



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 262/15

**MINUTES** for Wednesday, September 2, 2015

**Board Members**

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

**Staff**

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

**Absent**

Willie Parish

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

**090215.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

July 1, 2015  
MM/SC/TP/DK 5:0:0 Minutes approved.

July 8, 2015  
MM/SC/DK/TP 5:0:0 Minutes approved.

*Mr. Astor arrived at 9:02 am.*

August 5, 2015  
MM/SC/DK/TP 3:0:3 Minutes approved. Messrs. Hester, Kralios and Astor abstained.

**090215.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

**090215.21 FX McRory Building**  
419 Occidental Ave

Remove vents on the south face and replace with new window, remove windows on the north façade and replace with vents

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and photos provided at the August 12, 2015 ARC meeting and thought it was an improvement to restore the King Street façade with windows and move the louvers to a less visible location on the alley. The proposed windows appear to match the existing windows. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Chris Amonson explained the intent to move all mechanical to alley side of building. Louvers on the street front of the building will be replaced with windows to match existing – they have painstakingly measured all windows for details. He said that the new windows will be double hung with single pane. He said that windows on the alley side will be replaced with louvers to accommodate mechanical. He noted drawings illustrate window and louver changes that are proposed.

Mr. Kralios asked about 4<sup>th</sup> floor louvers.

Mr. Amonson said they have no plans for that now. Responding to questions he said they will match existing color.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and noted that the application met the rules for transparency and locating mechanical on non-primary façade. He said there is no impact to ornamental features.

Mr. Kralios said that they are returning louvers to operable windows which is preferable for the façade; the bank of louvers will be installed on the alley elevation which is a tertiary façade and appropriate. He suggested windows be salvaged in basement.

*Mr. Pearson arrived at 9:09 am.*

Mr. Astor agreed with his colleagues and said he was glad to see louvers off the primary façade.

This is rehabilitation of a historic building where the original appearance of the façade is being brought back to what it had been. Base on replicating the existing windows.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for removal of vents on the south face and replacement with new window, remove windows on the north façade and replace with vents per:

Code Citations:

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)

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

MM/SC/DK/TP            7:0:0    Motion carried.

**090215.22**

**Lucknow Building**

Uber—Support Center  
217 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. S.

Install vinyl decal signage on windows and front door

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC confirmed that the curtains which were formerly blocking transparency were removed. He said that ARC reviewed the signage proposed and while it complied with letter size and the color was thought to be appropriate, ARC thought that it appeared to be over proliferation of signage to have a sign in every window and door. ARC thought that it appeared that the building was being used as billboard to advertise the company because as the applicant representative described the purpose for this business location was to support drivers; the drivers would know where the facility was and the business would not be trying to attract customers off the street into this location. ARC suggested that they reduce the number of signs by half.

Applicant Comment:

Jon Ericson explained that per ARC suggestion they reduced the vinyl signs by half; there will be three on main windows and one on the door. He said signage is vinyl attached to interior of window. The sign shown in photo is temporary and will be removed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Pearson asked if hours would be included on door vinyl.

Mr. Ericson said it will.

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios said the letter size and color are okay and that what is proposed is compliant with the Rules. He said there is no over-proliferation and what was presented is proportionate.

Mr. Hester said the reduction in signage is appropriate.

Mr. Astor said it complies well. He said he likes the reduction in number which is more appropriate. He said the size and materials conform.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for signage as amended in today's meeting.

Code Citations:

SMC23.66.160 Signs

B. 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.

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.

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.

MM/SC/MP/AB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**090215.23**

**Squire Building**

On The Field - Wall Sign

901 B Occidental Ave S

Installation of new wall sign copy for iPhone 6 on the south wall sign

ARC report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the sign copy change as presented. They commented that the design might be the best they have proposed; it was simple and attractive. The applicant said they are selling the iPhone 6 at On the Field. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Nick Brown said they are making a copy change only and will reuse existing frame.

Ms. Nashem advised the board to look at their materials to make sure no website is shown on the copy.

Mr. Hester asked if the iPhone 6 would be sold on site.

Mr. Brown said it will.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios said the copy only is being changed. He noted it relates well to the context and the focus is on the product and not the sign.

Ms. Petrovich appreciated the simplicity.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for change of sign copy for iPhone 6. This approval does not include a determination that the sign qualifies as an on premise sign.

