



The City of Seattle

Pioneer Square Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

PSB 103/20

MINUTES for Wednesday August 19, 2020

Board Members

Lynda Collie
Audrey Hoyt
Olivia Price
Alex Rolluda, Chair
Felicia Salcedo

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kianoush Curran
Alise Kuwahara Day
Brendan Donckers

Chair Alex Rolluda called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx meeting link or the telephone call-in line provided on the agenda.

081920.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: none.

081920.2 PUBLIC COMMENT
There was no public comment.

081920.3 APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

081920.31 Maud Building
311 1st Ave S

Retroactive consideration of replacement of windows

Staff report: Ms. Nashem reported that this is now an application for replacement of the windows after the fact. ARC previously reviewed and application for replacement of the windows Nov 13, 2019. ARC indicated that the applicant needed to show better documentation of the condition of the windows including larger photos as the extent of rot was not clear. Only a couple small areas of rot were visible in the photos provided which appeared repairable. No additional 3rd party assessment was provided. The Board reviewed the proposal on November 20, 2019. The applicant provided one enlarged photo of windows from the exterior and no additional information on window condition. The Board again said that the application did not include enough information to determine that the windows were beyond repair. They again instructed the applicant that if he thought that the windows were in worse condition than the couple areas of repair needed shown in the documentation provided, to provide the information that would be needed for the Board to confirm that the windows were beyond repair. The Board agreed that windows were significant features of a building and they could not approve the removal rather than repair of the windows based on what was provided. The gave the applicant the opportunity to table the application to provide more information before they voted on the application. The applicant chose to table the application.

Staff became aware that the windows had been replaced although a Certificate of Approval had not been issued, reported the noncompliance to SDCI who issued a Notice of Violation. A new application for window replacement after the fact was submitted. Additional photo documentation of the removed windows is provided.

Applicant Comment:

Greg Percich, Jackson Main Architects said he is one of three owners of the building. He said the other owner who presented previously had retired and he stepped in to finish. He said the windows were severely decayed with replacement the best option. He showed slides of the building and windows and said he understands the windows were replaced without board approval and apologized. He said the back of the building was stucco'ed over; stucco was applied up against the wood frames which made rot worse and reduced the size of the jambs.

Mr. Rolluda asked if any work was done on 1st Avenue.

Mr. Percich said the front door was done a few years ago; the focus was on second and third floors now. He explained that the new windows are 2" wider than existing windows to accommodate the applied stucco. He said they matched the "nub" on upper windows and profiles. He said the color is close to existing. The aluminum sill has more slope to move water away; the inside of the sill is wood. He said trim around outside matches what is there and covers into building to cover rot. Responding to questions he said the 1" extrusion covers existing frame. He said the trim on back side is 1 1/2" wider because of the stucco. A photo showed how the stucco butts up against the wood, adding to the rot. He said the new installation creates a weather-tight condition. He said the original windows were not operational and counterweights are gone.

Mr. Rolluda asked about the grills.

Mr. Percich said they are still there. The new windows were installed from the inside which caused less disruption to the building. He said the jambs and sills were heavily damaged. He said the east windows were not as bad but were still damaged. He noted report from Bench Dog which stated they could not guarantee repair of the windows and did not recommend repair.

Mr. Percich apologized for having the work done before receiving board approval. He said the other owner who was handling the process at the time pulled together additional information requested by the board. Windows were installed because they anticipated approval. He apologized for installing windows without approval and noted the windows weren't installed until after the meeting.

He said the building is owner-occupied and they have made improvements to the building including bringing building up to seismic code. He said with the old windows it was hard to keep the building warm and there was substantial noise. He said it was best for their employees to replace the windows. He said repair of windows would have required removal of all frames; the destructive nature would have been substantial to operations and to building. He said there would still be noise and they wouldn't meet energy codes. He said they want to improve their carbon footprint. He said the aluminum clad wood window will still look the same; the aluminum extrusions will look the same. He said the color matches and you can't tell the windows are aluminum. He said it is a long-term solution for the 130-year-old building and will make the building fully functional. He said it will control noise and temperature and the aluminum will provide years of consistent finish level. He said the profiles were matched as close as they could to maintain the look of the building. He apologized for doing work without approval.

