



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 85/09

DATE: April 1, 2009
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Doug Ito
Lorne McConachie
Ryan Hester
Ann Brown
Catherine Person
Miriam Hinden
Adam Hasson
Erin Doherty

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

John DeLanoy

Chair Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

040109.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 4, 2009
MM/SC/RH/AB 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

March 18, 2009
MM/SC/RH/AB 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

040109.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040109.26 **Occhio Café** John Gascon
F and O Building
1022 1st Ave S

Installation of signage
Painting the storefront

ARC report: ARC reviewed the rendering and samples provided. ARC recommends approval of the painting and the signage.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

John Gascon provided samples of the proposed colors. The building is currently painted and has many layers. The proposed colors will be darker gray green on the concrete, the field will be a lighter gray green, with red trim and doors and copper detail.

Ms. Doherty arrived at 9:07 a.m.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Person noted the beautiful colors.

Mr. Ito said the colors are in keeping with the district and the signage meets all sign requirements

In response to a question about the A-Board Ms. Nashem said it met the requirements.

Action: I move to approve a certificate of approval for painting and signage as presented per

Code Citations:

District Rules

XX Rules for Transparency, Sign, Awnings and Canopies

B. General Signage regulations

C. 1 Letter Size

E. Awnings and Canopies 1.

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

D. Color

MM/SC/CP/MH

7:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.21

Wayfinding signage

Brian Henry

Various locations

Mr. McConachie arrived at 9:10 a.m.

Final location of three signs as conditioned in previous approval and relocation of two additional signs

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the proposed locations. ARC supported the proposed locations of the signs. For the sign located near Occidental Park they preferred the location in Occidental Mall. Public comment supported this location as well. It was also suggested that the kiosk could be located with the information center.

Staff Report: As a condition of previous approval COA PSB 34107, the exact locations of three signs were to be resubmitted to the Board. In addition they are proposing changes to the location of two previously approved signs. We will only be discussing location of the signs; the design of the signs has been approved.

Applicant Comment:

Brian Henry and Casey Hildreth from SDOT presented. Mr. Henry provided an overview of the wayfinding program which proposes to improve pedestrian wayfinding in the Center City, to encourage walking and to direct people to transit. They are now

moving toward implementation. Proposed are directional signs and map kiosks. He walked the Board through the new proposals:

- Directional sign at S. Jackson and Occidental
- Direction sign at Yesler and First Avenue
- Map Kiosk in Occidental Park
- Map Kiosk at S. Jackson and 2nd Avenue
- Directional Sign at S. Jackson and Yesler

Mr. Hester asked how the circular slab will fit into the brick around it and suggested instead a square or rectilinear slab might work better with the brick.

Mr. Henry said crews can install on brick and will minimize the impact to the brick. He clarified that within Pioneer Square District there will be 15 directional signs and 4 kiosks.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ito noted that locating the one in Occidental Park next to the info kiosk was appropriate and thought the other proposed locations were appropriate as well.

A discussion ensued about the Occidental Park location There was general consensus from the Board to center the sign in the triangular field of the brick.

Action: I move to approve the proposed sign locations as revised per discussion today as presented per

Code Citations:

SMC23.66.160 Signs A. C.

MM/SC/LM/MH

8:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.22

101 Yesler Way
Olympic Block

Mike Jones

Removal of metal arch, alterations to entryway and
Installation of building signage

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and renderings provided. ARC agreed the new signage will be easier to read. Mr. Jones showed the light fixture they are applying for but also the decorative metal that they would use if they can not install the light fixture. He clarified that the canopy lighting will be installed regardless of the sconces except that the lights will only shine up if the sconces can be installed. ARC requested a photo of a larger portion of the building. They would also like to see the proposed colors with the existing colors. ARC requested that the rendering be updated with the new doors and be made lighter so that they could see the changes. It was also suggested that the lighting be simulated as the entrance looks very dark and recessive in the rendering. The applicant thought that the lighting would really help. ARC also questioned the proposed sign band and what would be visible from underneath. ARC said that they would like to see the entrance have the same large scale prominent character of the historic buildings. ARC did not come to a recommendation.

Staff Report: The Board had previously approved removal the arches but the COA has expired so the owner has submitted a new application.

Applicant Comment:

Mike Jones, JPC Architecture, responded to ARC feedback about using bronze to show the two-story entrance of the space. He provided photos taken at daylight and at dusk. He said bronze is an historic material in keeping with Pioneer Square. They propose to fill in the recessed area on the sides with a bronze panel. The horizontal piece matches the existing concrete lintel over the doors; the lintel will be painted a bronze color. Behind the horizontal lintel element lights will provide light for pedestrian experience and will accentuate the two story height of the entry. Mr. Jones said because there exists already brown cinnamon color granite and bronze paint on the building, the bronze does fit in; existing doors are anodized bronze. The lintel panel is already over the door and helps to bring the name of the building forward. The sign is halo lit signage and the name will be in brushed stainless.

