



The City of Seattle

# Pioneer Square Preservation Board

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

PSB 303/15

**MINUTES** for Wednesday, October 7, 2015

**Board Members**

Mark Astor  
Ann Brown  
Ryan Hester, Chair  
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair  
Kyle Kiser  
Willie Parish

**Staff**

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

**Absent**

Tija Petrovich

Chair Ryan Hester called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**100715.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**  
Sept 2, 2015  
MM/SC/DK/MA 5:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Parish abstained.

**100715.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

**100715.21 Polson Building**  
71 Columbia Street

Installation of gates

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and agreed that there was a reason to install gates. It was recognized that the gates were for an emergency egress and would remain shut most of the time and also needed to swing out when they were in use. They thought the color and simple design was compatible with the building. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Ron Wright explained there are two deep – 4 ½' x 8' - alcoves at the sides of the building that provide emergency egress for stairs within building. He said that alcoves are being used as latrines and the gates are needed to close them off. He provided photos of the locations. He said the gates will be a simple design – wrought iron with welded wire mesh in keeping with the modern aspect of the façade. He said that each gate will have a panic bar allowing emergency egress.

Mr. Hester asked about attachment.

Mr. Wright directed board members to sheet A2 and said that the gate will be independent but secured at the sides. He said that two jamb posts will be mounted sideways into vertical posts with possibility of a spacer.

Mr. Kralios said that the storefront is new; when the building was remodeled in 2002-03 the entire lower portion of the building was rebuilt.

Mr. Kralios said that the gate on the east extends over the property line so applicant will need to work with SDOT on that.

Mr. Wright said he will come back if the SDOT won't allow it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios said the applicant demonstrated the need and the design is compatible with others that have been reviewed and approved in the District as well as with the adjacent storefront.

Ms. Brown complimented the applicant on work done to the building said it is a nice addition to the square.

Mr. Astor agreed and read the District Rules "...added security deemed necessary..." and agreed they were necessary in this location.

Mr. Hester said the gate does not damage or obscure any features.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of gates as proposed per

Code Citations:

District Rules

IX. SECURITY BARS AND GATES

Pursuant to SMC 23.66.100, the Pioneer Square Preservation District was created, in part, because of its historic and architectural significance, and remarkable business environment. District goals include preserving, protecting, and enhancing the historic character of the area, and encouraging the development of street level pedestrian-oriented businesses that attract citizens and visitors to the neighborhood. In keeping with these goals, installation of permanent metal security bars in storefront windows is prohibited. Permanent ornamental gates are permitted in street front entrances where added security measures are deemed necessary. Retractable roll down and scissor type gates are permitted only in garage door openings and in alley locations that require high levels of security. (5/96)

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 7, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

MM/SC/MA/DK 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**100715.22**

**Squire Building**

On the Field

901 B Occidental

Copy change for the Verizon Wall sign

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the sign and generally thought the sign had a simple design and the colors were compatible. There was a comment that it was hard to tell what the sign was advertising and the applicant said they would give that feedback to the client. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Kasey Kirk explained the copy change and said there will be no change to the attachment. She said it is Verizon new logo which she had increased in size by 25% to help visibility per ARC comment.

Mr. Hester said it is a copy change that will use the existing method of attachment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members appreciated the reuse of the existing frame.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of new Verizon sign copy as presented. This consideration does not include any determination by the Board that the sign qualifies as an on-premise sign.

Code Citations:  
SMC23.66.160 Signs

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 7, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

MM/SC/DK/KK      6:0:0    Motion carried.

