



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 81/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, April 1, 2015

Board Members

Mark Astor
Amanda Bennett
Ann Brown
Evan Bue
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Willie Parish
Tija Petrovich

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Marcus Pearson
Ryan Hester

Vice chair Dean Kralios called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

The Chair reserves the right to alter the order of the agenda

040115.11 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
March 4, 2015
AmB/MA 6:0:1 Motion carried.

040115.21 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040115.21 Pioneer Square Hotel Annex
110 Alaskan Way S

Design revisions to approved construction on a new building PSB77/08

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the revisions to the drawings and thought that the changes to the design to duplicate the French doors and Juliet balcony added symmetry, improved the organization of the building and made the building more compatible with the other buildings on the block. ARC asked for more information on the proposed railing. They thought removal of the bridge was also a visual

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

improvement. Access from the hotel will be at the ground level of the hotel. This also allowed for the layout of rooms to be adjusted. There was a change to the material of the garage door so the ARC requested a cut sheet and color for the proposed. ARC found other changes to widths in order to correct the drawings did not affect the overall design and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Bob Hale, Rolluda Architects, explained the need to reactivate the expired permit and to make revisions to the approved plan. He said that originally one bedroom suites were proposed but now each floor will have one 1-bedroom and one studio with a view. He said that French doors and Juliet balcony on each side of opening are proposed to bring symmetry to the building. He said they will eliminate the bridge between two buildings and the connection will be made instead on the first floor to connect the two lobbies. He said that they reduced the size of the building by 2' by eliminating the dumpster space. He said they will come back for interior dumpster room. He said that all three garage doors will be perforated to allow ventilation; he said the commercial roll up doors will match the color of the windows. He said that the Juliet balcony and guard rail will be plate steel and match what was approved on the balcony on the north side.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules and SOI's.

Ms. Bennett said that all are relatively minor changes and are in keeping in the character of the approved building.

Mr. Kralios said removal of the bridge is an improvement and the revised garage doors are okay.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval to amend PSB77/08 as presented.

Code Citations:

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)

New construction must be visually compatible with the predominant architectural styles, building materials and inherent historic character of the District. (7/99) Although new projects need not attempt to duplicate original facades, the design process ought to involve serious consideration of the typical historic building character and detail within the District.

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. Site. The property line is the line of the building mass. Street facades are uniformly located at the front property lines, thus there is a strong street edge definition. Building cornices, bay windows and ornament project beyond the main wall surface of some facades.
- B. Design. Building design is generally typified by horizontal divisions which create distinctive base and cap levels. Facades may also be divided vertically by pilasters or wide piers which form repetitive window bays. Street facades are also distinguished by heavy terminal cornices and parapets, ornamental storefronts and entrance bays and repetitive window sizes and placement.
- C. 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)
- D. 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)

23.66.180 Exterior building design.

To complement and enhance the historic character of the District and to retain the quality and continuity of existing buildings, the following requirements shall apply to exterior building design:

- A. Materials. Unless an alternative material is approved by the Department of Neighborhoods Director following Board review and recommendation, exterior building facades shall be brick, concrete tinted a subdued or earthen color, sandstone or similar stone facing material commonly used in the District. Aluminum, painted metal, wood and other materials may be used for signs, window and door sashes and trim, and for similar purposes when approved by the Department of Neighborhoods Director as compatible with adjacent or original uses, following Board review and recommendation.
- B. Scale. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the buildings in the immediate area.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/AmB/AB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.22

Stadium Place

201 S King St

Installation of minor communications utility including 1 antenna, 1 GPS, and 1 cabinet

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and thought because of the setback, and size of the equipment, and the fact that much of it is behind an existing screen, that the equipment would be minimally visible at the height proposed. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Carly Nations explained the proposal to install minor communications equipment to improve 911 response time and add GPS. She said the chosen site has the best triangulation for the equipment to work to its optimal levels. She said that there will be a 7' omni antenna on a mounting that will bring it to 15'. She said it will be mounted to the inside of existing screen wall – and painted silver to match - and won't be real visible.

Ms. Nashem explained that because they are proposing a minor communications utility taller than 4 feet above the roof, they will be applying for an Administrative Conditional Use permit to install equipment. The top of the antenna is 30 feet above the roof of the structure. There are several other rooftop features and penthouses on this roof. Because the development was developed under 23.49.180, the percentage of rooftop coverage is according to 23.49.008.D (35% or 50% depending). DPD will determine if the rooftop coverage complies. This proposal places this equipment on top of the existing mechanical penthouse so the calculation of the roof top coverage is not anticipated to change.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Nations explained that the equipment is all new; she said that only 4' is visible but it is set back so it is minimal. She provided paint color sample.

