



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 23/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, February 4, 2015

Board Members

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

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Amanda Bennett
Willie Parish
Marcus Pearson

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

20415.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** January 21, 2015
Postponed

20415.2 **APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

20415.21 **Crown Building**
Artifact
313 First Ave S

Installation of window signage

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios said that ARC reviewed the drawings provided. ARC found that the black vinyl 9 inch lettering and logo in the window and black vinyl logo on the door maintained transparency and complied with the rules for letter height. They found the signage to be compatible with the building and the District. ARC recommends approval.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Nashem presented on behalf of the applicant and said that the proposed signage complies with the District Rules and SMC.

The Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

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

- A. Transparency Regulations
- B. General Signage Regulations
- C. Specific Signage Regulations

1 Letter Size

SMC 23.66.160

MM/SC/DK/AB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

20415.22

City Club

McCarthy and Holthus
108 First Ave S

Installation of business signage

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios said that ARC reviewed the drawings and photos provided. ARC requested to see signage of other buildings on the block. They requested information about the tenant and how many other tenants there were as well as how many stories there are on the building. ARC discussed Rule 6 and thought that this appeared to be upper level signage that this location seemed to be where the building name would be. There is already signage in the sign band below it for storefront signage and some members thought that it confuses the name of the business in the storefront. They discussed that they did not know of any other location there was signage for upper floor tenants like this; that often if there are other tenants that there is a directory near the door to the upper floors or signage on the door to the upper floor. They read District Rules 6 and thought more discussion was needed to determine if this was a prohibited sign. They suggest that the applicant consider alternatives. ARC did determine that the letter size was compliant with the Rules and individual letters are the preferred signage type. ARC indicated that they needed to consider this carefully as to how it will affect other buildings in the district.

Staff Report: The Board should discuss rule number 6 and determine if it means that there should not be signage at this location or there should not be signage for businesses on the upper floor. Other buildings do have directories or signage on the doors for way finding. Some buildings have the historic name of the building at the location of the originally proposed sign. The Board should also discuss the SMC 23.66.160 C especially “to ensure that the messages of signs are not lost through undue proliferation, the number and location of signs” and “In determining the appropriateness of signs... 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”

We have not had a proposal for large signage for an upper level tenant except for the following circumstances but also may not be comparable to this situation:

ING /Capital One - exception was made for location of the sign and size of the sign because the building was large and primarily one tenant. It was considered a building name. Existing approved signage in the window for the ground level tenant remained. There is not a sign band on this building. It is clear by the location of the signage which signage goes with the building and which goes with the storefront.

Courtyard Marriot - The building is all the Courtyard Marriot, they also have signage in the window for the bistro with the hotel. The building is large. There is not a sign band on this building. It is clear by the location of the signage which signage goes with the building and which goes with the storefront.

EMC2 – New construction at 505 1st Ave, The building owner gave building naming rights to its major tenant. Sign was approved as a building name sign. The building has a sign plan for its future tenants at ground floor. There is no other signage for the other upper floor tenants.

Morgan Beers passed out updated plans and said they answered all questions ARC had but that the customer still prefers the original plan. She provided photos of other signs in the area. She said the building is named “City Club” and will not be renamed McCarthy Holthus who owns the building and occupies half of the 2nd floor, the whole 3rd floor, and half the 4th floor. She said the owners have tenant rights to the whole building – no other tenants do. She said that Tango Zulu and McCarthy Holthus are the only signage and no one else will ever be able to have a sign on the building. She said there will never ever be anyone wanting signage on the building – this is the only sign they will ever ask for. She said that the building element has a sheet metal façade with brick behind. She said they thought of flat letters over the door but it recessed back so they want a blade sign.

Ms. Brown cited XX.C.2 about the sign band as a place to display signage above the storefront windows and below the second floor windows.

Mr. Hester read from the Guidelines XX C.6 which states that upper floor signage is not permitted, except for temporary signage or when it is proposed as part of an overall integrated sign plan for the building.

Mr. Astor said it is not the name of the building, it is not retail; it is for offices on upper floors. He said the examples of signage provided pertain only to building names or a retail business on the ground floor. He said he was reluctant to approve office floor signage at retail level. He expressed concern about the precedent if this were approved.

