



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 166/18

MINUTES for Wednesday June 20, 2018

Board Members

Adam Alsobrook
Lynda Collie
Kianoush Curran
Carol O'Donnell, Vice Chair
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Brendan Donckers
Dean Kralios, Chair

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

062018.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
May 2, 2018
MM/SC/AR/LC 4:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Rolluda abstained.

062018.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

062018.11 Fobes Building
558 1st Ave S

Installation of signage

Sebastian Stafford explained the application for window stickers and a sandwich board.

ARC Report: Ms. O'Donnell reported that the applicant explained he would move forward with the Option 2 in the packet for the window signage. She said he also provided an A-board sign design. ARC thought that the application complied with transparency, letter height and size requirements and ARC recommended approval. She

said the 20" x 36" A-board meets the requirements and the stickers comply with the regulations. She said they are replacing a non-conforming design.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem said the applicant confirmed with a photo that they have removed the unapproved signage.

Mr. Rolluda said it meets the Guidelines and the applicant presented two options and is moving ahead with option 2.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of a vinyl sign in two windows and an A-board sign placed next to the building at the entrance.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 20, 2018 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

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)

A. Transparency Regulations

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

B. General Signage Regulations

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

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs not hide, damage or obscure the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than signs. (8/93)

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

C. Specific Signage Regulations

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

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

062018.12

Interurban Building

102 – 104 Occidental Ave S

Installation of signage per the sign plan
Alterations of the storefront

Steve Bull explained the proposed storefront alterations are needed to accommodate the new use as restaurant. He proposed new signage in the sign band and a new blade sign. He went over plans and oriented board members to building and site via photos. He said the door and panel will be replaced with plate glass window to match existing. He said they will replace the sign band with painted plywood consistent with what is there. He said the beveled glass is original; everything below that has been replaced twice. He said the signage on Yesler will be building standard signage. Two plate glass windows will have profile, header, sill detail to match what is there. He said that they will match mullion details.

Mr. Bull said they will replace the picture window on Occidental with bi-fold doors. They kept the doors as narrow as possible to keep is as close to window profiles as possible; the datum glass line across the front is consistent. He said three blade signs are proposed and noted the space occupies two separate addresses.

Ms. Collie asked if it will all be one restaurant.

Mr. Bull said there is one owner but two different operations: 104 will be a daytime lunch counter and the corner will be more a sit-down type restaurant.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem reported the building has a sign plan and what is proposed is consistent with the sign plan and therefore consistent with the regulations. While the District rules do say one blade sign per address they also assume that the business will only have one address in this case the business has two addresses and one of those on a corner. She said the Board might consider that the business has two addresses and that the two addresses appear as two different spaces and that the brackets already exist as there is a sign plan for the building. The Board can also consider “ensure that the messages of signs are not lost through undue proliferation” per SMC23.66.160 signs.

ARC Report: Mr. Rolluda reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and renderings provided, as well as old photos showing that the storefronts had be previously altered. ARC thought that the signage complied with regulations and was consistent with the sign plan for the building. They are applying for three blade signs: two because the business is on a corner and one for the express takeout location that is a different address. ARC requested that for the Board meeting they more clearly demonstrate this situation. They noted that the bracket for the blade sign is already there. ARC reviewed the proposed application for the door to window conversion for the Yesler façade and thought that it was appropriate and consistent with the other storefronts. ARC recommended changing out the plexiglass in the sign band to match the painted wood in the other sign bands. The applicant agreed. ARC discussed the alteration to the Occidental façade. There was some discussion that the doors would look more consistent with the storefronts with a bulkhead at the bottom. ARC discussed that it was not historic material, and that the storefront had already been altered so another change could be more flexible. ARC recommended approval on both the signs and the alterations.

Mr. Alsobrook concurred.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for alterations to the storefronts per the plans attached and installation of three blades signs and signage in the sign band.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 20, 2018 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

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.

SMC23.66.180 Exterior 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.

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)

A. Transparency Regulations

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

B. General Signage Regulations

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

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs not hide, damage or obscure the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than signs. (8/93)

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

C. Specific Signage Regulations

1. Letter Size. Letter size in windows, awnings and hanging signs shall be consistent with the scale of the architectural elements of the building (as per SMC 23.66.160) but shall not exceed a maximum height of 10 inches unless an exception has been approved as set forth in this paragraph.
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)

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:

- 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)

Secretary of Interior Standards

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

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.

Links

[Guidelines for Storefronts](#)

Recommended

Not recommended

<i>Identifying, retaining, and preserving</i> storefronts and their functional and	Altering storefronts and their features which are important in defining the
---	---

<p>decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. The storefront materials (including wood, masonry, metals, ceramic tile, clear glass, and pigmented structural glass) and the configuration of the storefront are significant, as are features, such as display windows, base panels, bulkheads, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, piers, and entablatures.</p>	<p>overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished. Replacing historic storefront features instead of repairing or replacing only the deteriorated material.</p>
--	---

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

062018.13 Century Link annex building

800 Occidental Ave S

Installation of roof top antennas for Verizon

Tabled by the applicant.