**100715.23**      **Union Trust Building**  
Estates Tasting Room  
307 Occidental Ave S

*Mr. Astor recused himself.*

Installation of signage

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the proposed signage and found that the signage in the sign band was under the letter height maximum and it appeared consistent with other signage in the area. ARC thought the three letters in the window signage qualified for being allowed larger than 10 inches and still maintained transparency. ARC inquired if there was an alternative mounting method but the applicant said there was not and the wood was repairable as there was evidence a previous repairs. ARC asked the applicant to bring photos of other existing signs and the proposed hours sign for the door even if the time indicated was going to change. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Mark Ward explained they would use cut vinyl window signage. He provided an image or proposed hours on the door and photos of other Occidental Mall similar signage. He walked board members through the packet noting existing conditions and proposed signs. He said the wood letters will be pin mounted into existing sign band above the store front; size is 1 ½” thick and 8” tall. He said the white “Estates Tasting Room” lettering on windows is cut vinyl, interior applied, and maintains transparency. Hours on doors will be in cut vinyl, interior applied, 2 ½” tall.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kralios said the sign is consistent with historic pattern. He said the graphic on windows is clean, tasteful and it makes sense to have it on both sides of the entrance for symmetry. He said that three letters can be over 10” and this complies. He questioned if hours need to be on both lights.

Mr. Hester said it is attractive and appropriate and that he appreciated the sensitivity to ornamental features. He went over District Rules.

Ms. Brown said the Alliance for Pioneer Square brought another great business to the square.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of signage including gold letters in the sign band, window vinyl sign with an allowance of three letters over 10 inches and hours on the door as presented per

Code Citations:

District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

A. Transparency Regulations

1. To provide street level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment and promotes public safety, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be obscured by tinting, frosting, etching, window coverings including but not limited to window film, draperies, shades, or screens, extensive signage, or other means. (8/93, 7/99, 7/03)
2. Window darkening and/or reflective film in ground or upper floor windows on primary building facades is not permitted. (8/93, 7/99, 7/03)

B. General Signage Regulations

All signs on or hanging from buildings, in windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. (8/93) Locations for signs shall be in accordance with all other regulations for signage. (12/94)

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)

Sign Materials: Wood or wood products are the preferred materials for rigid hanging and projecting (blade) signs and individual signage letters applied to building facades. (7/99)

### C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. Letter Size. Letter size in windows, awnings and hanging signs shall be consistent with the scale of the architectural elements of the building (as per SMC 23.66.160), but shall not exceed a maximum height of 10 inches unless an exception has been approved as set forth in this paragraph. Exceptions to the 10-inch height limitation will be considered for individual letters in the business name (subject to a limit of no more than three letters) only if both of the following conditions are satisfied: a) the exception is sought as part of a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business; and b) the size of the letters for which an exception is requested is consistent with the scale and character of the building, the frontage of the business, the transparency requirements of the regulations, and all other conditions under SMC 23.66.160. An overall sign package or plan will be considered reduced for purposes of the exception if it calls for approval of signage that is substantially less than what would otherwise be allowable under the regulations. (12/94)
2. Sign bands. A sign band is an area located on some buildings in the zone above storefront windows and below second floor windows designed to display signage. (7/99) Letter size in sign bands shall be permitted to a maximum of 12 inches. Letters shall be painted or applied, and shall not be neon. (12/94)

#### SMC23.66.160 Signs

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 7, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

MM/SC/KK/DK 5:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Astor abstained.

#### **100715.24** North Lot East Block 255 S King Street

Changes to previously approve design, material and colors  
Change of use from conference to restaurant for a 7463 square foot space  
Specific signage  
Building signage plan

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the changes to design and thought that all the materials, colors were consistent with the other materials and color on the building and with the district. They thought that the changes to the landscaping were acceptable and verified that they still met their required green factor. The applicants explained that the gabion wall was inspired by the areaway prism lights. As far a design changes, ARC thought the changes were consistent with architecture of the building. ARC asked them to consider if the light fixtures would provide sufficient light when the vines matured. The applicants indicated they would look for a light fixture with a longer arm or an arm to add to the proposed light fixtures.

ARC thought that the change of use to restaurant was preferred.