Mr. Kralios asked if the storefront is double height. He cited XX C.2 which states “below 2nd floor” so that would be relevant.

Ms. Beers said it is hard to tell; it looks like it is all one floor with high windows.

Ms. Petrovich agreed. She said she was reminded of the EMC signage and wondered how it was different.

Mr. Hester said it is on a non-primary façade.

Ms. Nashem said that it was approved as building name sign and part of a building sign plan.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and Seattle Municipal Code.

Mr. Astor said his concern is that it falls within the upper floor sign prohibition.

Mr. Hester agreed and said that if this was building name being displayed it could be treated differently with more flexibility. Although they are the owner this does fall within section C.6 for upper floor signage. There already is retail sign shown on the storefront then a blade would be appropriate.

Mr. Nashem asked the Board to discuss if “upper floor” pertains to the location of the sign or the location of the business.

Mr. Astor said that C.6 says ‘should not be allowed unless temporary’.

Mr. Kralios said he views it differently and said that it refers to sign that is located at upper floor not that it pertains to the use on upper floor, he thinks that would be too limiting.

Mr. Hester agreed and said that there is precedent to allow blade for upper floor tenant without ground floor presence.

Mr. Kralios said the Courtyard Marriott and the Butler Garage set precedent in district and fall within rules as both have signs located above the second floor.

Ms. Beers said that Tango Zulu entry is to the right and the upper floor entrance is to the left of that. She said that the proposed location is the most visible and appropriate. She said it is a smaller blade.

Mr. Hester cited XX.C.6 and said that only one projecting element is allowed per address with the exception for businesses on corners and that noted that going forward other tenants might want/need a blade sign.

Ms. Beers said there will never be anyone ever will want blade sign; it is written into lease that there will be no signage on the building. She said that it is written into the lease of tenants who occupy half of the second floor and half of the fourth floor.

Mr. Hester said this will apply to one tenant only.

Mr. Kralios said a blade sign is the preferred; pedestrians will notice this more easily and it acts as way finding. He said this sign works best. He said that the sign location is next to the main building entrance. He said that the size and letter height comply with the rules.

Mr. Hester said that the attachment complies.

Mr. Astor said a concise full building signage package that specifically limits what can be done in the future should be provided rather than taking the word of the sign company acting as the building owner's representative.

Mr. Hester said it could include verbiage that limits this to this specific tenant.

Ms. Nashem said that the Board could specify that they approved the sign only under the understanding that what was presented was a sign plan.

Mr. Astor said that would be basically changing the application by declaring that this is whole building signage. He said he is looking for something from the ownership declaring this is the only sign under sign plan; he said that leases come and go and he wants something from the owner that states this is the sign package and this is the only sign.

Mr. Hester said that the motion could include strict requirement for sign.

Mr. Astor asked if her representation for the ownership is binding.

Ms. Beers said that her contact from the firm told her this is the only building sign that is written into the lease – this and Tango Zulu.

Mr. Hester said board approval is specific to this action.

Ms. Beers said that it is written into the building plan – no matter who is in there they will never be allowed to have signage. She said she could provide a letter stating that.

Ms. Brown said it is the same as EMC

Mr. Astor said it is not the same as EMC which is a building name and the building has a signage plan.

Mr. Hester suggested stating in the motion that this is a sign plan for the building.

Mr. Astor asked Ms. Nashem if she could bind the ownership to comments made on record.

Ms. Nashem said she could with comments on record.

Public Comment:

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, expressed concern about office signage at sidewalk and said it is not consistent with retail. She said that she thought future retail tenants – Tango or another tenant – could want blade sign and that this would limit their ability to have a blade sign.

Mr. Kralios cited XX C.6 and said that there is one projecting element per address and would be no allowance for others.

Mr. Hester asked if the address is unique or has a different suite or street number.

Ms. Beers said the whole building is 108 1st Avenue.

Ms. Nashem said that Tango Zulu's signage application provided their address as 110 – 112.

Mr. Hester suggested tying approval to this tenant.

Mr. Astor said that bringing upper floor signage down to the retail level – even with contingencies – clutters it with office signage and reduces the impact of retail signage. He said he would not support what is proposed.

Mr. Hester said the placement is appropriate because it is a dedicated entrance with a unique address and that is allowed under C.3. He said that C.6 is difficult to interpret because of the sign location and tenant location.