Board Questions:

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Jones said the panel spans the whole width. The filler panel will go to the top concealing any outriggers. The panel is 1/8" thick bronze; there is no framing on the back just a sandwich panel spanned from column to column. The existing arch is attached to concrete which can be patched once removed; the former attachment won't be visible. Power will be brought to the lintels by a bronze box across the lintel. The conduit will not show.

The applicant stated the mullions would be painted salmon; Mr. McConachie and Mr. Ito agreed that the mullions should be painted bronze to pick up the bronze surround which would be more in keeping with the original architectural intent to have a darker color.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members agreed the changes were an improvement and would call out the entry and preferred bronze color.

Mr. Hasson liked the salmon color because he thought it tied the entry to the building better but thought the colors should blend more rather than be in contrast.

Action: I move to approve the removal of the arch, signage, lighting and building alterations as presented per

Code Citations:

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

B. Design, C. Building Materials, D. Color

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

MM/SC/CP/ED

7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Hasson opposed.

040109.23

Elliot Bay Café
Globe Building
101 S Main Street

Tamara Murphy

Tabled.

040109.24

Yick Keong Building

Modern Design Sofa
210 S Washington St

Anthony Moscatel

Tabled.

040109.25

ING Direct

83 King
Seattle Hardware Building

Eric Boston

Installation of business signage

ARC Report: ARC members reviewed the drawings and renderings provided. ARC suggested that the blade sign be designed with a more modern and simple design. ARC recommended not doing the column sign as it would do further damage to the column. ARC wondered if there could be a more artistic approach to the orange ball on the pedestal and wondered if the pedestal would be considered a free standing sign which is prohibited. ARC discussed that the large neon signs were obscuring architectural features so they suggested reducing the size of the sign on Railroad Way S to fit in the panel area of the building and eliminating the sign on the King Street façade being it would only be seen from the viaduct in the rear view mirror anyway. ARC was generally supportive of the other signs individually but wanted to discuss the total amount of signs when they saw the final proposal. ARC did not come to a recommendation.

Staff Report: The Board should be aware that the sign package proposed is asking for exceptions to the rules.

Blade sign: The blade sign is higher than the intermediate cornice or the second floor. Blade signs with neon are limited to 6 square feet. Other blade signs are limited to 8 square feet. This application is for a 34 square foot sign. To allow a blade sign with neon it is suppose to be part of an overall reduced sign package. The District rules state that an exception can be made to businesses on corners, in that case one projecting item may be permitted per façade.

Canopy sign: The letter height on the sign is taller than the 10 inches allowed.

Column sign: letters would be mounted into the stone causing damage as discourage in SMC 23.66.160 signs 1.c and the SOIs.

Half ball in window: The ball would obscure an architectural feature and could possible damage the window. This would be discouraged by SMC 23.66.160 signs 1.c and the SOIs.

Pedestal with ball: I confirmed with DPD that the ball would be considered a sign likely even if done more artistically because the ball is branding of the business. Freestanding signs are prohibited by SMC23.66.160 A.

Wall signs: The signs on the King and Railroad obscure architectural features of the building. District Rules state “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).” SMC23.66.160 also states “the appropriateness of the sign is dependant on the relationship of the shape of the sign to the architecture of the

building, the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure architectural features or details, and whether the sign lighting will detract from the character of the building.” Also according to 23.66.160 C6, “neon signs may only be recommended by the Board if they determine all other criteria for permitted signs have been met and that historic precedent, location or visibility concerns of the business for which the signing is proposed warrant such signing.” Although the sign is less than 10% maximum coverage, code also instructs the Board to “consider the purpose of the sign, the character and scale of the buildings in the vicinity, the character and scale of the building for which the sign is proposed, the location of the sign on the building, the total number of signs and size of the signs as well as the type of sign.” In addition consider SOI standards 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment. 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved. 9. New additions shall be compatible with architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Applicant Comment:

Dan Greenshields, ING Direct, provided an overview of their plans and said they realize they are asking for more than what would normally be allowed but hoped that given the size of the workforce they are bringing to the area it would be allowed.

Jim Risher, The Sign Factory, provided color samples and a color board.

In response to an applicant question Ms. Nashem explained the rules say a blade sign must go below intermediate cornice or second floor.

