



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 200/15

MINUTES for Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Board Members

Mark Astor
Ann Brown
Evan Bue
Ryan Hester, Chair
Dean Kralios, Vice Chair
Willie Parish
Marcus Pearson
Tija Petrovich

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

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

071515.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

June 17, 2015

MM/SC/AB/TP

6:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Parish
abstained.

071515.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071515.21 Lucknow Building

Uber—Support Center
217 2nd Ave. S.

Tabled.

071515.22 Tashiro Building

Caffé Vita/Via Tribulani
217 2nd Avenue S.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Install sidewalk café

Staff Report: Caffé Vita/Via Tribulani previously had a Certificate of Approval for installation of a sidewalk café with platform but the sidewalk café platform was not installed and the COA has now expired. The Board has approved planter boxes when the applicant has provided a maintenance plan.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and renderings shown. ARC asked for photos or cut sheets of the furniture proposed. They said considering the slope the decking is appropriate, the colors, if painted with matte rather than gloss, and materials were durable and compatible. The restaurant said they would maintain the flower boxes. ARC requested that the applicant provide a drawing that shows the glass prism in the floor plan to confirm that the decking does not affect them. They also requested the drawing be updated to show the cover of the gap below the deck as discussed. ARC thought there was sufficient space for pedestrians. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Jihan said they received approval previously for a sidewalk café at Prefontaine and Washington streets but time ran out. She went over proposed drawings of the sidewalk café that will run along the façade of the business. She said there is a grade change so the south end will have a platform; access will be on center to business. She said they will provide 20 seats. She said they shrunk the planters to miss the footprint of the prism lights in the sidewalk. She provided information that SDOT had done a retrofit of the sidewalk and.

Ms. Brown said that the sidewalk is listed on the inventory as historic.

Jihan said the post locations are illustrated on the plan and they will add a cedar planks skirt which will allow water to move through without trash. She provided a plant maintenance plan. She said the planters will be wider cedar planks than the deck and with a 20% gloss. She went through material samples and showed the round bistro tables and a marble top table and chairs.

Chris McDonald, owner, said that at their Georgetown location they gang the furniture together at night rather than bring it in each night and wanted to do that here.

Mr. Kralios said if they find there is a problem then he could bring it in.

Mr. Hester said he preferred the furniture be brought in at night.

Public Comment: Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square said the café will activate the street and was very much needed.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Brown asked if there were umbrellas, awnings or sandwich board.

Mr. McCormack said no umbrellas or awnings but they have a sandwich board.

Mr. Hester said that this is a great example of sidewalk café; it is appropriate for the building, storefront and compatible with the façade. He said that the materials are durable and there are no impacts to the building or prism lights. He said it meets the Guidelines.

Ms. Petrovich said she appreciated the maintenance plan.

Mr. Kralios said it is consistent with the Guidelines and the materials are high quality and compatible.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of a side walk café as proposed.

Code Citations:

XIII. SIDEWALK CAFES

MM/SC/TP/DK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.23 **Pacific Commercial (Furuya Corgiat) Building**
Flatstick Pub
220 2nd Avenue S., Cellar Suite 101

Change of use to bar and indoor participant sport facility for a brewpub and mini golf establishment

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem explained change of use is not reviewed at ARC and noted while indoor participant sports such as bowling alleys and ice skating rinks are prohibited, mini-golf is not listed as prohibited and is therefore permitted.

Applicant Comment:

Henry Walter explained the proposed use as mini-golf and craft brew pub in the vacant basement.

Sam Largent, owner, explained that the existing condition of the vacant 8800 square foot space is gravel floors. He showed the areaways are open to the space; he said they would like to occupy them with program and would be back for design. He said they plan to use the existing southeast entry. He noted the success with technical group activities and said there is a need for this in the neighborhood. He said they will have two spaces on the main floor – the entry to the basement and a 300 square foot retail spot.

Mr. Walter said an existing opening in the retail space would provide a visual connection to the basement space.

Public Comment:

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, said she has had ongoing contact with the owner and visited his other location; she said it is a lovely business that will be a great addition to the block.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Brown said it is a nice addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Hester said it is in compliance with the code.

Mr. Kralios said he appreciated they would have a street level presence and said it would help activate the area.

Responding to question about the areaways, Ms. Nashem said that the applicant would be back for approval for design.

Mr. Walter said they would like to do separate permit to get started on the areaway design process.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for change of use to bar and indoor participant sport facility for a brewpub and mini golf establishment as presented per:

Code Citations:

23.66.120 - Permitted uses

23.66.122 - Prohibited uses

MM/SC/MP/MA 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.24

Fortson Square

2nd Avenue S and S Yesler Way

Install chain link fence around park area

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the proposal. Barbara Gray, SDOT and Scott Lindsay, Mayor's Office, Gary Johnson, DPD presented. They explained that crime has increase in Fortson Square so they are proposing to install a chain link fence around Fortson Square to help break up the open air drug market established there. They said this had been done at Pine Street and was effective. SDOT said that they would also be cleaning the area and the art work during the time if it is fenced. They would be changing out the lamps in the street lights for brighter light and removing the parking from the street. They will come back for approval to install a bike lane in the future. They said they would continue to work with stakeholders on long term plans to take back the area and prevent the illegal activity from returning. The Lazareth Center would be moving out so without their clientele there would no longer be a cover for those doing illegal activity. They also told about the police program to redirect those involved in criminal activity in some cases. ARC considered chain link fence an exception for what would normally be considered compatible with the District. ARC had concerns that standard construction fence would add to the appearance of blight. While members recognized there were issues with the area they requested the data that shows the increase in crime, the data that shows the Pine Street fence worked and more details about the efforts to develop a long term solution for Fortson Square. ARC recommended that they use higher quality, more aesthetic fence, perhaps even painted chain link.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem explained that the Pioneer Square Board approved a temporary fence in this area in 2005 before the construction of the 201Yesler building. She said there were time limits, conditions for maintaining cleanliness, working on long term solutions and reports back to the Board.