062018.14 Frye Hotel Building

223 Yesler Way

Replacement of windows

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and the samples provided. ARC indicated that they would need to read the window survey thoroughly to understand the condition of the windows and they were not able to open the document that was provided via drop box. The ARC also suggested that if one side of the building is worse than the others that the applicant should highlight that for the Board. ARC requested more information of their exploration of a repair alternative. The applicant also discussed that this was part of a larger project that would include some internal building systems repair, such as heating and although the building has had some retrofit there may be additional work required. ARC indicated that this was not a decision that would be taken lightly. They discussed in general the common dilemma of maintenance needs and weather and the experience with the proposed windows and windows repairs. The applicant will try to resend the Drop box or send the PDF in smaller batches. ARC did not make a recommendation pending necessary information.

Staff Report: The windows with the exception of a few noted on the survey are original windows. The applicant recognizes that the preferred method in the Secretary of Interior’s Standards is to repair before replace. The Board will need to consider if the survey shows that replacement is necessary based on the condition of the windows. The Board should consider not only the rating of the windows but what those ratings mean. For example, if the windows are rated as poor because it needs to be painted, or if it is

rated poor because there is rot and a good portion of the window elements would have to be replaced in order to repair it.

While the board has reviewed several projects that are replacements of replacement windows and projects that have repaired existing windows such as the recent Union Gospel Mission, replacing original windows is rare. When it has occurred, it has been after an extensive survey indicating the condition of the windows warranted it. If the project is using State Funds or Federal Funds, the State Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation will review the project. The project has not been referred to them yet.

The Board questions are:

Is the replacement of the windows warranted per the Secretary of Interior's Standards? If so, is the proposed window replacement product consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards? And/or is the alternative material for the windows "compatible with adjacent or original uses" per code 23.66.180?

Brian Johnson, Environmental Works, explained they have changed their proposal since the ARC presentation. They now propose to install new windows on the back side of the building and refurbish windows on the public-facing side.

Jill Davies, LIHI, said they have owned the building since 1998. They provide units for low-income residents, many elderly and disabled. She noted the economics of maintaining the building.

Mr. Johnson said the meeting with ARC was good and he understands the board mission of preservation of historic resources. He said they want to reduce the ongoing maintenance costs while being a good steward of the building. He said new windows would go on south (back) and west (alley) sides of building which are not visible. He said the north and east sides are visible and windows there will be refurbished. He said the scope is to replace all windows on 2nd to 11th floors on south and west sides with fiberglass clad windows.

Ms. O'Donnell asked about muntins shown on the example.

Mr. Johnson proposed double hung to match existing windows; they will place in window opening and retain sill material, so it will be identical to what is there.

Ms. O'Donnell asked about metal sill covers.

Mr. Johnson said there will be a mix; they will have to see the condition when the windows are pulled out.

Ms. O'Donnell said NPS Brief #9 does not support metal covers.

Mr. Alsobrook said the window sill painting appears to have been done before and it is not the best practice.

Mr. Johnson said it traps water and causes problems. He said they looked at historic regulations which recommend replacement if respectful. He said they will refurbish east and north windows. He said they will make upgrades to tenant rooms which are really basic; the mission is to get people off the street. He said they will do exterior terracotta and brick cleanup. He said the building will look better and perform better with new windows; he said the. He went over window survey and noted the condition on north and east sides as pretty good.

Ms. O'Donnell asked if the fiberglass can be painted.

Mr. Johnson said yes but that he would double check. He said the material color is integral, so it will wear well. Responding to questions he said the reflectivity of glass will be as close to existing as possible while using insulated glass.

Ms. Nashem suggested a detailed scope of work for the proposed windows repairs on the on the north and east be submitted to her to provide documentation on proposed repairs.

Mr. Alsobrook asked about color.

Mr. Johnson said green; a material sample was provided.

Mr. Rolluda asked about glazing spacer.

Mr. Johnson said it will be black all the way around.

There was discussion about lack of clarity about at what point does rehab and repair become new. Wood windows are a character defining element of the building, especially on the primary façade.

Mr. Alsobrook said that not-for-profits, community service organizations are not afforded the same incentives that other building owners have access to. He said that there used to be a taller building where the garage is now; the alley and south elevations are secondary as architecturally intended. He said this unit is appropriate for this instance on non-primary facades with weather exposure. He noted the applicant will be looking at removal of south and west façade coating.

Mr. Johnson said they got a WOOFI analysis and it noted a problem.

Mr. Alsobrook complimented the applicant and owner for the willing to discuss with the board.

Ms. Curran agreed.

Mr. Rolluda asked if all the windows on the courtyard are included.

Mr. Johnson said yes.

Ms. O'Donnell noted that more detailed scope of work for north and east façades. is needed and should be submitted to staff for review and final approval.

Action: I move to recommend a Certificate of Approval for replacing windows on the south and west façades as the Board finds that the survey and inventory indicate that the extent of the repair on these façades are deteriorated beyond repair; windows on north and east façades will be rehabilitated and reinstalled; with conditioned detailed plan/specifications for rehabilitation and restoration of windows on north and east façades be submitted to staff. The Board finds that the substitute material is compatible in design with the existing windows.

