



The City of Seattle

Pioneer Square Preservation Board

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

PSB 358/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, November 4, 2015

Board Members

Ryan Hester, Chair
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Kyle Kiser
Marcus Pearson
Tija Petrovich

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mark Astor
Ann Brown
Willie Parish

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

110415.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
October 21, 2015

110415.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110415.11 **Florentine**
Bravo
520 First Ave S

Ms. Petrovich recused herself.

Installation of signage

ARC Report from Oct 14, 2015: Mr. Kralios reported that the applicant did not attend the ARC review. ARC thought that there were more signs in the window that were not included in the application and that a photo looking straight on to the storefront would be needed to consider all the signage. ARC also thought there were a lot of words on the A-board compared to typical A-boards and wanted to know why the applicant thought they were necessary. They also noted that only the condo owner signed the application and not the representative from the condo association. The ARC said they needed more information

from the applicant to consider the application and tabled it pending submission of the applicant. The applicant did not attend ARC on Oct 28.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem reported that the Condo Association president has now signed the application. She said the applicant originally applied for a sandwich board but she noticed a blade sign had been installed without approval. The building has a sign plan for white banners on existing brackets however the design, other colors and letter size has to be approved. In the past the building and the board have approved an alternative background in black and an alternative design of a neon blade sign.

Applicant Comment:

Paul Zuckerman explained the request for a blade sign/ vinyl banner at the top of the entryway similar to adjacent signage; a sandwich board; and window signage. He said the window signage are images of completed projects and there are multiple signs in the window.

Banner

Responding to questions he said that the vinyl banner will attach to existing brackets; he said he didn't know the size.

Mr. Kralios read from the District Rules that a non-illuminated sign could be up to eight square feet.

Mr. Zuckerman said he made the banner in accordance with what was there. He provided a sample of the slightly stretched 10 ounce vinyl.

A-Board

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Zuckerman said the color proofs are exact matches; lime on black field exterior grade vinyl. The A-Board is 32" x 24" weatherproof vinyl / laminate over foam core; there will be only one and it will come in at the end of each day.

Window signs / Transparency

Mr. Zuckerman said that hanging signs printed on large offset print will be on the inside of window area in some of the windows.

Mr. Hester asked how long they have been up.

Mr. Zuckerman said they have been up four months now.

Mr. Kiser asked about the relation to the other signage on the façade in photos provided. Mr. Zuckerman indicated on the photos and said they are showing examples of their work.

Mr. Hester asked if they had considered an interior display of their actual products that is not window mounted.

Mr. Zuckerman said there are lots of samples in the window and inside the space but it is barren without the signs.

Mr. Hester said the District has strict transparency regulations.

Mr. Zuckerman said they are free-hanging and are not against the windows; they are inset about 4 – 6”.

Mr. Kralios said the paperwork has no indication of the size of the signage or the size of the window.

Mr. Zuckerman said he can provide the information to Ms. Nashem. He said they don't take up the full window area.

Mr. Kralios asked the percentage of walk-in clientele.

Mr. Zuckerman said it was zero before he started but in this space he has had at least a dozen.

Mr. Kiser asked about the screen behind the sign.

Mr. Zuckerman said the space was previously used as an art gallery and the screens are Japanese style shades that sit about 2' back and were left in the space.

Ms. Nashem confirmed the screens were never approved.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios said that the blade sign is consistent with other blade signs on the building.

Mr. Hester agreed and said the color and reuse of existing attachment is okay.

Mr. Kralios said that the A-board is smaller than the maximum size allowed. He said he likes the tie in with the blade sign. He said that it is not overly busy but that the amount of text is distracting.

Mr. Hester said the color of the A-Board ties in with the blade sign. He thought the amount of text was okay. He said that the font, color, and layout are compatible.

Mr. Kralios said he struggled to see how the window signage fits the District Rules. He said it takes up lots of transparency into the space. He said there is no rationale for the three large signs but that he could support a consolidated effort in one window.

Mr. Hester agreed and noted that he didn't have specifics on the window signage and suggested tabling that portion of the application and having the applicant come back with samples, measurements of the window and the signs, as well as look at other options. He said that all neighboring businesses are held to the same criteria.

Mr. Kiser agreed with Mr. Hester on tabling the window signage. He said that the screens and extra signage are not allowed per the District Rules. He said that he could be in favor of

a more consolidated plan in one window but it is difficult to evaluate without seeing the details.