Scott Lindsay, Mayor's Office, explained the multi-prong strategy to deal with drug related activities in the area.

Lt. Tom Mahaffrey, SPD, said they planned to change the environment of the entrenched drug market as well as do enforcement. He said that alleys and dumpsters are used. He said that the multi-prong approach works and noted the intent to change the environment and landscape of the entire neighborhood to make it inhospitable to drug activities.

Barbara Gray said they plan to put up temporary fencing to create a psychological barrier. She said they discussed fencing options at ARC. She said they have talked with Jason Huff, Office of Arts/Culture, about fence wrap with

appropriate imagery for the neighborhood. She said they plan to remove the fence November 1. She said that they will clean pavement, maintain landscaping, clean up trees, and re-lamp light.

Mr. Lindsay said it is an imperfect solution – no one wants a fence – but in the judgment of the Mayor and the Chief of Police it is the best option.

Mr. Astor said he appreciated the data provided of general offenses and concentrated areas of crime.

Mr. Hester said the 2005 installation was similar and the itemized and specific criteria and plan are compatible with what was approved in 2005. He asked if any other signage was planned.

Ms. Gray said that there will be access to the site for the crews to do maintenance. To restrict curbside parking the signs will be hooded.

Mr. Lindsay said the plans have been coordinated with APS, Lazarus Center and the Chief Seattle Club.

Mr. Pearson asked the height of the chain link fence and if people could climb over.

Ms. Gray said it is a standard 6' construction fence.

Ms. Petrovich asked about the wrap.

Ms. Gray said that the Type 3 barricades used elsewhere wouldn't work here so they needed to restrict access and be able to customize it. She said that they presented their preferred choice.

Mr. Lindsay said that SPD presence will be there to enforce access and they can see in from the raised sidewalk.

Mr. Kralios said it is semitransparent and there is a street light there.

Mr. Aster asked about the potential for the problems to migrate elsewhere.

Lt. Mahaffrey said there are different groups in different areas.

Mr. Lindsay said that the groups are different compositions and tied to specific areas – largely white in one area and African American in the other.

Mr. Hester asked about a maintenance plan.

Ms. Gray said the BioClean will do landscape maintenance, re-mulch tree pits, clean pavement and limb trees. She said they will manage work within the fenced site during the 90 days. She said the art work was deeded over to City.

Mr. Kralios asked if any specific long term measures were anticipated.

Ms. Gray said they are eager to extend the protected bike lane in this area; it will create new activity.

Ms. Petrovich said it will be an improvement to public safety and asked for a report back.

Mr. Parish asked about the relevance of race and if ethnic groups other than blacks or whites were involved.

Mr. Lindsay said that the strategy on 3rd and Pike will not displace dealers to Fortson and vice versa because they are different demographics with a different clientele.

Ms. Brown asked where they would go.

Mr. Lindsay said that they are arrested, sentenced, some get treatment, the problem is dispersed rather than concentrated. He said they won't defeat them all but when concentrated other markets are created.

Mr. Parish noted the very open dealing at Occidental Park.

Lt. Mahaffrey said that the strategy will be all encompassing.

Public Comment:

Colleen Echohawk, Chief Seattle Center, said the main issue is safety. She said their clients are harassed and assaulted when arriving for services and that it is a dangerous environment for clients and workers. She encourages approval of this strategy. She said that the Native population in the City is 30,000 people; 5% of the homeless are Native peoples. She said the original people of this area were the Coast Salish People.

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, said she supports the temporary effort and the long term comprehensive strategies.

Joshua Curtis, DSA, said he supported the plan and that physical alterations were needed. He said it is similar in strategy to what they are doing at 3rd Avenue.

Jennifer Newman, Lazarus Center, agreed with Ms. Echohawk's comments and said the safety issue has gotten much worse over the past months. She said it is

scary for their clients who are preyed upon. She noted the drugs and violence 24/7. She said they can't afford full time security to deter the behavior.

Greg Aden said increasing police presence will help as will walking a beat there.

Lt. Mahaffrey said they will have an increased presence with bike cops.

Nick Luccio said he supported the objectives and plans and noted his employees avoid that corner.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules. He said that the plan will have impact and he appreciated the details. He said the big picture addresses the concerns very well and he appreciated the response to ARC comments.

Mr. Kralios said he appreciated the applicants taking ARC concerns to heart and responding to them. He said that it is a strange application but he appreciated the wrap. He said the fence sends a clear signal that effort is being made and he looked forward to the results.

Mr. Parish said that this is a step in the right direction. He thanked the applicants for their time and effort.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for temporary installation of a chain link fence, including addition of artwork on a screen with the following conditions:

- The temporary fencing will be removed in 90 days (November 1, 2015),
- SDOT will make a report in writing, evaluating the impacts of the temporary fencing on the site and surrounding block, and the progress of working with stakeholders on developing a long-range management plan for Fortson Square at the end of 90 days,
- SDOT will repair any damage to the fencing and keep the area behind the fence clean.

Code Citations:

23.66.030- Certificates of approval-Application, review and appeals

MM/SC/TP/DK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.25 **1st and Columbia Garage**

Mr. Astor recused himself.

Installation of gates

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and renderings and samples provided. Johan Fredrickson, Martin Smith Inc., discussed that there have been issues with the recessed space being used for bathrooms and illicit behaviors so they are proposing a decorative gate to block off the space. He said they are proposing the same fence, same manufacturer on the First Ave side as the neighboring building and a simpler gate for the Post Ave side. The gate will be mounted to concrete except one side on Post Ave will be mounted into the mortar of the brick. The area will be accessible for cleaning. ARC suggested looking at the floor plan to see if the fence is needed the full width. ARC appreciated the quality of the materials and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Frederickson explained the intent to enclosed recessed alcoves because of ongoing maintenance and public safety challenges. He said that the gate on 1st will be ornate wrought iron to relate to the neighboring gate; it will be attached into the neighboring building and this one. He said that on the Post Alley side they will use diamond mesh which will be installed into the concrete on this building and into the mortar on the neighboring building. He said they will use the same fabricator as the 7-11 gates. He said that man gates will be on 1st with a Fire Department lock box. He said that there will be a man door on the Post Alley side to allow access for cleaning trash.