Mr. Rolluda appreciated the detailed presentation and said approval first is preferred and said that retroactive review is difficult especially if something is non-compliant. He asked if the finish would be matte.

Mr. Percich said the finish will be standard and more of an eggshell, neither matte nor gloss.

Mr. Rolluda appreciated the close resemblance to original profile and noted the sensitivity to detailing such as the "nubs" at ends of sash.

Ms. Hoyt asked if hardware was salvaged.

Mr. Percich said no; he noted that ropes broke and counterweights are in the walls.

Ms. Collie asked about existing transom windows.

Mr. Percich said they were replaced also; they were not operational and were replaced as fixed. He said they were not sure if original windows were awning or not.

Ms. Collie noted concern for front elevation and asked clarification on which windows were front versus alley side.

Mr. Percich indicated on photos. He said they still have all the windows and hope to re-use them in some way.

Mr. Rolluda asked if the board has approved aluminum clad wood windows in the past.

Ms. Nashem said they have where there were not original windows and on a very tall building, and on the alley façade of the Frye Building.

Mr. Rolluda asked board members if they felt they had enough information to make a decision.

Ms. Collie said no. She said the deterioration on the alley side warranted replacement, but she struggled with front window condition. She said the front windows may have been repairable and she was not entirely convinced replacement was warranted.

Mr. Percich went over photos 1-A and noted deterioration.

Ms. Hoyt noted the deterioration. She said they windows should have been maintained long in advance to avoid deterioration.

Mr. Rolluda asked if the wood windows were operational.

Mr. Percich said it would have required additional work to the jambs. He said with the aluminum clad windows they could put in aluminum jambs and cover the old for weather protection. He said it is still not visible from the street.

Ms. Collie said the photos were helpful. She said she would support because of existing condition of severely rotted wood and frame and that the new product does protect and encapsulate the jambs. She said the visual impact appears to be minimal. She said replacement appears to have been warranted and the aluminum preserves what was left to preserve.

Ms. Price echoed other board member comments.

Ms. Salcedo had nothing to add but noted appreciation for information and context.

Action: I move to recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for replacing original windows because the windows were found to be beyond repair. The Board approves the aluminum clad wood windows after the fact installation.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the August 19, 2020

public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99)

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

The following architectural elements are typical throughout the District and will be used by the Board in the evaluation of requests for design approval:

- A. Building materials. The most common facing materials are brick masonry and cut or rusticated sandstone, with limited use of terra cotta and tile. Wooden window sash, ornamental sheet metal, carved stone and wooden or cast iron storefronts are also typically used throughout the District. Synthetic stucco siding materials are generally not permitted. (7/99)
- B. Color. Building facades are primarily composed of varied tones of red brick masonry or gray sandstone. Unfinished brick, stone, or concrete masonry unit surfaces may not be painted. Painted color is typically applied to wooden window sash, sheet metal ornament and wooden or cast iron storefronts. Paint colors shall be appropriate to ensure compatibility within the District. (7/99)

Secretary of Interior's Standards

- 2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Guidelines for Windows **RECOMMENDED NOT RECOMMENDED** Pages 102 – 109 of STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION & GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATING HISTORIC BUILDINGS found in your Board resource books.

[Preservation Brief 9 Repair of wooden windows](#)
[Preservation Brief 16 substitute materials](#)

MM/SC/AH/FS 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Percich said they are committed to the district and are trying to keep the building in good repair. He understood the board's position.

081920.4 BOARD BUSINESS

081920.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Alex Rolluda, Chair

081920.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Ms. Nashem noted she is still working on the Design Guidelines and consultants will do presentation at the end of September, beginning of October. She will have a draft available to board members ahead of time.

Mr. Rolluda asked about 165 Washington.

Ms. Nashem said the application is not yet complete. She hoped to do an ARC first.

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227