



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 83/18

MINUTES for Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Board Members

Adam Alsobrook
Kianoush Curran
Brendan Donckers
Carol O'Donnell, Vice Chair
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Linda Collie
Dean Kralios

Vice Chair Carol O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

032118.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
December 20, 2017
MM/SC/BD/KC 5:0:0 Minutes approve.

032118.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

032118.21 Cadillac Hotel Building
Klondike Gold Rush National Park

ARC Report: Mr. Alsobrook said ARC reviewed the signs. They thought that the signs were in compliance with size, letter height and the color and the design was compatible with the building and with the District. ARC asked that they either increase the size of the bracket or otherwise make accommodation to ensure that the placement of the bolts is in the mortar joints and not the brick.

Applicant Comment:

Michael McGinn, Rainmaker Design, proposed a pair of hanging blade signs. Responding to ARC comments he will have bracket custom made to attach to mortar joints.

Ms. O'Donnell said it meets the District Rules.

Mr. Donckers asked about the red "X" on the plan.

Mr. McGinn said there was an additional proposed location, but they changed their mind and crossed it off.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of two blade signs with the attachments points to be in the mortar joints only.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the March 21, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SNC23.66.160 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.

Pioneer Square Preservation 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)

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)

3. Projecting Elements (e.g. blade signs, banners, flags and awnings). There shall be a limit of one projecting element, e.g. a blade sign, banner, or awning per address. If a business chooses awnings for its projecting element, it may not also have a blade sign, flag, or banner, and no additional signage may be hung below awnings. (6/03) Exceptions may be made for businesses on corners, in which case one projecting element per facade may be permitted. (12/94)
4. Blade signs (signs hanging perpendicular to the building). Blade signs shall be installed below the intermediate cornice or second floor of the building, and in such a manner that they do not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. Typically, non-illuminated blade signs will be limited to eight (8) square feet. (12/94)

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/AA/AR 5:0:0 Motion carried.

032118.22 Fire Station 10

ARC Report: Mr. Alsobrook reported that ARC reviewed the color proposed of the windows and thought that it was compatible with the building and with the District.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem said this color has been used on windows in the District before. Because black is commonly applied for the Board has often looked at neighboring colors to assure that there is a variety of color. In this case the applicant has provided photos of the surrounding buildings showing a variety of color.

Applicant Comment:

Rhoda Lawrence, BOLA, proposed painting the window trim black; review of adjacent structures revealed that various colors have been used for trim. She proposed using Tricorn Black for non-original window trim and man doors.

Mr. Alsobrook clarified that the fire truck doors remain red.

Ms. Lawrence said they will. Responding to question about the mullions, she said they are applied.

Mr. Donckers asked if windows on north façade will be painted as well.

Ms. Lawrence said they will. She said the man doors are in recess on east and north sides; there are upper level doors to be painted black as well. She said the windows on the alley are original and will not be painted; they are an odd pink. Responding to questions she said the rails will be touched up with black paint.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. O'Donnell went over District Rules.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Painting the windows and doors Ticorn Black with the exception of the fire truck garage doors which will remain red.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the March 21, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

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

significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

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

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)

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

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

MM/SC/KC/BD 5:0:0 Motion carried.

032118.23

Squire Building

On the Field – wall sign
901 B Occidental Ave S

Installation of new sign copy for the south façade wall sign

ARC Report: This was last reviewed at ARC on February 28, 2018. At the time the ARC asked for staff to get a reading on the sign complying the requirements for an on-premise sign.

Applicant Comment:

Ellie Newby explained the sign had been revised; the website and app were removed.

Ms. O’Donnell asked if T-Mobile service is available in On The Field; if you can talk to a person about it; and if you can set up service there.

Ms. Newby said yes, the service is available at On the Field; you can talk to a person and set up service there.

Mr. Donckers asked the duration of the sign.

Ms. Newby said it will be up for 1 – 3 months.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem explained that she let the applicant know that she confirmed that the sign as proposed does not qualify as an on-premise sign. She said that the

applicant is revising their proposal. Considering the definition of an on-premise sign for this sign, what it being advertised should be determined and then how that product is provided should be considered. For example, if it is a product such as a phone or camera, is it for sale at On the Field? And if it is a company is part of On the Field or if it is a service if that service provided by On the Field or is it accessed by phone, computer or any other device to allow a person to obtain a service rendered. This is new information the Board can use to consider the sign even if it is similar to a sign that was approved in the past before the Board had the information. If the Board also needs more information about the sign proposed, they can request that of the applicant or staff and table the application until they get the information.