Ms. Petrovich said she can recall an example of a retail business that was located on the second floor having a blade sign on street level but she thought that was different because it was retail and needed to attract pedestrians.

Mr. Kralios said that there is nothing to preclude upper floor office sign at ground floor.

Ms. Nashem said they will have to work with Guidelines to further refine but for now they should make a decision based on their interpretation of the rules at this time.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Installation of business signage as amended for a blade sign under the condition that the sign is for this tenant only and any changes have to come back to the Board for approval.

Code Citations:

District Rules XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1 Letter Size

6 Upper Floor Signage

SMC 23.66.160

MM/SC/DK/EB 3/3/0 Motion failed. Mmes. Brown, Petrovich and Mr. Astor opposed.

Mr. Hester said a revised package is needed stating specific sign plan in accordance with XX C.6. It should be clear what is allowed per lease and include a clear statement regarding the address of each tenant in building – are there unique street numbers or suite numbers.

20415.23

Furuya Building (Pacific Commercial)

Pilchuck Glass School

240 Second Ave S

Installation of neon blade sign

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios said that ARC reviewed the application drawings, photos and renderings provided. ARC discussed the district rule 7 which prohibits back lit or internally lit signs. The applicant explained that they could do a full neon sign but prefer to do the back lit acrylic because it can be done solid and more represents the logo of the business and makes the logo more legible. The rest of the sign would be in neon. The applicants showed a sample. Some ARC members thought that this type of back lighting was different and of higher quality than back lit signs then a sheet of acrylic with graphics printed on it that they thought were the type intended to be prohibited. There is also existing vinyl lettering in the windows. ARC thought that vinyl lettering was compliant with the rules. They thought the blade sign was compliant with size of neon sign, letter size and number of colors of neon signs, the location of the sign and the method of attachment. ARC generally agreed that looking at the two renditions, that the acrylic did better represent the logo as the neon could only outline the logo not recreate the solid design of the logo, that it was a small portion of the sign, and because as shown in the sample it mimicked the style of the neon, it was a suitable substitute in this case. ARC thought that the color of neon was bold but was subdued by having one color and one color background. ARC recommended approval.

Staff Report: As noted in the ARC report the signs comply with all the rules, except the question of backlit / internally lit signs. The Board will need to reiterate how they see this if different than other non- desired backlit / internally lit signs such as acrylic panels.

Applicant Comment:

Lia Hall, Pilchuck Glass School, explained the proposal for a double sided projecting blade sign with letters in neon. She said the proposed logo will be in acrylic push through with only the push through areas lit. She said the internally illuminated portion will be less bright than the neon. She said the location and method of attachment would be as shown in the packet. She said the attachment will be to the right of the storefront. She said they will epoxy threaded rod through wood to concrete. She said the conduit will come out through the window mullion 4' adjacent to sign and will be painted black to match sign.

Mr. Kralios asked if the top of the sign would align with the top of recess and be as wide as recess of column.

Ms. Hall said yes they will try to fit within the column recess. Responding to questions she said that LEDs will be used on interior with neon tubing inside.

Mr. Astor asked if the school will be on the first floor.

Mr. Hall said yes. She said that they will be able to regulate the brightness of the internal light to very closely match neon. She provided a lighting sample.

Mr. Kralios he preferred to use light to match color and intensity of neon to make more harmonious.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kralios said that the acrylic push through sign is all opaque black unlike internally lit signs that are typically clear. He said that it is different from halo light. He said that the school has a strong enough brand and it is important to be consistent.

Mr. Astor agreed and said they were replicating the intent of neon in a tasteful and appropriate way.

Mr. Hester said that it meets XX C.7. He said it is a solid opaque field material; he said it is an attractive sign.

Ms. Hall said they also propose white vinyl on glass door.

Mr. Hester said that the UV rating won't fade and Suite 100 is included along with name and logo.