Mr. Kralios said that the location and size prevents transparency the District Rules require.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Zuckerman said he had a problem with concerns raised and said transparency is a subjective issue. He said that there is much visibility into space and that it is better for people to view something aesthetically pleasing rather than vacant space. He noted other businesses with items hanging in the windows. He said his windows are beautiful compared to what else that is seen in Pioneer Square.

Mr. Kralios said that in the strictest interpretation of the Rules it wouldn't be allowed at all.

Mr. Zuckerman said he would bring in photos of others in violation of the transparency regulations.

Mr. Hester said he appreciated the feedback. He said that the board is required under Code to uphold the District Rules and transparency is a key component of the Rules. He encouraged the applicant to come back with alternative sign plan as it relates to the District Rules. He said that there is some flexibility in the Rules and the board would work with him. He asked for a motion for the blade and A-Board signs and tabling the window signage.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Installation of an A-board and a blade sign as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 4, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

District Rules: XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

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

A. Transparency Regulations

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

F. Sandwich Board Signs (A-frame signs) shall follow adopted Pioneer Square sandwich board signs regulations:

Sandwich board signs shall be located directly in front of the business frontage either next to the building face or at the street side of the sidewalk by newsstands, street lights or other amenities. Signs shall not impair pedestrian flow. (12/94)

Sandwich board signs shall be limited to one per address. When multiple businesses, including upper floor businesses, share a common entrance, a single shared sign shall be used, rather than multiple, individual signs. Such signs shall be limited to one per entrance to the shared location. (7/03)

Sandwich board signs shall occupy the sidewalk only during business hours and cannot be chained to trees, parking meters, etc. (12/94)

Sandwich board signs shall:

1. Comply with all other regulations for signs in Pioneer Square. (12/94)
2. Be a minimum of two feet high and a maximum of four feet high. (12/94)
3. Be a maximum of two and one half feet wide; (12/94)
4. Be a free-standing A-frame type sign to allow a horizontal component (e.g. chain or bar) between 3 to 8 inches above the ground on all four sides. This chain or bar accommodates high winds and sight impaired persons. (12/94)
5. Be prohibited from containing neon in any form. (12/94)
6. Have letter size restricted to 10 inches in height. (7/03)
7. Have the consent of the property owner prior to submittal to the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. (12/94)

SMC23.66.160 Signs

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

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

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

- c. The possibility of physical damage to the structure and the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure desirable architectural features or details of the structure (the method of attachment shall be approved by the Director);
 - d. The relationship of the proposed colors and graphics with the colors of the building and with other approved signs on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - e. The relationship of the proposed sign with existing lights and lighting standards, and with the architectural and design motifs of the building;
 - f. Whether the proposed sign lighting will detract from the character of the building; and
 - g. The compatibility of the colors and graphics of the proposed sign with the character of the District.
3. Signs not attached to structures shall be compatible with adjacent structures and with the District generally.
6. Projecting signs and neon signs may be recommended only if the Preservation Board determines that all other criteria for permitted signs have been met and that historic precedent, locational or visibility concerns of the business for which the signing is proposed warrant such signing.

MM/SC/DK/KK 3:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Petrovich recused herself.

110415.12

Seattle Hardware Building

Capital One
83 S King St

Ms. Petrovich recused herself.

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawing for the changes and noted it was verified that the sign is not back lit but ARC recommended that they provide more clear drawings.

Staff Report: This sign was approved at a larger size because of the size of the building, and that it was primarily one tenant.

Applicant Comment:

Cindy Thompson explained that existing cabinet will be removed and repainted; neon will be removed and LED letters will be installed. She said the chemical anchors will remain. She said the letters will be halo lit, not back lit. She said the red swoosh is 26 ¼' x 46 ¼'. She said the C is 8 ¾" and the O is 10 ¾". She said the new letters will set off the cabinet 1 – 2".

Mr. Kiser said that ARC had requested clarification that the letters are not backlit.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules and said that just the light component is being changed. He noted that there is no change or impact to the District or building or the overall sign plan.

