new gutters are proposed similar to what is there but they are making change to water management to better protect roof. He said that gutters are above parapet wall and color is to match the off-white.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kessler said that an exterior mounted junction box will be incorporated into the walls.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of new CertainTeed Landmark Pro asphalt roof shingle, Replacing EIFS with Hardi panel on dormers, Painting the chimneys and replacing gutters as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 15, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 15, 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

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)

Secretary of Interior 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/MA/AR 3:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. O'Donnell recused herself.

061516.3 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Nashem reminded board members of the upcoming work session.

061516.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

061516.5 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227