



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 82/08

DATE: March 19, 2008  
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

#### Board Members Present:

#### Staff:

Doug Ito  
Ryan Hester  
Adam Hasson  
Lorne McConachie  
Ann Brown  
Catherine Person  
Rick Friedhoff

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

Alex Bennett  
John DeLanoy  
David Strauss

Doug Ito, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

**031908.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Draft minutes from March 5, 2008  
MM/SC/AH/RM 6:0:1 Mr. Hester abstained

### **031908.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

031908.21 **Bus Shelter Mural**  
South side of S. Washington St, west of 4<sup>th</sup> Ave S

Application: Installation of artist painted mural on bus shelter

ARC Report: On February 13, 2008 ARC members reviewed the proposed art work. The applicant said the painting will be on plywood and sealed for weather proofing and resisting graffiti. He said the panels will go on the inside back and sides as well as the outside sides in the solid portions of the shelter. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment: Dale Cummings said that Roger Wheeler, a resident of the Tashiro Kaplin Building offered to paint a mural on the bus shelter just south of that building. It would be done in the standard way for shelter mural: the work would be done in his studio. The painting would go on the lower panels inside of the shelter, on the back and end panels on the inside and outside. A mural like this would typically last four to eight years.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Board comments:

Mr. McConachie thanked the artist.

Public Comments:

Carl Weiss said it was great.

Board Discussion: The Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the installation of a mural on the bus shelter as presented per Code Citations:

District Rules

I. A. General Requirements

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

XI. Street Furniture

**MM/SC/AM/CP**

**7:0:0**

031908.22

**200 Occidental Ave**

Jay Janette

Summary of Application: Preliminary design for proposed new construction of an 11 story building at 130 feet with a rooftop amenity room, green roof and photo voltaic panels. The alley is proposed at 16 feet. Off street loading is proposed to be reduced from three to two. An oversized curb cut is proposed to accommodate trolley access. Five levels of parking above the first floor are internal to the building. Approval is requested for one retail unit over 3,000 square feet.

Establish use in proposed new construction.

Ground level will contain two retail units for a total of 7, 560 with one retail unit over 3,000 square feet, the Streetcar Trolley Maintenance Facility of 13,425 square feet and the parking entrance and loading at 2,500 square feet.

Second – Sixth levels will contain a total of 142 parking stalls for a total of 55,630 square feet and 57 loft style apartments for a total of 58, 775 square feet.

Seventh – Eleventh levels will contain Class A office space for a total of 129, 925 square feet.

Rooftop will contain a penthouse amenity room and garden.

ARC Report: The ARC reviewed the drawings and renderings provided. The applicant reviewed the departures requested and the reasons they were necessary. They said that the 11<sup>th</sup> floor would be set back as would the penthouse. Mr. Janette said that they would be providing 10, 000 square feet of residential use over what was required by the amended code for height. He said the voltaic panels are set back a minimum of 10 feet and the penthouse is set back 30 feet. They are at 34.9% coverage, just under the 35% maximum allowed. ARC recommended approval of the preliminary design.

Jay Janette, architect for the project, said they are seeking a departure to not comply with land use code. He said that the ARC has explicitly asked them to review their rooftop setbacks and how the envelope relates to height, bulk and scale relative to the property line. He introduced Bill La Patra.

Bill La Patra used slides to present. He showed the extent of the green roof and pointed out the shadow lines. He said the amenity and penthouse are set back 21 feet off the alley, three feet are required; 32 feet off each side, 30 feet are required; and 31 feet off the front and 30 feet are required. He showed the plan which showed the Photo Voltaic farm which will provide over 2% of power. The height is 130 feet to the finished pedestrian surface of the roof amenity and an additional 15 feet which is the allowable in the code for the amenity building. He said the solar reflectors on the roof are less than eight feet.

Mr. Janette said they are actually twelve feet for the base building with three feet of solar reflectors at a 31° pitch to stay under the 15 foot envelope.