Public Comment: there was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules and SMC and said the location is far back and behind existing screen so it is not real visible.

Mr. Astor said it is minimally obtrusive; it is set back and not visually detracting from the building.

Ms. Petrovich agreed.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of minor communications utility including 1 antenna, 1 GPS, and 1 cabinet which are greater than 4 feet above the roof.

Code Citations:

23.57.014 - Special review, historic and landmark districts.

Communication utilities and accessory communication devices for which a Certificate of Approval may be required in IDR, PSM, IDM, PMM (see SMC [Chapter 25.24](#)) zones, the International Special Review District, the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and the Ballard Avenue (SMC [Chapter 25.16](#)), Columbia City (SMC [Chapter 25.20](#)) and Harvard-Belmont (SMC [Chapter 25.22](#)) Landmark Districts shall be sited in a manner that minimizes visibility from public streets and parks and may be permitted as follows:

A. Minor communication utilities and accessory communication devices may be permitted subject to the use provisions and development standards of the underlying zone and this chapter, with the following additional height allowance: communication utilities and devices may extend up to four (4) feet above a roof of the structure, regardless of zone height limit.

B. An Administrative Conditional Use approval shall be required for communication utilities and accessory devices regulated per [Section 23.57.002](#), and which do not meet the requirements of subsection A above. Any action under this section shall be subject to the Pioneer Square Preservation District and the International Special Review District review and approval and the Department of Neighborhoods Director; in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board and the Department of Neighborhoods Director; in the Pike Place Market Historical District by the Pike Place Market Historical Commission, and in the Columbia City Landmark District and the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District by the Landmarks Preservation Board, according to the following criteria:

1. Location on rooftops is preferred, set back toward the center of the roof as far as possible.
2. Communication utilities and accessory communication devices shall be installed in a manner that does not hide, damage or obscure architectural elements of the building or structure.
3. Visibility shall be further minimized by painting, screening, or other appropriate means, whichever is less obtrusive. Creation of false architectural features to obscure the device is discouraged.

MM/SC/AmB/AB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.23

US Rubber Building

321 3rd Ave S

Installing an exterior awning including address signage and replacing the door, painting the door

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the renderings and drawings provided. ARC asked for a photo from farther away to evaluate the building as a whole. ARC suggested that they look at an alternative for the awning that is consistent with the

existing awnings. While ARC members generally thought that the new door was appropriate and supported the idea of a color on the door, some members had a concern that the color was not from a Victorian color pallet and that it appeared that the color would not coordinate with the existing colors on the building. ARC suggested providing a color swatch or photo to show how the colors interact or providing another color that coordinates with the existing colors. It was noted that in each of the photos that the color of the existing building looked a little different.

Staff Report: Because I had concerns that the rendering showed the awning being installed askew; to trim that was at a different planes, I went to do a site visit. There is trim that is at the same plane. The applicant provided a plan drawing to indicate their intention of installation it straight, to trim at the same plane.

Applicant Comment:

Michelle Cheung, Samis, explained that the entry door is easy to miss; they propose to change the door to a single light and to add an awning to better show the address. She said the awning will be raised higher and sloped. She said they preferred a vibrant yellow but toned it down per ARC suggestion and selected Brittle Bush SW 664. She said they want to inject color to the drab street. She said they raised the awning higher to be the same height and slope as existing awnings; she said the address – 321 – will be removed from the door and put on the awning.

Ms. Bennett asked what material is behind the awning.

Ms. Cheung said it is a stucco concrete.

Mr. Astor asked if the awning will have the same dimensional balance so it will be uniform with others.

Ms. Cheung said that it will. Responding to questions she said that they will use a different font from that used on adjacent awnings for the address.

Public Comment:

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, said she was happy to see the block get more attention and looking more inviting.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over district rules and code and said the door was non-original and the replacement style is appropriate; he said the color will help indicate the entrance and the new color selection is more in keeping with Pioneer Square colors.

Mr. Astor agreed. He said the awning is sloped, classic and durable with no gloss. He said it is appropriate in context with its neighbors. He said that it is reversible, appropriate and attractive.

Ms. Petrovich agreed and said the Brittle Bush is a more appropriate color.

Ms. Brown disagreed and thought a color choice from Alliance for Pioneer Square's color chart would be better.

