



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 245/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, August 19, 2015

Board Members

Ann Brown
Evan Bue
Ryan Hester, Chair
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Tija Petrovich

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mark Astor
Willie Parish
Marcus Pearson

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

081915.11 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
July 15, 2015
MM/SC/DK/TP 5:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

081915.21 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

081915.21 **State Building**
The London Plane
165 S Main St

Change of use from retail to restaurant for a commissary kitchen for a 1972 square foot space

Applicant Comment:

Edward Pierce explained the proposed expansion is needed to meet demand; he said they have exceeded kitchen capacity. He said they propose an interior door opening from this building into the main kitchen. Responding to questions he said that the commissary kitchen will support the restaurant itself as well as take out. He said they will have no retail component in the kitchen.

Mr. Kralios encouraged maintenance of transparency into the space.

Mr. Pierce said they will use the same colors and design and the aesthetic will be the same in both spaces; there will be visibility in.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Petrovich said she was comfortable with it as long as transparency remains and it is neat and tidy.

Mr. Hester said the link between the spaces is appropriate and he noted the consistent installation of interior design.

Ms. Brown noted the exciting success of the business.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for a change of use from retail to restaurant for a commissary kitchen for a 1972 square foot space.

Code Citations:

23.66.130 Street-level uses

A. 1. Uses at street level in the area designated on Map B for 23.66.130 require the approval of the Department of Neighborhoods Director after review and recommendation by the Preservation Board.

B. Preferred Street-level Uses.

1. Preferred uses at street level must be highly visible and pedestrian oriented.

Preferred street-level uses either display merchandise in a manner that contributes to the character and activity of the area, and/or promote residential uses, including but not limited to the following uses:

a. Any of the following uses under 3,000 square feet in size: art galleries and other general sales and service uses, restaurants and other eating and drinking establishment uses, and lodging uses;

MM/SC/TP/DK 5:0:0 Motion carried.

081915.22

Union Trust Building

Estates Tasting Room

Change of use from gallery to eating and drinking for a wine tasting room for a 1588 square foot space

Applicant Comment:

Mark Ward explained that this business will be across from the London Plane and was previously an art gallery. He said they will do 70% wine tasting and 30% retail. He said there will be a small food prep area but no cooking. He said that signage will come later.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Petrovich asked if window display was planned and if transparency would be maintained.

Mr. Ward said that there will be full transparency but there will be vinyl signage which will be reviewed later.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for a change of use from gallery to eating and drinking for a wine tasting room for a 1588 square foot space

Code Citations:

23.66.130 Street-level uses

A. 1. Uses at street level in the area designated on Map B for 23.66.130 require the approval of the Department of Neighborhoods Director after review and recommendation by the Preservation Board.

B. Preferred Street-level Uses.

1. Preferred uses at street level must be highly visible and pedestrian oriented. Preferred street-level uses either display merchandise in a manner that contributes to the character and activity of the area, and/or promote residential uses, including but not limited to the following uses:

a. Any of the following uses under 3,000 square feet in size: art galleries and other general sales and service uses, restaurants and other eating and drinking establishment uses, and lodging uses;

MM/SC/DK/TP 5:0:0 Motion carried.

081915.23 **FX McRory Building**
419 Occidental Ave

Tabled.

081915.24 **Lucknow Building**
Uber—Support Center
217 2nd Ave. S.

Tabled.

081915.25

Nugent Building

Wang Group LLC DBA Stage
172 S Washington St

Ms. Petrovich recused herself.

Installation of a station and rope on the sidewalk

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the proposal and thought that the stanchion and rope will only be out during business hours at night and then stored inside that the proposal would not interfere with the pedestrian flow or negatively affect the appearance of the building. ARC discussed that the business did not have signage and clarified for the applicant that they needed approval of any signage. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Alice Hsiao explained the need for rope and stanchions for customer queuing. The ropes and stanchions will be stored inside at night.

Mr. Hester said they would be used from 10:00 pm – 3:00 am and noted that there would be no impact to historic fabric or ornament.

Mr. Kralios asked if they door will be manned.

Ms. Hsiao said it would not.

Ms. Brown expressed concern about the queue and noise and rowdiness. She said the stanchions could be thrown.

Mr. Hester said that it provides designated area for queue.

Public Comment:

Greg Aden, resident, asked if they were in business now.

Ms. Hsiao said not yet.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules. He said that it meets the criteria as street furniture and there will be no attachment to the building. He said there is no negative impact on pedestrian flow and they will should back for signage.

Mr. Kralios said the sidewalk is wide enough and there is no interference with pedestrian flow. He said it is temporary – in at night. He said that other changes would be under a separate application.

Ms. Brown expressed concern about this type of business and noted problems in the past. She said she hoped the future signage would be very specific about who was

performing and what ages were allowed and that the signage will comply with the District regulations.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for installation of a stanchion and rope on the sidewalk

Code Citations:

District Rules

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)

MM/SC/DK/EB 4:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Petrovich abstained.

