Chair Dean Kralios called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

040418.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
January 3, 2018
MM/SC/CO/AR Minutes approved.

January 17, 2018
MM/SC/AA/CO Minutes approved.

040418.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040418.21 Yesler Building
Method Homes
95 Yesler Way

Installation of a blade sign on an existing bracket

Staff report: The building previously had a blade sign here with two tenant listings. I assume the building owner is intending to continue with that sign plan being they asked the tenant to have holes in the bottom of their sign.
ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and material samples. The sign will be hung on an existing bracket. ARC preferred if the applicant used a black carabiners and eye hooks and the applicant agreed. They found the letter height and size complied with regulations and recommended approval with an express review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of a blade sign on an existing bracket.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the April 4, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:
SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required
SMC 23.66.160 Signs

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

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

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)

Sign Materials: Wood or wood products are the preferred materials for rigid hanging and projecting (blade) signs and individual signage letters applied to building facades. (7/99)

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.

2. **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 façade may be permitted. (12/94)

3. **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**
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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.

MMC/SC/AA/LC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

---

**Fisher Building**
115 and 121 S Jackson St

Installation of a temporary gas line

Staff report: this is work associated with the installation of the vault for the project a 419 Occidental Ave S but the work will be done on the Fisher building across the alley.

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the proposed plans. The applicant explained the mounting of the temporary main line will be in the mortar joints and they can adjust the location and direction of the brackets to assure that they meet in mortar locations. ARC requested information on proposed mortar hole filling as the building owner has yet to propose tuck pointing the building.

Applicant Comment:

Jordan McLean, PSE, said Seattle City Light (SCL) needs to install a 1200 square foot vault; it affects a PSE gas line and with safety concerns they need to route line out of way during underground activities. He said they need to run part of the service to east of
current location and a mount temporary service to exterior of building. The temporary installation is for 4 – 6 months and then it will be installed underground.

Mr. Kralios asked how easy will anchor be to remove when temp install is removed.

Mr. McLean said the threaded piece can be pulled out, blown-out with compressor and re-grouted.

Mr. Kralios said the mortar must be compatible with what is there now.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of a temporary gas line with the attachment holes repaired upon removal with product reviewed by staff for appropriateness.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the April 4, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:
SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

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.

VIII. MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

The preferred location for mechanical systems is in the building interior. In cases where locating systems in the interior is not possible, exterior mechanical systems equipment, including but not limited to air conditioning units, compressors, boilers, generators, ductwork, louvers, wiring and pipes, shall be installed on non-primary building facades and/or roof tops. Mechanical equipment shall be installed in such a manner that character-defining features of the building are not radically changed,
damaged, obscured, or destroyed. Screening and/or painting of equipment may be required to diminish negative visual impacts.

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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/AA/AR       6:0:0     Motion carried.

040418.3       PRELIMINARY REVIEW

040418.31   60 Yesler Way

Briefing Regarding possible new construction of a hotel on a vacant lot

Case Creal, Gensler, presented via PowerPoint; full report in DON file. Following is a summary and board and public questions and comments. He provided project goals: Activate the street level along all three adjacent and nearby streets; complete the urban street wall along Alaskan Way; and create a building that expresses a contemporary vision while taking cues from and being respectful of the neighborhood. He provided context of the site spatially and historically. He said throughout the early 20th century the site was occupied by a lower, one story building. He noted proposed Waterfront redevelopment main corridor changes. He provided an analysis of buildings in the neighborhood. He noted the warehouse typology and materiality. He went over zoning envelope and proposed massing progressions noting their preferred option.

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules.

Mr. Alsobrook asked for more information about the portion of the site that is not under this team’s control.

Mr. Creal pointed out the area on plan; it is under control of ownership of 619 Western. They can build up to property line, but with no glazing. They can have 45% glazing if they set back 10 feet. If they set back further at ground floor they can have more glazing in the storefronts.

Board members expressed concern about assumption of use of non-buildable piece of land.

