



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 245/17

**MINUTES** for Wednesday, July 19, 2017

### **Board Members**

Mark Astor, Chair  
Brendan Donckers  
Ryan Hester  
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair  
Caitlin Molenaar  
Carol O'Donnell  
Alex Rolluda

### **Staff**

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

### **Absent**

Chair Mark Astor called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**071917.1**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** June 7, 2017

**071917.2**      **APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

**071917.21**      **WA and OR Railroad building**  
**304 Alaskan Way**

Adam Michelson

Installation of conduit and vault in the alley and re-laying of brick

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans provided. The applicant explained he needed more power for his building and that the new vault would also help power for other buildings on the block. Because he is the first to want it, he has to pay for it. ARC thought the meters were installed in rear façade of the building and acknowledged that the applicant had explored alternatives but couldn't find a less prominent location that it complied with code requirements. The applicant will bring a new rendering that shows an alternative location for the business sign. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Adam Michaelson explained the need for a utility upgrade; they will trench down the alley, add meters, two vaults, and conduit and will also move a sign.

Ms. Nashem noted the restoration plan is provided on the back page.

Mr. Kralios asked about impact to granite section and paver units.

Mr. Michaelson said they will be removed and reinstalled.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem reported that this is a brick alley and the district rules say that the original material needs to be reused when it is available. The applicant intends to reuse the existing historic material consistent with this rule.

Responding to questions Mr. Michaelson said there will be temporary pedestrian access to retail provided. He said that the neighboring building has emergency access to alley. He said they haven't applied for street use yet.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Astor went over District Rules and SOI.

Mr. Kralios said it meets the guidelines. He said the material will be salvaged and reinstalled. He said there are few options for placement of the meters; he noted installation will be at the back of the building.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of conduit and vault in the alley and re-laying of brick and granite curb, installing meter and relocating the business sign.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 19, 2017 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

VIII. MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

The preferred location for mechanical systems is in the building interior. In cases where locating systems in the interior is not possible, exterior mechanical systems equipment, including but not limited to air conditioning units,

compressors, boilers, generators, ductwork, louvers, wiring and pipes, shall be installed on non-primary building facades and/or roof tops. Mechanical equipment shall be installed in such a manner that character-defining features of the building are not radically changed, damaged, obscured, or destroyed. Screening and/or painting of equipment may be required to diminish negative visual impacts. (7/99)

#### XVIII. ALLEYS

- A. Alley Paving. Alleys are to be paved with unit paving materials. Three types are acceptable in the District: remolded paving bricks, cobbles, and interlocking brick-tone pavers. Alleys should be repaired or re-paved in the original unit material when these materials remain available. All other alleys should be paved with remolded brick. The center drainage swale, peculiar to alleys, should be preserved as part of alley re-paving. Unit paved alleys should not be patched with any material other than approved unit paving.

#### **Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation**

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

**071917.22**

**Theater Building**  
95 S Jackson St

Libby Hinsley

Alterations including new entries, canopy, signage, lighting, reestablishing window openings, one new window opening and adding glazing to former loading dock doors and seismic.

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and renderings provided. They had some discussion on the curtain wall system but overall ARC supported the curtain wall system as an effort to read the former rolling doors as different than storefronts and more transparent relating to if the rolling doors were in the open position. The applicants noted that the remaining rolling door mechanism would remain with the rolling door up as it is an original feature of the building. ARC thought that the reestablishing bricked up openings was appropriate and the windows would match the existing windows although the existing windows are not original. ARC supported the new openings and thought that they limited them to the minimum necessary for the program functioning of the building. The new openings were a consistent size and fenestration pattern with the existing openings and did not distract from the architectural character of the building. ARC commented that the proposed canopy did not provide overhead weather protection and that it did not extend 5 feet as required in code. ARC suggested that they provide an alternative. ARC discussed that the using reclaimed brick on the wing walls would create confusion and make it appear to be an original feature rather

than a new feature. They thought that it should be a differentiated material. ARC recommended approval withholding recommendation on the canopy and wing walls.

Staff Report: Another example of the loading doors being replaced with glass with the door mechanism being retained is at the 619 Western Building. In this case they used an opening glass garage door to accommodate a possible restaurant sidewalk café use on the loading dock. The door mechanism was required to be retained. The Board for the record should restate the ways the new openings comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards and the ITS 14 and 21.