081915.26

Parking Lot

Behind 123 3rd Ave S

Installation of a fence

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the proposed fence. Lisa Dixon, Alliance for Pioneer Square and the property manager, presented. They discussed the issues that the parking lot was having with crime and illicit behavior now that the building is vacant awaiting redevelopment. They noted that the owner had previously had a security guard and had to end the contract with Diamond Parking because of problems with crime and vandalism to cars. They also noted that the being Fortson Square is fenced off the drug market was moving around the corner. ARC thought that the black coating and style gave the fence a higher quality appearance. ARC confirmed that there would be no barbwire on the fence. ARC suggested putting a timeline on the approval so that they fence would not become indefinite but wanted to allow a reasonable time for the new development to go through the approval process. The applicants and ARC agreed 18 months would be reasonable to at least have a construction time line. The applicants could renew the COA if more time was needed. ARC recommended approval with the timeline of 18 months.

Applicant Comment:

Lisa Dixon, Alliance for Pioneer Square, explained the proposal to put up a chain link fence. The parking lot is no longer owner-operated and there has been much negative behavior there – drugs, prostitution. She said they propose a black vinyl fence; access to the area for cleaning will be via the garage.

Robert Leaning said that the fence will be installed into the ground surface and there will be no concrete blocks. He said they have a contract with CityScape to do clean up.

Ms. Dixon said that clean up now is occurring 3 – 4 times a day.

Ms. Brown asked about lighting.

Mr. Leaning said they replace five existing lights on the building; three on the parking lot side and two on Washington – they are on auto timer.

Ms. Petrovich said she has no desire to see fencing but she applauded the action in this case but noted she sees bad activity there all the time and noted the larger picture and steps taken by Mayor's Office around the corner.

Responding to questions about fencing at Fortson Park Ms. Dixon said a little of the activity had shifted to this site.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester said there are no impacts to historic fabric, and no barbed wire just slanted top panels.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for installation of a fence around the parking lot for a period of 18 months.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval Required

District Rules

IX. SECURITY BARS AND GATES

Pursuant to SMC 23.66.100, the Pioneer Square Preservation District was created, in part, because of its historic and architectural significance, and remarkable business environment. District goals include preserving, protecting, and enhancing the historic character of the area, and encouraging the development of street level pedestrian-oriented businesses that attract citizens and visitors to the neighborhood. In keeping with these goals, installation of permanent metal security bars in storefront windows is prohibited. Permanent ornamental gates are permitted in street front entrances where added security measures are deemed necessary. Retractable roll down and scissor type gates are permitted only in garage door openings and in alley locations that require high levels of security. (5/96)

Mr. Kralios made a friendly amendment to add 'per the cleaning and maintenance plan as discussed'.

MM/SC/TP/DK 5:0:0 Motion carried.

081915.27

Silver Hotel
627 1st Ave

Retile the entry way

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the proposal for installation of new tile in the areaway. ARC found that the existing tile was not historic. The applicant explained that due to the deliveries at the 7 – 11 that a more durable tile was needed. They said that they chose the colors as more modern colors, compatible with the colors on the building, in a modern size but laid in a classic entry pattern to be compatible with the historic district. ARC found the tiles to be compatible in color and design and differentiated by color and size and appropriate for this entry location. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Brad Sturman explained the entry serves 711 as well as the apartment. He said that 711 uses pallet jacks for delivery and they have broken tiles. He said they plan to replace the existing tile with a more durable type that will work for deliveries and look nice for residents. He said they took their inspiration from other buildings in the district and said they will use tile in three colors – one field and two accents. He clarified that they will use 1” x 1” tile and the sample tiles in 2” x 2” were intended as color samples. He said that tiles will be mortar set onto existing concrete slab. Responding to questions he said that the existing gate will remain in place and that there is no basement in this area so no need to add a waterproof membrane.

Public Comment:

Greg Aden asked about inspiration for new tile.

Mr. Sturman said that he had included a photo of an existing entry in the application but he did not know the name of the building it was from.

Ms. Petrovich noted that the existing tile is not historic.

Board Discussion;

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Hester said that the tile is compatible with the building and the district but is clearly new tile.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for installation of new tile in the entry way.

Code Citations:

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 the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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

MM/SC/DK/AB 5:0:0 Motion carried.

081915.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

081915.31 **Buttnick, Gottstein and Grand Central Buildings**
202, 206 and 216 1st Ave S

Briefing regarding proposed alterations

Harry Fuller, Unico, explained that they are looking at three scenarios for the buildings. He introduced Susan Boyle who would provide historic overview of the buildings.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, provided a historic overview of what she referred to as the 'premier block in Pioneer Square'. (Full report in DON file).