ARC discussed the building signage, “Hawks Tower” and discussed that the size of the building name was an exception and that they exception was consistent with exceptions made for the west block building signage where they also took into consideration the size of the building and a hierarchy of signage. ARC supported the required door signage. There was some discussion about the building plaque and what it would say and if it was necessary. The applicants explained that the stone had to be cut to accommodate it and that is why they needed approval of the sign now before they know what the plaque was going to say. They said that they would bring photos of other similar plaques in the district. ARC noted that the plaque was small. ARC was supportive of the location of E Park sign under the condition that the details for the sign size and color be returned to the Board.

ARC reviewed the signage plan. ARC thought that the signage plans for the large upper story wall office tenants was not consistent with our regulations, was over proliferation, were too large and were located above the second floor. ARC noted no buildings in Pioneer Square or even downtown have giant tenant signs on the building. They thought that the lobby was the appropriate location for office tenant signage. ARC thought that the sign plan for the street level retail locations, if they have either a blade sign or a canopy sign per business, was appropriate. ARC thought that with the code exception for the hotel signage above 65 feet could be considered, however there was more signage than necessary, this was also over proliferation of signage and suggested that the most successful signage was the signage on the east and west. Staff also noted that roof top signage is prohibited and the sign mounted to the mechanical penthouse may be considered rooftop signage. There was discussion about the proposed flags that the American flag and the State flag we exempt from the number of projecting items but that there could not be both a signage flag and a blade sign for the hotel.

Applicant Comment:

Arthur Chang, Freiheit and Ho, explained they would present three categories of revisions: 1) minor revisions to finishes; 2) architectural revisions; 3) building signs.

Detailed report and plans in DON file. Following are board questions and comments.

Mr. Chang explained change in metal panels due to vendor change; he brought revised finishes and said they got as close as possible to the original proposed materials. He said that they corrected the plans to show powder coat color for brace frames and steel canopies frame supports. He provided material samples of glass for gabion wall. He showed the change in plaza stone and noted they propose tinted concrete to delineate pedestrian and vehicle areas in the driveway.

#### West Plaza

He said that they will put in a staircase instead of glass bottom pool. He said they will introduce glass gabion wall with light coming through from underneath and within rock providing an even glow. He said they moved trees to other side of plaza. The eagle sculpture – originally to be bronze – will be stainless now for easier maintenance. He said it will read as a Seahawk. He noted the proposed gabion detail under bench and said they eliminated in-ground LED. He said the trees will continue indoor, and the revolving door is now a slider. He said they added planters and more landscaping to frame the vestibule.

Jen Caudle said that lighting will stick out 12 – 14”, diagonals 6” – 8”; lighting will be outside of green area. Mr. Chang said they will eliminate the free standing poles for the catenary lighting because they require driving a pile and are not economical.

Mr. Hester asked about light fixture finish.

Ms. Caudle said it matches the storefront finish; green wall cables will be in the same tone. She said black will be used just for the canopies.

#### Signage

Ms. Caudle showed photos of adjacent building signage that is halo illuminated. She said the “Hawk Tower” will be in stainless letters 2” standoffs with LED light behind; letters are 18” tall and are building identification. She said the address will be in 2 ¼” stainless letters to the glass facade on both King Street and the West Plaza elevation. She said the building plaque is planned for the interior at this time. She went over room identifier signs, service plaque with garage accessibility hours, and E-Park sign. She said that United States, Washington State, 12<sup>th</sup> Man, and Embassy Suites (or 2<sup>nd</sup> 12<sup>th</sup> man) flags are proposed.



There was board discussion about District Rules, if flags are projecting elements, and number of projecting elements allowed per address. It was noted that it is unclear at this time the number of suites, lobby, bar, and what the addresses will be. It was determined that there is not enough information at this time to make a decision.

Mr. Chang said it is a decision for the owners to make and the flag portion of the application will be tabled pending more information.

Mr. Kralios suggested tabling the upper building signage as well.

Public Comment:

Carl Leighty said there is also a City of Seattle flag.