Doug Swan, Hudson Pacific, reported the project was an adaptive reuse of the building; he said they responded to ARC comments. He provided an overview of the history of the building as a storage and distribution warehouse; he said the west façade was highly activated. He said they propose to retain historic architectural elements; peel away the 1960's – 1980's renovations; and, alter the building for future use.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, said they will remove non-original elements and get back to the transparency of the original look as if the doors are open. She said a few new openings are needed for this project; she cited other buildings in the district with new openings. She provided side by side renderings showing existing and proposed openings.

Randy Morgan, architect, explained they will remove non-original elements and retain historic. He said the concrete entry slab will be removed and reinstalled to meet ADA standards.

Mr. Swan said they added glass weather protection.

Mr. Morgan said that the glass in the canopy will be ½" plate; they will extend the canopy 60" from the exterior of building and the proposed brick wings have been changed to metal clad.

Ms. Mirro said the new structure doesn't touch original fabric.

Mr. Morgan said a 16" sign is proposed for the address; no other signage is planned. They will add a curtain wall system. The original coal chute windows will be retained; they will add iron gates to them.

Ms. Mirro said originally, they were large roll-up doors.

Mr. Morgan said they will add a new opening on the west elevation with granite sill to match coal chute window. He said they will retain the iron guard and window frame but will add a new sash. He said there will be a mix of repaired and replaced windows identified on the plan.

Ms. Mirro said they added a window to mitigate deteriorated brick; based on the patterning it may have been an opening previously.

Mr. Morgan said they will use Pella window system, all wood inside and out. They will match the window above in look and feel. He said they will add a curtain wall, new steel-clad portal inset per SDOT requirements for egress. They will retain original door coil, remove non-compliant stair, granite sill and coal window. He said that they will remove infill due to bus accident and reinstall window.

Mr. Swan said two openings were added in 1982.

Mr. Morgan said they will add one curtain wall and double doors and one curtain wall without doors.

Mr. Swan said the two new openings are programmatically driven and address deterioration issues. He said they have been faithful to the G. W. Loughton design intent. He said the south west opening will be a new egress stair; at the southwest corner, they will depress interior slab to grade to create SDOT compliant sidewalk stub. He said it will be considered temporary until the waterfront development project is done.

Mr. Kralios asked if there are any original windows.

Mr. Swan said the majority are non-original and they have insulated glazing on original windows but they look original.

Ms. Mirro said there was a Certificate of Approval in the 1980's for replacement of windows of upper floors of Merrill Place.

Mr. Kralios asked if some of the original windows were not touched.

Mr. Swan said that is correct.

Mr. Hester asked how the new curtain wall works with the granite sill that has a slight dip to the side.

Mr. Morgan said that they will tailor the bottom of the system.

Mr. Swan said there is a 105-year wear pattern; they will custom scribe the sill plate of the window system to fit that sill condition. Mr. Swan said they won't modify the granite sill in any way.

Mr. Rolluda asked the color of the wing wall.

Mr. Morgan said it will match awning color.

Mr. Rolluda asked the use behind the new window.

Mr. Morgan said it will be office.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester asked if the interior of the metal mullion finish is black.

Mr. Swan said it will be color match to the exterior.

Mr. Kralios said that proposed entries in existing openings gives flexibility. He said the far south loading area provides emergency egress. He said the curtain wall is appropriate to convey the sense of open space as former loading door. He said the loading doors are a unique feature and what is proposed is reversible. He said extending and adding glass to the canopy is a good revision to meet the District Rules. He said the sign code allows an exception for up to three letters and this address sign is two letters. He said it is part of a reduced sign package; no other sign components will be applied. He noted that original openings were being reestablished and new windows would match existing. He said that one new opening mitigates some deteriorated brick and supports the use of space behind. He said if anything is salvageable, it should be saved.

Mr. Hester agreed and said there is precedent elsewhere for curtain wall and the locations are appropriate; he appreciated the profiles. He said they will match the curtain wall system to that opening; it is a good use of existing penetration.

Mr. Rolluda asked if the granite sill could be reused elsewhere.

Mr. Swan said they haven't explored that but noted they have an existing storage of materials salvaged from the building over the years.

Ms. Molenaar asked why the mullion division is different from original.

Mr. Morgan said they tried not to match the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor lines to create differentiation.