Mr. Kralios said that it is basically an in-kind replacement and the attachment remains the same.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for changes to the sign as proposed

Code Citations:

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 4, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

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)

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)

SMC23.66.160 Signs

- B. To ensure that flags, banners and signs are of a scale, color, shape and type compatible with the Pioneer Square Preservation District objectives stated in [Section 23.66.100](#) and with the character of the District and the buildings in the District, to reduce driver distraction and visual blight, to ensure that the messages of signs are not lost through undue proliferation, and to enhance views and sight lines into and down streets, the overall design of a sign, flag, or banner, including size, shape, typeface, texture, method of attachment, color, graphics and lighting, and the number and location of signs, flags, and banners, shall be reviewed by the Board and are regulated as set out in this [Section 23.66.160](#). Building owners are encouraged to develop an overall signage plan for their buildings.
- C. In determining the appropriateness of signs, including flags and banners used as signs as defined in [Section 23.84A.036](#), the Preservation Board shall consider the following:
 1. Signs Attached or Applied to Structures.
 - a. The relationship of the shape of the proposed sign to the architecture of the building and with the shape of other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - b. The relationship of the texture of the proposed sign to the building for which it is proposed, and with other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - c. The possibility of physical damage to the structure and the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure desirable architectural features or details of the structure (the method of attachment shall be approved by the Director);
 - d. The relationship of the proposed colors and graphics with the colors of the building and with other approved signs on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
 - e. The relationship of the proposed sign with existing lights and lighting standards, and with the architectural and design motifs of the building;
 - f. Whether the proposed sign lighting will detract from the character of the building; and
 - g. The compatibility of the colors and graphics of the proposed sign with the character of the District.

3. Signs not attached to structures shall be compatible with adjacent structures and with the District generally.
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.
6. Projecting signs and neon signs may be recommended only if the Preservation Board determines that all other criteria for permitted signs have been met and that historic precedent, locational or visibility concerns of the business for which the signing is proposed warrant such signing.

MM/SC/DK/KK 3:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Petrovich recused herself.

110415.13

Wayfinding Signs

4th Ave at Jackson St, Washington and Main St

Tabled.

110415.14

Seattle Plumbing/ Johnson Plumbing

Gridiron

Final Design for alterations to existing historic building façade and an 8 story addition and street scape alterations on Occidental Ave S

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings, rendering and product samples and material provided and thought the products and colors differentiated the new addition but were compatible. While the plans for the sidewalk was not initiating the new Occidental plan it was compliant with the District Rules with 2 x 2 scoring and concrete containing lamp black. Mr. Kralios noted that ARC had asked them to come to the full Board with some alternatives to address the heaviness and unwelcoming large blank space of the bulkhead above the residential entry.

Staff Report: The preliminary design was approved in July PSB18915.

Applicant Comment:

Chris Taylor, Hewitt, presented the application via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). He said that general use for the first floor will be restaurant, resident lobby, and back of house services. He said that parking will be behind the masonry façade. He said that new will be differentiated from existing with vision glass and spandrel glass and a couple accent pieces – bays and painted steel cornice and balcony elements. He said that the window wall begins at level 5; the glazing will be neutral with spandrel glass at opaque areas. He said that metal panel framed into wall system will be gunmetal color.

He said the windows at the base will all be new either steel or aluminum in dark bronze. He said that existing windows and louvers will be a light color – Rockwood Shutter Green. He said that they propose a couple concrete bulkheads. He said that a metal wall panel will be

at level 12 terrace and north face of elevator corridor and storefront. He said that windows will be repaired, replaced and openings restored in-kind with new treatment.

He said that the northwest corner will be a combination of new and existing openings. He said the garage door will be a dark bronze anodized color. He noted the residential entry with concrete bulkhead and noted they could impress into the concrete. Responding to questions about entry visibility he said they will come back with lighting proposed for residential entry. He said that the niche on Railroad Avenue will be the entry to two private residences.

Mr. Taylor said that decks will be back of existing parapet. He said the level 6 balconies will have dark bronze rails. He said that the existing parapet cap is not in good shape and they want to remove the existing coping and replace it with precast coping. He said that the existing roof is inaccessible now and he noted the hodge podge of conditions. He said that all venting occurs in the metal panel. He said that they will seismically separate the building from adjacent property and remove portion of the brick wall. He said they will add bronze sheet metal cover to provide separation. He said they will saw cut wall and hand rake any joints. He said that a concrete vehicle barrier will be constructed at the perimeter of parking area; it will be visible only in a couple larger openings.