Greg Benton, Akiyama Architects, provided context of the site and said they are looking at three scenarios: 1) residential and retail; 2) office, grocery store and retail combining buildings into one single building; and 3) just seismic upgrades. Details in PowerPoint in DON file. Following are board comments and questions.

Regarding penthouse Ms. Nashem explained for office usage the height has to be over 60' and also the coverage for either office or residential penthouse can't be more than 50%.

Mr. Benton said the Grand Central is 62' tall so they qualify. He said that as it is being planned for 1 and 2 is to combine all three buildings into a single property so it will be one. He said based on that they have gross area of all three to get this floor plate. He said they are allowed up to 50% of the entire roof area and this is slightly less.

Stacy, Akiyama Architects, provided a sightline study of the penthouse.

Mr. Kralios asked if the study represents a 12' structure.

Stacy said it is a 12' height and they increased it the average height of parapet so it is overall 13'.

Mr. Kralios asked to what conditions measurements are taken from roof to top of additions.

Ms. Nashem said the measurement of the height of the building is taken by the mean of frontage of the building. If this applies to penthouses like it does other rooftop features like mechanical, elevator penthouses, the height can be adjusted by average height of parapet off the roof.

Mr. Kralios said when they measure to the top of the addition at what point of the addition is taken – the highest? Is it the parapet or the roof or is there is a parapet exception for additions.

Ms. Nashem said the code also talks about allowance for a 4' parapet but that she didn't think that that was talking about a parapet on penthouse rather a parapet on new construction or adding a parapet to existing building so that has to be clarified. She said another clarification needed is if the combine the buildings into one building and the roofs are still at different levels is it 50% of the total roof footprint or total coverage of the foot print of that roof.

Mr. Kralios asked if the percentage overall of this proposed addition is for three buildings combined?

Mr. Bennett said they took the combined gross. He said they would not see language in the code that stipulated that roofs below 60' are to be excluded.

Ms. Petrovich asked what percentage of coverage is the penthouse of the Grand Central Building

Mr. Bennett said he didn't know.

Mr. Kralios said it is a unique nuance to this particular application. He said his guess is that when the Code was written they didn't assume a block long building.

Ms. Nashem said she would clarify. She said there have been other cases of multi-levels and of new construction and each roof level was calculated separately.

Mr. Bennett said they met with Nick Vann at DAHP and Gary Sackow at Parks Service about the project. He said they reviewed the drawings and plans and various scenarios. He said through them they have identified a couple historic elements in building that they plan to retain but they agree that the buildings have gone through extensive remodeling and changes over the year and there is not a lot left in the interior that is truly original.

Mr. Kralios asked if they planned to use federal historic tax credits.

Mr. Bennett said they are looking at that.

Mr. Kralios asked about storefront replacement on the ground floor.

Ms. Boyle said that the bulkhead and recessed doors and glazed display windows and transoms but looking individually there are differences. She said she didn't think

they are original. She said within that pattern the bulkheads are the same height consistently but she said she thought most of the window display areas have been changed and probably some of the doors. She said there are subtle inconsistencies

Ms. Nashem asked if she was describing the Grand Central or all three buildings.

Ms. Boyle said they focused on Grand Central and the Buttnick Building. She said because of the explosion which occurred after the period of historic significance there was a lot of changes to those storefronts. She said there is even a big concrete infill piece.

Mr. Kralios asked if upper floor windows on Buttnick Building were replaced.

Ms. Boyle said that they look consistent with historic photos and they are wood frame center pivot windows. She said she was surprised to see the consistency of all the windows and said they look like the older ones.

Mr. Kralios asked if they could find out from earlier remodel.

Ms. Boyle said that Clark's work was primarily interior, seismic upgrading and according to part 2 application they submitted they didn't change the windows out.

Mr. Kralios asked about upper floor changes windows in the other buildings.

Ms. Boyle said there have been some changes on the Grand Central windows because the meeting bars are so small – it looks as though the pattern of a double hung has been retained but they are not.

Mr. Bennett said that they were part of a 1972 remodel.

Ms. Boyle said it is hard to know because there are no original drawings.

Ms. Petrovich asked about the brick infill on Grand Central that they plan to put glazing into and asked what era they are shooting for.

Mr. Boyle said that the buildings have been layered and surmise what era some elements were added or changed. She said there is no recorded information that validates assumptions.

Mr. Bennett said that the arched heads and sills are there and he assumes they were windows.

Ms. Petrovich said what if it was just brick repair.

Mr. Bennett said it is possible. He said they are also trying to increase the interactivity between the park and the building. He said the more openings and windows they can get the more action they can generate.

Mr. Kralios said to do window studies in any scenario.

Mr. Hester asked the anticipated schedule.

Mr. Fuller said they are working on design and permitting in 2016 and hope to start work in first quarter 2017.