Mr. Risher explained the sign would be halo lit mounted on a steel plate through the brick mortar joints in two places; it will project out 3”. The current height of “83 King” signage is 19” which will be replaced with 12” letters which is a more appropriate scale. He explained the corner column sign noting it would be mounted on white plaquard and mounted at four points.

Mr. Hasson asked if other material had been considered. Mr. Risher said they did not want to compete with the historic sign.

The applicant said that the sphere in the window would spur conversation and interest. He said it would fit into the “porthole” window and would affix to the glass but would be removable without damage to the glass. Mr. Risher went over the drawing regarding the pedestal ball and said they could table it if code wouldn’t allow it. He continued to review the rest of the signage in the application.

Ms. Nashem said that the pedestal would have to satisfy SDOT as well as DPD but as long as it represents a business it is considered signage.

Board Questions:

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Risher explained the orange and blue were corporate colors but the sheen could be adjusted.

Mr. Hester cited drawing 14A, the sign at the cornice, and said that architectural elements should not be covered or concealed. He suggested if the sign was rotated and shrunk down it would achieve the intent but wouldn’t impact the cornice. He said it would be more compatible with the building.

Mr. Risher would check with headquarters.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Nashem inquired about the blade sign for the fitness center which had been approved but was not shown in the photos. The applicants said they wanted to determine the ING signage first.

Ms. Person was opposed to the vertical sign.

Ms. Doherty appreciated the changes but was concerned with the scale. She said the “big white box” blade sign was not compatible with the building.

Mr. Hasson concurred and said the color and materials are too stark and need to relate to the District. He did not think the sign was in compliance. He thought the signs if approved for this tenant should not be grandfathered to future tenants.

Mr. McConachie agreed that the revisions since ARC were an overall improvement. This is a major tenant for the District but agreed the signs should not be grandfathered.

Mr. Ito stated the signage is tied to the tenant; if the building were a multi-tenant building it would not be possible.

Ms. Nashem stated that if a new business came they would have to apply for their signage.

Mr. Hasson and Ms. Person did not like the stark white color and preferred a cream color.

Mr. Risher explained they could do a brushed stainless background and frame. The Board supported this change.

The Board reviewed details of the proposed signs. The blue band was generally thought to be okay but the Board expressed a preference for a matte blue finish. Mr. Risher stated he would be willing to do this. The over canopy area was discussed in terms of size. There was general agreement amongst Board members that the larger sign was a better fit with the scale of the building although Mr. Hasson said the smaller 20’ sign would be adequate and is already out of District rules. The column sign was determined to be unnecessary and damaging to the stone. The half sphere was thought by some Board members to be a whimsical addition they could approve but others thought it competed with the historical character of that particular opening. While most Board members liked the idea of the Ball as street art, it was determined that it was not allowed by code. Board members expressed concern about the size, number and placing of signs of the wall signs. The applicant stated the signs needed to be visible. Mr. Hasson advised that the Board’s parameter is to protect the historic features of the building and we need to consider the interaction of the sign with the building and the District instead of the visibility of the signs to the vehicular traffic on the viaduct or other locations outside the District. Board members agreed Sign I should not be approved because it obscured historic detail in both proposed locations. Sign J would be visible at the same time as the one on the Railroad Ave. side and should be the same size and the sign would not go over the window tops. The Board agreed they would be willing to consider an amended application as stated.

Action:

I move to approve signage for ING to include:

Blade Sign (A): illuminated 2'10" x 12" sign with 9 7/8" letters on a brushed stainless steel background and frame mounted in the mortar on the First Ave S façade (east).

Sign Band (B): painted fascia band PSM 281 blue in a matte finish.

Canopy Sign (C2): 30' x 4'11" neon canopy sign attached to the existing canopy structure per the drawings on the S King St façade (north).

Building address sign (D): brushed aluminum 12" letters attached to the sign band of the canopy on the S King St façade (north).

Wall Sign (H2): neon wall sign 20' x 2'2 3/8" sign mounted on the Railroad Way (west) façade.

Wall Sign (J) *amended*: neon wall sign 20' x 2'2 3/8" sign mounted on the south façade. The sign should be mounted so that it does not contact the widows.

All per

Code Citations:

District Rules:

XX Rules for Transparency, Sign, Awnings and Canopies

B. General Signage regulations

C. 1 Letter Size, 2. Sign Bands, 3. Projecting elements, 4 Blade signs

D. Neon Signs

XI. Street Furniture

III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

D. Color

SMC 23.66.160 Signs C. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6

Secretary of Interior Standards 1, 2, 5 and 9 with the following specifics about each of the signs.

