



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 261/08

DATE: November 5, 2008
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Lorne McConachie
Ryan Hester
Erin Doherty
Ann Brown
Adam Hasson
Catherine Person
John DeLanoy

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Doug Ito

Chair Lorne McConachie called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

110508.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes for October 8

MM/SC/AB/RH 5:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. De Lanoy abstained.

Ms. Person arrived at 9:05 a.m.

October 15

MM/SC/RH/ED 6:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. De Lanoy abstained.

110508.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110508.21 T and T Hair Salon and Spa
Pioneer Square Hotel Building
83 Yesler Way

Thanh – Truc Nguyen

Ms. Nashem explained the application for installation of business signage and the signage meets the requirements for height and number of neon signs if the “Open” neon sign is removed.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

“Printed on Recycled Paper”

Staff Report: Signs meet requirements for letter height and the number of colors of neon. The linear street frontage is only large enough to accommodate one neon sign. Other issues to consider are transparency and the proportion of the signs to the building.

Applicant Comment:

Thanh Nguyen said there would be three signs: one is lettering on the existing awning; one is a window neon sign; and one is vinyl lettering on the existing window.

Ms. Nashem said ARC reviewed the sign proposal and ARC recommends approval under the condition that the “open” sign is removed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Mr. Hester confirmed the “Open” sign was not included.

Ms. Nguyen confirmed it would not be.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for signage to include a neon sign, window lettering and lettering on the awning, under the condition that the neon “open” sign is removed per:

Code Citations:

District Rules XX Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

- A. General Requirements
- B. Specific Requirements
 - 1. Letter Size
- C. Neon Signs

MM/SC/RH/JD 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110508.22

Stadium Lofts

Tejal Pastakia

Seattle Plumbing Building
589 Occidental Ave S

Summary of Application:

Renovation of the existing building to include alterations to some window and door openings, re-establishing previous window and door openings and new openings for vents. A landscaped public deck will be located on the roof of the existing building.

Staff Report: This approval is for the renovation for the existing building only.

Applicant Comment:

Leslie Bain, architect with Weinstein stated since last meeting they have received notice the proposed vinyl windows are not okay and are looking for alternative. They are

looking for approval for work to be done on the existing building. They intend to keep the look of the building and have minimized the penetrations for mechanical. They will restore windows where possible and if replacement is necessary they will replace with new in-kind fir to match profile of original wood windows. Using existing openings they will install louvers for intake/relief. Where they are putting brick back they will harvest from bricks from existing building. They propose a mild wash to the building. The garage entry will be a two-way. There will be pedestrian entries for the residential units on both Occidental and Railroad Ave. They will have two permits, one for the lower portion of the project – the existing building – and another for the upper new construction.

Mr. McConachie asked if the brick cuts for new openings will be at existing joints.

Tejal Pastakia said yes.

Mr. McConachie asked about the header, jamb, and sill condition.

Ms. Bain explained it was all running bond and they were presenting a proposal for how they would handle louvers; it is a whole new cut. She said they believe there is a steel lentil. New windows will match that. The places where reproduction windows are being located are in existing openings.

Mr. McConachie asked if all joints cut will match existing brick joints.

Ms. Bain agreed and said in most areas there is a choice where to put that.

Mr. McConachie asked what the proposed color is for the windows and if scrape tests have been done to determine what historic colors might have been on the building.

Ms. Bain said the intent is to match the color and they did bring in a color board previously.

Ms. Pastakia said it is a dark green, almost black. The only old photos they have are black and white.

Ms. Bain said they have not done a scrape test but they are happy with the color proposed. The louver color in the infill windows will match the window frame color; they like the dark color because it helps the louvers to recede.

Ms. Doherty asked if the brick will remain unpainted.

Ms. Bain said yes with the exception of where it is already painted; they will just wash it.

Mr. Hasson asked if all the retail windows at the prow exist but are hidden.

Ms. Bain said they believe they are just behind a piece of masonite on the inside.

Mr. Hasson said the drawings state they will be reused or match a window called Window E3 and asked for clarification.

Ms. Bain said when they start doing the demo they will see if the existing windows are in good enough condition to rehab; if they are bad they may have to be redone rather than rehab. They will reuse what is there if possible.

Mr. McConachie asked about the sill of the windows that are being recut.

Ms. Bain said it is a stone sill.

Ms. Bain explained the white string course that runs beneath the windows is existing.

Mr. McConachie asked if that continued on the other side of the building.

Ms. Bain said it is a stone sill that slopes and explained the existing stone sill is in place in all situations.

Ms. Person asked if the intent was to split the projects.

Ms. Bain said the plan is to carry on with the entire project; they have to rethink the window system and are looking at different systems. They want to keep moving the project ahead. They will be back to present a new window system in the addition.