Ms. Newby said she hasn't been in the store and she assumed a T-Mobile person would be there.

Nick Brown, On the Field, said the representative in the store would be On the Field representative who has applications and phones he sells.

Ms. Nashem said the ad is not selling a device, it is selling T-Mobile. She asked how a person gets services there.

Mr. Brown said when purchasing a phone there, customer will purchase plan.

Ms. O'Donnell asked if they want to keep their own phone and just switch service from another carrier to T-Mobile?

Mr. Brown was not sure how that would work.

Mr. Donckers had questions about the process, buying a phone there and if a person is not buying a phone, could they still get service there.

The board tabled the application pending more information.

032118.24 419 Occidental Streetscape

Paving north south alley, paving the east private passage, remove asphalt covering to assess the prism panels, installing a new sidewalk on Occidental, installing a new sidewalk and extending the sidewalk on S King, removing one tree, installing three new trees

Tabled by the applicant.

032118.4 Preliminary Design Review

**032118.41 Grand Central, City Loan and Buttnick Buildings
(Squire Latimer, Gottstein, Brunswick-Balke-Collender)
216, 206 and 202 1st Ave S**

Briefing on proposed additions on the Squire Latimer (Grand Central) and the Brunswick-Balke-Collender (Buttnick) buildings

PowerPoint presentation in DON file. Following are board and public questions and comments.

Melissa Glenn, Graham Baba, provided context of the buildings and noted they are in the center of the district. She said the area is zoned PSM100 and noted the great variety of height and scale in the District.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, said there is a path for multi-story additions. He said that PSM 100 is allowed; the Code contemplates building penthouses. He said they looked to Board Guidelines and applied Code consistent with the intent of the District. He said the Code discourages but doesn't prohibit additions. He said SOI 9 has no proscriptive component and says to differentiate but be compatible. He said they looked at SOI 9 and how to do that in each project; the addition needs to be subordinate. He said that Preservation Brief 14 is most illustrative and speaks to how to do an addition. He noted other buildings, such as the Reedo and Johnson Plumbing buildings, had found a pathway to approve multi-story additions on historic buildings.

Mr. Donckers said board books contain Preservation Brief 17 but that he had not read Preservation Brief 14.

Ms. Nashem said Staff Report includes Code citations as well as links to Preservation Briefs 14 and 17 and to interpreting standards: #3, new addition; #14, new addition; #18, new addition; #36 rooftop addition; #47, rooftop addition.

Jim Graham, Graham Baba, went over examples of board-approved multi-story additions, some successful and some not. He noted the Butler Garage has a 9-story addition on top of two-story building; he considered it not successful example. He said the Reedo Building is a successful example; it has two stories added.

Ms. Nashem said the Reedo addition is 1-story with a mezzanine.

Mr. Graham noted the Gridiron's location and said a gasket separates new from old. He provided renderings of Cannery Building and the Maritime Building. He went over Preservation Brief 14 and items in the design toolbox and said they see them as their pathway to the additions.

Brett Baba, Graham Baba, said the proportion is 1/3 – 2/3 relationship new to old. He said the Buttnick addition is more successful. He noted the rhythm and grid for the Grand Central addition is taken from the building below. He said there is less set back on alley façade; it is still aligned with grid below. He said the additions are subordinate and compatible.

Staff report: Ms. Nashem read from Preservation Brief 14 which the applicant had not presented.

Page 1 A new exterior addition to a historic building should be considered in a rehabilitation project only after determining that requirements for the new or adaptive use cannot be successfully met by altering non-significant interior spaces.
Preserve Historic Character

Page 5 A new addition should always be subordinate to the historic building; it should not compete in size, scale or design with the historic building. An addition that bears no relationship to the proportions and massing of the historic building—in other words, one that overpowers the historic form and changes the scale—will usually compromise the historic character as well.