Mr. Hester said that the connection location is in to non-historic material or into mortar. He noted the 1st Avenue public safety issues.

Mr. Frederickson said that there are no prisms impacts. He noted the finish will be the same semi-gloss polyurethane as next door.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Mr. Kralios said that he liked the choice of material and that it was consistent with the District Rules; he said it will tie in with the neighboring fence. He said that the Post Alley side is tertiary and the more modern style is appropriate.

Mr. Hester agreed and noted the quality and durable materials. He noted the thoughtful placement of attachment.

Ms. Petrovich supported the choice in fencing and noted the public safety issue.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of gates as presented per:

Code Citations:

District Rules

IX. SECURITY BARS AND GATES

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

MM/SC/MP/ 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.26

Occidental Park

Installation of new amenities including: tables, chairs, planters, game tables, trash cans and reading room

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the proposed amenity items and their locations. The applicants explained that due to a misunderstanding, they had already ordered the chairs and tables but provided an alternative that they could switch the chairs with Westlake park. The Board discussed that although the colors were bright, they were accents and not dominating, the colors were in a historic district but were not on a historic building, the chairs and tables were movable and replaceable, therefore the ARC indicated they would support either color. They thought the other items were durable and the idea of activating the park was commendable. ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Joshua Curtis provided an overview of the 2010 Parks renaissance and said they have worked in partnership with the Alliance for Pioneer Square. He said that urban parks need more activation and stewardship than others. He said they have entered into a one-year contract with Parks. They propose to install furniture, game tables, 24/7 staffing of parks, fitness, games, movies, and they will renovate the bocci ball area. He said they have already launched this in Westlake. He said they will coordinate with Alliance for Pioneer Square to hang baskets. He said that later they will plan a play space. He went over colors: table and chairs – aqua tables and grey tables with green chairs.

Ms. Brown expressed concern with maintenance and asked if there will be follow up. She noted trees are dying.

Denise Caruso said that trash cans will be black and recycle bins, blue.

Mr. Kralios suggested green as well.

Mr. Curtis said that they will use what is elsewhere in the district.

Mr. Hester asked if the furniture will be left out 24/7.

Mr. Curtis said that the park will be staffed 8:00 am – 8:00 pm; 8:00 pm to 8:00 am overnight security will monitor.

Public Comment:

Karen True, Alliance for Pioneer Square, supported that application and said the bright colors are positive and bring attention to something new in the Park.

Adam Hasson supported the application and said the color creates interest and excitement.

Carl Lieghty, Alliance for Pioneer Square, noted that there are black and blue trash cans in the district.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hester went over District Rules.

Ms. Brown said she agreed with the public comment and said it is an exciting step forward.

Ms. Petrovich noted the nice colors.

Mr. Hester said the colors are accents and there will be transparency. He said he was okay with the color and materials.

Mr. Pearson said he had no problem with accent color. He said he sees the changes in Westlake and this will be a fantastic addition to the neighborhood. He said to make sure there is adequate staff coverage.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of new amenities including: tables, chairs, planters, game tables, trash cans and reading room as presented per

Code Citations:

23.6.030- Certificates of approval-Application, review and appeals

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

MM/SC/TP/MP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.27 **316 Alaskan Way**

Final design for demolition and new construction of an 11 story, 120' mixed use building with a rooftop amenity

Use: 200 residential units on floors 2- 11
4, 984 square feet of retail on the ground floor
79 parking spaces on floors 0 – 1.5

ARC Report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the plans and renderings, and samples for the final design approval for demolition and new construction of the building. He said the applicants noted the change to brick sills and that they were able to record an easement that allows them to have the windows on the north side. The applicants showed the material samples and where they are on the proposed building. He said that ARC and the applicants discussed that a door to the lobby looked out of place because it was the only one not centered. ARC made no recommendation.

Staff Report: There is not a street level use requirement for this area.

Applicant Comment:

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, said they have been talking to the board about this project for the last 18 months. He said that this is the culmination of over a decade of work in Pioneer Square. He said when the city started in 2005 taking a look at the zoning for improving and enhancing the vibrancy of the district one of the messages over those hundreds of community meetings that council and the city went through was the need for market rate residential to encourage and enhance the vibrancy of Pioneer Square. He said when the city adopted the zoning following environmental review, considering how to develop new products that are compatible with the historic character of the district but are also incentivizing market rate residential. He said they heard from the community that market rate residential was important for the vibrancy and continued health and security of the district. He said they are excited Gerding Edlen to be the first project to come forward under that zoning. He said that as they have worked with the board over the last year he said that it is important to note that the special review district board is separate and distinct from downtown design review and that is because of the code and the council saying 'we want to think about historic compatibility and design'. He said as they have worked through the process with the board they have as a design team always kept in mind the purposes of this district to encouragement of a variety of new and rehabilitated housing for all market income types in Pioneer Square, to avoid the

proliferation of parking uses in Pioneer Square and to return unproductive structures to useful purposes and always to improve the visual and urban relationship between new and existing structures in the district. He said that those - along with the board's direction - have really been their guidance. He said this is a parking garage structure that has been non-contributing since the district was created. He said consistent with the code and the guidelines they are doing market rate residential housing. He said that they are participating in the affordable housing MFTE program for low income and affordable housing units. He said they have evolved a design that is modern, is of its time, but it is situated and is complementary to the district. He said that they have heard from the community and from the board about challenges of scale and the challenge to integrate a new building into a historic district. He said the design has really evolved; the spatial relationship between this building and the specific elements that are called out in 23.66.180 B and the surrounding neighborhood and community. He said they are excited to ask for the board's vote of approval on the CofA package.

Kyle Anderson, WTGBD, said they are asking for board approval on the existing building's demolition which they first brought to the board in November of 2013 to affirm that the board is in agreement that it is a non-contributing building.