Mr. Kralios said that it is consistent with district regulation. He said it is a consistent packet with font and type similar to the neon. He said the actual address of building is elsewhere on building.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Installation of vinyl lettering in the window and a neon blade sign. An exception will be granted for inclusion of the logo to be back lit push through acrylic per

Code Citations:

District Rules XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1 Letter Size

3 Projecting Elements (e.g. blade signs, banners, flags and awnings)

4 Blade signs (signs hanging perpendicular to the building)

D NEON SIGNS

SMC 23.66.160

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

20415.24

WA and OR Railroad

304 Alaskan Way

Installation of a new door and transom window and installation of a balcony

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios said that ARC reviewed the revised and corrected plans. The applicant said that the plan had changed to show that they could reuse the "x" pattern from the original fire escape balcony. He said he made corrections to the drawing to accurately show the types of windows – double hung on floors two and three and original mullioned windows on the first floor, and corrected the spacing below the balcony. He changed the transom window to be a solid glass window similar to the other windows on this floor. It was noted that the sash was different size than the door but similar size as the other windows. It was determined that there would be a 5/16 difference in the width of the sash between these windows and the other windows. The

applicant thought transom windows above doors were different sized than the door below them because doors have to be wide enough sash to accommodate the door handle. ARC requested a photo of the entire building and a close up of the first floor door. The applicant showed a photo of the building in its condition with the wooden staircase before it was removed so the Board could compare its condition prior to the rehab projects, the historic photos and the proposed elevation drawings. While most ARC members agree that being there was an existing alteration for a door opening and there had previously been a balcony for a fire escape here that the installation of a balcony and new door were appropriate. However some ARC member also thought door was unnecessarily tall and that it would be most respectful of the building if the bottom rail of the transom window above the door lined up with the meeting rail of the other windows on the 3rd floor. ARC noted that a regular sized door would accomplish that line and would not affect the usefulness of the balcony. Ms. Bennett also noted that it was difficult to tell what it would look like, the elevation was small and the detail drawings was out of context and did not include the frame. The applicant thought that the oversized door was chosen by his architect because it looked good from the interior. He said that the door was already purchased so he wanted the Board to consider this door rather than proposing a new door.

Staff Report: The Board last reviewed this application on October 15, 2014. The Board did not make a decision because it wanted to see an alternative for the style of window and door and to consider the application with accurate drawings. This application makes use of an existing alteration to the building and recalls a previous historic condition. The Board might consider that the alteration of the balcony and new door and window if it makes a compatible use for the property and if it respects the original architectural style of the building and is compatible in terms of scale and material. I have provided three draft motion options. Options two and three would separate the application into two decisions – one for the balcony and one for the door and transom window.

Applicant Comment:

Adam Michelson said changes were made since his last presentation; he brought material samples. He said that the earlier drawing was out of scale so he updated/corrected it. He said that now you can see the correct representation of brackets that hold up balcony. He said that the relationship between proposed door (divided lights) and original divided light window and said he followed the board suggestion that the window be single pane instead. He said that he added an 'x' to the front of the balcony from removed salvage from back of building. He said the Juliet balcony references the fire escape. He provided a photo that shows the building when they purchased it – windows on third floor had been replaced. He provided a photo of the building now and said that the staircase had been removed and windows replaced. He said what they are proposing now will provided usability of the space.

Mr. Michelson went over photos that show the size of upper window and door; the door is 9' and there will be a 3-1 ration of door to transom window. Responding to clarifying question he said the level 3 windows were replaced in the last year; they had gotten a Certificate of Approval for the work. He said that the CofA included brick infill for door which they didn't do.

Ms. Nashem confirmed obtaining a CofA doesn't mean they have to do the work.

Mr. Michelson said that the balcony will be all new material with the exception of the 'x' which will be welded to new. He confirmed that attachment will go into mortar.

Mr. Hester said the 36' x 30' transom will be all wood, the door painted to match and the hardware consistent with the rest of the building.

Mr. Michelson said yes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester went over the relevant rules.

Mr. Kralios acknowledged that upper floor openings have been altered. He said that the opening where the balcony will be has already been altered. He said that he can accept the divided light door as is. He said that the comparison as to how it relates to adjacent windows was useful. He said that the typical ground floor opening is larger than upper so making the upper floor as large is not appropriate. He said that there had been a balcony on the 3rd floor and this new location with new material. He said there is historic precedent and it seem purposeful. He said the upper floor sashes keep the datum.

Mr. Astor agreed and said it is an existing opening. He said the design choices are in keeping with the building and the district and this doesn't harm any features. He said the rail is a life-safety issue. He said that he had no concerns and that everything was mitigated.

