



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 234/16

MINUTES for Wednesday, August 17, 2016

Board Members

Ryan Hester, Chair
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Kyle Kiser
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mark Astor
Colleen Echohawk
Carol O'Donnell

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

081716.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
August 3, 2016
MM/SC/DK/AR 4:0:0 Minutes approved.

081716.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

081716.21 State Hotel Building
114 1st Ave S

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and photo provided. The applicant said he would try to reuse the existing door but wouldn't know until the metal box on the door was removed. If that door was not reused then he would use a similar door. ARC thought that was acceptable but that he could also chose a different more compatible door. ARC asked him to bring a cut sheet of the door. ARC recommended approval.

Staff Report: Note that the plans say that the door will be replaced with a flat panel door that matched the other existing door though at the meeting he said they would reuse what was there or it would be a paneled door similar to what is there. While the location

is on an alley façade allowing some flexibility in door type, the Board should just be sure that they are clear on what it is they are approving.

Joshua Masterson explained the need to replace the existing door and noted the difficulty in finding a similar 5-panel door. He proposed a 2-panel door which he said would be the most consistent fire door type available. He said they will replace the jamb, and frame with metal and then apply a brick mold. He said it is a 90 minute rated door and they will modify the metal jamb to fit the wider opening.

Mr. Hester noted the brick around the door is in bad shape and he expressed concern about the potential need for tuck pointing in that area during the replacement process.

Mr. Masterson said it is more that it is dirty than anything and they have no plans to tuck point at this time.

Mr. Hester said that if they tuck point to make sure to match that hardness of existing mortar and to have it reviewed administratively.

Mr. Rolluda asked if they were doing threshold replacement and noted missing bricks at the bottom.

Mr. Masterson said he didn't know but that there was an alley repaving project that would be happening soon that will require changes; some modifications will have to be made at that time.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios said that while the existing door appears historic it is not known if it is original and said that door should be retained on site for reuse. He said the proposed door is to go on the alley which is a non-primary façade and already altered; he preferred a flat slab door instead. He said he didn't want faux historicism.

Mr. Rolluda agreed.

Mr. Hester agreed and noted that the flat panel is more in keeping with SOI and added that the existing door should be kept on site.

Mr. Kralios said the color match makes sense and will help the door to disappear.

Mr. Hester asked if it was the Type F door on the cut sheet.

Mr. Masterson said it is.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of installation of a new door to replace an existing door on the alley façade as presented. If tuck pointing is required mortar will be approved administratively by Staff.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the August 17, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

23.66.180- Exterior building design

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

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

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99)

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/DK/AR 4:0:0 Motion carried.

081716.22

Bedford Hotel Building

1 Yesler Way

Alterations to the north and west façade
Signage

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and photos provided. ARC thought the removal of the bars was an improvement and made the façade more welcoming. They thought that the changes to the door and window on north façade that had been altered in the 60's was a minor change. They thought that the signage was consistent with the regulations and that the address sign provided some architectural interest as well as function. They discussed that it was appropriate to install a new storefront in the location of previous storefront that had been filled in. They thought that it would also provide some more eyes on the street and appreciated the forward thought of future tenant. Two options were shown and ARC thought they were both compatible storefronts. ARC discussed the proposed more modern appearance light fixtures. They discussed that there are two different facades and that it made sense that they would use the same fixture so this one being simple and small would blend in and the color would be unified with the storefront. It was noted that the windows on the west side would be replaced with new wood windows of matching the existing. ARC requested a cut sheet.

Staff Report: Anticipating many future requests for alterations along Alaskan Way, the Board may want to point out that on the west facade there is pictorial and physical evidence that there was formally an opening in this location, that the proposed storefront is within that former opening, being the storefront is missing that they can propose a new compatible storefront. While their preferred option is not a replica of the previous, it is differentiated as new and still using the traditional storefront anatomy of a transom above panels of glass storefront and door all consistent with the SOI.

Applicant Comment:

Brian Runberg, Runberg Architects, explained the restaurant tenant left and that they have been looking at other uses; he noted the challenge of all the construction activity. He said that they will occupy it themselves to keep it active and mitigate nefarious activity. He said the tarp on the adjacent fence adds to the bad activity. He went over the history of the building as an SRO and said it has housed various ground floor tenants over time. He said that in 1966 changes were made to the ground floor, some windows were infilled and there was some brick infill. He said they propose to replace three windows on the west façade, replace glazing on north façade with insulated glass; and remove window grates, grind down and grout over holes.