Ms. Nashem asked about the height of the solar collectors that are not on the penthouse.

Mr. Janette said approximately 3' 6" by the time they are mounted off the base roof.

Mr. Ito clarified that they all meet the setback requirements.

Mr. Janette said correct and that they are allowed up to seven feet at the distance at which it is set back.

Mr. La Patra said they have terraced the building at the floor below as part of the shaping of the building.

Mr. Ito asked them to explain the other departures they are requesting.

Mr. Janette said they are requesting six departures: they would like a 16 foot alley width in lieu of the two foot dedication that SDOT wants as they think that is in character with the rest of Pioneer Square; due to the impacts of providing the street car facility into the floor and in order to create animated and active retail, create a proper lobby and get garage access off alley way, they are asking for a reduced loading zone from three to two; they are requesting an oversized street cut to accommodate the street cars; they are requesting 5000 square foot retail on the north portion to create an anchor tenant that activate the park edge; they propose to put five levels of parking above the first floor, because of the high water table it is too costly to put in below ground parking; they think the required overhead weather protection on Washington and Main is inconsistent with the fabric and the rest of Pioneer Square, they will have one entrance canopy at the main lobby which will allow them to pursue blade signage down the road.

Mr. Ito reminded the board that this is specifically for mass, bulk, scale and use and that the Board is not looking at detailing of the building such as the screen wall, cladding etc.

Ms. Nashem said that District rules say that there can be only one projecting element per address; the departure they are requesting would be from DPD for the overhead weather protection as their proposal is consistent with District Rules. Mr. Ito said we are making a suggestion.

Mr. McConachie said with regard to street level use he understands the desire for a larger restaurant; he said it is designed so that it could still be

smaller retail. He clarified that they are asking for the exemption for the larger space.

Mr. Janette said yes.

Mr. McConachie asked if the loading area being down to two bays with restaurants, retail, residential, office would be adequate. He asked if there is a plan of how loading and service would occur.

Mr. Janette said they were just on a threshold of even needing the third bay from a square footage standpoint from the way the municipal code tables certain uses.

Mr. Ito said the trigger is for commercial use and given that there will be 3000 square foot of retail that would be about it. He asked if there would be a building manager and coordinated use of the loading dock.

Mr. Janette said yes, it would be a shared use. Commercial loading would be during the day with residential use at night.

Mr. La Patra said that restaurant loading is usually early in the morning. He said that with the mix of uses there is a diversity of need for the dock; with a building engineer on site the operations would be coordinated.

Ms. Brown asked who the 142 parking spaces would be for.

Mr. Janette said they would be for the residents; weekends it might be open to event parking.

Ms. Brown said it is taking up more than 120 spaces of public parking. Mr. Jay said it was 126. Ms. Brown said they would have to park elsewhere if they are working there.

Mr. Hasson said it is a good idea to not have the overhead weather protection here given that a park is adjacent to the building; he would hate to see it become a camp out place.

Mr. Ito said he would not be in favor of overhead weather protection because there are no other canopies that front or are adjacent to the park. He thinks it would be an anomaly to the park and that it would be a conflict in the Board's code as well as the Land Use Code for overhead weather projection, blade signs and other projecting elements; it would be cleaner in the end to not have it code wise and because blade signs are an attractive and good use for the square.

Mr. Janette said they would like to reserve their ability to put an entrance canopy at the ground level.

Staff Report: The code as amended in January 2007 requires that *the building may attain a height of 130 feet provided that the structure has, in residential or hotel use, gross floor area equivalent to the gross floor area in the structure above one hundred feet.*

The Code as amended December 2007 set the conditions that must be met to include common recreational space on the roof in section 10. In summary the common recreation area and solar collectors incorporated into those areas may exceed the height limit by 15 feet. Elevators may be up to 20 feet, rooftop coverage can not exceed 35%, rooftop common recreation area, mechanical and elevator and stair penthouse must be set back a minimum of 30 feet from the street and 3 feet from the alley, and solar collectors must be set back 10 feet. The final design must include a plan for interpretive signage for the sustainable features.