Page 5 The appropriate size for a new addition varies from building to building; it could never be stated in a square or cubic footage ratio, but the historic building's existing proportions, site and setting can help set some general parameters for enlargement. Although even a small addition that is poorly designed can have an adverse impact, to some extent, there is a predictable relationship between the size of the historic resource and what is an appropriate size for a compatible new addition.

Rooftop Additions

Page 12 Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height to minimize its visibility and its impact on the proportion and profile of the historic building. A rooftop addition should almost always be set back at least one full bay from the primary elevation of the building, as well as from the other elevations if the building is free-standing or highly visible. It is difficult, if not impossible, to minimize the impact of adding an entire new floor to relatively low buildings, such as small-scale residential or commercial structures, even if the new addition is set back from the plane of the facade.

Summary

This guidance should be applied to help in designing a compatible new addition that that will meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:

- **A new addition should be simple and unobtrusive in design, and should be distinguished from the historic building—a recessed connector can help to differentiate the new from the old.**
- **A new addition should not be highly visible from the public right of way; a rear or other secondary elevation is usually the best location for a new addition.**
- **The construction materials and the color of the new addition should be harmonious with the historic building materials.**
- **The new addition should be smaller than the historic building—it should be subordinate in both size and design to the historic building.**

The same guidance should be applied when designing a compatible rooftop addition, plus the following:

- **A rooftop addition is generally not appropriate for a one, two or three-story building—and often is not appropriate for taller buildings.**
- **A rooftop addition should be minimally visible.**
- **Generally, a rooftop addition must be set back at least one full bay from the primary elevation of the building, as well as from the other elevations if the building is freestanding or highly visible.**
- **Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height.**

- **Generally, a rooftop addition is more likely to be compatible on a building that is adjacent to similarly-sized or taller buildings.**

Ms. O'Donnell asked which takes priority, SMC or SOI.

Ms. Nashem said SMC is law; the District Rules are Guidelines that support the Code and SOI Standards.

Mr. Rolluda asked about setbacks on each façade per the Guidelines.

Ms. Glenn noted set back information is at the back of the packet, pages 65-66.

Mr. Phillips said that two weeks ago they presented porch options and received solid direction from the board. He said they would be back in a couple weeks.

Public Comment:

Mark Astor spoke in opposition to the additions. He said financial feasibility has been mentioned multiple times; it is not an option that can be considered. He said he predicts the Johnson Plumbing (Gridiron) Building violates the SOI and will be delisted when surveyed. He said in a 2007 letter, Michael Houser said the proposal jeopardized contributing status of the building, did not meet SOI, and would not be eligible for tax credits. He said the 1st and King Building's two-story addition and changes to the storefront led to its delisting. He said it is in the Code, Guidelines, SOI; that multi story additions are discouraged and not compliant.

Carl Leighty, Alliance for Pioneer Square, supported residential development and noted it is part of the 2020 neighborhood plan. He said market rate housing is supported. He said historical buildings are a prized asset and he trusts the board's decision will not endanger their status.

Barb Graff, Emergency Office, said her office has been meeting with many stakeholders about how to financially afford retrofit of URM buildings. She said they provide three brochures: URM building owners, URM building business owners, URM building tenants. She said she would like to come back for further discussion sometime.

Mr. Donckers asked if policy updates would not be sent to Council until financing issues were worked out.

Ms. Graff said yes; everyone has a little something to offer but they need to work on that.

Ali Ghamberi, Cherry Street Coffee, noted his love and respect for this great project. He said this is next to the park which he said is the Champs Elysees of Pioneer Square; we cannot afford to lose blue sky or sun. He said we cannot set precedent; cannot lose blue sky or light. He noted his great appreciation for the applicants' work. He only supports a 1 story addition.

Ms. O'Donnell read a compilation of public support provided by applicants (in DON file); it included comments from Karen True, David Mosely, Barry Blanton, Jackie Hackett, Doug Van, Susan Wickwire, Jane Nelson, Jan Cassius, Tony Toppenburg, Joanne Allen White, Rich Reel, Tija Petrovich, Katherine Rogers Merlino, Midge McAuley, Kelly Cost, Gabriel Grant.

Ms. O'Donnell read a letter from Greg Smith, Urban Visions (in DON file). He supported the project but not more than a one-floor addition. He said multi-story addition violates the integrity of the district and sets a precedent. He said it impacts the light and sunshine on the park. He doubted financing issues and offered to buy the buildings. He thinks that they can do one story.