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, asked if the restaurant use would be in addition to 13 Coins. Mr. Chang said they don't have a tenant for the space at this time.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester clarified that the flags would be tabled, building flag deleted, and the building sign plan would be tabled.

Mr. Kralios said the proposal for "Hawk Tower" is in keeping with previous approved signage and in keeping with the District Rules. He said the materials are durable and high quality. He said that metal change is negligible and the paving is in keeping with the overall design.

Mr. Hester said he agreed. He said the paint, gabion wall, and lighting, entry vestibule adjustment are all minor; he had no objection to the tower signage 18" letter height departure because of the size of the façade; he said the font and color and lighting are appropriate. He said he had no objection to the parking sign height.

Mr. Kralios said regarding the change of use that restaurant is a preferred use in the District. He said the proposed storefront provided for flexibility for future subdivision of space.

Mr. Astor agreed with Messrs. Hester and Kralios and said he had no concern. He noted that unsettled issues were being tabled.

Ms. Brown agreed.

Mr. Kiser agreed and said the new plaza design is an improvement and the glass gabion will add to the area.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for of changes to previously approved design, material and colors as presented, Change of use from conference to restaurant for a 7463 square foot space, Required door label signage and parking operations as shown, The building identification sign “Hawks Tower” is allowed with letters at 18 inches, The location of the EPark sign with the specific sign dimensions and colors of the sign to be included in a future application,

Code Citations:

**Design Guidelines for New Construction on the North Lot in Pioneer Square**

**District Rules**

**XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES**

The Pioneer Square Preservation Ordinance reflects a policy to focus on structures, individually and collectively, so that they can be seen and appreciated. Sign proliferation or inconsistent paint colors, for example, are incompatible with this focus, and are expressly to be avoided. (8/93)

**A. Transparency Regulations**

1. To provide street level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment and promotes public safety, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be obscured by tinting, frosting, etching, window coverings including but not limited to window film, draperies, shades, or screens, extensive signage, or other means. (8/93, 7/99, 7/03)

**B. General Signage Regulations**

All signs on or hanging from buildings, in windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. (8/93) Locations for signs shall be in accordance with all other regulations for signage. (12/94)

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)

Sign Materials: Wood or wood products are the preferred materials for rigid hanging and projecting (blade) signs and individual signage letters applied to building facades. (7/99)

### C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. Letter Size. Letter size in windows, awnings and hanging signs shall be consistent with the scale of the architectural elements of the building (as per SMC 23.66.160), but shall not exceed a maximum height of 10 inches unless an exception has been approved as set forth in this paragraph. Exceptions to the 10-inch height limitation will be considered for individual letters in the business name (subject to a limit of no more than three letters) only if both of the following conditions are satisfied: a) the exception is sought as part of a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business; and b) the size of the letters for which an exception is requested is consistent with the scale and character of the building, the frontage of the business, the transparency requirements of the regulations, and all other conditions under SMC 23.66.160. An overall sign package or plan will be considered reduced for purposes of the exception if it calls for approval of signage that is substantially less than what would otherwise be allowable under the regulations. (12/94)

### SMC23.66.160 Signs

B. To ensure that flags, banners and signs are of a scale, color, shape and type compatible with the Pioneer Square Preservation District objectives stated in [Section 23.66.100](#) and with the character of the District and the buildings in the District, to reduce driver distraction and visual blight, to ensure that the messages of signs are not lost through undue proliferation, and to enhance views and sight lines into and down streets, the overall design of a sign, flag, or banner, including size, shape, typeface, texture, method of attachment, color, graphics and lighting, and the number and location of signs, flags, and banners, shall be reviewed by the Board and are regulated as set out in this [Section 23.66.160](#). Building owners are encouraged to develop an overall signage plan for their buildings.