Public Comment:

Carl Weiss asked what the exterior material is. Mr. Ito said the current design is a stone exterior for 75% and 25% would be transparent glass/screen wall.

Mr. Weiss asked to see elevations.

Ms. Nashem said that exterior materials are not being approved as part of the preliminary design.

Dean Haugen asked if the maximum height was revised and by whom. Ms. Nashem said it was a year ago by the City Council.

He asked if it was for the whole Pioneer Square; Ms. Nashem said it was just for a building that contains a trolley barn.

Mr. Haugen said it is way out of scale for Pioneer Square; he asked what the old rule was. He thought it was 100 feet. Mr. Ito said there were variable heights in Pioneer Square.

Mr. Haugen said 100 feet is the max and then maybe on the outside of the square it gets higher. He said this is the first notice he's had of this height change. He said the signage on the site is misleading; there is nothing about the increased heights, nothing about a variance to change the heights. It just says "eleven stories".

Mr. Ito said the notices on the code amendment for height changes were out over a year ago and then it went to Council.

Mr. Haugen said he never saw anything that said 100 feet. He said he is trying to keep the flavor of Pioneer Square. He said it is great to get something in this lot, but he asked if this is a new precedence and said that it will tower over everything else around it. He said if the sign had said "130 feet plus 15 foot penthouse" that more people would be here talking about it. He said he thinks it was slid in and not above board.

Mr. Ito said that considering how many meetings they have had about this project over the last year, he said it was not slid under the table. Mr. Ito said the height is per code and that comments on the height would have had to have been made a year ago at City Council.

Ms. Nashem said the Board doesn't actually make decisions on code amendments, just comment on them. He would have seen on the agenda a briefing for a code amendment.

Mr. Haugen said he doesn't want a precedence set; parking is being lost and he would like to have it maintained.

Sara Jane Bellanca said she is speaking on behalf of herself and also the Pioneer Square Community Association. She is in favor of this project; she wants the trolley to come back. The Pioneer Square Community Association is in favor of this project; it follows part of the

Pioneer Square plan which envisions some building in this space and the return of the trolley.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hasson said with regard to heights for Pioneer Square, there is a South Downtown Livability Study that is looking to change heights to 130 feet at sites that are vacant. There is time for public to participate and express opinion about height. He said it is a pretty big departure to go this high but it is a process that has been going on for a while.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary design for building height, bulk and scale only.

The building is approved for 11 stories at 130 feet with a rooftop amenity room, green roof and photo voltaic panels. The alley is approved at 16 feet. Off street loading is approved to be reduced from three to two. An oversized curb cut is approved to accommodate trolley access. Five levels of parking are approved to be above the first floor, internal to the building. Approval is granted for one retail unit over 3,000 square feet.

Use is established for:

Ground level will contain two retail units for a total of 7, 560 with one retail unit over 3,000 square feet, the Streetcar Trolley Maintenance Facility of 13,425 square feet and the parking entrance and loading at 2,500 square feet.

Second – Sixth levels will contain a total of 142 parking stalls for a total of 55,630 square feet and 57 loft style apartments for a total of 58, 775 square feet.

Seventh – Eleventh levels will contain Class A office space for a total of 129, 925 square feet.

The rooftop will contain a penthouse amenity room and garden.

The following requirements have been attached as conditions of this Certificate of Approval:

The owner of the structure must provide an annual report beginning one year after the date of first occupancy, documenting compliance with the minimum renewable energy generation and green area factor criteria.