Ms. Doherty said the intent is not to change the design or character of the upper levels but the Director of Department of Neighborhoods didn't want to see the composite vinyl system.

Ms. Bain said their hope is to keep the design concept intact and they will get as close to it as they can with a different window system. The windows on the lower portion will match the historic windows. Above the storefront they will infill with brick.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca explained a lot of brick was replaced on the railroad side of this building after the earthquake and there are a lot of brick types available. A lot of the brick near First Avenue was replaced at that time. With regard to the windows that were rejected by Director, Department of Neighborhoods she commended the board for going forward with vinyl window system that was proposed. She believed that when the North Lot guidelines were done the Board approved the possibility of vinyl windows for the North Lot project. She explained she used to sit on the Board and considers the addition to this building like a new building and was surprised by the rejection of the windows. She stressed the importance of the residential projects to Pioneer Square and thought any stumbling block to residential projects is a very difficult thing to swallow. She wants to see the projects up and running and residents in Pioneer Square.

Miriam Hinden asked if this project would receive tax credits.

Mr. McConachie said no.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McConachie said that given the rejection of the composite vinyl windows there is always the issue of doing half a project or starting a project before we know what is going on. He said the work on the historic masonry building is compatible with

Secretary of Interior Standards in the vast majority of the work with a couple small exceptions. This is restoration of a contributing building and even if the project doesn't work out in terms of the new construction the care of the existing building is in keeping with reasonable direction for restoration of a building. He supported the proposal even though it is not a complete package at this time due to the question of the composite windows above. He thought it was important that the Board generally doesn't want to approve half projects or pieces of projects because things can go awry.

Ms. Doherty noted the projects are integrated and if this were looked at as a stand alone piece it may have not been approved if the rest of the project were not approved.

Mr. McConachie said the Board can only look at this piece right now.

Ms. Doherty asked the schedule.

Ms. Pastakia explained they are trying to figure out the window system and are hoping to get it resolved within the next month and will have to come back to get Board approval. They would like to stay on schedule, get a building permit and break ground next spring. They asked for the two-part process to allow them to move ahead and work on energy calculations and mechanical systems.

Ms. Bain said they didn't want to assume that because they had received approval last time that they didn't need to come back; they wanted to clarify the Director's letter that the entire application was not approved.

Mr. McConachie stated at this point this is a stand alone review.

Ms. Doherty asked if the approval could be contingent on maintaining the same proposed use of the building and the project as a whole.

Mr. McConachie agreed that approval is contingent on what happens above for example, the garage doors being approved today are linked to plan that is integrated to what a garage door is needed for.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for renovation of the existing building as presented conditional on approval and implementation of the addition making these alterations necessary per:

Code Citations:

District Rules

III. General Rules for Rehab and New Construction

B Design

VIII. Mechanical Systems

SMT 23.66.140 Height

C. Rooftop Features

2. Railings, planters

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, 6, and 7

Guidelines for Mechanical Systems

Guidelines for Treatment of Windows

MM/SC/CP/ED 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**110508.3 BOARD BUSINESS
PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**

110508.31 **201 S King Street** Alan Cornell
Briefing regarding possible new construction on the North Lot

Alan Cornell with the North Lot Development, John Chao and Don Miles with ZGF presented the briefing.

Mr. Cornell provided historical context of the North Lot Development with regard to the impacts on the area as well as defining the envelope: height, bulk and scale. The proposed heights fall outside the zoning code and would need a contract rezone or text amendment both of which are underway. He explained outreach to International District, Pioneer Square and the Florentine group and said they plan to be back before the Board for a Certificate of Approval by the end of the first quarter 2009.

Don Miles provided more history and said the North Lot location is at the nexus of several neighborhoods: Pioneer Square, International District, and Stadium SoDo. The intent is to connect the three neighborhoods, increase density with transit-oriented development, provide housing, activate the street and public spaces, respect historic neighborhoods, create sustainable development, and add to the complexity and richness of the pedestrian experience. Views are important and are bi-directional rather than one dimensional. The ground floor on Occidental and King are proposed to be active retail that can spill out to public space at the corners of the block and move lobby spaces that tend to deaden spaces to mid-block. The eastern block is office over retail and where replacement parking for the north half of the North Lot is located: 491 spaces. The office was located near King Street Station transit hub. The western block is residential above retail and accommodates parking for residents; the access for parking will be on the extension to 2nd Avenue where it is now which would accommodate game day traffic and allow Occidental to be closed and be opened only for permitted residents. On the Weller side the project is set back 10' to allow for the creation for a lane that would be at sidewalk level. They are setting back 9' from the right of way at Occidental which allows the 21' sidewalk to be continued all the way south. He noted the importance of street wall compatibility and suggested it might be where the base-middle-top expression occurs. They are trying to emulate the proportions and storefront heights seen to the north and to the west.