SMC23.66.180 Exterior 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.

Secretary of Interior Standards

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

Recommended

Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair (if the overall form and detailing are still evident) using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the feature or when the replacement can be based on historic documentation. If using the same kind of material is not feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Not Recommended

Removing a character-defining window **that is unrepairable or is not needed for the new use and blocking up the opening or replacing it with a new window that does not match.** Using substitute material for the replacement that does not convey the same appearance of the surviving components of the window or that is physically incompatible.

MM/SC/AA/KC

5:0:0 Motion carried.

062018.2 PRELIMINARY DESIGN BRIEFINGS

**062018.21 Fisher Building
115 S Jackson**

Rehabilitation of the existing building.

Greg Shiffler presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). Following are board and public questions and comments.

Mr. Shiffler said they are trying for Federal Tax credits; they will limit the height of the building and sight lines. He said the west façade is where all the action is in terms of interventions. He indicated that the primary Art Deco façade treatment turns the corner into the alley. He went over concept for penthouse residential units and said they propose just under 50% coverage which complies with District Rules.

Mr. Shear said the massing of the penthouse is removed from the parapet to indicate separation. He said they are sensitive that there is a building across the alley and the configuration allows units to gain southern light but also have privacy. He said the guard rail design has not been developed yet. He said they are looking at Corten cladding, similar to what was approved for stair tower; it is good color and patina match.

Mr. Shiffler said they propose small storefronts; any modifications to street level will be underneath existing headers.

The applicant explained the alley fenestration approach and said they will do header construction for three new openings. He explained which openings will be new and which will be opening filled-in openings and went over plan showing windows to be replaced and those to be refurbished. He said they will restore all windows on the front façade. The alley façade is a hodge-podge of windows. He said a proposed storm water planter on the rear alley is on private property.

Ms. Nashem said they need to document the condition of windows.

Mr. Shear said they want feedback / input on how to remove the steel sash windows because they are mudded in.

Mr. Shiffler said the areas with windows being repurposed at doorways, they want to re-use the windows on site; he indicated where windows would be re-used.

Thomas noted that the difficulty of taking out steel sash windows at 419 and said they may need to restore in place and waterproof. He said they are open to options and are interested in board input. He indicated new infill on south elevation and asked if they should put in a window to match adjacent or a modern one.

Mr. Shiffler said ARC though the proposed balcony on the south side was too large, so they made it smaller; installation will be through mortar joints. He noted page 37

and asked board preference for steel or concrete lintel; ARC noted preference for steel.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if all new openings on the west façade are punched.

Mr. Shiffler said yes.

Mr. Alsobrook said he supported punched openings with concealed lintels; otherwise it is faux historicism. He said modern treatment in modern opening should be minimal, discrete, and should disappear.

Ms. O'Donnell and Mr. Rolluda concurred.

Mr. Shiffler said the planted element is on private property; it will provide nice greenery, conceal addition next door, and is required for storm water management.

Mr. Alsobrook said concrete is suggested and referenced in Board Guidelines; it fits in nice with industrial scale and character – especially here with the railroad dock, right of way. He noted the utilitarian and straightforward design and said he supported it.

Ms. O'Donnell agreed.

Mr. Shiffler said the transformer vault is nearby.

Mr. Alsobrook said removing steel windows will be difficult without destroying them – the sash could be racked. He said they were state of the art in 1910-20 but not how we construct them today; they had no waterproofing then. He questioned if we have justification to re-use salvage for new window opening and said to be clear in the approach. He said too much moving around of historic material is not good. He said the changes are sympathetic to the building and he noted the integrity on some façades – secondary and tertiary are not as good. He noted the deliberate attention to meeting the needs of 2018 and advised the team to be realistic in their intentions.

Mr. Shiffler said they will do preliminary design – bulk, mass, scale – first and will come back with finer detail.

Mr. Alsobrook noted to be mindful of SOI Standards.

Chris said that all windows need to be removed – openings are being enlarged and windows will be re-set.

Mr. Shiffler said they are also changing the building program; there will be loss of historic material and they want to be honest about what they are doing. Thomas said it is critical in current retail environment to have retail access points. He asked if they could make transoms in style of steel sash window.

Mr. Alsobrook said to do a window survey and to get as close as they can with steel windows and analyze their condition.

Chris asked if they could use modern windows if the steel sash is too deteriorated; he asked about relocation of original window to a new opening.

Mr. Alsobrook cited NPS Preservation Brief #13.

Mr. Rolluda said he hopes for Corten for the penthouse.

Board members concurred.

Mr. Shiffler said the prospective tenant for the Schoenfeld space wants to create a coiled roll up door in the historic window that wraps primary façade into the alley. He said it is a historic window from the period of significance.

The Board agreed that it was not appropriate; The storefront wraps around the side and is considered part of the primary façade and the window is of historic materials.

Mr. Shiffler said they have suggested using the existing door just south of the window.

The Board agreed that was appropriate access to the space.

062018.3 BOARD BUSINESS

062018.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Dean Kralios, Chair

062018.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227