Prior to issuance of any subsequent permits from the Department of Planning and Design, including a building permit, the applicant shall obtain a Certificate of Approval for Final Design from the Board and the Department of Neighborhoods Director. Design features to be considered as part of the final design approval, which are not included in this preliminary design approval include, but are not limited to the following:

- design and materials associated with the double wall system
- detailing of the building façades
- detailing and color of the materials
- landscaping and alley paving
- lighting and signage, including the required interpretive signage

Code Citations:

District Rules:

II. Certificates of Approval for Use, Design, and Demolition

D. Preliminary Design

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

IV. Permitted Uses  
VI Height limits  
VII. Mechanical Systems  
XX. Rules for transparency, signs, awnings and canopies  
    B.2 Projecting Elements  
    E. Awnings and Canopies

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses  
SMC 23.66.130 Street Level Uses A.  
    B. Preferred uses 1.a,  
    C. Discouraged Uses 1.b. and 2.  
    D. Conditions of Street level uses 1.  
SMC 23.66.140 Height (as amended Jan 18, 2007)  
    C. Rooftop Features (as amended Dec 20, 2007)  
SMC 23.66.170 Parking and access  
    B.2  
    D.1 and 2  
SMC 23.66.180 Exterior building design B and C.  
SMC 23.66.190 Streets and Sidewalks

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 9 and 10  
Guidelines for Setting

**MM/SC/LM/RH**

**7:0:0**

031908.23

**Bread of Life Mission**  
97 S Main Street

Walt LeCouteur

Summary of Application: Replace all but ten windows on the second and third floors with new windows to match existing.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings, and window surveys provided. Mr. LeCouteur said that they already replaced ten windows after the earthquake in 2001 so those would remain. He said that many of the existing windows have shrunk and are in poor condition. He said that they are working with Bear windows to replicate the existing windows except that the new windows would be double pained. He said that the company measured the windows. He said the replacement windows would be wood. The applicant said that they would be painting the windows to match existing color. Mr. Hasson asked if they would like to change their color but Mr. LeCouteur said that they liked the color. Mr. McConachie asked if they had looked into repairing the windows. Mr. LeCouteur said that they had, but the cost would be the same and they thought the new windows would last longer. Mr. Ito asked about the condition of the bays. Mr. LeCouteur said that they had opened it from the interior and found it to be structural solid. Mr. McConachie said he could see the glazing needed repair and that there was some "alligating" but he did not see all the rot that was noted in the survey. He noted that you can't get wood as good as the old growth fir and that the wood might be solid behind the "alligating." He thought from the inside pictures the windows didn't look that bad. Mr. LeCouteur said that the real concern was the shrinkage and that the windows might fall out. ARC members requested a drawing of at least one of the existing windows so that they could verify that the new proposed windows replicated the existing windows. ARC members also asked for more photos of the exterior of the windows demonstrating the damage as many of the photos of the interior did not demonstrate the damage. ARC members also asked for drawings of the detailing above the windows if replacement was necessary. Mr.

McConachie suggested looking at the building in person. ARC members did not make a recommendation pending additional photos and drawings.

Mr. LeCouteur brought additional photos for the Board's review.

Mr. Ito asked if the color would remain the same. He asked what were the plans for the decorative piece above the arch, if it would be preserved or replicated.

Mr. LeCouteur said it is the company's intent to reuse all original materials. If the original is damaged he has contracted with Millwork Supply who will do any of the scroll work that gets damaged. He said they replaced a few when they replaced windows after the earthquake.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hester asked if alternatives were investigated for color.

Mr. LeCouteur said they stayed with what was originally on there; the intent was to keep it the same.

Mr. Hester said in portions there are existing windows that will not be replaced.

Mr. LeCouteur said there are 10 windows that were replaced following the Nisqually earthquake damage; those will not be replaced.

Mr. Hester asked if they would be repainted.

Mr. LeCouteur said no, that they are the same color.

Mr. Ito asked if there would be a maintenance plan for the new windows.

Mr. LeCouteur said they are looking at long term maintenance including cleaning the brick and repainting the trim at the time. He "inherited" a building that has been in existence since 1890 and it has had a lot of people who preceded him.

Mr. Hasson asked what type of window would be put in and to describe the material.