He proposed blackened steel planter beds under each window. He said they propose to move the entry door one bay to the west, replace glass, add planter boxes and add a simple steel canopy with 50% transparency glass and blackened steel. He said on the west façade they will put in a four bay store front with two leaves that will function as doorways to accommodate future outdoor dining. He said that new sconces will add light and more visibility to help cut down on bad activity. He said a second option is to put in a three bay system similar to what was originally there but their preference is the four bay system. He said the 2nd floor windows are a Marvin metal clad wood window and were installed in 1995. 3rd floor windows are the same Marvin window and were installed in 2005. They propose to install the same window on the west façade.

Mr. Kiser asked if the new storefront doors would be shut for now.

Mr. Runberg said they will screw it shut for now.

Mr. Hester asked if they plan to relocate the entry card scanner and doorbell when they relocate the entry door.

Mr. Runberg said they will.

Mr. Hester said the four bay option is preferred.

Mr. Kralios asked if the planter boxes will overhang the building edge.

Mr. Runberg said the façade curves and the planters will set on the ledge and cantilever off; they will check with surveyor to make sure they do not hang over property line.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios said the north façade is significantly altered which opens up some leeway. He said that what is proposed is consistent with the 1960s alteration. He said removal of the security bars and addition of planters will improve the pedestrian experience. He said the new door location is acceptable and the canopy is a nice addition. He said to make sure connections are through the mortar even though this is non-historic brick it will be better for the building. He said he supported the preferred option for the storefront on the west facade. He said to paint to match windows. He said window replacement is ok and is consistent with past approvals and District Rules. He said the lighting style is contemporary and is ok and finishes are acceptable and consistent with what is there.

Mr. Hester agreed. He said the removal of window grates will improve visibility into the space.

Mr. Kralios said the signage 'one' is consistent with letter height and letters are 9". He said it meets the three letter exception and doubles as address. He said letters will be mounted inside frame.

Mr. Runberg asked if the Board would write a letter to Tunnel Partners about the make improvements to construction site by at least removing the tarp.

Mr. Hester said he thought that this might be resolved with a phone call and asked staff to find out the status of what is happening.

Ms. Nashem said she will talk to WSDOT at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Runberg said the building is getting tagged 1 – 2 times a week.

Mr. Kiser said he appreciated the forward thinking in how to integrate the building with the changes in the area.

Mr. Kralios said that awnings should have a functional purpose per Code and should project out 5'; this sign "one" projects 3'.

Mr. Hester said he considers it more a signage component than an awning.

Mr. Kiser agreed and said that because of the scale and width of doorway 5' would be unwieldy.

Mr. Hester said he considers it a blade sign and it is compliant with District Rules.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for alterations to the north and west façade including, replacing glazing, replacing a door with a window and replacing a door, on the north façade, replacing windows, restoring an opening with a new storefront on the west façade, adding lighting, and planters. Installing signage including door signage and a new address signage.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the August 17, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

23.66.180- Exterior building design.

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

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

the Department of Neighborhoods Director as compatible with adjacent or original uses, following Board review and recommendation.

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99)

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

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. Exceptions to the 10-inch height limitation will be considered for individual letters in the business name.
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)

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

[Guidelines for Storefronts](#)

Bulletin 13 Replacing storefronts <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/applying-rehabilitation/standards-bulletins.htm>

MM/SC/DK/AR 4:0:0 Motion carried.

081716.3

PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

081716.3

419 Occidental Ave S

Briefing regarding the public spaces – streets and alleys

Brice Maryman presented via PowerPoint (for details see report in DON file). Following are board questions and comments.

Mr. Maryman provided an historical overview of the area since the arrival of European settlers and noted the arrival of the rails and growth of Seattle. He said this area is at a confluence of transportation and activity. He said this provides many opportunities for the alley design.

Mr. Kralios said there are a lot of good ideas. He said to look at how to deal with multiple uses such as dumpsters and pedestrian activities and how to integrate them in the vision. He said there is lots of flexibility with the vacated rails and said to look at solving problems such as load zones and dumpsters. He appreciated seeing the examples of Portland and Vancouver's raised areas. He said to look at how to maintain flexibility of use and noted they have hinted at that with the foldable furniture and set time for uses. He commented on how to make places known with signage, blending of paving to invite people in.

Mr. Hester noted the plaza option and said to recognize the dependency on cross streets, access, and how what is proposed will impact the larger neighborhood –

parking, taxis, etc. He said to look at the current function of the space – trash collection – and how to have minimum impacts and maintain functionality. He didn't recommend the paint option and recommended patterns be done with materials. He noted the value of multiple furnishings options in alley enhancement but cautioned against too much clutter. He said to pay attention to function there and how to maintain it. He liked retail spaces in alleys. He said that vertical activation should be kept simple. He said the beauty and presence is in the buildings themselves. He said wall planters are good and lighting goes a long way.

