



The City of Seattle

## Pioneer Square Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

### MINUTES OF MEETING

PSB 10/08

DATE: January 16, 2008  
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

#### Board Members Present:

David Strauss  
Ryan Hester  
Adam Hasson  
Lorne McConachie  
Ann Brown  
Rick Friedhoff  
Catherine Person  
John De Lanoy

#### Staff:

Genna Nashem  
Joanne Walby  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

Alex Bennett  
Doug Ito

Lorne McConachie, Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00

#### **011608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Moved to approve the minutes of December 19, 2007

MM/SC/RF/AB 5:0:2 Mr. Strauss and Mr. DeLanoy abstained.

Moved to approve the minutes of January 2, 2008 as amended

MM/SC/DS/AH 5:0:2 Mr. Friedhoff and Mr. Delanoy abstained.

Catherine Person arrived at 9:06 a.m.

#### **011608.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### 011608.21 Utilikilts

Christian Jacobson

620 First Ave

Install permanent signage,

Design changes to previously approved alterations to the storefront-

**Application tabled.**

##### 011608.22 Smith Tower

David Yuan

506 Second Ave

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Application: Install a residential call station and door opener, install a new door at alley entry, install new loading ramp and replace coiling door at alley, replace existing fencing with glass and wood railing at level 22, install a new mechanical penthouse at level 22, install new louvers on the east and north tower elevations

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings and renderings provided. Mr. Almon explained that they are moving forward with converting the tower portion into 12 residential units. Mr. Yuan said that the louvers are necessary per code and will be installed on the alley façade into half the window with the historic window frames remaining intact. He said there are existing louvers there already. He said there is also a proposed stairwell pressurization louver on the north façade. ARC asked if the overall number of louvers could be reduced. Mr. Yuan said he would look at the uses for the existing louvers to determine if it was possible to have fewer louvers. Mr. Yuan said that the proposed mechanical unit is more than 300 feet from the street and referred to the site line drawing showing that it would not be visible from 300 feet. ARC asked the applicant to provide photos of existing rooftop features and to identify if there are alternatives that would allow for clustering of rooftop features or a lower profile so the equipment is less visible. ARC asked the applicant to explore if there were alternative colors that more closely match the color of the terracotta. ARC asked the applicant if call station could either be moved or face mounted so there would be less cutting of the stone. Mr. Yuan said he will inquire but that the station has to comply with ADA height regulations. ARC asked for more detailed drawings of how the granite base will be altered at the coiling door. ARC recommended approval of replacing the coiling door and replacing the alley doors. ARC asked for detail on how the new railing sections and the old railing sections will meet.

Staff Report: The applicant will be prepared to address the ARC's questions and requests for alternatives.

Applicant Comment: David Yuan, Mike Almon, Mark Bloom presented the application. Mr. Yuan said they intend to convert the upper floors, the tower, into residential units and will need to make accommodations for residential use. He said the challenge of introducing residential use of building is the need for more air in/out of building due to dryers, cooking, etc and that the choices to accomplish this are exhausting up or horizontal; their solution is to go for the horizontal mode introducing modifications that won't impact prominent facades. He said they tried to consolidate exhaust to one side to go for the minimal number of louvers. He showed that the louvers will fit into the existing window frame in the upper light on the east and lower light on the bottom on the north. The applicant said he looked into removing existing louvers on the east however, by the patina and material of the louvers; the louvers appear to be original. He also said to use the existing louvers they would have to build soffit that would impede egress.

Mr. Almon asked the board if it would prefer them to remove the louvers or to clean them up and leave them if the louvers were original.

Mr. McConachie asked about the material of original.

Mr. Bloom stated it was bronze and that the new louvers would be anodized metal to match.

Mr. Yuan said they have not selected a louver yet; and suggested the board could condition the exact louvers be returned for approval.

Mr. Hasson asked if there would be ducting in the stairwells.

Mr. Yuan said that some louvers are in the stairwells with a sheetrock soffit through the unit wall.

Mr. Yuan said the construction of a mechanical penthouse on level 22 houses domestic boilers. He said the height has been reduced from twelve feet to ten feet and that from three hundred feet, a person can see only a small corner from the street. He said in order to reduce the height they would need to expand the penthouse by about one foot.

Mr. Almond said they would be removing the old chimney flue from the roof and locating the mechanical penthouse there.