Mr. LeCouteur said it was fir. The contractors said they had some old growth, it is the last they had in the warehouse. The windows will be duplicates of the original windows with the exception that they will contain double pane glass and won't have counter weights. They will operate the same as the original window. The double pane windows and new ceiling will reduce the amount of heat loss and will reduce heating cost.

Mr. McConachie said he looked at the building; he thanked Mr. LeCouteur for the supplying the details of the original sizes versus new. He said there are minor discrepancies but he thinks these are close as replications. He noticed the ones that had been installed after the quake were very much in keeping with the character of the existing windows. He said it is hard because it has to do with old fabric that is worn but not worn out. There are some that don't appear to be as bad as some he's dealt with. He has mixed thoughts about losing windows because it is a loss of historic fabric. He asked if they could be fixed, everything looks like it is repairable; they would need to be stripped, reconditioned and put back together. The Secretary of Interior states to hold onto historical fabric; he said he could go either way and is throwing it out to the Board for discussion.

Mr. LeCouteur said he did investigate repair; there are three different companies that bid on the preservation but the problem was they were going to have to replace 25 – 50% of the fabric in those windows to get them functional. He also said repairing them would mean they would be without windows while they were repaired.

Mr. McConachie said he raised an interesting point about the impact on his ongoing operations as well as part of this process; he is mainly trying to raise a discussion point for the board.

Mr. Ito said they are trying to do the right thing; replicating beautifully and he said he would have much more reservations if they were trying fiberglass, or aluminum clad etc. He said he commends Mr. LeCouteur for going the step up doing an actual replication of the historic windows.

Mr. Hester commended them investigating the alternatives.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Comment: The board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the replacement of all but ten windows on the second and third floors with new windows to match existing.

Code Citations:

District Rules  
III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation  
and New Construction  
C. Materials

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior building design A. Materials

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, and 6  
Guidelines for the Treatment of Windows

**MM/SC/CP/RF**

**6:1:0 Mr. McConachie opposed.**

031908.24

**Jimmy Johns**  
104 First Ave S

Willard Parks

Summary of Application: Install business signage including signage in the sign band, a blade sign and three neon window signs

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the new application. The applicant said that the sign is now tight to the wall. ARC asked that the sign band trim be shown in the section drawing so that they can tell how the sign fits. Mr. McConachie noted that the elevation drawing still does not reflect the post that separates the sign band as visible in the photo. Some members thought that if the sign in the sign band was scaled down it might be appropriate. Other preferred individual letters. ARC asked that the drawing identify the height of the transom windows. If the transom windows are above 10 feet the ARC thought the number of signs meet District Rules for number of neon signs. ARC asked the applicant to note the letter size of the neon signs on the drawings to verify if they meet height requirements. Staff read SMC 23.66.160. 4. concerning the number of signs. JJ, Jimmy Johns, owner said that there are several business that have more than the number of allowed signs. Mr. Ito said that being others were out of compliance was not a reason to request to be out of compliance. ARC did not make a recommendation.

Willard Parks, representative from the sign company, said they met with the ARC and took its direction; the sign was brought down to 10' long which is size of center panel on the sign band with the height of the sign being 16" which is the height of the sign panel behind the sign. They stuck with the black background which is part of the Jimmy Johns standards; they wanted to keep that brand identity. They provided more accurate dimensions of the storefront windows. The sign shrunk, the sign will still be attached to the storefront. The attachment detail is the same.

#### Board Questions:

Ms. Person asked if the round sign is the same height as the neon door sign; she asked if they would make it symmetrical.

Mr. Parks said he thinks he can raise the neon sign.

Mr. Gentile said that Jimmy Johns wanted them to be staggered but he said he didn't think it is a deal breaker so they could be adjusted.

Mr. Ito said he agrees. He said looking through the modified drawings they have given the top of the transom but not the transom bottom height; he said the height that is needed is the transom light height, the bar to which the sign is to be attached.