C. In determining the appropriateness of signs, including flags and banners used as signs as defined in [Section 23.84A.036](#), the Preservation Board shall consider the following:

1. Signs Attached or Applied to Structures.
  - a. The relationship of the shape of the proposed sign to the architecture of the building and with the shape of other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;

- b. The relationship of the texture of the proposed sign to the building for which it is proposed, and with other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
  - c. The possibility of physical damage to the structure and the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure desirable architectural features or details of the structure (the method of attachment shall be approved by the Director);
  - d. The relationship of the proposed colors and graphics with the colors of the building and with other approved signs on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
  - e. The relationship of the proposed sign with existing lights and lighting standards, and with the architectural and design motifs of the building;
  - f. Whether the proposed sign lighting will detract from the character of the building; and
  - g. The compatibility of the colors and graphics of the proposed sign with the character of the District.
2. Wall signs painted on or affixed to a building shall not exceed ten percent of the total area of the façade or 240 square feet, whichever is less. Area of original building finish visible within the exterior dimensions of the sign (e.g., unpainted brick) shall not be considered when computing the sign's area.
4. When determining the appropriate size of a sign the Board and the Director of Neighborhoods shall also consider the function of the sign and the character and scale of buildings in the immediate vicinity, the character and scale of the building for which the sign is proposed, the proposed location of the sign on the building's exterior, and the total number and size of signs proposed or existing on the building.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 7, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

MM/SC/DK/MA 6:0:0 Motion carried as amended.

Mr. Hester made a friendly amendment correcting signage to Hawk Tower with 16" letters. Mr. Astor seconded the amendment.

**100715.25** **Furuya Corgiat / Pacific Commercial**  
Flatstick Pub

Installation of signage of signage - Tabled  
Alterations to the sidewalk and areaway

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC thought that the proposed work in the areaway avoided historic material and was reversible. Discussion ensued about the replacement of prism lights. The applicant provided photos of the existing conditions of the prism lights. ARC discussed if the new panels and replacement panels should be differentiated. ARC thought that it would be best to have them all the purple color as it would be distracting to the character to have them two different colors. The placement of the new panels was consistent with the existing panels and pattern of panels in the district.

Applicant Comment:

Shane Stanley and Henry Walters, Drome Atelier, presented. They noted that SDOT will collect any salvage panels.

Mr. Stanley said that they will occupy the entire basement at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Main including the areaway. He showed drawings that indicated sidewalk prisms.

Mr. Walters said the skylights are in rough shape and have been paved over. He said they propose to refurbish and add to them.

Mr. Stanley said they will restore, replace and install new per drawing; all will be lavender consistent with historic prisms. He said that the existing historic prisms are just under 3" and the new ones that will be purchased are 2 3/4" – just slightly different. He said they will seal sidewalk cracks with grey sikaflex.

Mr. Walters cited sheet 3.1 and noted that where the sidewalk meets the building is the weakest point.

Mr. Stanley said inside they will add a new floor slab, seal the underside of the sidewalk with grey dri-lock.

Richard Adalto said that backer rod will be needed and they will use Pioneer Masonry to do the work.

Public Comment:

Carl Leighty thanked the applicants for the restoration.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios read through District Rules XVIII and said what is proposed is consistent and does retain character without doing damage to it. He said that changes being made are to concrete and not masonry. He said he appreciated that salvaged prism lights will go to SDOT and noted that with the size of the

new not being an exact match to the old one can tell they are new. He said keeping with the lavender color is in keeping with the historic color. Mr. Aster said it is an excellent pragmatic compromise and the continual reuse of the space warrants compromise.

Mr. Hester agreed.

Mr. Kralios said that it is great that the areaway will be used and experienced.

Mr. Kiser agreed and noted that natural light will be coming in.