Mr. Hester asked who owns the building.

Mr. Fuller said a Unico subsidiary.

Mr. Hester asked about potential impacts to areaways during seismic work.

Mr. Bennett said that there will be some work in the basement within the building footprint. He said there will be foundation work and some micro piles; he said that sprinklers will be added. He said that they will stay away from areaways.

Mr. Hester said the board needs to know the scope of work and impacts and he noted that there is well-documented historic fabric there.

Mr. Kralios agreed.

Ms. Brown said it is a historically important area and that Mimi Sheridan was involved in the inventory.

Mr. Hester said that a truck fell through the sidewalk on Washington and substantial emergency work had to be done.

Mr. Bennett said they plan to keep existing vault in sidewalk and use it as a transfer point. He said they will recreate the vault inside the building. He said to get equipment in there they are hoping to use the existing vault under the sidewalk.

Mr. Bennett said the vault is more to the southeast corner by the alley; He said the vault is only accessible through grates in the sidewalk.

Mr. Hester said that all scopes of work related to retrofitting and vault installation falls under board purview.

Ms. Nashem said it is an SDOT document; she would get areaway maps to them.

Mr. Hester said it was unclear how they propose to create a single building from the three. He said he was unclear about how internal connector will work. Are they planning to punch doorways through? He said they need detailing and plan.

Mr. Bennett said they should have been in the packet which he forgot.

Mr. Hester said that the board will see that at some point. He said it is rare to hear such a proposal.

Mr. Bennett said there are challenges – the floors don't all align.

Mr. Fuller said the City Loan / Buttnick buildings do communicate and you'll notice—ramping and stairs between. He said that will have to be reworked, emulated, and copied.

Mr. Kralios said there was mention of ground level floor for commercial space larger than 10,000 square foot space. He cited SMC 23.66.130 C – it talks about discouraged street level uses and notes that anything occupying more than 50% of block front is not allowed.

Ms. Nashem block front is defined as the area that is surrounded three sides by street and the fourth side by an alley or another street. She said the block front would be the whole area compared to street frontage which would just be the linear length of the facades. Street frontage vs. block frontage.

Mr. Kralios said the historic pattern for business in Pioneer Square is for smaller business and he cautioned against disrupting the cadence of the district with its smaller storefronts. He said changing it to be one big business starts feeling different as pedestrian and it changes the building feels and reads.

Ms. Brown said that a grocery store would be humungous and noted that the streets and buildings are not set up for deliveries of this size. She said small businesses can be served with small trucks. She said that there are pipelines underground and it is delicate.

Mr. Kralios said to consider all the use options and what the impacts are. He said the board would want to see plans for how trucks would service the use.

Mr. Bennett said it is early in planning. He said it is easily demised in smaller spaces.

Mr. Hester agreed with Mr. Kralios about level of detail that is expected.

Mr. Kralios asked what would determine which of scenarios 1 and 2 they would pursue.

Mr. Fuller said cost and what is best for neighborhood. He said the seismic upgrade will be voluntary because at a minimum they want to make Grand Central safe. He said they are just trying to paint a picture of what they can and can't do to formulate a decision on their end. Responding to questions he said that depending on floor heights they may look at office in one building and residential in another but at this point it is all one or the other.

Mr. Kralios said that new mechanical systems will be introduced and he said to keep in mind that the board will not want to see those coming out through façades. He said to allot significant percentage of roof area for these.

Mr. Hester said that the facades here are all primary facades – very highly visible.

Mr. Fuller said that now most equipment is on the Buttnick roof. If they were to do a penthouse on the Grand Central they would have to relocate some of that equipment over to the Buttnick building.

Mr. Bennett said there is a huge conglomeration of junk on the Buttnick; he said a lot of it is hidden by the stair tower. He said the plan is to bury all the new stuff.

Mr. Kralios said it is hard to have mechanical be the driver of a lot of decisions and noted when you start planning around parapet etc. it would impact the size of the addition.

Ms. Nashem said that other kinds of roof top features can only cover 25% of the roof; penthouse can cover 50%. She said that is another code question if the combined coverage could only be 50% when there is a penthouse or 75% if they can be added together. She said she didn't think the intent was to allow 75% coverage but she would verify that.

Mr. Hester said that Merrill Place is the only multi-building block development and it may be a good case study except that it is not combined into one parcel.

Public Comment:

David Westman said the glass addition is in use for Swanny's restaurant and the bar spills into it. He asked about impacts to existing tenants. He said there is a shortage of grocery stores and it would be a good addition to the area.

Mr. Fuller – said they don't know about existing tenants yet. They would have to vacate the 1st floor and basement while they do work.

Board requested board packets for the next briefing.

Mr. Kralios said to include information on logistical challenges.

081915.4 BOARD BUSINESS

081915.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

081915.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227