Mr. Parks said right below the sign they've provided a dimension: curb to top of window is 9' 1/2".

Ms. Nashem read from the code: *for a business that has a transom window beginning at 10' above the sidewalk one additional neon sign can be located in the transom window.* She said that would not meet the rules.

Mr. McConachie asked if the mounting bracket of the main sign is a continuous angle that is screwed to the frame of the signage band.

Mr. Parks said no that it would be three 2" wide clips.

Mr. McConachie asked if the clips could be reversed and bolted below to a piece of blocking so they wouldn't be visible.

Mr. Parks said that is do-able.

Mr. Hasson said in regard to that sign he read from the code: Signbands C. *Specific Signage regulations. Signband is an area located on some buildings in the zone above the storefront windows; below the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows designed to display signage; letters size inside the signband shall be fitted to a maximum 12"; letters shall be painted or applied, and shall not be neon.* He said that is an affirmative on exactly how signs are applied to signbands; they are not supposed to be boards that are attached to it in relief as a projecting element. He said he understands the need to match their corporate signage but even Subway around the corner has their letters applied in signband.

Ms. Person asked if he was talking about getting rid of the oval back board.

Mr. Hasson said yes, the oval does not meet the code; it is surface mounted, it projects.

Mr. McConachie asked if it was a signband. He said in a way he could argue that these are spandrel panels just simply part of the glazing system that is part of this storefront as opposed to a signband which is more of a continuous strip.

Mr. Hasson said it is being treated as a signband regardless and it is mirrored on all the buildings in that block.

Mr. McConachie said he is playing devil's advocate. He said in looking at one of the exhibit photos, there is not signage on either of the bands. He said the difference is because they express the bay widths of windows, they are different from the more continuous signband.

Mr. Hasson asked if they would be treating this band differently from every other band on the block.

Ms. Nashem asked what the new letter height is of the new proposed sign.

Mr. Parks said 9 ¼".

Ms. Person asked if a race track oval could be painted directly on to signband between the two flanking vertical bars on each end and then lettering applied to it instead of having a protruded race track oval.

Mr. Gentile said he didn't have a problem with that and asked if that would ruin the paint continuity on the building.

Ms. Person said that she couldn't answer that question.

Mr. Parks said yes that could be done.

Ms. Person said they would need to check with the building owners.

Mr. Ito asked if they want the lighting on it or not.

Mr. Parks said he is trying to figure out where to put the lighting; right now it sits behind the signband. Without the sign there would be exposed boxes and wiring on the face of the building. He said there are similar types of lights across the street but they had not looked at how they were installed.

Mr. Hasson said they have a lot of illuminated signs so it wouldn't be losing too much by not having the signband lit.

Mr. Gentile said he isn't sure if it is a Jimmy Johns requirement. He said one of the nice things about having the lights there now is that they illuminate the sidewalk in front of the store.

Ms. Person said the boxes could be painted out the same color as what is behind it to minimize it; it won't be as nice but it would be in compliance.

Mr. Ito said the Board was debating the language of the code and the definition for a signband.

Mr. McConachie said he would weigh in favor of this in light of the SMC regulation and reading carefully: "a signband is an area located on some buildings in the zone above the storefront window and below 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows designed to display signage." He said the question here is because the spandrel panels are in essence aligned with 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows, is

this a signband and he said he would argue that it is not a signband. He clarified that the letters are not neon they are being illuminated with lights above.

Mr. Parks confirmed they are front lit, not neon.

Mr. McConachie said he would support this.

Mr. Ito said he would support it as-is versus painting it on and mounting junction boxes through the sign; he said it would not look good.

Ms. Person said she agreed.

Mr. Ito said it is much smaller than it was originally proposed.

Ms. Brown said it is within the confines of the bay window.

Mr. Ito said sign number 2 on B 1.1 does not meet code for extra sign.

Ms. Nashem said that only two signs would be allowed.