Mr. Kralios noted that the color chart was not approved as the a color chart for the District Rules, compliance with it are not regulated.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of an awning as proposed and installation of a new door painted Brittle Bush SW 664

Code Citations:

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

- E. 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)

E. AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

Awnings and canopies are structures attached to buildings above storefront windows and entrances to provide weather protection. Awnings are light-weight structures constructed of metal framing with fabric or vinyl covering. Canopies are heavier, more permanent structures constructed of rigid materials such as metal or metal framing with glass. (7/99) Those buildings wishing to use awnings or canopies shall adhere to the following requirements:

1. Awnings shall be sloped, rather than bubble type. No writing may be placed on the sloping portion of the awning. (12/94) Scalloped or cut-out valances are not acceptable, nor are side panels. (8/93) Return of valances on awnings shall be permitted, but no signage of any kind shall be permitted on valance returns.
2. Shiny, high-gloss awning materials are not permitted. Retractable awnings of a through color are preferred, i.e., the underside is the same color as the exposed face. Awning colors shall be subdued to ensure compatibility with the character of the District. (7/03)
3. Canopies that are compatible in design, scale, materials, color, details, and method of attachment with the building and that do not display a false historical appearance are permitted. (7/03)
4. Awnings and canopies covering more than one story are not allowed. Distinctive architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure.
5. Awnings and canopies must serve a functional purpose, and therefore shall project a minimum of five (5) feet horizontally. (7/03)
6. Internally illuminated awnings or canopies are not permitted. Neon is not allowed on awnings or canopies. (7/03)

SMC 23.66.160 5. Information displayed on the valance of awnings, canopies or marquees shall be limited to identification of the name or address of the building or of an establishment located in the building

MM/SC/AmB/MA 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Brown opposed.

040115.24 Silver Hotel/Totem Loans

Replace north and south non original windows with egress capable windows

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios said that the applicant showed an old post card showing that the building had been altered. ARC reviewed the plan to install new egress capable windows. ARC thought that the window is not original so that the alteration was appropriate. They thought that keeping the symmetry of the windows was important. The applicant said they would paint the new windows to match the existing Behr Clove Brown. The windows will be wood. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Leigh Cristobol, property manager, explained the plan to renovate the upstairs to two residential units from one and that egress windows are required by DPD. She said they will install new windows on lower portion of north and south windows to match what is above; she said they will swing out. She said they will use clear glass with the lower portion being tempered. She said that the trim, frame work will match existing design. She said the gate that was installed allows for two openings the design matches all the way across.

Mr. Kralios asked if a hopper window is in the middle.

Ms. Cristobol said it is existing and opens inward. She said they would like to install screens as well.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules and Code. He said that this is a life safety issue and egress is needed. He said that the proposal works with the existing symmetry of the building, they are using wood and they will match existing color which is in keeping with the District Rules.

Mr. Astor said it is a reasonable alteration for reasonable purpose and not historic features are damaged; he said the windows are non-original.

Ms. Brown complimented the applicant on upgrades to the buildings.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval to replace north and south non-original windows on the east façade with egress capable windows as presented.

Code Citations:

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.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.

MM/SC/MA/TP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

040115.31 316 Alaskan Way

Briefing regarding proposed demolition and new construction

Jack McCullough said there were three parts to the presentation: 1) Kobe Terrace Park views; 2) scale in its location and in district; and 3) proposed project.

Presentation made via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). Presenters included Kyle Andersen, Meyer Harrell, and Kevin Johnson. Following are board questions and comments.

Board Input/Questions:

Mr. Kralios asked about the northwest view/windows.

Mr. Andersen said it is set back enough from the property line to have windows at the top.

Mr. Kralios asked what the changes to the rear façade are.

Mr. Andersen said there is a regular grid to historic buildings and they evened out theirs to groupings of twos.

Ms. Bennett asked if the glass upper two stories are only on the west.

Mr. Andersen said it is and it is needed to turn corner to be compatible. He said there is metal on the other side to be more compatible with the district.

Ms. Petrovich asked about canopy type difference.

Mr. Andersen said it was up high and they have dropped it down to 12' per Board comments. He said that it reinforces the hierarchy of the corner.

Public Comment:

York Wong, district resident, provide sun shadow analysis (available in DON file) and spoke about the impact of sun shadow on existing buildings, plants, and the quality of life in the neighborhood. He said a better study is required to understand the impacts.

Greg Aden, district resident, said that poor development in the past has impacted the views from Kobe Terrace Park. He said that the views are minimal now and what is left is so important it needs to be protected. He said that the public has not had enough time to review documents. He said that their height comparison should include mass. He said the building as proposed is monolithic and not good for the neighborhood.