Mr. Alsobrook said that it is unfortunate that the neighbor is unwilling to sell the strip of land. He thought they would rather have a setback next to the building to allow light in the existing windows.
Mr. Creal said the building owner thought they had enough light and was not interested.

Mr. Rolluda asked about living room space and said that it is over allowable 3000 square feet.

Mr. Creal said that the character of those spaces is small enough in scale and living room uses will be distinct and different in character to break down scale of space. He said they would elaborate further later and may asked for a departure.

Mr. Donckers thought the street setbacks appropriate. He had a little issue on massing and scale - consternation on going above building heights without a setback from south. Materiality he thought responded to PS with, and thought some brick was important. He thought there was more flexibility being it was a vacant lot now. As for the art proposal he was concerned it could fall into signage. It would be helpful if art is put into a package with signage, so it can be evaluated all in one. He reminded them that Pioneer Square is unique.

Mr. Creal said that art can be changed out, but it is not meant to be any kind of billboard or advertisement.

Mr. Donckers said that other businesses may come in and say their sign is art so they need to be able to differentiate.

Mr. Creal said that maintenance will be needed – re-stretching the canvas or reprinting it.

Mr. Donckers said to be mindful of the District Rules – that this isn't a billboard.

Mr. Creal said they will come back later with more information on art. He said they just wanted to get it into the conversation at this point and to be intentional about plans for blank facades. He said they are creating an intentional canvas. He said the proposed materiality of the building will be in character of the area; the complete block is concrete warehouses. He said they are exploring use of brick, possibly red to differentiate it from the warehouses but they would like to discuss color.

Mr. Rolluda suggested looking at the top of historical buildings in the area for the vocabulary of for how cornices are developed.

Mr. Creal said they will study how to terminate the building.

Height, Bulk, Scale

Mr. Kralios noted the irregular-shaped site and the constraint of the strip of land in front. He said it is a smaller footprint and he was not as concerned with the height. He said it seems proportionate to buildings in the immediate area. He said the adjacent Polson and 611 Western buildings are broader. He said he had some concern about setback on Alaskan Way. He said the style of the arcade or portico at base is
not seen in the district. He said bookended by a blank façade with no support under buildings seems unresolved. He noted the good studies on proportion and said to apply that here in sizing of vertical and horizontal elements. He said to make sure it is compatible and works well. He said that brick would be a great addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Alsobrook asked about mechanical.

Mr. Creal said the will come back with mechanical and screening. He said they will do view studies. He said mechanical has to go somewhere and because of the soil and the tunnel, a basement is not feasible. He said the mechanical will be put into a small place on first floor or at grade on Western. He said there is no loading dock planned.

Mr. Kralios said to be thoughtful about how the building is organized, how it affects the façade and pedestrian experience.

Mr. Creal said in the typical guest room the bed is against the window. He said that glazing is floor to ceiling and they want to utilize opaque glazing from bed to floor; there will be no additional mullion.

Mr. Alsobrook noted historic precedent or use of spandrel; he said there are two industrial buildings to the north. He said it could be interesting visually.

Mr. Donckers noted that the building’s southeast façade is important and highly visible.

Mr. Alsobrook agreed this is a very visible site.

Grand Central, City Loan and Buttnick Buildings
(Squire Latimer, Gottstein, Brunswick-Balke-Collender)
216, 206 and 202 1st Ave S

Ms. Collie recused herself.

Briefing on proposed alterations to the existing buildings

Presentation was via PowerPoint, full report in DON file. Following are board and public questions and comments. Project goals: activate the Square; rehabilitate the buildings; and adapt the use. He went through existing retail deficiencies and retail activation solutions. He went over proposed window alterations, weather protection, and proposed alley activation solutions. He provided history of the secondary façade.

Mr. Donckers asked why the canopy is located in the top 2/3 of windows.

Mr. Graham said they made sure the historical arches will be above. He said it is also a logical point. He said if higher it wouldn’t provide protection from wind-driven rain.
Mr. Donckers clarified that they are saying that the canopy above the windows wouldn’t provide weather protection.