Mr. Ito asked which signs they wanted.

Mr. Gentile said 1 and 3 and they would get rid of #2.

Mr. Hasson said even if this is not considered a signband he said it is still a projecting sign and is elevated from the building and two projecting signs are not allowed; it should be surface applied.

Mr. Friedhoff agreed and said he said thinks this is what is described in the code as a sign band. He said that this seems to function as a signband and it seems that all the other signage on that block and across the street, are letters directly applied to what is functioning as a signband. He thinks letters should be applied directly to the building and that it preserves the architecture of the building.

Mr. Ito said he would prefer letters applied directly but would not support exposed junction boxes with lighting.

Mr. Hester asked if electrical conduit could be run behind the panel.

Mr. Parks said they can work it out; perhaps from inside and there wouldn't be any surface mounted wire it would just be the box with the light. He said they would investigate if that is workable.

Mr. Ito said the easier path of travel would be applied letters, no lighting and come back later to modify for lighting.

Ms. Nashem said they would still need a drawing that would reflect the applied letters, and materials to revise the application.

Mr. Gentile said that Mr. Parks did propose the applied lettering and Jimmy Johns said they wanted the black oval in the background so to not even think about applied lettering. He asked if he could get something from the Board stating that "we are rejecting anything except applied lettering".

Mr. Ito said they could to put the application up for a vote; if the Board rejects this proposal the applicant can submit a new application for applied letters.

Mr. Gentile asked if the sign were to be rejected now how long would it be before he would get the rejection in writing.

Ms. Nashem said it is hard to say because it has to be reviewed by the department Director; code gives 15 days for the denial to be issued. She said usually signage is done as a package but an option the Board could consider is to approve the two neon signs and the blade sign but deny the sign in the sign band and the third neon sign.

The board determined that they would vote on the two neon signs and the blade sign. There will be two motions.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the blade sign, the extremely fast delivery sign, and the Jimmy Johns circular sign in the window excluding the third neon sign in the transom window per:

District Rules

XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

- A. Transparency
- B. General Signage Regulations
- C. Specific Signage Regulations
  - 1. Letter Size
  - 2. Sign Bands
  - 3. Projecting elements
  - 4. Blade signs
- D. Neon Signs

SMC 23.366.160 Signs C. 1, 4 for number of signs, and 6

**MM/SC/LM/AH**

**7:0:0**

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for a sign in the signband as submitted with the tabs turned inward per:

District Rules

XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

- E. Transparency
- F. General Signage Regulations
- G. Specific Signage Regulations
  - 5. Letter Size
  - 6. Sign Bands
  - 7. Projecting elements

SMC 23.366.160 Signs C. 1, 4 for number of signs, and 6

**MM/SC/LM/RF**

**1:6:0 Mr. Hasson, Mr. Ito, Ms. Person, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hester, Mr. Friedhoff opposed.**

*Mr. Friedhoff left at 9:18 am.*

031908.25

**Alaska Hotel Annex**  
Old Firehouse building  
110 Alaskan Way

Melissa Glenn

Summary of Application:

Final Design: Renovation and adaptation of an existing building including new windows and rebuilding of the front façade with original and new brick. An addition will be added to the fourth floor.

Use in proposed renovated building

39 parking stalls on basement, entry and mezzanine levels

910 Square feet of retail on the ground level

30 hotel rooms on second, third and fourth floors

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the final proposal drawings and renderings. The applicants showed the ARC a sample of a wood composite product proposed for the windows. The applicants noted that the wood beam above the storefronts is now proposed to be a green panel. The applicants said that they will maintain the asymmetry of the building. Mr. Hartung said that the stair penthouse is set back 17 feet one inch from the street. He said that the stucco material is paintable in case of graffiti. Mr. Hartung said there will be expansion joints in the stucco material and he will submit drawings that indicate that.