Code Citations:

SMC23.66.160 Signs

MM/SC/MP/TP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**090215.12**

**Interurban Building**

Verizon wireless

102 Occidental Ave S

Exchange 9 antennas, add 4 antennas, 9 RRU's and 12 surge protectors and 8 filters and cables on existing rooftop installation

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans proposed. They noted that the antennas are minimally visible especially being they are painted to match the penthouse. Some antennas are being replaced but there are a net of four antennas.

Applicant Comment:

Les Cooley explained the proposal to replace nine existing antennas with life size models and to add four new ones on the existing penthouse. The new antennas will be attached to side of existing penthouse rather than to top of building. He said there will be no significant changes in visibility from today. Responding to board questions he explained that the penthouse material is stucco and the galvanized frames will be bolted to that and not the roof. There will be no new frame mounts.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios noted the challenge of keeping the historic district active and vital and said the infrastructure is necessary.

Action: I mover to approve the exchange of 9 antennas, add 4 antennas, 9 RRU's and 12 surge protectors and 8 filters and cables on existing rooftop installation per:

Code Citations:  
SMC 23.66.140 C.4.d

**23.57.014 - Special review, historic and landmark districts.**

Communication utilities and accessory communication devices for which a Certificate of Approval may be required in IDR, PSM, IDM, PMM (see SMC [Chapter 25.24](#)) zones, the International Special Review District, the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and the Ballard Avenue (SMC [Chapter 25.16](#)), Columbia City (SMC [Chapter 25.20](#)) and Harvard-Belmont (SMC [Chapter 25.22](#)) Landmark Districts shall be sited in a manner that minimizes visibility from public streets and parks and may be permitted as follows:

A. Minor communication utilities and accessory communication devices may be permitted subject to the use provisions and development standards of the underlying zone and this chapter, with the following additional height allowance: communication utilities and devices may extend up to four (4) feet above a roof of the structure, regardless of zone height limit.

B. An Administrative Conditional Use approval shall be required for communication utilities and accessory devices regulated per [Section 23.57.002](#), and which do not meet the requirements of subsection A above. Any action under this section shall be subject to the Pioneer Square Preservation District and the International Special Review District review and approval and the Department of Neighborhoods Director; in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board and the Department of Neighborhoods Director; in the Pike Place Market Historical District by the Pike Place Market Historical Commission, and in the Columbia City Landmark District and the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District by the Landmarks Preservation Board, according to the following criteria:

1. Location on rooftops is preferred, set back toward the center of the roof as far as possible. If a rooftop location is not feasible, communication utilities and accessory communication devices may be mounted on secondary building facades. Siting on primary building facades may be permitted only if the applicant shows it is impossible to site the devices on the roof or secondary facade. Determination of primary and secondary building facades will be made by the appropriate board or commission.
2. Communication utilities and accessory communication devices shall be installed in a manner that does not hide, damage or obscure architectural elements of the building or structure.
3. Visibility shall be further minimized by painting, screening, or other appropriate means, whichever is less obtrusive. Creation of false architectural features to obscure the device is discouraged.

MM/SC/MP/MA 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**090215.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**

090215.31 **Framework Streetscape Concept Plan**

Inventory of existing streetscape amenities and plans for future enhancements

Liz Stenning, Alliance for Pioneer Square, explained they are working with multiple agencies to have a conceptual plan for the district regarding streetscape amenities and parks and gateways to district.

PowerPoint in DON file. Following are board questions and comments.

Darby Watson, SDOT, explained the conceptual plans to make street special and leverage through private development.

Jenny Compson and Leslie Bain presented.

Ms. Petrovich asked if they would work with others and cited bike racks and newspaper racks.

Ms. Watson said it is a challenge that the newspaper racks can't be moved /removed but that they have put in permanent black ones with 4 – 8 boxes to encourage those to be used instead. She said that it helps.

Ms. Petrovich noted the many styles and colors of trash containers.

Ms. Watson said that there are multiple versions and that many in center city are owned and operated by MID.

Ms. Petrovich asked if there is an overall plan to make them all similar.

Ms. Bain said that they haven't gotten that far yet and noted that there are many carriers.

Ms. Petrovich reported that the trash cans around the sports arena overflow all the time.

David Westman, area resident, asked if resident concerns had been addressed.

Ms. Bain said they will have community input.