Mr. Yuan said they chose a darker stucco color for the penthouse to match the existing terracotta.

Mr. McConachie asked if the existing stair enclosure stucco could be painted the same color for a consistent look. Mr. Almon said they could paint it.

Mr. Strauss said that he thought the penthouse was compliant.

Mr. Yuan discussed the need for a handrail for the decks on the roof. The handrails would be metal stanchions, glass infill with a teak handrail cap. He said the height study shows that from the south the handrail is not visible while the existing fence is. He said the plan is to replace a portion of the existing fence with a new handrail with a four inch gap in between the new handrail and the existing fence.

Mr. McConachie expressed concern that this might impede window washing or maintenance of building.

Mr. Almon said that this would not be an issue.

Mr. Hasson asked if there was any plan to replace existing fence with same new system.

Mr. Almon said that the transition between the old and new is important and they are making adjustment to make transition more appealing where visible.

Ms. Brown disagreed and said that looking up at the existing metal fence it is extremely visible and ugly.

Mr. Almon said that they are looking at what they are coming from the perspective that they are making it better. He said that anything they do has to be absorbed by twelve units rather than 150 units and impacts their ability to upgrade rather than leave things as they are.

Mr. Hasson asked if there was a way to modify existing chain link fence to make it shorter.

Mr. Bloom said they had looked into modifying the existing fence, but that modifying the fence would be complex and more cost effective to replace.

Mr. Yuan said they were balancing the provisions of guidelines with provisions of building code. He said the glass was for visibility for end user to have better visibility.

Mr. Yuan said they wanted to replace the non-original double door within the alley. He said they want to replace the existing coiling door and re-do the ramp to make a better entrance to the building. He said they discovered that it is rusty metal rather than stone under the ramp and they want to remove it to install a new concrete slab to replace the yellow ramp. Mr. Yuan said they do not have any original drawings of this area.

Mr. Yuan said they have proposed installing a call station on the north side of the door recess and have located it where only one piece of stone would have to be disturbed. He said it is handicapped accessible. He said they could not do a surface mounted station as there would not be room for the door swing.

Mr. Almon said they plan to keep the existing doors so they are not looking at replacement of door system to accommodate call station.

Mr. Hasson said the elevation drawing shows the station in one stone but in the PhotoShop photo the station is impacting two stones.

Mr. Almon said that the button will move down and that this is not shown in the photo. He said the call box will be handicapped accessible and is pushed as low as possible to only impact one stone.

Mr. McConachie asked if the granite existing on the building is available today.

Mr. Yuan said that he wasn't sure but that it was Alaskan or Vermont grade.

#### Board Questions:

Mr. DeLanoy said in looking at the guidelines and this proposal, "open railings", could mean structurally it is open or it could refer to visibility, meaning you can see through it. Not ignoring guidelines, he said he thought it fit in with guidelines.

Mr. McConachie said we need to be concerned with the placement of railings because we don't want to give the impression we are open to putting up railings all over Pioneer Square.

Mr. Hasson said that the metal fence should be researched. He thinks the fence is a mistake either approved by a previous board or an owner who did it without process. He said it is an eyesore and as a long term vision is detracts from the building. He suggested it is worth looking into installing a shorter fence that isn't visible at all.

Mr. McConachie said that his read is that they really don't want to embrace the existing chain link fence.

Mr. Strauss said that only two issues are irreversible: the placement of the call box and the ramp; the fence is reversible.

#### Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca said she looked up at the louvers and that they were not visible; she doesn't think it will make a difference. In reference to the fence she asked why is it necessary to discuss something that already exists. She also asked about the potential for the lower portion of the building to go residential.

Mr. Almon said that it was possible that the lower portion of the building to go residential but that there might not be the right conditions again.

Draft Motion: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project on the condition that the applicant returns to the board for approval of the exact louvers:

Code Citations:

District Rules:

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction. B. Design, C. Building Materials

VIII. Mechanical Equipment

SMC 23.66.140 C. Rooftop Features 2. Open railings, 4 Features height and setback,

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior's Standards 1, 2, 4, 5 and 10

MM/SC/CP/DS 8:0:0 Motion carried.