Mr. Astor appreciated the increased awning. He said Window 201 opening matches fenestration on the elevation. He appreciated the use of solid wood windows. He noted the appropriate restoration of Window 302.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Alterations including new entries, canopy, signage, lighting, reestablishing window openings, two new window openings and adding glazing to former loading dock doors and seismic bracing as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 19, 2017 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160 Signs

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.

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.

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.

**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.

C. Awnings. Awnings shall be functional, serving as weather protection for pedestrians at street level, and shall overhang the sidewalk a minimum of five feet (5'). Awnings may be permitted on upper floors for the purpose of climate control. All awnings shall be of a design compatible with the architecture of buildings in the area.

#### 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.

### 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)

#### 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)

#### 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)

#### 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:

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)

#### **Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation**

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. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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.

Preservation Briefs

[Brief 17](#)

[Brief 41](#)

Interpreting the Standards Bulletins

ITS 14 [Adding New Openings: New Openings in Secondary Elevations or Introducing New Windows in Blank Walls](#)

ITS16 [Loading Door Openings: New Infill for Historic Loading Door Openings](#)

ITS21 [Adding New Openings: Adding New Openings on Secondary Elevations](#)

MM/SC/DK/RH

5:0:0 Motion carried.

**071917.23**

**Smith Tower**

506 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave

Meghan Kauffman

Replace awnings, installation of signage and graphics

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and renderings provided. ARC thought the awnings' 7-foot extension complied with the code requirements and that the color and style were compatible with the building. The letter size on the awning was compliant at 5.27 inches. ARC thought the art deco design and banding with lettering complied with transparency guidelines and was compatible with the building in color and design, and the letter size 5.58 inches was compliant. ARC discussed the graphics and signage on the Yesler windows and thought that it did not comply with transparency guidelines and one sign did not comply with the letter height requirements. ARC had some discussion about what are street level windows. Some members thought it was the upper windows. Some members thought it would be acceptable to block transparency in the lower windows. ARC recommended approval withholding the recommendation on the graphics with signage that blocked transparency. The applicants said that their reason for wanting to block transparency was that the upper windows was their bike storage and they didn't want people to see the bikes and the lower was a kitchen and an engineering room and they didn't want people to see what they were doing. They also noted that the neighborhood was not good. The referenced a report that they thought suggested that they cover these windows.

Staff Report: During the ARC members asked staff to review past examples of when transparency had been considered. She provided examples:

In 2000 window film was denied at 83 S King St. Proposed because of security reasons of office use. The denial was affirmed by the Hearing Examiner.

In 2001 window film was denied at 201 S Jackson in a partial subterranean space. Proposed because of safety concerns around counting money. The denial was affirmed by the Hearing Examiner.

In 2001 approval was granted for installation of photos, set back 2 feet not covering the entire window to allow some visibility in and out of the space.

In 2012 another window film was denied at 83 King in a partial subterranean space with an office use. Proposed because they wanted confidentiality of their work. Decision not appealed.

In 2015 solar blinds not to be lowered below 6 feet for customers relief of the sun on was approved at 240 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Clear visibility in and out of the space.

In 2016 pattern film was approved in just the lower half of a window at subterranean space, allowing visibility into and out of the space but blocking from the interior customer view of garbage fallen into the light well.

In 2013 UV a temporary window cling with a semitransparent image relating to the museum display was approved at 310 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave S. The purpose was to protect the museum display but to still allow some visibility in and out of the space. Other windows in the museum remain clear. This application has been approved for additional displays as well.

She said the Board should discuss which are street level windows here: the lower windows, the upper windows or both. The Board might consider how you access a space or what an average pedestrian sees into when they walk by. In the appeals, the appellant didn't argue that the windows were not street level, but one did argue that they were in a location that street level uses were not required and they thought the rule should only apply to spaces with a retail use. The hearing examiner said that the transparency regulation wasn't specific to retail use but to the visibility in and out of the windows. While both appellants also said there was a safety reason for their window film, the hearing examiner said there was also a safety reason for the transparency regulation.

She said she looked through the files for approvals of use for and engineering office, kitchen and bike storage but could not find one. There was a previous change of use for the entire building to residential with retail remaining on the lower floor. The space behind the two locations where windows covering are proposed was identified as building maintenance however the project never happened.