Ms. Stenning said that they are doing inventory and data collection now and they will have public notice and will contact public early. She said that they will work on accessibility and sustainability and will need board input.

Ms. Compson suggested a work session with the board.

Mr. Pearson asked how to unify and incorporate into street plan public versus private company and noted the newspaper racks.

Ms. Brown said that after earlier inventories there are at least seven ADA ramps that have never been updated and yet now there is a green bike square that she has no idea what it is. She asked how they planned to get info to residents.

Mr. Hester was appreciative of the broad approach. He asked what the criteria are for rating.

Ms. Compson said that it will be by the block, low, medium, high; they looked at the condition – if it is usable and functional.

Ms. Brown said there are rules for street furniture.

Ms. Petrovich asked for bike rack placement to be considered and noted that the bike rack near her business is not used because it is not visible and bikes are stolen.

Ms. Compson said they have looked at where bike racks are and how (or not) they are used.

Mr. Hester said that security and public safety components should be considered. He asked if they have investigated lessons learned from other historic districts.



Ms. Compson said that this is focused on Pioneer Square. She said that something similar was done at the Pike Pine renaissance downtown.

Ms. Bain said she is aware of historic districts in other cities and their elements.

Ms. Compson said that they looked at Boston's elements.

Mr. Kralios noted their intent that private development take on this work and said that a lot of the projects that were shown are infrastructure.

Ms. Watson said that it would only be for a full street re-do that they would implement the street concept.

Mr. Kralios asked how they would avoid the patchwork quilt approach / look.

Ms. Watson said that community organizations will have opportunity to apply for grants to get specific elements.

Mr. Kralios said that a property owner is not interested in infrastructure unless they have to be. He said to make sure that we don't end up worse off. He said to identify specific streets as pilot project.

Ms. Watson said that it will be voluntary and they will have developers who will say they don't have to participate. She said that there is no separate funding for streetscape projects.

Ms. Nashem said that this is a conceptual plan and the more specific we can be in the Guidelines the more that can require e.g. if they want every bench to look the same or not.

Ms. Petrovich cited the 1<sup>st</sup> and King streetlight and said it is the last remaining one that was gifted to the city and there must be a balance between the plan and historic elements.

Ms. Brown noted preferred colors used in preservation district.

Ms. Nashem said to be clear about who will implement and how and noted there was miscommunication on the Occidental Plan about who will implement.

Ms. Brown said that meanwhile no one is doing anything.

Mr. Hester said that a work session with the board would be good for specific feedback.

090215.32

**Parks and Gateways Project**

Plans for future enhancements

PowerPoint in DON file. Following are board questions and comments. Walker Macy, Laura Rose, and Mark Hinshaw presented.

Ms. Petrovich asked what 'active building edges' means.

Ms. Rose said that it basically means ‘eyes on the park’ and general usership of spaces.

Ms. Petrovich asked how they chose the space.

Ms. Rose said that it was via input from public, Alliance for Pioneer Square, preservation board, etc.

Mr. Hinshaw said they would get input on Parking Day.

Ms. Petrovich said that trees are an ongoing cost and asked how they would be maintained and how that would be funded.

Victoria Schoenburg, DOPAR, said that the funding is better and they can address the needs. She said that some will be removed which will remove maintenance needs.

Ms. Stenning said that they pruned trees out of BIA funding.

Ms. Rose said to make sure that everyone is on the same page about what we want this to look like.

Ms. Nashem said to be clear on guidance on tree removal rules.

Mr. Hester said he appreciated the collaborative effort. He said that there is a lot of value in looking at lighting and said to be aware of architectural features. Regarding landscaping he said the London Plane is the Pioneer Square standard tree and over time they get dense. He said ‘thoughtful editing’ sounds like a smart strategic plan. He said the historic element is under addressed. He noted the Trail to Treasure project and said that there have been good attempts but that there is more to do. He said the execution is a challenge.

Mr. Pearson said he appreciated the identification of gateways which are important especially the eastern ones so you will know when you are in the district.

Ms. Petrovich reiterated her support of care of the trees and that lack of trimming and arborist oversight is detrimental.

Ms. Nashem said the redevelopment of City Hall Park and moving entry of the Courthouse back to park side was started but stopped when economy took a turn.

**090215.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

**090215.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Ryan Hester, Chair

**090215.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227