He said the site is located at the corner of Jackson and Alaskan Way. He said the parking garage is a three story garage from 1909; it used to have some brick features and cornice at the top that have since been removed. It has structural challenges. Mr. Morrison said the federal nomination since '74 has designated the building as historic, non-contributing and was originally considered an intrusion in the District. He said their archival research shows that there is no historic character that was related to the ownership, to the construction, or to the uses within the scope of the district. He said the first known owner of the building was known as 1949 and has been a garage use. He said that historic integrity of the building is lost as there have been significant changes to the windows and the parapet has been removed. He said consistent with discussion by the board in November 2013, they are asking for a determination of non-contributing status based on their archival research and the federal nomination.

Mr. Anderson said the alley has an SCL duct bank that runs through it that takes up about three feet; this project is dedicating two feet to the alley increasing its width from 16 – 18'. He said that as they rebuild this apron they will be salvaging the brick to patch various asphalt patches that exist today in the alley.

Mr. Anderson said they have a 6' change in grade along Jackson Street so they are tucking their first level of parking and some mechanical spaces underneath. He said they have stretched the residential lobby across Jackson Street activating the storefront with mail boxes. He said they have a loading dock lift at the

corner so they created a window gallery there to activate the corner. He said that the rest of the residential use includes a vestibule, a leasing office, a lobby for waiting, and then close to 5000 square feet of retail along Alaskan. He said the top floor of parking includes bike locker facilities and tenant storage, some mechanical elements and then double height space looking down into the retail and into the lobby space. He said canopies are inset between pilasters and then a very unique glass canopy at the corner entry and the tie rod connection is a nod to the historic canopy connections.

He said the first level of residential sits on top of that podium with residential outdoor amenity including a green roof to give it more of a graphic quality when looking down from above. He pointed out this level is lower than the garage is today which should allow greater light through this area. He said for the next nine levels are a typical unit layout of the residential; at the top two floors it steps back. He said the roof includes a rooftop amenity and has 35% coverage with 30' setbacks along the street frontages. He said there is fitness, community room and more mechanical space.

He said along Alaskan Way they have taken cues from gridded warehouse vernacular pattern. He said there is a glass infill between the brick pilasters. He said they set the top two floors back a foot and clad those in glass and spandrel glass to give it more of a reflective quality to let it dissolve into the sky. He said that they created a cornice line at a 100' datum. He said that along Jackson the window box treatment comes from borrowing cues from neighboring buildings; very vertical reading and layering by alternating pilaster width. He said brought pilaster down to the ground. He said the alley has a green wall rather than blank wall, access to the garage, brick touching the ground, and a reveal. He said they transition into more of a static read on the courtyard compared to earlier designs that were more playful. He said the owner has secured air rights of the building to the north so they can include operable windows to help break down the scale of what would otherwise be a very tall blank party-wall.

He said the landscaping part of getting their green factor but also adding a little bit of softness. He said that the R-1 level surrounded by a glass guard rail. He said they want to take a foot of the two foot alley dedication to plant a living wall to help soften and give a little bit of texture. He listed some of the abbreviated design changes since their review started– adding bricks at level to create depth at the western façade; changing the glass canopy at the entry to add hierarchy and punctuate that residential entry; adding ivy to the alley; removed the trellis on the top that encroached the 30' set back, changes to the window patterning, to the materials along Alaskan Way. He thought those things have led to a very quiet and contextual building for the district. He said they tried to strengthen the base, middle and top, so they added a tall arcade at the ground floor brought the pilasters down and set the top back and introduce metal. He said he thought it was Dean who said the patterning was too relentless and rigorous so started alternating the widths of the pilaster from an A-B-A reading

across the façade. He said they carried the brick around the corner, and lost that glass element along Alaskan Way so the brick was now cohesive on all four sides of the building.

He said they were trying to have the cadence of the window openings line up with datums to the north and to the east but it created a bit of an odd three-story reading so they went back to a 2-2 reading that was more static, very quiet reading. He said there are details in these window openings He said the cornice line at that 100' ties in to some of the future development that is being contemplated. He showed a side by side comparison of where they started when the board first saw this project to the final proposal.

He quoted SMC 23.66.100 'to preserve and protect and enhance the historic character,' 'to return unproductive structures to useful purposes' and 'to avoid the proliferation of vehicular parking' and said they are bringing both affordable housing and market rate housing; bringing people into the district that live, work and play in this area that actually shop here, eat here and live in the area and call it home. He showed the building massing program and diagram illustrate the zoning envelope that they are operating within. He said the zoning asks them to not set back up to 100' along frontages of Jackson and Alaska and the two added floors are what they earned through the bonus housing incentivized in the code and then the amenity on the roof.

He thought it was important to mention that if this was an office building it may fill that whole site up to 100.' He said this diagram shows the housing typology; a unit, corridor, and a unit that makes an L-shape. He said that is what works best for housing. He said touching specifically on the 23.66.180 B, specifically window proportions, floor height, cornice line and street elevations. He said the strong datum throughout the area is a base level retail plinth seen on historic building with sandstone or cast iron or brick coming to the ground. He said this is the pedestrian zone where people engage in the district. He said that even though the Jackson façade is a broken up of the neighboring building doesn't have the very strong base, it does when you turn on to 1st Avenue. He said taking cues from structural rigor of the load bearing fabric, especially in the warehouse type buildings, they created this more structural framework to the building's aesthetic. He said they introduced both a primary and secondary scale reading to the building and by layering those different groupings they are able to break down the scale of the massing.

He said that the window vernacular was literally looking at the two story grouping vertical grouping of the windows both at 80 Jackson and 97 across the street, except instead of being flush here they are setting back 3" and pushing the horizontal back 3" so you get depth in layering.

