



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 374/15

**MINUTES** for Wednesday, November 18, 2015

## **Board Members**

Mark Astor  
Ann Brown  
Ryan Hester, Chair  
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair  
Kyle Kiser  
Willie Parish  
Marcus Pearson  
Tija Petrovich

## **Staff**

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

## **Absent**

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

**111815.11 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**  
November 4, 2015

**111815.21 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

Applications were reviewed out of agenda order.

**111815.22 1016 1<sup>st</sup> Ave**  
1014 1<sup>st</sup> Ave S

Installation of new minor communication utility on a rooftop

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and photos provided and thought that the increase in height to the existing penthouse was minimally visible and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Les Cooley indicated the proposed changes on the drawings provided. He said that the screening wall will be painted to match the existing penthouse. He said the fiber board is custom and allows the rays to go through; he said they will paint the entire structure. He said the changes are needed to improve service otherwise they would need a new cell site. He said the material is opaque.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester said it complies with code.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of minor communications utility on top of an existing penthouse as proposed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 18, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC23.66.140 Height

Minor communication utilities and accessory communication devices, except that height is regulated according to the provisions of Section 23.57.014.

**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/MA/DK            4:0:2    Motion carried. Mmes. Petrovich and Brown abstained.

111815.21            **505 1<sup>st</sup> Ave S**

*Ms. Petrovich recused herself.*

Change of use from retail to office for a 1,163 square foot space

Ms. Nashem reported that "Office" is not a preferred street level use but also this size office use does not fall into the category of discouraged use. Typically the Board has put a caveat on an approval of use from a preferred use to another use and that the change of use apply only to the current tenant and return to retail use when the tenant vacates.

Applicant Comment:

Kim Petty explained the proposal to change one bay of streetscape retail to office use. She said they share the long term vision for retail or sidewalk café but noted the challenge with construction projects, Railroad Avenue and the Waterfront projects in the short term. She said to link the change in use to their tenancy with it reverting back to retail when they leave. She provided a diagram showing the percentage of block front and said they are only taking a 30' entryway. She said the front of the space is for the reception desk to retain activation; typical office functions will be moved to the rear of the space.

Ian Morrison said that it is only about 5% of the block.

Ms. Petty said that to the north there is a furniture showroom with retail frontage.

Public Comment:

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, did not support the change of use and noted they have been working to build vibrancy in the district with restaurant, retail, and service uses. She said this discourages a potential restaurateur. She said she recognized the challenge of mixing right now in this area and while they aren't there yet they want to encourage people to come further down 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. She said she hoped it would be a short term lease and then revert to retail.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Astor noted Ms. True's comments and the struggle for retail activation on that block. He said that it is difficult to take on faith that it won't be a ten-year lease. He said that some activation is better than none.

Mr. Kralios echoed Mr. Astor's comments. He said that retail activates pedestrian use. He said that it is not large enough retail space that it will dictate use of the building. He said that the space to the south is divisible.

Mr. Hester agreed and said activation has tremendous value. He said a clear duration of the lease is needed. To Ms. True's comments he said it is tough to approve with an unknown duration of lease.

Mr. Astor said the length of lease should be a condition.

Ms. Nashem said that lease duration hasn't been known in similar cases.

Ms. Brown said she hates to see this use and that the area needs action and vibrancy. She said this is the entrance to the stadium district. She said the Alliance for Pioneer Square works hard for the district.

Mr. Hester said activation is needed and it is tough to target what could be versus what isn't there yet.

Mr. Morrison said that this tenant is trying to target residents to be their insurance provider. He said they encourage walk-in traffic.

Mr. Kralios said for future retailers moving into vacant storefront with not adjacent retail is onerous.

Mr. Astor said it is a small section and very shallow and doesn't preclude the whole south end from being vibrant retail. He said there is retail to the north. He said there should be no expansion of office use on the entire façade.

Mr. Kiser said it is so small compared to the rest of the street front. He said an insurance sees a fair amount of foot traffic.

Ms. Nashem said the board could state intention to not approve future office uses where it is not a preferred use.

Mr. Morrison said he would convey back to Hudson that the board stated a clear direction on future uses.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for change of use from retail to office for a 1,163 square foot space during the tenancy of the Allstate Insurance office with the use reverting back to retail when the tenant vacates the space.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 18, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted uses

23.66.130 Street Level uses

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;

b. Theaters.

2. Accessory parking garages that serve preferred street-level uses on streets or malls, parks or alleys designed for pedestrian uses are also preferred.

C. Discouraged Street-level Uses.

1. The following are discouraged at street level in the area designated on Map B for 23.66.130:

a. Any use occupying more than 50 percent of any block front;

b. Any of the following with gross floor area over 3,000 square feet: general sales and services uses, eating and drinking establishment uses, and lodging uses;

- c. All other uses with gross floor area over 10,000 square feet;
- d. Professional services establishments or offices that occupy more than 20 percent of any block front; and
- e. Parking garages that are not accessory to preferred uses.

MM/SC/DK/MA 5:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Petrovich recused herself.

111815.23

**Squire Building Wall sign**

On the Field  
901 B Occidental Ave S

Installation of new sign copy for Verizon on the north façade

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the proposed changes to the sign copy and thought that the color and design were similar to what has previously been proposed. They noted the split back ground colors. ARC recommended approval.