Ms. Brown agreed.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Alterations to the areaway, Replacing damaged prism glass panels, and installation of new prism panels in purple.  
All per:

Code Citations:

**District Rules**

**XVII. SIDEWALK TREATMENT**

**B. Sidewalk Prism Lights**

The glass sidewalk prism lights are one of the unique elements in the District, and their retention is required. The Board maintains the right to require applicants for sidewalk repair to repair sidewalk prism light panels and individual prism lights that have deteriorated into a state of disrepair. (7/99)

**XVIII. AREAWAYS**

Areaways are usable areas constructed under the sidewalk between the building foundation and street wall. Areaways were created after the Great Seattle Fire of 1889 when the District was rebuilt and the street elevations were raised. Building standards adopted shortly after the fire required fireproof sidewalk construction to replace the pre-fire wooden sidewalks. Areaways are part of the City's right-of-way area, however, the space is often available for use by the adjacent building owner. (7/03)

The most significant qualities of an areaway are its volume of space, which provides a record of its history, and the architectural features that render its form, character, and spatial quality. These features include use of unit materials (brick or stone), bays articulated by arches and/or columns, ceiling vaults, and other special features including tilework or skylights (sidewalk prism lenses). The historic characteristics of areaways shall be preserved. (7/03)

In 2001, the Seattle Department of Transportation completed a survey of approximately 100 areaways in the District. Each areaway was rated in terms of its structural condition and presence of original historic characteristics. A range of structural repairs options were proposed based on the structural and historical ratings. The 2001 Seattle Department of Transportation Areaway Survey shall serve as a guide for the Board's decision making on future alterations or repairs to areaways in the District. (7/03)

### **Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation**

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 7, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

MM/SC/DK/MA 6:0:0 Motion carried.

*Mr. Parish left at 10:35 am.*

## **100715.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**

### **100715.3 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave Transit Corridor**

Briefing regarding proposed street and street amenity alterations

Matt Portius and Melinda Winn from Hewitt presented. For details see PowerPoint in DON file. Following are board questions and comments.

Mr. Hester asked if they would use the sill cell technique.

Mr. Portius said where they can they will and noted the tree well will be 8' x 8'.

Mr. Hester said to pay attention to areaways and granite curbs.

Ms. Brown asked about Prefontaine.

Mr. Portius said they are going down Prefontaine; the north side will have changes but the south side will not.

Mr. Aster asked if the Flex Seal product is modular.

Mr. Portius said it is a poured product that has been used in the Pike Pine area; he noted it is cost effective. He went on to say they are capturing underutilized space and it is an opportunity to re-signalize the lights to shorten pedestrian wait time. He said the sidewalk at Prefontaine will be widened and they propose to narrow the corner for pedestrian crossing. He said there will be three canopy stops and a tactile warning strip.

Ms. Brown requested a handout that would help to identify street names.

Mr. Kiser agreed.

Mr. Kralios asked if they have thought about all the components and materials and if they are compatible with the District.

Ms. Winn said the canopies have four stainless posts and have screens. Responding to questions she said there are lights on top, on the front and back edges and there is a center upright. She said that they are not solar powered.

Mr. Kralios said it would be helpful to see the actual design drawings, heights of components, size, etc.

Mr. Portius said that they will present to the Design Commission and they are in the middle of the RFP effort right now.

Mr. Kralios said to consolidate elements to reduce clutter.

Mr. Hester agreed and said he appreciates bridging multiple scopes – transportation, public space, landscape - and to pay attention to the unique elements of Pioneer Square. He requested written documentation and increased detail. He said to be specific in how they address the District Rules.

Ms. Brown asked if the busses would be electrical.

Mr. Portius said this project doesn't address the busses – only stops.

Mr. Kiser asked if they are coordinating with the 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue project and said it is critical to coordinate with them in a district like Pioneer Square.

Mr. Portius said they have similar parallel efforts.



**100715.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

**100715.41 316 Alaskan Way S**

On remand by the City Hearing Examiner the Board must approve and submit a written recommendation to the Director of Department of Neighborhoods concerning the 316 Alaskan Way project.