He showed images to illustrate the relationship of shorter building and a taller building across an alley throughout the District. He said sometimes the

relationship of those two buildings was 100' - 50', two times the size. He said they also studied compatibility as it relates to colors and materials and there is richness to the materials and to the color of the area. He said there is a lot of patina, a lot of more weathered qualities to the materials over time and they wanted this building in particular to not feel like it had a weathered quality to it as well and in keeping with the material palette that exists today. He said they feel strongly that the brick should be Coal Creek and thought the darker color sets a nice backdrop to the historic buildings themselves.

He showed photos of the Coal Creek brick in context with the buildings that surround the site and a couple renderings in different colors that they had shown previously. He said they are using clear glass LoE coating, there is no reflective coating on this glass. He said they are using a clear insulated spandrel unit which unlike the mono-unit which puts the paint at surface the back side of surface 2 is painted giving a bit more depth. He said the dark metal panel would be the reveal color that comes up and becomes the penthouse level and identified where the light metal panel would be. He said where they are using Doug Fir at the underside of their canopies.

He said the door at the alley is a perforated door for passive ventilation. He said the glass at the residential canopy will have a fritted pattern, 50% open area with 1/4" circles so that it helps conceal dirt on top but clear to let light through.

Mr. Kralios asked for clarification on the two metal panel colors and where they are on the elevation.

Mr. Anderson showed him using the elevations drawings.

He showed a photo of the Pearl District, the old Blitz Weinhard Brewery, with a development built around it. He said he thought the slide illustrates a new building with a muscular quality to it being contextual in the district and more of a backdrop emphasizing the historic building. He thought if the building been red or a lighter color the contrast would have been lost and one might have asked what is new and what is old. He said that clearly the building is of its time and is not trying to mimic and be historicist in any way. He said that the building is quiet respect to fabric and the historic character of the district.

Mr. Anderson showed security lighting along the alley way and wall lighting along the pilasters that graze up and down that pilaster. He said that at L-2 and R-1 terrace the lighting level is low. He provided a night time rendering at Jackson and Alaska.

He said for now the only signage is the address. He said that Dean had a comment about the placement of this door; he said they weren't able to recraft all the drawings that is shown in but it is an easy modification if the Board wants that as a condition of approval.

He said they can't install canopies along Alaska with the viaduct in place so they are asking for approval of design with the canopies not installed and then with them installed. The building will be built in such a way that the canopies could be bolted on once the viaduct is down. He said right of way improvements on Alaska will not be made until that viaduct is gone so that is under separate contract.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hester asked the applicant to briefly identify the massing items in the rendering and confirm that all of those are current.

Mr. Morrison identified 200 Occidental, 450 Alaskan, 589 Occidental and 520 Occidental. He said that 50 University is outside of the district boundaries but included it for context along the waterfront. He said the 200 Occidental has received both a preliminary and a final CofA and is under construction. He said that 450 Alaskan is in process and is the only project that has not received a final or preliminary CofA. He said that 520 Occidental has both a final and preliminary and is under construction. He said 589 Occidental has a preliminary CofA.

Mr. Hester asked if these are accurate representations of each current design as reviewed by the board.

Mr. Morrison said that it represents the massing and is current based on the information and the approvals that we have today.

Mr. Hester clarified as of the date that the slide was created.

Mr. Morrison said there have been no changes in the massing or the height.

Mr. Hester said he was concerned with the massing and the scale.

Ms. Petrovich said she is having a problem with is the fenestration especially with the middle and didn't think the arrangement and proportions of the design of the windows as compared to the buildings next door. She said she is just not seeing the compatibility. She said she would like to see an improvement in the visual relationship between the neighboring buildings. She said she agreed with the applicant that the building reads new and muscular she didn't see it as compatible.

Mr. Anderson said that the muscular description was about the Pearl District.

Ms. Petrovich said she sees this proposed building as new and muscular. She said the middle appears very one dimensional to her and not broken up like the

rest of the buildings especially the neighboring building. She said it seems very relentless and one dimensional. She said she appreciated the changes made so far but that she thought it could go farther if you compare it to the buildings next door.

Mr. Anderson clarified he did not mean they were trying to mimic the building next door.

Ms. Petrovich said she is looking at the visual compatibility inherent in the historic district and she said she is not seeing it yet.

Mr. Anderson said the variation and pilaster width is one of those elements that does actually play off of the district and as far as depth goes part of the window is set back 3", and the another setback another 3" and it is all framed by brick detailing. He said the building next door has a similar treatment though only the horizontal is set back. He said the warehouse vernacular buildings in the area, especially to the north and to the east, have a very strong rhythm and pilaster reading to them.

Ms. Petrovich said she agrees with the north and the east statement - it is the immediate neighboring building.

Mr. Morrison said they have tried to incorporate more detailed inspired by the neighboring building to the east especially the window pattern and detail.

Ms. Petrovich said it is subjective and noted that she saw that they have achieved a base, middle and top. She said she is still having problem with the middle – maybe it is the one dimensionality of looking at a slide but it seems relentless.

Mr. Morrison said it was an intentional move to step those sills back to give that depth so that in 3-D it reads more consistent with the level of detail seen throughout the district with the brick work.

Mr. Hester asked for more context about what went into the study comparing adjacent properties throughout the district. He asked if they evaluated or differentiated between what the actual parcel size was relative to the mass and scale.

Mr. Anderson asked in relation to datums.

Mr. Hester said yes.

Mr. Anderson said they did not do a volume study.

Mr. Hester asked if these are actual horizontal elevation review in comparison.

Mr. Anderson said yes, trying to pick up datums of that base element, that pedestrian zone. He said clearly the more retail focused element of that ground floor is what they are trying to register to. He said he thought the slide that shows the shot down Jackson shows very much how the neighbor to the east has a very strong ground floor on 1st though it doesn't on Jackson.

Mr. Hester cited pages 42 and 43 and said that is more consistent with what his question was. He noted the cut through sections of the alley scale study. He said he thought the response would be the same for parcel size, but that really didn't come in to this study at all.