Mr. Graham said that it would also greatly change the experience of being under the canopy as a pedestrian or as seated in café. As it raises to get above windows it overpowers store line. He said you can view the arches in their fulness – they are only removing brick material below canopy; he said the whole arch is landed on brick.

Mr. Kralios appreciated seeing the plan which allows him to see how the team views space subdivided for retail. He said that some openings already have substantial storefronts. He said it is a little out of place and wondered why more was needed. He said he was skeptical that the opening up to 24” of brick was really adding that much for retail viability – they are such small spaces. He said that windows as existing are sufficient given what is there now. He said that the canopy looks in keeping with the scale of the building.

Ms. O’Donnell agreed and said she likes the way the canopy is broken up, it adds interest.

Mr. Donckers said this revised canopy is more consistent with what the code allows. He said he likes that it is broken up but that he doesn’t like the break-up of the windows. He said where there is canopy, it is better than it was before. He said to reduce impact to brick at connecting points. He said the large rifts have been altered and with minimal alteration to the brick it is not offensive as a concept.

Mr. Graham said that there are three active usable retail fronting business because of current design openings. He said they propose to create seven active park facing retail bays.

Public Comment: Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square appreciated seeing the evolution of the design. She supported more opportunities for retail in park.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Alsobrook asked about status of tax incentives application with NPS.

Mr. Phillips said this portion of the project is not connected to that; they won’t apply tax credits for this portion of the project.

Mr. Donckers wanted to hear more on getting to details and wanted a better understanding of transparency. He wondered if there is a way to minimize alterations. He questioned if it is appropriate to break up canopy in another way without impacts to the bricks. He suggested more exploration.

Mr. Graham asked where there would be less material removal.

Mr. Alsobrook said to connect to re-opening filled-in openings.
Mr. Graham indicated on page 7 of plans which windows are being re-opened. He said transparency is relative to the space behind it.

Mr. Kralios said a small sliver doesn’t seem that critical and said that with speculative development they are making concessions for the unknown.

Mr. Graham said they are test fitting a grocer, but it may not be who is there.

Mr. Kralios said that if someone is dead set on being there in the historic district, one less window is not a big deal.

Mr. Graham said they are trying to connect to other proposals in Occidental Park – the pavilion and the children’s play area. He said they are exploring how the façade is responding. He said they are honoring the ghost sign and filling in the pit. He said three small incisions of brick would be removed in center park and two larger openings on the end.

Mr. Kralios said the SOI addresses new openings for light, venting. He said that people who want to be in the square want to be in a historic district; it doesn’t seem like it is make or break.

Presenter said they are trying to be deferential to the corner. He said there are no new cuts / windows to bay at either end. He said that Grand Central Bakery benefits from a large opening created by Ralph Anderson’s project.

Mr. Kralios said it is an arcade.

Mr. Graham said that experience would be different if only heavy mass was there. He said they plan no new openings in 1/3 of the block; he noted difficult retail struggles.

Mr. Kralios said they are looking at the elevation as if it is the only retail access and that is not the case. He said there is a large storefront onto Main. He said the Buttnick Building also has retail facing onto Washington. He said they have to look holistically. He said to look at the spaces affected and question how critical additional openings are. He said a window will not make or break a deal.

Ms. Nashem noted a business that has been in violation with curtains for a year because they didn’t want so much transparency. She said it should be made very clear that if new openings are added that they can’t be covered by future tenants.

Mr. Graham thanked the board and said they will incorporate comments.

Mr. Alsobrook echoed concern about openings. He said one opening in the center of Grand Central is not as much as the whole cumulative impact. He said lots of alteration has been proposed. He said it must be holistic and meet Code and District Rules. He said he is having a hard time rectifying those – they are really taking a lot away. He said the canopies are the right height. He expressed concern about so much historic fabric being removed.
Mr. Kralios said the focus will be on substantiating change and why. He said they want to know how the canopy is integrated into building and if removed how the existing fabric is impacted.

040418.4  BOARD BUSINESS

040418.5  REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Dean Kralios, Chair

040418.6  STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227