Applicant Comment:

Meghan Kauffman explained they will replace four existing, failing awnings; they will use the same size and the same fasteners. She said they propose to install 16" tall vinyl band

sign across the top of window. She said existing graphics are interior-mounted, light gold vinyl to pick up architectural elements. She provided detail of the proposed graphic. She said that they propose window covering on the subterranean windows on Yesler behind which are back of house operations. The coverings come in a range of transparency options: 10 – 100%. The coverings depict the Smith Tower logo, photos, and info in sepia tones. She said proposed font size is 4.5". She also provided a stacked vertical option. Responding to clarifying questions she said their preference is Option 1.

Board members discussed the opacity of the proposed window coverings on Yesler; some suggested seeing a mockup of the application.

Public Comment:

Carl Leighty, Alliance for Pioneer Square, supported the application and said it is a visual improvement that has added visual interest. He said the gold banding is good.

Linda Gallagher said she couldn't see the slides and said the signs have already been installed. She said the large format graphics don't meet transparency requirement and aren't allowed.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios said that awning replacement is in-kind with exception of color and re-uses the same connections. He said the vinyl bands on Yesler are high enough and transparency is maintained; the letter height is OK. He said the decorative graphics have been installed but the board reserves the right to ask them to be removed if they don't comply. He said that visual interest is added and transparency is maintained so he supported the approval.

Mr. Astor cited XX.A.2 and said that what is proposed for the lower windows doesn't comply.

Mr. Hester said that the window graphics is already installed but that doesn't mean it can stay; if it doesn't comply with the District Rules it will have to come off. He said the board reviews for color, material, and design suitability. He said that he appreciated the quality of the design.

Board members discussed what constitutes ground floor, what is the function of the space behind, and what is the appropriate level of transparency in this particular location. It was decided to table the consideration of the window covering graphics portion of the application.

Action: I move to recommend approval for replacing the awnings including signage at 5.27 inches, art deco graphics on the windows with window signs in letters 5.58 inches and smaller. The consideration of the non-transparent graphics and signage is tabled pending further information or alternatives to be submitted.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 19, 2017 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC 23.66.130 B. Preferred Street-level Uses.

1. Preferred uses at street level must be highly visible and pedestrian oriented. Preferred street-level uses either display merchandise in a manner that contributes to the character and activity of the area, and/or promote residential uses, including but not limited to the following uses:

a. Any of the following uses under 3,000 square feet in size: art galleries and other general sales and service uses, restaurants and other eating and drinking establishment uses, and lodging uses;

SMC23.66.160 Signs

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.

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.

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.

#### 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)

### 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)
6. Upper Floor Signage. Upper floor signage is not permitted, except for temporary signage as per SMC 23.66.160D or when it is proposed as part of an overall integrated sign plan for the building. (7/99) When permitted, the preferred location for temporary signs is in windows, rather than attached to the building. (8/93)

#### 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)

#### **Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation**

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.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
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/DK/RH            5:0:0    Motion carried.

### **071917.3            PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW**

#### **071917.31            74 S Jackson St (former addressed as 316 Alaskan Way) Briefing regarding proposed demolition and new construction**

Jack McCullough said the board has reviewed this building and determined it to be non-contributing and nothing has changed since then so they would not spend any more time on it; he said he was available if there were questions.

The briefing was presented via PowerPoint (in DON file). Following are board and public questions and comments.

Jerry Garcia, Olsen Kundig, explained how they evaluated scale in the neighborhood and went through elements: strong corner presence; building transitions; detailed and layered storefronts; varied heights, not only between new and historic building but between historic buildings; vertical scale - base, middle and top; horizontal scale; material; rich pedestrian experience; and the front a distinguished style and back is different.

Tom Kundig said Pioneer Square is a neighborhood in transition. He said they look at the district as an ensemble of heights, parts, styles, evolutionary buildings. He said time adds patina. He said there have been development patterns over time and there

is a lot of alley development to come. He said that older buildings have handcrafted nuances; there is a light well pattern in the neighborhood and large windows to bring light in. He said how to define the entry is important and he gave example of recessed entries. He said that what happens inside is articulated outside. He noted the importance of window scale, character, and patterns; how articulated, built and how transitions are made. He said that the entry of the building will be off Alaskan and there will be an entry on the corner as well. The datum lines will pick up lines of adjacent buildings. He said that there will be retail at the base and office above; he said there will be a couple decks of parking.