011608.23

**Metropole Building**  
423 Second Ave Ext S

Dave Heinen

Repaint exterior of the building, replace non-original storefronts at grade level, replace non-original windows on second or third story, and alter the main building entry

ARC Report: Mr. Heinen said the building repairs are being considered a substantial alteration so they are required to bring the building up to code. He said the building uses are not proposed to change. Mr. Heinen said they looked at removing the paint and determined that it would be too extensive to remove so they are proposing to repaint.

Mr. Heinen said the existing store fronts and upper floor windows are not original so while bringing them up to code they are also proposing a design that is more in keeping with the original architecture. He said the storefronts would be wood and the upper windows will be aluminum painted a custom color. ARC suggested that they look into a wood clad window that has more profile. Mr. Heinen said that they are required to make the building accessible so they are proposing to remove the steps from the main entry.

He said that building forensics show that the floor was raised and the old photo circa 1900 shows only two shallow steps. He said they do not know if the original steps were destroyed when the entry was remodeled. He said they propose to remove the steps and the security gate and make the entry at grade. Mr. Heinen said they wanted to move the door back to its original location. Mr. Heinen said that the upper windows on the annex are original and will be repaired but they will replace the non-original storefront. ARC members suggested that being the storefront was originally different it could be treated different. ARC members suggested differentiating the brick and stone with a slight color difference. Mr. Heinen showed a sample of the black slate they are proposing for the base instead of wood for durability. ARC asked if there was an alternative to the blank door in front of the exit stairs. ARC members discussed the storefronts and asked if there could be more order in the pattern. Mr. Heinen said that it is a complicated program but they could take another look at it. He pointed out the header that brought back hints of the original headers. ARC members suggested that they consider where louvers and signs might go in their design. ACR members noticed some errors on the detail drawings and asked for corrected ones. ARC discussed that they may recommend approval of removal of the non- original windows and storefronts on the condition that they submit alternative replacement plans for approval.

Staff Report: Although it would not be ideal to approve removal with out replacement plans, because the windows and storefronts are not original it could be considered in this case. The Board could also consider limiting the removal to only the deli storefront which was damaged in the fire.

Applicant Comment: David Heinan said they would approach work in a phased format. He said they have more investigation to do; he had no updates on design. He said the door at the store will have glass. He is looking at a different color scheme for the back alley. He said he is investigating window choices for upper two levels and is looking at aluminum with a larger more robust and more traditional profile. He said by February 16 he should have updated information and would like to go back through the Architectural Review Committee full cycle. He will present a plan of the rooftop that introduces new rooftop mechanical units that will be out of view.

He said the Deli area is where the storefront sustained the most irreparable damage. He said they gutted most of the interior and that the interior of the Deli was the most historic part of the building; they salvaged as much historic material as possible for possible reuse. The Deli's non original storefront sustained significant charring; he wants permission to remove the last of the smoke damaged product so he can go in and clean and seal the building. At this time he is requesting permission to remove the damaged storefronts.

He handed out packets and said that specifically the boarded up storefronts below the band (9 -10 feet) are all aluminum and thinks they don't have significance.

Board Questions:

Mr. DeLanoy asked if this was a Board issue that the Code is silent on casualty damage if damage is by fire; he isn't sure this is a Board issue.

Mr. Hasson asked the applicant to provide documentation of interpretation of what is "burned down".

Mr. Strauss asked if it is irreparable and if it is original?

Mr. Heinen said the materials are from the 1940s – 1950s.

Mr. Strauss said the issue is a Board issue. He said he is in support of the applicant to clean and exhaust the building but he will need details on the rebuilding.

Mr. Hasson said he thought that the Board should review the condition of the windows.

Mr. Heinen said they need to replace the storefront windows because all the windows were broken by the Fire Department; there was a lot of smoke, steam and water damage. Mr. Heinen said they are looking at the demo of three bays only at the Deli location at this time.

Public Comment: There was not public comment.

Ms. Nashem read section 6 of Secretary of Interior's Standards **"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.”** She said that the old photos show that the windows were not original. She said the Board can determine which era of window style is most appropriate to replace.

Mr. DeLanoy talked about the vagueness of the ordinance and asked what is going in temporarily and if the plywood structure will be painted so it wouldn't be a total blight but would match somewhat.

Mr. Heinen said they would paint the plywood.

Mr. McConachie said that the board would rather not approve half proposals because there is no assurance that someone will complete the work. He said he will consider that due to fire damage it seems reasonable that the board move forward on a temporary COA so they can remove the damaged storefronts but notes this should not be considered a precedent.