Ms. Nashem said the Hearing Examiner asked that the Board make approved written recommendation to the Director of Department of Neighborhoods that she will pass on to the Director. This is a recommendation that reflects the discussion and verbal recommendation at the July 15, 2015 meeting.

Patrick Downs said her explanation was adequate.

Public Comment:

York Wong ceded his time to Mike Hogan.

Jessica Lucio ceded her time to David Bricklin.

Leslie Haynes ceded her time to David Bricklin.

David Bricklin, Save Our Square, said that he was involved in the appeal and that he sent a letter on Monday.

Board indicated they had seen Mr. Bricklin's letter.

Mr. Bricklin said the letter of recommendation to the DON Director was written by Ms. Nashem and he encouraged the board to craft their own letter to be sure their concerns were adequately stated. He encouraged revisiting the integrity and historic value of the existing garage. He thought that the changes made since 1919 were cosmetic and the building could be restored. He said the Historic Register mentions two garages and this would be the oldest.

Mike Hogan said he echoed Mr. Bricklin's comments. He said that per the July 15, 2015 meeting minutes Ms. Nashem didn't capture the full gravity of the 7 – 1 vote and board member comments (minutes available on [seattle.gov/neighborhoods/preservation.htm](http://seattle.gov/neighborhoods/preservation.htm)). He said he would like the board to write their own written recommendation. He said he is not anti-development but that he is a preservationist and responsible residential development is key. He said the minutes of July 15 and August 19 document the discussion and board concerns.

Board discussion:

Ms. Hester said that the minutes documented the discussion, objections, and concerns very well and iterated his stance on the project. He supports demolition. He noted the inclusion of minutes by reference. He said his opinion had not changed.

Mr. Kralios said that recommendation is a summary of what was discussed and viewed in tandem with the full meeting minutes and an effort to reiterate that is redundant.

Mr. Aster said he agreed and said that the thrust of the board's 7-1 decision was reflected in the written recommendation. He said it should reference meeting minutes as a way to substantiate the summary statements that were put in the letter to the Director. He asked if this process was required because there was a concern that the Director didn't use the minutes.

Patrick Downs said the Director considered both minutes and what was offered as the Board's recommendation; she considered everything.

Action: I move to approve the written recommendation dated October 7, 2015 to address the remand.

MM/SC/DK/MA 4:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiser abstained.

**100715.42**

**450 Alaskan Way S**

Approve and submit a written recommendation to the Director of Department of Neighborhoods concerning the 450 Alaskan Way Project.

Public Comment:

York Wong said he had no comment.

Jessica Lucio said that the purpose of the Secretary of Interior's Standards is to return non-contributing buildings to contributing status. She said that preservation and rehabilitation are the purpose of the Board and the SOI standards are supposed to be guiding guidelines. She said when a building is demolished the opportunity is gone forever. She said that there was no SEPA with 80 S. Main. She wants to see the collection that is Pioneer Square strengthened and to extend the period of significance to protect the built heritage and collection of buildings that people come to see. She said the Square was saved in 1970s. She said she wants to see it protected.

Mike Hogan read some quotes from an email written by Greg Aden which said that he felt he did not have an opportunity to review the application and that the Board fast tracked the project. (Mr. Aden's email in DON file).

David Bricklin has no comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios said he didn't think that the project was fast tracked and that they had reviewed it several times over the last year; he thought about eight times. He said even the architect for this building didn't think the building was a significant. He said that the agendas are published on the website.

Ms. Brown said that minutes are not published until they are reviewed by the board per Robert's Rules but are otherwise on line.

Mr. Hester said that if the Board feels that things are missing in the minutes they can bring them up. That is why they review the minutes before they are approved. He thought the written recommendation reflected the discussion at the meeting. He said that his opinion had not changed.

Action: I move to approve the written recommendation dated October 7, 2015.

MM/SC/DK/MA 5:0:0 Motion carried.

**100715.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Ryan Hester, Chair

**100715.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227