Mr. Garcia said they are inspired by historic fabric and will be using historic brick. He said they are aggressively trying to integrate the building into a rich building fabric; 100' makes sense rather than 120'. He said they responded to board request for theories established for driving design, massing feedback, bulk, scale, height. He said they are exploring canted double height windows and how much they tip

Mr. Kundig said some super high-performance windows become mirrors; if they angle they will resolve some of that affect.

Mr. Kralios asked why there is no recess on the Jackson Street notch.

Mr. Garcia said they reinforced the notion of multiple parcels. He said they extended the brick frame over the opening to register with adjacent buildings to appear more horizontal than vertical.

Mr. Hester asked if there will be a curtain wall at the vertical recess on Alaskan.

Mr. Garcia said yes.

Mr. Kralios asked if the curtain wall will be notched at 5'.

Mr. Garcia said it would be and it follows all the way up.

Mr. Rolluda noted the façade breakup represents parcels. He appreciated the big blocks of windows. He noted that after the notch there is a change to punched windows and it seems false conjecture that something is different behind it when there is not.

Mr. Garcia said they anticipate how space will be used will be different in this area.

Mr. Kundig said they are showing the potential to break up the floor plan and how it will be used realistically – work stations, conference rooms, offices.

Public Comment:

Linda Gallagher thanked the team for responding to comments. She appreciated the proposed use of old brick. She said the black brick presented by another team was awful. She expressed concern about the scale and mass, horizontally and vertically

and said it still looks large. She said it will be a big blocking wall for other. She said not to compare scale and massing to new buildings and to scale back to better fit. She said there has always been a waterfront.

York Wong, resident, said the design is several levels above the previous design. He appreciated the thought that went into it. He said the building is inconsistent with the height and scale of adjacent buildings in the block. He said that scale is always in context with other buildings in Pioneer Square. He said they talked about Ann's buildings but they have not addressed scale and height to other smaller buildings in block. He said the previous building was not consistent with the Code.

David Mimon said he works in the neighborhood and supported the project and appreciated the time and effort spent to make it complementary to the neighborhood.

Rob Brewster, said he owns other buildings in the district and supported the project. He said it was fantastic looking; the size and scale are right. He said they have done a good job with the warehouse look and feel. He said it makes him think of the Embarcadero in San Francisco and about how the scale of buildings was too small compared to the size of the road and made it feel unfriendly.

Jessica Lucio, resident, said she was involved in the Hearing Examiner decision and they did not say anything about contributing status. She said the mass and scale are important. She said the facades need to be complementary in scale with being the west edge of a low lying historic district. She thought that difference between 100 feet and 120 feet was negligible. She said demolition of historic resources doesn't protect or enhance the preservation district. She said the project is incompatible with the district. She questioned how the project got in front of the Board and thought it is not an effective use of Board time. She said the building must be mitigated for height.

Nick Lucio, resident, said demolition of a historic building is in conflict with 'preservation' and rehabilitation of current structure is appropriate.

Ali Ghamberi, business owner, supported the project and noted the investment made in the district will benefit the district.

Ann Michelson, property owner, supported the project and said she has worked with Tom Kundig on other projects. She said she would normally not be in support of demolition but she noted the thought and dedication to the project and to the people here and supported the project.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester thanked the design team for the thoughtful design, good dialog and materials. He echoed public comment on the bulk mass and scale. He said this is a new project / owner and demolition of existing building is revisited. He read from a letter from Jeffrey Ochsner (in DON file) noting that it referred to the rise of

automobiles, the decline of Pioneer Square, that there are two other parking garages that are contributing in the District and that this is an example of a concrete building. Mr. Hester said there is a reason that it is listed on the national register as non-contributing. Mr. Hester said he had no objection to demolition of the building. He said he appreciated the choice of materials and the curtain wall recessed 5' from the façade which breaks up the massing. He said he had some concern about the canted windows, new introduction into the district and thought it should be further discussed. He appreciated the fenestration pattern. He said he would support the bulk, mass and scale.

*Mr. Hester left at 11:05 am.*

Mr. Rolluda agreed with Mr. Hester's comments and agreed about the canted windows He thought there was a reason it was used at Vulcan building and there is no rationale here. He said to be more deliberate with the base, middle, and top and not to consider the setback amenity space as the top.