Ryan Smith, Martin Smith, applauded Unico and the design team and noted residential is needed and activation is important. He shared the concern about multi-story additions and said it would change the neighborhood character. He said if that were not the case they would have added stories to their buildings in Pioneer Square; they have lived within the guidelines.

Mr. Rolluda agreed with comments and said that financial responsibility is not part of the board's purview; he is concerned about blockage of sunlight into the park. He noted percentage of penthouse coverage and said 50% is maximum. He said that height limits are going over, and a variance would be needed. He said what is proposed opens the gate for precedence; he cited SMC 23.66.140 C 3. He said the board has seen applicants who have provided evidence that what they proposed was minimally visible from 300' and this is not minimally visible.

Mr. Phillips said that they have had two-day light studies conducted and even without trees there is minimal shading. He said with trees, there is no impact.

Mr. Rolluda said one needs to be able to see the blue sky.

Ms. Nashem asked if they had anything in writing from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Mr. Phillips said he has talked with Alison Brooks and Nicholas Vann; they encouraged him to talk to Sarah Sodt, City Historic Preservation Officer, and Genna.

Ms. Nashem said she hasn't discussed this with them but with Johnson Plumbing Building although they said they don't initiate delisting, when the District is re-evaluated they will consider recommending delisting. NPS makes the determination and has in the past delisted building seven without DAHP recommendation. She noted change in status of Norfin and Cannery buildings.

Mr. Rolluda left at 10:30 am.

Mr. Donckers applauded applicants' desire to convert use to market rate residential. He noted the struggle to get past the one-story issue and said he would read up on it.

He said the board doesn't look at economic feasibility. He said seismic is important and he asked if the applicants' position is that seismic upgrade is tied to additional height.

Mr. Phillips said the financial realities are a way to justify the cost. He said the buildings can be upgraded without additions, but they want as much height as possible to allow them to pay for it.

Ms. Glenn said that the additions are part of the seismic solution and in a way, they are tied together. It is an efficient solution.

Mr. Donckers said that size has nothing to do with upgrades. He asked if it is their position that four-stories is essential.

Carol O'Donnell said what is proposed is a substantial change to the building.

Mr. Morrison cited the SMC 23.66.100 which states, '...to return unproductive structures to useful purposes;'. He said to achieve a return to productive purposes, seismic is needed.

Mr. Graham said it is not limited to seismic; other systems are deficient, and it is a cost issue.

Ms. O'Donnell requested a list of deficiencies.

Applicants directed board to page 9 in packet.

Mr. Alsobrook said it is irrelevant, it has to be done anyway.

Mr. Phillips said that significant deficiencies need to be addressed. He said there is significant cost and life safety. He said their proposal goes beyond that.

Mr. Donckers asked if Code mentions that is allowed.

Mr. Morrison cited SMC 23.66.100 A, intent of District. He said the Johnson Plumbing Building is in a different context; it doesn't mean the same will be done here.

Mr. Phillips cited SMC 23.66.100 C (4) "...will continue to enhance the District's economic climate."

Ms. Curran asked about the formal study on shade impact.

Mr. Graham said it is in the appendix.

Ms. Glen noted it is pages 50-53.

Ms. O'Donnell appreciated the work done for the addition. She noted concern about the possible loss of contributing status and said that would be significant. She

reiterated Mr. Rolluda's comment about board purview and noted the Code, District Rules take priority.

Ms. Curran agreed and said she will closely read materials to inform her decision.

Mr. Alsobrook asked who handles the district designation.

Ms. Nashem said the designation is through the State office and National Park Service. Pioneer Square Preservation Board has jurisdiction, not the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Ms. O'Donnell said it appears that many board members want to review materials more closely.

Ms. Nashem said board wanted a summary of examples shown.

Mr. Morrison said it is a complex issue and it is fair to mull it over. He said they can put together a narrative on how they think this meets the Code. He said a lot of discretion from the board is required on how to stitch this together.

Mr. Graham said examples were provided that were approved but are not all good examples.

032118.5 BOARD BUSINESS

032118.6 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Dean Kralios, Chair

032118.7 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Ms. Nashem noted that the 255 King hearing is done but the Hearing Examiner has yet to make a ruling.

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227