Mr. Anderson said if you think about the narrower buildings only in New York would you do a 35' wide building that is tall. He said that typically those narrower type buildings do have a lower elevation; the bigger the size of the lot, the taller the buildings end up being. He said that though they didn't analyze it, he could generalize that buildings that are taller are sitting on bigger piece of property than the buildings that are smaller.

Mr. Hester said it does.

Mr. Morrison said that one additional point he thought was important is the fact that the code is very clear and it is the predominant vernacular of the district to hold that street line up to 100'. He said that upkeeping those street edges up to 100' is one of the reasons why took the voluntary setback at 100 feet and then changed the glazing to reduce the perception of scale for that top 20 feet.

Mr. Hester asked approximate size of this parcel.

Mr. Morrison said the lot area is 20,773 square feet.

Mr. Hester said there was no comparison in that that alley study of the parcel size and how that compared with comparison properties.

Mr. Anderson said no they didn't use that metric.

Mr. Hester said the public comment period was limited to 2 minutes a person.

Public Comment:

Mary Peabody, resident for 16 years, said she and her husband first lived in condo at 75 south Main and then moved to 87 S. Jackson. She said there have been improvements to make the alley an attractive space. She said the alley is surfaced with cobbled brick of the 1890's. She said the board should protect the historic nature; an integral part of the character of Pioneer Square. She said the board is not just replacing one building with another, the board could potentially

be destroying the very character and potential life of an alley. She said if preserved it would be enjoyed by neighbors and residents and people who come.

Jessica Luccio, resident of 80 S Jackson, said she has been coming to these meetings since she moved here in January. She said does not feel that the proposed building fits into the fabric of Pioneer Square. She said she is here to make sure the new use in this district fits into the fabric of Pioneer Square's existing uses. She thought quoting zoning and codes is fine but quoting families and business and ideals are the things that matter. She thought the building would be a curtain rather than a backdrop. She said that she has heard the board talk about massing and context and she has seen the developer and their lawyers stand behind code and not be able to make an effective argument for why Pioneer Square, why Seattle would benefit from the project. She said that is more important than zoning or code or anything, is what is going to be best for the people that live and work here.

Nick Luccio, resident of 80 S Jackson, said they had their business in Pioneer Square for a number of years but they moved to Pioneer Square recently. He said the reason they chose Pioneer Square was because of the historic nature and the charm. He said he did not want anyone to think that he is not in favor of new housing, new buildings, or changing development but he thought it needed to be appropriate for the neighborhood in terms of scale, size, massing and its look, he is in favor of it. He said that is why they are here. He said the south elevation is not consistent from last week.

Jeff Davies said he was speaking for Jan Sutter who is a owner at 80 S. Jackson. He said like Nick said there is a general acceptance of the project; development is important for the vital life of Pioneer Square. He said that it is just that the scale is wrong. He said that the building is over twice as large as the 80 S. Jackson Building. He said it is 13 stories and completely dominates the sightline if you are coming in from the Bremerton ferry. It will be the largest building south of Yesler. He said that to the developers – just because you can do something doesn't mean you should do something. He said the architects are missing an opportunity to make a statement with this building that would be consistent and sensitive to the Pioneer Square area.

Adam Hasson, Samis, said he has been involved in neighborhood planning for almost 20 years and he could say categorically this type of development is exactly what people, general stakeholders from across the neighborhood, residents, business owners, city officials, planners, have been talking about and desiring. He said that the code was written specifically to encourage residential development which increases the vitality and the height was written specifically to encourage this kind of development. He said the alternative is an office building that is full lot that will still block views and take away more light and more air. He thought the set back on the alley façade was better for the neighbors. He thought the applicants responded to the board; he would have

preferred the glass façade but the recent reiteration with the two floors of glass, of lighter material, is a big improvement. He thought that this is what the neighborhood needs. He said it is tough to be a neighbor next to a non-contributing building but when you own property next to a non-contributing building you have to expect big change. Those buildings are supposed to be torn down to revitalize whole neighborhood.

Helena Burlea, Bainbridge resident, the unique character of this neighborhood is what draws tourists and residents alike. She said this project is out of character, it is blocking light and views to the sound and to the sky. She said the color of the brick is not in keeping with the red preponderance of the red brick that is in the district.

Lauren McCaffrey, resident 80 S. Jackson, she wanted to talk about scale less visually and more as a community stance. She said prior to moving to 80 S. Jackson they lived at the Post, but did not like living in a large building. She said they met their neighbors at 80 S Jackson. She said that buildings like what is proposed tend to attract larger volumes of people who care less for the neighborhood.

Frank Stauff, business owner with an office in the Grand Central building, said he supported the project. He said that more stakeholders are needed who are invested in and care for the community. He said this building project will meet that need. He said it ties in with the historic buildings very nicely with high quality of brick and glass.

Glenn Peterson, works in 80 Yesler, thought the progression of the design that was presented, with the work the board and development team has done, resulted in a phenomenal building. He said he supported it. He said that touching on something else, he hearkened back to the Pioneer Square of the 1980s that he desperately missed. He thought the City had foresight to push forth projects like this and zoning like this to allow residents to allow the reactivation of Pioneer Square so that workers don't want to race out of Pioneer Square at 6:00. He said that projects like this are exactly what brings increase in safety.

Bob Sousy, chief operating officer for the northwest carpenters union, said he had previously worked with the development team, design team and general contractor associated with the project. He said he thinks like the projects in the Pearl District in Oregon the project fits in to the neighborhood. He said 100 years ago Seattle looked a lot different than it does today. He said that zoning changes are done for the greater good of the whole not just to reflect what the individual needs of one property owner has. He believes that having more full time residents will enhance the economic value and social aspect and help people feel safer than an office building wouldn't provide. He said he is in support of this project.

Leslie Hains, resident 80 S Jackson, said they love the historic character and wanted the gritty city vibe and got it. She said that together with her neighbors at 80 S. Jackson they created a beautiful place in the alley behind their building. She said she opposed this project because she is worried about private appropriation of public space.