Regarding the contributing status, Mr. Kralios said Jeffrey Ochsner's is one opinion. He said that the building has lost any significance: anything that could have made it significant is gone, it is listed as non-contributing in the National Register District and he is OK with demolition. He noted the granularity of Pioneer Square and the number of buildings on each block. He said the notch on Alaskan Way helps break down the mass but the building is still integrated. He said that a notch on Jackson might be interesting to see. He said that the 15' amenity is top heavy and to bring it down to scale. He appreciated the eyebrow on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor but it would help to not extend it out as far. He said he was indifferent to the canted windows. He thought the proportion of the windows was compatible and the cant might distinguish it as a new building.

Ms. Molenaar appreciated the west façade break down and said it feels like a different parcel. She said the building has the potential to look large but doesn't because of how it is divided up, especially with the windows. She said it won't feel like a massive wall.

Mr. Rolluda asked if they explored reuse of the timber and cardecking in the existing building.

Mr. Kundig said there are probably toxic issues but they will harvest anything they can.

Mr. Astor said he was a fan of breaking up of the Alaskan Way façade and it would be interesting to explore this on Jackson as well. He noted Mr. Rolluda's comment about the top heaviness of the penthouse and said to explore ways to mitigate it. He said he was part of the original decision that the existing building is not contributing and the information that was provided hasn't changed his mind. He said he would support demolition.

071917.32

**Korn and Walker Building**

Mike Mora

119 Yesler Way and 107 Occidental Ave S

Briefing regarding proposed rehab of the Korn Building with a penthouse and an addition on the Walker Building

Rob Brewster, Interurban Development presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). He said that the Korn Building was designed as a three-story building; the top two floors were destroyed by fire and have been rebuilt. He said that the cornice is gone and the interior has been altered and is decayed. He said that the Walker Building has been a market much of its life. He said that the original band across the front and iron columns have been removed. He said that the condition of the building is poor. He said that for adaptive reuse they will need height. He cited Pine Street Market in Portland as an example. He said that zoning at this site is allowed to 120' and they propose 85'. He said that they propose to add a small penthouse, set back 15', to the Korn Building. He said there will be two stories of residential. He showed studies in relation to adjacent buildings and others in the district.

He said that the Korn Building façade would be preserved and protected. He said they would preserve the lower level of the Walker Building and retain the back of it with addition of window and door openings. He said what they propose would not overwhelm the existing buildings and would be appropriate. He said they propose to have a market on the first floor, offices above and residential possibly on top.

Mr. Astor said both buildings are historic and contributing so would be considered the same way; the board would rely on the SOI Standards. He said that a one-story set back addition could work on the Korn Building. He said the Walker Building couldn't survive and remain an asset with a large addition.

A member of the public said that Jeff Ochsner said the building was originally four-stories and drawings don't exist. They said that Mr. Ochsner thought that the board would be receptive to adding three additional floors that were intended to be added.

Mr. Kralios said that Pacific Commercial had loss of floors and had photos to base reconstruction on. He said if are no plans, and there is no record, it is just anecdotal. Mr. Kralios noted there is criteria for setback and height of penthouses in the code.

Mr. Astor said the Guidelines, Code, and District Rules preclude this type development; he noted NPS Interpreting the Standards Bulletins 36 and 47 for additions as well as Brief 14. He said it is not workable to use the logic of adding floors that were planned but not built with no records. He said it doesn't comply.

Mr. Rolluda concurred with Mr. Astor.

Public Comment:

Catherine Merlino said Jeffrey Ochsner said the building had been planned for four stories. She thought one floor was not usual. She supported additional floors and said it would fit in the context the district height; it is an interesting site and she was glad it is getting attention. She thought the Board should consider that it is midblock and should consider the original plan for the building.

Linda Gallagher said that Capital Hill can do this but not here. She said to preserve the existing buildings, not the spirit of the fabric. She said what was proposed is a new building.

Jessica Lucio, resident, said read the definition of rehabilitation and that it is only preservation approach where an addition is allowed if it is context of the buildings and has minimal impact.

Matt Herron said the top three stories were not built due to economic issues.

Mr. Brewster said neighborhoods will change and they make sure that what they present has an economic component that is holistic and organic. He said that Greg Smith has done this a lot to modify the neighborhood. He said that too much restriction will prevent housing.

- 071917.4**      **BOARD BUSINESS**
- 071917.5**      **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Mark Astor, Chair
- 071917.6**      **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227