Draft Motion: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval to remove non-original storefronts at grade level in the location of the former Deli, on the condition that final design plans are submitted and approved for the replacement of windows and storefronts, repair of the upper floor original windows of the annex, painting, and alteration of the main the main building entry.

Code Citations:

District Rules:

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction. B. Design, C. Building Materials, d. Color, E. Building Base

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior's Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10

Guidelines for treatment of Storefronts

Guidelines for treatment of Windows

MM/SC/MM/JD

6:0:1 Mr. Hasson against, motion carried

011608.24

**1016 First Ave S**

Ed Linardic

Change of Use: From office to retail on the ground floor and from warehouse to office on floors two through four

Façade alterations: Modify a storefront on the east façade, replace windows and replace fill in filled windows on the south façade and install seismic bracing

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans, drawings and window survey provided. Mr. Linardic said that because they are doing major alterations they are required to bring these windows up to code or fill them in. He said there is a gap between the buildings but the windows are not visible. Mr. Linardic explained the seismic bracing system. He said the braces are four feet back and allow for some use of the storefront window space. ARC recommends approval of the application.

Applicant Comment: Ed Linardic said he wants to change use on the ground floor from retail to office and then from warehouse to office use on the upper floors. He said that years ago windows were changed and that they are planning to upgrade the entire structure with braces.

Mr. McConachie asked what alternatives were looked at.

Mr. Linardic said that this is the second alteration. With regard to the bracing he said they could tie to the existing footings four feet back and tie into beams that connect north to south.

Mr. McConachie said looking at the east façade one can see steel beams in front of each window and asked if it could be reconfigured to less impact to windows and hold the historical character in at least the central bays.

Mr. Linardic said they are trying to minimize frames visible to pedestrians and trying to distribute loads evenly. He said that from an engineering standpoint it looks efficient but from a visual perspective there may be room for scaling back.

Mr. Hester said he has a similar concern and requested an engineer review the design with the Board.

Mr. Strauss said he was puzzled by the layout but said it is nice that the center bay at grade is open. He said he also wanted to hear from the engineer.

Mr. McConachie asked if the windows on the south side must be replaced for fire resistance.

Mr. Linardic: said that there are a variety of windows and they must be changed to meet code. The paint will match existing. He said there is no reason to have windows on the first floor on south side and he wants to infill the windows to allow space for retail. The next door building is about seven feet away.

Mr. McConachie asked with what material the windows will be filled.

Mr. Linardic said that the South wall is cast concrete. He said that currently drywall fills the window, but that CMU is the most cost effective way to fill the lower windows.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hester said that he would like to table the bracing.

Mr. McConachie said that with regard to the CMU in-fill, the wall is not well seen and that the CMU is reversible although with difficulty. He asked if there are alternatives.

Mr. Hester said that it is not visible to the street.

Mr. Strauss said that the adjacent property owner could build right up against the building and that CMU is most consistent with original design.

Mr. McConachie said code does not excluded CMU material.

Mr. Linardic said that the wall will be painted to same as north wall.

Mr. McConachie said the patching would disappear. He asked if any change of use has to be approved.

Mr. Strauss asked if the retail use needed approval for use over 3,000 square feet.

Mr. Linardic said the space is about 4000 square feet.

Ms. Nashem said a motion can be made stating the Board is approving retail use over 3000 square feet and excludes the approval of the brace frames.

Mr. Linardic said he will bring the structural engineer to the next meeting to explain the brace frame design.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Motion: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for a Change of Use from office to retail over 3,000 square feet on the ground floor and from warehouse to office on floors two through four and to modify a storefront on the east façade, replace windows and replace fill in filled windows on the south façade  
This COA excludes braced frames at East and West all per

Code Citations:

District Rules:

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction.

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses

SMC 23.66.13 amended to allow change of use to retail at 4036 square feet.

Secretary of Interior's Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10

Guidelines for treatment of Storefronts

Guidelines for treatment of Windows

MM/SC/DS/CP 7:0:0

**011608.3 BOARD BUSINESS**

011608.31 **Briefing regarding the Livable South Downtown Planning Study-** Susan McLain  
Discussion Tabled

**011608.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

**011608.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem Staff report was tabled.

Issued: January 16, 2008

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227