Mr. Chao explained the proposed massing and described the process for how they got to the current concept. They are suggesting lower mass on the edges – near Pioneer Square on the west side and King Street Station on the east. He said most of the higher masses would be along 2nd Avenue. He showed potential setbacks and showed how they carved away to drop portions down. He shared photos showing existing and proposed development from multiple viewpoints.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

Ms. Doherty asked if there were plans for the remaining surface lot.

Mr. Chao said it belongs to the Stadium.

Mr. Hester commented on the street level experience and said an earlier design cantilevered over the sidewalk which he did not think was in keeping with the neighborhood; he liked the newer stepped back design and the maintenance of the sidewalk space. He said a lot of curtain wall is proposed and asked the applicant to incorporate brick as a response to the District.

Mr. Chao explained they have worked on how to express this development in the context of this neighborhood and if they should treat it as a replica, or a respectful way of dealing with the existing fabric or dealing with it from a proportional angle. He appreciated hearing Board comments/expectations.

Ms. Doherty mentioned the pedestrian experiences with regard to how the edges of the site are being developed but noted that parking is facing parking and wondered how people would be encouraged to interface with the parking.

The applicants said because of the parking they have looked at the corner blocks on the south side to identify uses based on how they relate to events and that the Weller bridge is the access to Sounder Light Rail. They discussed the challenge of street walls especially on the south side; they said it is an architectural solution rather than retail solution. 2nd Avenue is a private roadway and the design will accommodate development of retail.

Mr. Hasson asked if this project would have any influence over parking at the street level in the area.

Mr. Cornell said they will be adding some curb parking on Occidental and maintaining the curb parking on King; they are adding new curb parking on 2nd. There would be an increase in short term access to retail. With regard to potential traffic volume, a traffic analysis has been done and will be provided to the Board. There are very few impacts; there are 500 stalls there already. The parking will be within the structure at grade level and above due to the water table.

Mr. Hasson questioned the setbacks and the long wall.

Mr. Chao explained they are still working on that.

Mr. Cornell said they are working with height, bulk and scale so everything they are presenting they have done shadow analysis, adjacencies and views and know that as they move from height, bulk and scale they will get into the program of carving away and getting into the details as they refine the architecture. At this point they are still working to get to the architecture.

Mr. Chao said they are refining the massing at this point.

Mr. Cornell explained the parking is totally concealed within the development on the west block.

Ms. Doherty asked the applicants to explain how the office block developed, especially the angle.

Mr. DeLanoy left at 10:24 a.m.

Mr. Chao said on the residential side it is driven by what is facing externally but internally by function. From the office standpoint they typically do a center core building and would like to have around 42 ½' clear span on either side which would allow for the best flexibility for office and cubicle size.

Ms. Person asked if the apartments are rentals or condos.

Mr. Cornell explained there are 650 units most of which are condos but they have not ruled out having some as rentals. 450 parking spaces will be allocated for residential. They have found that in other areas, the more urban centers .2 - .4 cars per unit is typical; this area is .7 and they are studying that. They hope to reduce parking further. This is the most transportation oriented site in the entire City. In New York a lot of people don't have cars; Seattle is not there yet but this project is a few years off. In terms of affordability, if they don't have a car and don't have to pay for parking space, they can afford more in terms of housing.

Mr. Miles stated these will be green buildings so the market they are looking for would be people who have that kind of orientation.

Ms. Person said the square footage is modest and it seems like the applicants are trying to accomplish a great deal in a very small space. She asked if a grocery store is still planned.

Mr. Cornell said it is the desire of the guidelines to have a grocery store but it is too early to lease and find one but there is recognition that one is needed. He said they are trying to maximize retail at the ground level.

Ms. Brown noted that the smallest unit is 496 square feet and asked what the largest is projected to be.

Mr. Cornell wasn't sure at this point but it is possible that units could be combined.

Ms. Person asked the percent of affordable.

Mr. Cornell stated there are 100 units are required for moderate income.

Sara Jane Bellanca interjected it is not low income but affordable work rate housing.

Mr. Hasson left at 10:38 a.m.

Mr. McConachie asked about the future use of the south façade parking lot and expressed concern about a dreary streetscape versus a nice pedestrian streetscape.

The applicants stated there could be development in the future but at this point they are not planning retail.

Mr. McConachie stated the elements are moving in the right direction and the applicants have done a good job in terms of breaking down the massing. He said this project is too large to have just one texture or element and encouraged the masses to take on distinct character. He said there are interesting opportunities for materials that could juxtapose with the brick and masonry of Pioneer Square. He likes the West 1 example is a powerful precedent that would encourage a Modernity to reach the street as well play off the more traditional facades.

Ms. Doherty appreciated the model and the aerial views and stated she would like to see a straight down view site plan and would like to hear more about the sustainable piece.

Mr. McConachie encouraged the applicants to come back more often.

110508.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

110508.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227