Paula Wing, resident of 80 S Jackson, 10-year of Pioneer Square, said that she is happy about the recent changes to Pioneer Square and that she is for development. She said that since the beginning this building has been called monolithic, too big and massive, and out of scale. She said that she has witnessed very little change in the design. She said that as a design professional she finds it shocking that the design of the building has remained massive, out of scale, flat, dark, horribly uninteresting and could be given the green light.

Craig Moss, resident of 97 S Jackson, said his family has lived here for a month. He said that he was not a fan of the proposed building and that Pioneer Square area is in a unique position as the waterfront project develops. He said the board has tough decisions that will shape the face of this area. He said makes decisions on trips not by what a City has chosen to build as often as what they have chosen to preserve. He asked that this area be allowed to retain its character and not give it away to the first development opportunity.

Cindy Aden, resident of 80 S Jackson, provided handout which she said addresses the question of scale. She said she didn't think the drawings provided by the architect were not accurate. She said the Smith building, is two buildings is almost four times less massive than the proposed building. She said she wanted to make a graphic point. She said the building looks beautiful, the drawing is a huge improvement but still it doesn't give the full effect of what the building will look like. She said that Jack Phinney talks about time travel – when you are in Pioneer Square it feels like you are in another place and magical and should be preserved.

York Wong, resident of 80 S Jackson, said he thought that the color of bricks, the shape, the windows and other details don't make an out of scale building in scale. He said the minutes they have been saying that since the August 24 minutes. He said the building isn't compatible, it does not fit in the character of this historic neighborhood and he asked that be taken into consideration rather than the code and all the technical criteria. He said this building is out of scale.

Greg Aden, resident of 80 S Jackson, provided a handout. He said that the handout shows the Culver Building in Portland a 100 year old building like the Old Seattle Parking Garage, GBD redesigned and made it beautiful with a glass penthouse, to scale. He said to quote Brian Libby the Culver building and the importance of fabric buildings. He asked why Portland retain its history, character and scale and Seattle doesn't.

Ken Rasmussen, property owner, said that Pioneer Square Preservation Board does not have to subjugate to anyone. He said that the proposed building is not of a scale that is compatible with surrounding structures, he said he owns one of those structures. He said he thought just because another city entity wants to change code does not mean that our historic district has to incorporate those changes. He said that the board has a right to say no without being vilified or considered anti-progress. He said he thought the building proposed put the block out of balance. He said that the 1974 designation was non-contributing but he thought because it was parking garage it should contributing especially because parking is needed. He said he had been occasionally reminded that when he made the choice to buy into a historic neighborhood he bought into a special level of constraint and oversight and that those rules should apply to everyone.

Joseph Ryan said he would be willing to give his time to Mr. Rasmussen.

Mr. Rasmussen said the affordable housing emphasis doesn't change the unacceptable nature of this proposed structure. He thought the alternative of an office building should not shape the decision. He said this was going to affect all future development. He said that this is our moment in history to save our history, our moment to tell others that our history and historical nature is special and not for sale.

Linda Gallagher, works in Pioneer Square, said that she cares about Pioneer Square thought it was the one neighborhood in Seattle where historical designation meant extra requirements for developers to meet before they get to make changes and take things away. She said that she would love to live in Pioneer Square but not in this building or buildings next to it that are going to be in shadows of this huge not to scale, not proportional building. She said that the brick is designed not to look like brick but it isn't the color of the square. She said there is no awning. She said that even though a building can be demolish that doesn't mean you put anything in its place. She this building doesn't compare to is King County's King Street Building; it is eight stories and this is a tower. She said that it has an alley treatment, a plaza and a walkway behind it by the alley and more things to accommodate this group. She urged the board to reject the Certificate of Approval for this project the way it is currently developed and presented. She said that there has not been accommodation of the regulation especially about scale and proportionality. She said that Pioneer Square has historically been always has been a waterfront neighborhood. She said it is today and they want it to be in the future. She walling off and blocking off the waterfront from the other buildings in the neighborhood just is not fair.

Mr. Morrison said he had a letter to enter in to the record for a commenter who had to leave: Dave Heater, July 15, 2015 (letter of support of project in DON file).

Mr. Hester went over applicable District Rules.

Mr. Kralios added SMC 23.66.150 B, C, & D

Mr. Hester noted SMC 23.66 120 and 122.

Mr. Astor cited SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design B – scale. He said that the window proportions, floor height, cornice line and street elevation of this project do not relate to the scale of building in the immediate area. He cited SMC 23.66.100 – creation of the district. He said that he has concerns about the scale in relation to the neighboring buildings with respect to the floor heights, and cornice lines.

Ms. Petrovich said she agreed with Mr. Aster and said her comments have stayed consistent through all presentations and she agreed that she can't see the relation especially to its immediate neighbors yet. She said that while she appreciated all the changes that have been made so far she didn't think it was 'there'. She said she thought there needs to be an improved visual relationship; fenestrations need to be worked on. She said she doesn't find it in scale with the buildings in its immediate area or in the immediate surrounding area.

Mr. Hester cited SMC 23.66.100 and said he thought the project does for the majority support and complies with that SMC code section. He said that it comes down to 'preserving, protecting, and enhancing the historic district....' He said that there are portions of the code section as it relates to building mass and scale that this design proposal does not comply with. He said SMC 23.66.180 'to complement and enhance historic character....' He said that regarding subsection A the materials selected for this project are appropriate for the district both in color, exposure and recognizing this is a new construction project. He said that subsection B address scale and subsection C addresses awning. He said that he had no concern with the awnings. He said that subsection B states that 'the building should be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures.' He said that scale is a component of multiple design principles – compatibility, orientation, proportions, massing. He said in a historic district compatibility of a new structure doesn't mean that it has to replicate a historic development or existing historic building. He said a new building should be seen as a product of its own time and successful design should enhance the character of the district, and it should respect the context of not only the district as a whole but where it is located as a specific site. He said the orientation of the building is also a major component of the design. He said that this building has an L-shaped massing, its principle façade is on Alaskan. He said that he thought the mass and orientation blocks the view into the district and it also blocks the view out of the district. He said there are two different types of scale – there is the finite scale which are the design details, the fenestrations, the patterns, the rhythms and then there is the scale of the overall building. He said he didn't have so much conflict with the finite scale, items such as windows, and doors, and cornices, and patterns, or the