Mr. Kiser said he applauds the ambition. He said to think about which moves are most impactful and how to order work based on that. He said to work with other property owners on the crossroad intersection coming off Occidental so it is holistic and not bifurcated.

Mr. Rolluda agreed. He said that flexibility is important. He said to let the spaces evolve. He liked the seasonal artwork and conceptual ceiling. He said to hearken back to original uses.

Mr. Kralios said to be responsive to what is there already and accentuate that rather than obscure it. He noted consistency in lighting and paving.

081716.3

Metropole Building

433rd 2nd Ave Ext S

Briefing regarding rehabilitation of the building

Mr. Kralios reported that ARC members toured the Metropole areaways which he said is intact. He noted the arched brick, exposed steel lintels, sandstone masonry although it is mostly brick, and said there is evidence of some water intrusion.

Matt Aalfs explained they are moving to submit for Certificate of Approval. He provided photos of the original building and areaway. He pointed out the areaway stone street wall which he said is an area of water intrusion. He went over window report and said original windows will be restored and retained. He said they propose new aluminum wood windows at upper levels and storefront and entry systems will be wood. He said they will replicate the breakup, operation and function of the original windows as they understand it. He said the storefronts will be similar to originals but without the bay windows and he compared what is proposed to historic photos. He said they propose operable windows.

Mr. Rolluda left at 10:00 am.

Mr. Kralios said the majority of the windows have been replaced. He appreciated the effort to get back to what was there originally. He asked if the window color could be custom.

Mr. Aalfs said there are preset colors but custom is possible. He said the cornice will be reconstructed in a dark color to match the upper windows. He said the windows at street level will be different. He said that whatever they do it will be integral to the overall design. He went over the Marvin windows that are spec'd and said the aluminum cladding provides long term durability; they will be fixed for hotel room use. He said original windows were single or double hung.

Mr. Kralios said what is proposed is compatible with the District Rules. He said they proposed openings complement the building and is compatible in how organized. He said some operable windows at ground floor provide flexibility and good pedestrian interest.

Mr. Hester said that wood windows are encouraged and he noted some concern with aluminum clad. He said the profile, maintenance, durability are good.

Ms. Nashem said that aluminum clad have been approved when the profile and color are compatible.

Mr. Kralios notes the just-reviewed Bedford Hotel Building.

Mr. Hester concurred and said that what was proposed is compatible.

Mr. Kralios asked about the approach for window colors in the annex building.

Mr. Aalfs said that is up in the air at this point.

Mr. Kralios said it is good to have the annex read as separate.

Mr. Aalfs said discontinuity is a nice thing and noted the episodic nature of the street front.

Mr. Kiser said he could support continuity in the color of paint on windows.

Mr. Aalfs said they consulted with experts on paint removal in both buildings. He said that Mark Leibman reported that paint on both buildings is damaging and needs to be remedied. He said that three methods were tested: sponge jet, needle scaling, and peel away. He said the sponge jet approach involves spraying a medium on the building which will pull the paint off. He said that different grits and pressures were tested. He said if too much grit and pressure are used much of the tooling of the stone can be lost. He said the peel away method involves application of a chemical poultice that will then peel off; it is the most gentle. He said that up to 1" of surface could be lost and because of damage already done they won't know what will happen until they start. He said after paint removal they will do 100% tuck pointing and will retool if needed.

He said that the brick on the alley is in bad shape and the paint can't be removed because it would remove the fire skin. He said Leibman recommended removal of

the mortar and repointing. He said in certain areas they could relay the brick, or pull it out and turn it around which isn't a good solution.

Mr. Kralios noted that if brick were to be turned around there is no guarantee it wouldn't look like a patchwork.

Mr. Hester said the plan makes sense but questioned if they were going to go to the effort to remove paint and mortar how much more would it be to replace the brick façade.

Mr. Aalfs said replacing the brick façade is not an option financially. He said removing paint from the brick will cause a loss in the brick and it will be unserviceable. He noted an option not presented is using a lime based stucco coat.

Mr. Hester said that historically the brick was exposed.

There was discussion about exploration of an option to remove the mortar, repaint the brick and then re-tuck point which will allow the mortar joints to breathe.

Mr. Aalfs said he would follow up with the team.

Mr. Kiser said he would like more detailed photos of brick and condition and what it would look like to leave it as is.

Mr. Kralios asked about the Dutchman repair.

Mr. Aalfs said it is removing a stone piece and replacing it. He said they will need to do that in a couple spots.

Mr. Hester said the stone proposal would meet the Guidelines but more discussion is needed on the alley façade solution.

Mr. Aalfs said he could have Mr. Leibman come and speak to the board.

Ms. Nashem noted that if there is no case study in NPS this might be a good one to write up.

081716.4 BOARD BUSINESS

081716.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

081716.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227