MM/SC/LM/AH

8:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.27

219 S Washington

Martin Kaplan

Installation of security gates

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the revisions to the design on March 11, 2009. Changes included changing the screen to a welded wire mesh, removing two structural bars and full leaf doors rather than a fixed transom. Some members thought that the welded wire mesh did make the gate more transparent, but most thought that the gate still read like a door and was not compatible. An ARC member also noted that when the gate is open it would be covering a window. The applicant said he did not think there were any architectural features for the gate to relate to and they were concentrating on addressing the security issues. ARC asked for material samples and asked if the applicant could provide a rendering so that they could get a better feel for the how the gates would look than what is provided with the drawing.

Staff Report: On December 17, 2008 the Board reviewed the first proposal for gates. The Board said the gates should read more like a gate than a door; it should be lighter in appearance, more transparent and for the proportions to be more consistent with or sympathetic to the historic storefront and door beyond it and it should be more strongly related to the architecture of the building.

Applicant Comment:

Martin Kaplan reported that following the ARC meeting he lightened up the door and brought material samples of the proposed mesh for Board review. He preferred the 1” scale with a heavier gauge wire. 12” kick-plates would be required to maintain strength on the door.

Ms. Person left at 11:12 a.m.

Using Photo Shop image of the door Mr. Kaplan stated the address had been removed because they thought it would be visible through the mesh; they would put them back on if required. The wire mesh will be black and the frame, green to match the green of the facade. Photos were provided of other gates in the district although it was not ascertained if any/all had been approved.

Mark Bloxom, building owner, asked when the gate at the Lofts Building was approved.

Per a couple Board members the Lofts has a true gate and had been done about eight years ago.

Mr. Bloxom said the transparency of the building had been set at a different bar.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Brown was not supportive because the gates were for security rather than being ornamental and the rules say they can only approve ornamental gates.

Mr. Hasson appreciated the amount of work that had been put into the design but said the gate still reads like a door rather than a gate. He preferred a gate with larger openings that better matches the character of the building with more transparency.

Ms. Doherty appreciated the reduction in the size of the plate hiding the hardware. She questioned the necessity of gauge of the mesh and said it reads heavy and obscures the building behind. She questioned the redundant elements and said the intent was to make it as open as possible, and there are still redundant bars or elements that don't relate or defer to the building.

Mr. Hester said the mesh was the biggest challenge and that vertical elements would accomplish the same with more transparency.

Mr. Bloxom expressed frustration that liquids would still get through. Board members noted that liquids would get in with applicant's proposal.

Mr. Ito explained the reason for the bar on the door was that the door needs to be opened from the inside without a key during a fire. Mesh, glass or Plexiglas is needed to prevent someone from reaching their hand in and pressing on the bar to gain entry.

Mr. Hester asked if there were other options in terms of gauge of opening.

Mr. Kaplan said at ARC talked about different sizes. The cage on the west side of the proposed doors has an opening that is about ¼ of what is proposed and people through all kinds of stuff which gets through. The material will be powder coated and it is expensive to repaint so Mr. Bloxom wants something that won't get kicked in and have

to be replaced. They've already increased the opening 50% since the last meeting and prefer to keep it the way it is.

Mr. Ito said there is a size limitation to keep someone's hand from going through the hole if they want security.

Ms. Hinden expressed concern that the gate is not transparent and there is already another gate on another portion of the storefront. It takes away from the historic character of the storefront.

Ms. Doherty said it is a challenge and she didn't question the need for a security gate only the character and compatibility of what was proposed.

Mr. Ito said it looks like a door; he thought that the larger flat panel style rails make it read too much like a door.

Mr. Kaplan stated this is made out of 2 x 2 tube steel so there is no extra mass. ARC asked that the transom be kept and he did that. There is no extraneous structure. The door frames are 2 x 2 and the only thing they are asking for is a kick plate. If requested they could reduce it by 2# but it is going to get damaged and will look bad and they want to maintain it. They have 1 ½ cross bars to support the fabric – nothing extra that isn't needed.

Ms. Doherty clarified that the ARC did not ask for the transom they just asked that the gates be full height rather fixed transom as originally proposed, ARC did not say the transoms had to be part of the design.

The meeting ran over time and the application was tabled.

Mr. Kaplan expressed frustration that he thought he got one answer from ARC, doing what was asked and then getting a different set of answers here after waiting for 2 ½ hours.

040109.2 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

King County Courthouse
500 3rd Ave

Vernon Abelsen

Postponed.

040109.3 BOARD BUSINESS

040109.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Doug Ito, Chair

040109.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227