Staff Report: This is a legal non-conforming sign which means that it was established in court that an on-premise sign can remain because it had been in use before the code prohibiting this size of sign was adopted but the size of the sign cannot change and the location of the sign cannot change. It is required to be an on-premise sign. I am asking the Board to not make a determination if they think the sign is an on-premise sign but to evaluate the sign based on the other criteria in our District Rules and the SMC23.66.160. The sign will still be required to comply with the on-premise sign permit through DPD and other city laws.

Casey Crook explained the proposed change of copy to the stretch vinyl on the north side. She said there will be no change to the frame. She said it will be up ninety days. She said there are two separate field colors and it is part of Verizon's full rebranding. She said the colors are more muted and more appropriate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Motion: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of new Verizon sign copy as presented. This consideration does not include any determination by the Board that the sign qualifies as an on-premise sign.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 18, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations: SMC23.66.160 Signs

MM/SC/KK/TP 6:0:0 Motion carried.

111815.24

**Maud Building**

311 First Ave S

Installation of a door replacing a gate  
Tabled.

**1118115.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**

111815.31 **Pioneer Square Gateways**

Update on the potential gateway improvement project.

Lara Rose, Walker / Macy presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file).  
Following are board questions and comments.

Ms. Rose explained they have been studying all neighborhood parks and gateway areas. She said that there are three zones: 1) City Hall Park (Courthouse); 2) Pioneer Square Park; and 3) King Street Station (Union Station Square). She said they have studied issue with the spaces and said there is not enough “there” there. She explained the concept of adding historical narratives at each zone.

She said that Pioneer Square’s proximity to the original shoreline and Native community will be the focus there. She said that features will include improved lighting, sunny spaces, public art, improved visibility, and events. She said that at King Street Station / Union Station Square the size of roads could provide fantastic pedestrian walkways and she suggested bricked and tabled intersections like in Portland. She said they want to see larger and more trees. She said the railroad was built with Chinese labor which could be focus of narrative in ID and Pioneer Square. She said that they want better uses at City Hall Park. She said they propose removing some trees to bring in more light. She said they want to improve the connectivity between the park and Prefontaine and Fortson parks. She noted there could be strong pedestrian activity in Jackson Street right of way. She noted the value of create destination spots. She said that there is no sense of arrival or welcome at Pioneer Square Park. She said they want to increase the inside – outdoor relationship with buildings. She said they propose to prune / limb up trees some of which are heritage trees. She suggested making the pergola more of a gateway and active edge. She said in the existing planting area they suggest a low deck instead.

Ms. Nashem asked if they knew the background on the shape and location of the planting area.

Ms. Rose said it is a remnant of original triangle – the original road went through and there has been an accretion of various things that were not specifically designed.

Mr. Hester said the streetcar added a lot of width to the road.

Ms. Rose said they want to rotate the benches and create gathering area.

Ms. Petrovich asked about lighting.

Ann Marie Schneider, Walker / Macy, said they are working on light plans and have a lighting designer. She said they are looking at catenary lights to re-engage the Pioneer Building with the park and tie in with Pioneer Passage which has catenary lights. She said that they are looking at types and sizes of trees for Pioneer Park and propose relocating the tri-globe lights to another edge of the park. She said they are looking at smaller globes.

Mr. Kralios commented that the park has always felt like a remnant; it is not pedestrian friendly and has huge curbs. He asked about reuse of historic paving.

Ms. Nashem said it is worth looking at historic development of the park to be able to make those determinations. She said that the totem pole being placed in the dirt is making it susceptible to rotting and they need to come up with adjustment to the ground around it.

Mr. Kralios said there are lots of historic elements but the context around has changed and he wondered about repurposing elements.

Ms. Nashem noted that there are areaways and bathrooms underneath park.

Ms. Schneider said that the totem pole, Chief Seattle, contemporary panels, and other things have been deposited over time but not integrated into the site design.

Ms. Nashem suggested they talk to City's Arts and Culture group.

Mr. Kralios suggested cross department coordination with SDOT and DOPAR.

Mr. Astor said that opening up the park and making some changes is great. He said what is there now is a mish mash that makes no sense.

Mr. Kiser noted the waterfall effect of growth. He noted the corridor all the way to King Street Station. He reiterated the importance of cross department collaboration and noted the street car planning being too siloed. He said to keep consistency. He said that art at traffic island brightens the landmark and helps with sense of arrival.

Mr. Kralios said to look at how the railroad adds a layer to the city. He said it is important to relate spaces. He said the road cuts up and suggested to find ways to encourage pedestrians to want to walk around.

Mr. Kiser said to be careful at City Hall Park regarding emphasis on an axis between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> that may never develop relationship to building.

Mr. Astor said it is hard to imagine the front of the building with all the HVAC and mechanical equipment right there.

Ms. Nashem said that at one time there was a plan to re-do this park and the entry to the building. He said the courthouse is in the district but under the purview of the King County Landmarks program; they presented it to us as a courtesy. She said the park is the purview of the Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

**111815.3 BOARD BUSINESS**

**111815.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Ryan Hester, Chair

**111815.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227