Mr. Kralios asked for clarification at the roof level why they don't continue with glass.

Mr. Taylor said that the glass rail on 5 is to keep it from competing with the façade; on 6 the picket system fits in with the balcony supports and contributes to the industrial feel.

Ms. Petrovich asked about the ghost signage.

Mr. Taylor said they plan to keep it; they will clean it with as mild a method as possible.

Mr. Kiser noted the alternatives for the bulkhead at the residential entry and asked if a similar alternatives 1 and 2 treatment could carry over to the restaurant entry.

Mr. Taylor said yes that it makes sense to carry over the treatment.

Ms. Petrovich asked if they preferred Alternative 1 or 2.

David Hewitt said they prefer a smooth panel and incised name above.

Mr. Kralios thanked the applicants for exploring options and said they are moving in the right direction with alternatives 1 and 2. He asked if they looked at reducing the size of the bulkhead.

Mr. Taylor said there is some mechanical venting coming out of the soffit and that is one reason they dropped the concrete below the slab.

Mr. Kralios said to minimize the concrete to what is needed and to give some height back to the niche space.

Mr. Hewitt said they could set it back and create a shadow line.

Mr. Kralios said it makes sense and would be compatible with the district. He said to keep the concrete and keep it honest and to the bare minimum.

Ms. Petrovich asked if the sidewalk would be 2 x 2 and with lampblack. She asked how this would work with the Waterfront and Occidental Promenade plans.

Mr. Taylor said it would and noted it will be there until those two projects are implemented.

Public Comment:

Liz Stenning spoke in support of increased residential and the opportunity for more home ownership. She said the design fits well in the neighborhood.

Maria Barrientos said it is a wonderful design and a great addition.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules. He noted the signage and lighting were excluded from this application.

Mr. Kralios said that the selection of materials are appropriate and contrast with historic fabric. He noted the composition and articulation of the bays. He said he appreciated that the addition is confined within the existing building footprint. He said it is excellent that they are maintaining as much historic fabric as possible and that the design is sensitive to original openings.

Mr. Kiser said the material is tasteful and compatible. He appreciated the designers' response to ARC comments. Regarding the cornice replacement he said that it is deteriorated and requires replacement; in-kind with architectural character of building is acceptable. He said that the design is great and the concrete bulkheads are the right direction.

Mr. Hester agreed. He appreciated the materials, fenestration, and reclamation of building openings. He said the materials and colors are good and appropriate. He said this is a great example in relating to others in the area. He appreciated the sensitivity to the original design intent of the building and the evolution to modern. He said that depending on how Railroad Avenue evolves some street fixtures may be adjusted. He said the niche / nook is a unique detail of the building. He said that the entrance to residential is a covered recess and noted safety and security issues so lighting will be important.

Ms. Petrovich appreciated the care and concern as well as the repair of the lower portion. She cited 23.66.180 and said that especially alternative B is a wonderful job that relates to the adjacent buildings. She said it is a beautifully proposed package.

Mr. Kralios said it is a transitional property and gateway to the district. He said it is a nice entry point to the district and said that there has been much change and there is more to come.

Ms. Nashem said that lighting and signage will come back for another Certificate of Approval.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Final Design for alterations to existing historic building façade and an 8 story addition and street scape alterations on Occidental Ave S. The following conditions have been attached to the Certificate of Approval:

To break down the solid massing of the bulkhead above the residential and storefront entries, this area will be used for signage as shown in the attachment. The applicant will submit a follow-up application for signage which will include specifics including letter size.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 4, 2015 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code citation:

Seattle Municipal Code

23.66.140 – Height

A. Maximum Height. Maximum structure height is regulated by Section 23.49.178 Pioneer Square Mixed, structure height.

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.

District Rules for the Pioneer Square Preservation District

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99) New construction must be visually compatible with the predominant architectural styles, building materials and inherent historic character of the District. (7/99) Although new projects need not attempt to duplicate original facades, the design process ought to involve serious consideration of the typical historic building character and detail within the District.

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

A. Site. The property line is the line of the building mass. Street facades are uniformly located at the front property lines, thus there is a strong street edge definition. Building cornices, bay windows and ornament project beyond the main wall surface of some facades.

B. Design. Building design is generally typified by horizontal divisions which create distinctive base and cap levels. Facades may also be divided vertically by pilasters or wide piers which form repetitive window bays. Street facades are also distinguished by heavy terminal cornices and parapets, ornamental storefronts and entrance bays and repetitive window sizes and placement.