Mr. Hester said the material and color choices are appropriate.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of a new door and transom window and installation of a balcony as presented per

Code Citations:

District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

MM/SC/MA/AB 5:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kralios opposed.

20415.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

20415.31 Waterfront Seattle Waterfront Seattle Design Update

The overview was done via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). Following are board questions and comments. Marshall Foster, DPD, and Steve Pearce, SDOT, presented.

Mr. Hester asked about lighting standards.

Mr. Foster said that there will be two lighting palettes. The triglobe would be on Alaskan Way on the east sidewalk; the west will be more modern and consistent throughout project.

Mr. Hester asked if the east sidewalk is a visual boundary of Pioneer Square.

Mr. Pearce said the roadway overheads will be a modern system.

Ms. Petrovich said that Pioneer Square boundary goes all the way to the water.

Mr. Foster said that the project overlaps and they will integrate the letter of law ensuring that Pioneer Square is also defined as part of the larger project.

Ms. Petrovich said it sounds like it should integrate to the west side.

Mr. Kralios said where the crossings are the tri globes could be at gateway and especially related to Washington Street boat landing.

Ms. Petrovich said they still have new integrated on top but could still signal that it is Pioneer Square goes all the way to waterfront; it is important to show that.

Mr. Foster said you could look up and see the globes on the modern fixture and get an idea that there is history there.

Mr. Hester asked how the new Alaskan Way interferes with existing access to Pioneer Square.

Mr. Pearce said the median extends through Washington and Main intersections; there are no left turns on to them now. He said that Jackson will have a turn. He said they are willing to work with the district and community to avoid cut through traffic. He said that people have to get into ferry queue. He said that Alaskan Way will handle all downtown traffic in addition to transit. He said that he though Jackson will see some additional traffic because it is an arterial.

Mr. Hester said that it would be great to have in future reviews a clear vision of how transit flows and how traffic loading will be distributed. He said that there is lots of transit because of the street car and it is a pinch point. He asked for impacts to traffic, parking and businesses.

Mr. Pearce said that there will be turn restrictions on 1st because of the street car. He said good local access is needed while discouraging cut through.

Ms. Nashem asked if directional signage to Pioneer Square will be provided.

Mr. Pearce said they could work on signage if there is a preferred route.

Ms. Brown said there is a lot of signage from the train station.

Mr. Pearce said there is a similar proposal at Colman Dock.

Public Comment:

Adam Michelson asked if the work was going out to bid and if so what the time frame is for that. He said not enough has been done – he noted the triglobes and strips of bricks - and said he wanted to see a dramatic transition to Pioneer Square so that it is very obvious you are there.

Mr. Foster noted use of a paving pattern, lighting and London Plane trees.

Mr. Michelson said that he wants to see a real change rather than tokenism. He said they should be more consistent with the brick, planters, etc. He said the Rapid Ride station is an eyesore.

Ms. Petrovich asked if Rapid Ride will run 24/7.

Mr. Foster said it will and there will be 50 buses an hour.

Mr. Pearce said that the streetcar has its own shelter design and the Rapid Ride is city wide. He said that King County has some flexibility on shelter design.

Ms. Nashem said they should come to a board briefing.

Cindy Aden, resident, said it is very exciting to see all the care and consideration. She noted the character of the district and questioned the higher height limit along the waterfront and how that is integrated. She said to keep the nature of the warm brick lower profile.

Mr. Foster said they are working closely with Planning and Zoning. He said there will be no changes to heights with this project. He said they will work on streetscapes but not to impacts to height allowance.

Angie Brady said that tunnel completion will be mid to late 2017 and they will be going out to bid for Waterfront in late 2017 – 2018.

Greg Aden said to be clear about current pattern on lanes.

Mr. Foster said the widest section is at the ferry queuing lanes, general purpose traffic and transit. He said it narrows down and by Union Street is down to four lanes.

Mr. Pearce said that traffic volumes here almost double those at Union and there is lots of intense use of the road.

Mr. Foster said that traffic function is the biggest challenge on project and to discuss will take a longer meeting.

Mr. Aden said that surface traffic seems excessive especially in Pioneer Square.

Mr. Hester said to come back to discuss specific points.

Briefing regarding proposed alterations
Deferred.

20415.4 **BOARD BUSINESS**

20415.5 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Ryan Hester, Chair

20415.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227