Jessica Luccio, district resident, said the size of the building relative to its position in the neighborhood is too tall. She talked about the cumulative impact to more height.

Cindy Aden, district resident, noted the unique qualities of the neighborhood and said she wants a thriving Pioneer Square. She said the shadow studies provided by applicant were disingenuous and noted that now people use rooftops. She said that longtime residents are committed to the Square. She said that this building in this position negatively impacts the district.

Adam Hasson, Samis, said he was on the Board when the zoning changes were established and they were vetted to encourage taking over parking and vacant lots to do infill and it has taken a long time to get to this point. He said the zoning allows the height. He said that the applicant showed they met reasonable standard and that other lots closer to Kobe Terrace will impact the views. He said he supports the design and likes the warehouse type. He said he liked the original design and said the glass would have been lighter and more fitting with our time.

Leslie Smith, Alliance for Pioneer Square, said it has been a very contentious issue. She said this neighborhood has waited 30 – 40 years for residential development; she said it is needed otherwise they cannot sustain the retail. She said she supported moving forward.

Board Comments:

Mr. Kralios said they have done a thorough and exhaustive study on Kobe Terrace views showing view impacts and providing good illustration of reasonableness of protection. He said that it is a vague code section.

Mr. Astor said that given the limits in limiting heights on infill sites he said his objection to bulk and scale were in relation to how development impacts views at Kobe Terrace – one of the few codified provision. He appreciated the study and said that the ambiguity of the statute was not helpful. He said a lot of viewpoints were shown from Kobe Terrace. He noted the significant impact on water views and said he was not sure SEPA provision allows focus on such small slice of view. He said the building is less burdensome than originally thought. He said if he had the ability to control the height he would require shorter but that is not in board purview.

Ms. Bennett said she appreciates the exhaustive study and the many views from Kobe Terrace.

Mr. Astor noted public comments and said that DPD – not the board - has purview over shadow studies or views from buildings. He said the overarching height guideline was raised to 120’.

Mr. Kralios said the board does not have authority to adjust underlying zoning height. He said the design has come a long way and he appreciated the analysis and context studies. He said the use of brick focuses on 100’ datum which is already part of the context on Alaskan Way. He said the glass helps to de-emphasize a portion of the mass and upper stories. He said it reinforces warehouse district and symmetry in re-evaluating the fenestration. He said the more rigorous window grouping of two is more successful. He said that the canopies were lowered which provides a better pedestrian environment. He said that the addition of northwest corner upper windows is good and breaks down the mass a bit. He said he struggled with the choice of brick color and urged applicants to consider something more in keeping with district such as red brick, sandstone.

Ms. Bennett said she appreciated that the applicants looked at new ways of reducing massing at the top. She said that the glass does reduce the heaviness at top. She said that the north side windows are good. She said she likes the new fenestration on the west facing elevation and said it gives a lower feel. She said that the upper stories of glass on the north side seems funny.

Mr. Brown said she has no problem with darker brick because it sets if off as a new building unlike the 505 building which is a poor mix of red brick.

Mr. Kralios said the NOLO building is a much shorter building and the dark doesn’t work against it so much; he noted the height and volume of this project.

Ms. Petrovich said that because of the mass of the building the dark is more appropriate for a new building. She said it is a new building and should be treated as such. She appreciated the glass o top to make it differentiated. She said she lives in the district and can’t control the height. She said she was concerned about the Kobe Terrace views and said that other buildings were put up that block views more. She said this project is reasonable.

Mr. Bue said the building will look large regardless of brick used but noted lighter brick would mitigate it more. He said the glass separates the top from the reference to old buildings below. He said that the way it wraps looks fine. He said the canopy change is good and that anything to minimize the middle section is good.

Mr. Parish said he appreciated the hard work and effort on this project.

Mr. Astor said the glass top two floors is a welcome change and minimized the mass. He said the optical illusion makes it more tolerable. He said the design now highlights the building that pays homage to historic buildings.

Ms. Bennett thanks the design team for going over quick mass studies to show the design rationale.

Mr. Kralios said to consider the type of glass on the west elevation because of the afternoon sun; it is important to the immediate neighborhood.

Ms. Petrovich noted the blinding reflection from the NOLO building.

Mr. McCullough said they will pursue the glass options to keep reflectivity as low as possible.

Mr. Kralios said that the palette of brick is not limited to red but extends to browns too.

040115.4 BOARD BUSINESS

040115.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

040115.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227