Staff Report:

Applicant comment:

Mr. Hartung, project Architect, said this is a cross-over project; it is not exactly a new building and not exactly a renovation. The intent is to restore in character with the District but to acknowledge the elements that are new. He said in response to the ARC comments they have simplified the porch. In terms of overall project changes the Board may want to discuss the visibility of the penthouse from the street. They've indicated on the plan the 300 foot line on page A 3.2. He said the upper portion of the stair penthouse the setback from the front is 17'1". He said one would have to be on the other side of the viaduct to see it.

Ms. Nashem asked it is less than eight feet tall.

Mr. Hartung said it is just under the maximum height of eight feet. He said they are trying to respect the scale of the original building but not to replicate it.

Ms. Nashem asked what the color of the window would be.

Mr. Hartung said forest green. He said the all the windows will be painted the same color; the owner of the building will be coming before the board at a later date for new windows on in the Pioneer Square hotel.

Ms. Nashem asked about the color of the stucco.

Ms. Glenn said it would be Honey Twist.

Mr. Hasson asked about stucco versus concrete on the alley façade. He asked if it was real or synthetic stucco.

Mr. Hartung said it is true stucco, so it is a cementitious material.

Board Questions: There were no Board questions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Comment: The Board determined it had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for renovation of the existing building including new windows and rebuilding of the front façade with original and new brick in kind. An addition will be added to the fourth floor. The front façade addition material will be blond brick. The composite wood material is approved for the windows. Stucco (color) will be used on the north and east facades.

Use is changed from retail to 39 parking stalls on basement, entry and mezzanine levels, 910 square feet of retail on the ground level, 30 hotel rooms on second, third and fourth floors.

This approval does not include signage, lighting of mechanical equipment.

Code Citations:

District Rules:

II. Certificates of Approval for Use, Design, and Demolition

B. Use

C. Design Approval

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

A. Site

B. Design

C. Building materials

D. Color

E. Building Base

G. Street Paving

H. Curbs

IV. Permitted Uses

VI Height limits

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses

SMC 23.66.130 Street Level Uses A.

B. Preferred uses 1.a,

SMC 23.66.140 Height

C. Rooftop Features

SMC 23.66.170 Parking and access

B.2.

D.1 and 3

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior building design A. and B.

SMC 23.66.190 Streets and Sidewalks

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10  
Guidelines for Setting  
Guidelines for New Additions

**MM/SC/RH/AB**

**6:0:0**

031908.26

**Schoenfeld Interiors**

Steve Zamberlin

119 S Jackson St

Summary of Application: Install new business signage and building signage

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the revised drawings of the signage. ARC thought that the revision allowed the columns to read through. The building signage "Fisher Building" was revised. ARC asked the sign designer, Greg, why he proposed this font. Greg said that this was similar to the first one except that it did not have serifs and he did not want the sign to

compete with the architecture. ARC would like to see options that were considered for their art deco compatibility. ARC is recommending approval of the Schoenfeld signage.

Staff Report: All signage meets requirements for letter height.

Applicant Comment: Bob Schoenfeld said per ARC request he brought three options for lettering; he said his preferences were the top and the bottom options for the lettering of the Fisher Building. He said it is a smoother and more flowing font.

Mr. Ito said that at ARC they had recommended approval for the Schoenfeld Interiors sign and felt it expressed the columns more. He said they asked the applicant to come back with three options for the Fisher Building font.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions: There were no board questions.

Board Comments: Board members said they thought that the two fonts were fitting the style of the building. The Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for business signage and building signage as revised per:

District Rules

- XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies
  - A. Transparency
  - B. General Signage Regulations
  - C. Specific Signage Regulations
    - 1. Letter Size
    - 3. Projecting elements
    - 8. Wall signs

SMC 23.366.160 Signs C. 1, 2, and 4

MM/SC/AB/LM 6:0:0 Approved as presented.

**031908.3 BOARD BUSINESS** There was no board business.

**031908.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

**031908.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 am.

Issued: March 5, 2008

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227