C. Building Materials. The most common facing materials are brick masonry and cut or rusticated sandstone, with limited use of terra cotta and tile. Wooden window sash, ornamental sheet metal, carved stone and wooden or cast iron storefronts are also typically used throughout the District. Synthetic stucco siding materials are generally not permitted. (7/99)

D. Color. Building facades are primarily composed of varied tones of red brick masonry or gray sandstone. Unfinished brick, stone, or concrete masonry unit surfaces may not be painted. Painted color is typically applied to wooden window sash, sheet metal ornament and wooden or cast iron storefronts. Paint colors shall be appropriate to ensure compatibility within the District. (7/99)

E. Building Base. Buildings are allowed a base of approximately 18-24 inches. Base materials should be concrete, sandstone, or granite, and may be poured, cut to fit or unit-paved. The color relationship between the sidewalk and building must be considered. Brick or tile materials should not be used except when existing walks are of the same material.

G. Street Paving. Streets within the District are to be paved according to standard Engineering Department practices with a weaving coat of asphalt concrete.

H. Curbs. Where granite curbing presently exists, it will be the required replacement material. In other instances the same concrete and lampblack mixture used for the sidewalk will be used.

XV. STREET LIGHTING

The three-globe Chief Seattle bronze base light fixture currently used in the District will be the approved street lighting standard. Additional alternative lighting standards and fixtures that are compatible with the historic character of the District may be approved by the Board for installation in conjunction with three-globe fixtures as needed to improve pedestrian-level lighting and public safety. (7/03)

XVII. SIDEWALK TREATMENT

A. Standards

Sidewalk paving and improvements shall be completed with one pound lamp-black per cubic yard of concrete, scored at two-foot intervals. This material shall be used for all projects of 1/4 block or greater size. On small projects, if it is feasible, sidewalk material may be selected as for all projects of 1/4 block or greater size. On small projects, if it is feasible, sidewalk material may be selected to match adjacent sidewalks in color, pattern and texture.

110415.2

PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

110415.21

Cannery Workers Building

213 S Main

Briefing regarding new construction retaining portions of the existing building

Sean Ludvikson presented the briefing (full PowerPoint report in DON file). Following is an overview and board questions and comments. He reported they will maintain existing façade remnants, restoring masonry, but will remove alley façade south of that and roof and floor structures. He went over proposed demolition. He said that the south bearing wall is shared with a neighbor building and work will be coordinated with that neighbor. He said they will remove the existing divided window system because it is structural and will replace it in-kind with matching profiles. He said they will retain the base and introduce 40 new residential units on eight levels with a rooftop terrace and penthouse. He said they would maintain the pieces of existing façade remnants and would recall the warehouse character. He said that cornice treatments will be at 4th floor and 7/8. He said that between 8 and 9 it will be recessed 1' from plane and architectural lighter material will be used. He said that mechanical penthouse will be recessed 30' back from the street face façade. He said they would respect the center bay arched element on the 2nd Avenue extension. He said that exhaust will come through windows. He said that on S. Main they will use slightly more articulated mullions to contribute to expression at the top of the balding form. He said they will wrap the cornice around the corner on the west side. He said that the on the south façade would be panelized cladding that would transition to thin stone panel. He said they will remove the seismic load on the design and that they would put large windows at the residential core. He provided an overview of proposed materials. He said they propose to use over 21% of the rooftop area most of which will be occupied by roof top terrace.

Ms. Nashem said that the board can allow up to 25% coverage.

Mr. Ludvikson said that they would asked for a setback modification. He said they plan to use an auto elevator and will have no drive ramp. He said the residential entrance will be off Main Street with retail entrances on other facades. He requested board input on their approach to the rehab of façade remnants, input on design composition, input on departure requests, and input on if anything is out of compliance.

Public Comment:

Nick Lucio, district resident, said the building would be out of scale with the neighborhood and it would not be compatible for the neighborhood. He said the building is contributing and what is proposed doesn't meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. He said the scale is way off.

Liz Stenning, Alliance for Pioneer Square, spoke in support of more residential and said it would be a great addition. She noted the importance of alleyways and the alley programs in the district.