base, middle, top detailing but he did see a lot of conflict with the overall building scale. He said that as an overall building design this building reads as a monumental scale and not compatible with the district especially this specific site location. He said that another point is proportion. He said he appreciated the public comment that identified the cubic footage massing and thought that showed why this proposed design is disproportionate with its site and with the district. He said that massing has to do with the articulation of the façade; it contributes to the character of the district. He said that the façade fenestration patterns are articulated well but he can't ignore the monumental scale. He said he supports demolition of the existing building because it has been recognized as a non-contributing building. He said he also supports responsible development of this site. He said the design must address the site specifically, and with the district and he has concerns about its massiveness relative to the district. He said he has concerns about its proportion both relative to adjacent property and its proportion in the district. He said that he didn't think the building enhances the district character as is explicitly called out in SMC 23.66.180 subsection B – scale. He said when he compared the before and after design changes on slides page 22 and 24 he thought there was no real modification to the big picture design of the building – it was all minutiae. He said that he supports the finite detailing and that the design team has done a fantastic job of that but have not addressed the requests 'please address the massing', 'please address the scale of this building'. He said that he appreciated the through-block connection, the amenity space, that this is a residential development and not office, the gallery space, the landscaping and the lighting. He said the way that this building is massed it has full blocking to the south and full blocking to the west. He said that unless you are on the roof there is very little sun exposure. He said that page 17 of presentation was the south elevation and it really jumped out as how monumentally out of scale the design is. He said to summarize his comments he said he has significant concerns with scale under 23.66.180; he supports the materials under subsection A; he supports the awning under subsection C and he supports demolition of the building but the design as proposed is not compatible with the district, it is not compatible with the site, and while the use is beneficial to the district the current design as proposed is not.

Mr. Parish said he appreciated the effort and work and beautiful building but he believed it is in the wrong place. He said that a picture is worth a thousand words and looking at the pictures really brought things into play for him as far as the scale. He said that the design is out of scale and is not compatible with the district. He said that when the board volunteered to take these positions they volunteered to accept the charge that they would protect, preserve the Pioneer Square district. He said that he would be negligent in his duties if he approved this structure in that place.

Mr. Pearson said he appreciated the board's comments particularly everyone on the board who has spoken so far has honed in on the question of scale. He said that he thought that other people have adequately covered that. He said that from

his point of view the question of compatibility with the district itself the board needs to be very cognizant of the fact that we have a multi-faceted charter. He said he looked to 23.66.100 and the 10 different charges that are brought on the board including the 'preserve, protect and enhance the historic character of the area', attract visitors to the city', 'return unproductive . . .useful purposes', 'avoid proliferation of vehicle. . .'. He said he thought the board needs to balance all those factors when making a decision. He still falls on the side of the rest of the board that the scale on this particular instance is not been addressed to the satisfaction of the board. He said that he is concerned that their discussion of scale could discourage residential uses in Pioneer Square. He thinks more residential in needed for the long term viability of the square. He said that other viable residential projects in the square so far have taken advantage of being located in a different area than this one, it is pretty building, but it might be in the wrong place.

Ms. Brown agreed with Mr. Pearson. She said she is one of two members on this board who actually lives here and said that residential is of primary importance. She said she remembers when the Kingdome was imploded and the North Lot was developed and 505 got built and everyone said it was going to be horrible. She said we have gone forward. She said everyone has worked hard on this project. She said those who have spoken who do not believe in the code, we are governed by the code, the preservation district rules, and the Secretary of Interior Standards. She said we need more residential development, more people down from 6:00 pm until 6:00 in the morning.

Mr. Kralios said that he thought everyone on the board is in favor of more residential development. He said the key is more responsible residential development. He said that Pioneer Square is a unique local, state and national district and has importance beyond just a single site. He said he feels that the application has come a long way from when they first saw it in but has not gone far enough in terms of addressing issues of scale. He cited District Rules 23.66.150 item A said that 'structures located within subarea A – which this site is located in shall cover the full width of the lot along street block lines. . .'. And said however D said that 'for all subareas modification. . .'. He said there is an opportunity for setbacks that haven't been explored to help mitigate the scale of the building. He said he has urged the applicant to explore in it past ARC and full board meetings. He said he has repeatedly he stated that he thinks the color also contributes to the out of scale character of the building. He said selecting a color that is timeless and not trendy is something that will help tie the building to the district rather than set it apart.

Mr. Hester said other new construction projects have come before the board in his tenure. He said that economy is always a major driver for project. He said they go up to the limit because it pencils out but it is not necessarily saying that less massive building, fewer units would not pencil out – it just doesn't pencil out as well. He said a very important to recognize is Pioneer Square is a

valuable district and also a sensitive district. He said that architecturally speaking a new development needs to be respectful of the district because the character can change very quickly. He said the public comment that he appreciated was from Mr. Rasmussen who said that by buying into the district you recognize that there are special constraints. He supports development of this parcel but with great opportunity come great responsibility.

Mr. Bue said that despite all the benefits of the project this project, it is degrading the historic character and fabric of the district.

Action: I move to deny a Certificate of Approval for demolition and final design of new construction of an 11 story, 120' mixed use building with a rooftop amenity.

The Board makes its recommendation based on the following factors:

The proposed building façade is larger in scale than other buildings in Pioneer Square and therefore not compatible with surrounding buildings.

The proposed street elevations do not relate to the scale of the buildings in the immediate area.

The proposed building is not visually compatible with inherent historic character of the District.

Code Citations:

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.

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:

B. Scale.

Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the buildings in the immediate area.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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

MM/SC/MA/TP 7:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Brown opposed.

071515.3 BOARD BUSINESS

071515.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Ryan Hester, Chair

071515.5 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.68.0227