Board Comments:

Mr. Kralios said the building is non-contributing to the National Register and is considered a ruin. He noted the more recent important local history of the building. He said that in general he liked the direction the design was taking. He said the base, middle and top is difficult with the existing historical base because of its scale it is hard to get a proportional base. He said the lower cornice might not be working and suggested having the historic base be the base and the last two levels at the top be the top. He noted how the horizontals between the windows are being expressed with the dominant vertical and interstitial datum lines and said to mitigate the verticality with horizontal.

Mr. Ludvikson asked if metal would be allowed as cladding.

Mr. Kralios said the board can review on a case by case basis. He said that it is progressing nicely. He said that regarding departures 15% roof coverage is allowed outright and they are asking for 21%.

Mr. Ludvikson said there are itemized components in the packet. He said they aren't able to enclose the mechanical to the east within structure. He said they want to bring double use to the penthouse area.

Ms. Nashem said that per Code solar collectors can be a maximum height of 7 feet and set back 10 feet; the proposed panel would be over that height but it would be functioning as a canopy. She said that because it is attached to the building it counts as part of the building and the set back is measured from that edge of the building. A modification to the setback would be needed if after review from 300 feet determined that it was minimally visible.

Mr. Kralios said that given where it is located on the roof he would support it because it is not visible from the sidewalk.

Mr. Kiser asked if photo voltaic would work in that location.

Mr. Kralios said that further analysis is needed on the photo voltaic – the ground floor plan and where the stair exists. He said that the entrance seems deeper than necessary and there are public safety issues with that; he said to study that further.

Mr. Kiser said the 2nd cornice is not effective. He questioned the way the horizontals will be in the future and how the building would compete scale wise. He noted the base, middle, and top on non-primary facades should be carried through because the parking lot to the south side makes it very visible. He noted the care in wrapping the cornice line but not on base. He said that materially it is not successful.

Mr. Kralios asked if they plan to reuse the alley brick and extend around the corner as well.

Mr. Ludvikson said that they could study that and noted that they wanted to establish a clean break between old and new in a clear way.

Ms. Petrovich said they do have a clean break but it looks unfinished.

Mr. Hester said he understands that they are trying to differentiate the old from the new and suggested giving more thought at what happens at that corner.

Ms. Petrovich said that as proposed it almost seems ghost like. She said there is a strong historic base but she didn't see a middle or top; it doesn't look like its strong neighbors. It looks almost as if the new was stuck on top of the base.

Mr. Kralios said one of the keys with the precast is to study joints and how they come together and carrying across any datum lines.

Mr. Hester said that the board has touched on the rehab of the façade, the precast panels, the use of the east and north facades potentially or investigate the use of historic materials as it wraps that alley northwest corner.

Mr. Kiser clarified that the building is non-contributing in the National Register but that locally there is cultural historic significance here.

Ms. Nashem said that per the Code demolition is prohibited unless it is determined there is no architectural or historic significance; in this case the proposal voluntarily keeps the façade, but the board could have required it and they can determine that parts of the façade require retention.

Mr. Kralios said they would need an analysis or window survey to determine if they can be repaired before replacing them.

Mr. Hester said it would be nice to have more design response to the general proportions of the windows – the horizontal mullions and relationship to the vertical.

Mr. Kiser noted the cornice line is not as embellished as the neighboring buildings but they were planning on that portion of the facade being demolished and replaced. He suggested look at removing the middle cornice.

Mr. Ludvikson said there is fairly minimal coping now. He said that it is a challenge with higher retail elevation because it impacts the height of the residential windows.

Departures:

15% roof coverage allowed up to 25%

Need more design consideration / substantiation on placement of photo voltaic

Horizontal mullion layout

West façade wrap the northwest corner

Create more base-middle-top deferring to the original building.

Consider the depth of the residential entry

Maria Barrientos said they will replicate the divided light windows above the storefront. She noted the difficulty in restoration of metal and get the energy rating. She said they can replicate the windows to look exactly the same and will get energy rating.

Mr. Ludvikson said there will be steel windows on 2nd Extension S. and wood on Main which will reflect the two eras.

Ms. Nashem said that the Board has said more information is needed about restoration, replication and alternatives such as a second pane of glass behind restored windows before the Board could make a recommendation. She noted that the survey will provide more information.

Mr. Hester said more information and a good survey of windows and materials are needed.

110415.3 BOARD BUSINESS

110415.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

110415.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227