



The City of Seattle

Pioneer Square Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

PSB 142/18

MINUTES for Wednesday June 6, 2018

Board Members

Adam Alsobrook
Lynda Collie
Brendan Donckers
Dean Kralios, Chair
Alex Rolluda

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kianoush Curran
Carol O'Donnell, Vice Chair

Chair Dean Kralios called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

060618.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 4, 2018

MM/SC/BD/AR 5:0:0 Minutes approved.

April 18, 2018

MM/SC/AR/AA 4:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Kralios abstained.

060618.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

060618.21 Fobes Building

558 1st Ave S

Alterations to the storefront to add a door

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans for the new door. ARC thought that the historic glass transom was being preserved but that the storefront was a replacement storefront, so no historic elements are being removed. They thought that the design of the revised storefront was minimally visible and did not significantly alter the appearance of the storefront. ARC thought that being the existing storefront was

aluminum that the new aluminum storefront was acceptable. ARC asked for updated photos showing the non-approved sign removed. ARC did not make a recommendation pending assurance of the removal of the unapproved sign.

Applicant Comment:

Josh Peterson said they installed a new door to allow public access that meets Code previous access was a key code-controlled access from the stairwell. He said they will remove one panel of glass and two wood sill pieces to create a landing area. They will frame in with a storefront system with color similar to what is there. Responding to clarifying question he said Beastmode signage had been removed.

Mr. Kralios said that application for new signage will come later.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kralios went over district Rules and said what is proposed is reversible and minimally visible.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for alterations to the storefront to add a door as presented on condition that unapproved signage is removed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 6, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.180 [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.

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

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

- B. Design. Building design is generally typified by horizontal divisions which create distinctive base and cap levels. Facades may also be divided vertically by pilasters or wide piers which form repetitive window bays. Street facades are also distinguished by heavy terminal cornices and parapets, ornamental storefronts and entrance bays and repetitive window sizes and placement.
- C. Building materials. The most common facing materials are brick masonry and cut or rusticated sandstone, with limited use of terra cotta and tile. Wooden window sash, ornamental sheet metal, carved stone and wooden or cast-iron storefronts are also typically used throughout the District. Synthetic stucco siding materials are generally not permitted. (7/99)
- D. Color. Building facades are primarily composed of varied tones of red brick masonry or gray sandstone. Unfinished brick, stone, or concrete masonry unit surfaces may not be painted. Painted color is typically applied to wooden window sash, sheet metal ornament and wooden or cast-iron storefronts. Paint colors shall be appropriate to ensure compatibility within the District. (7/99)

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

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

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

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

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

MM/SC/LC/AA

5:0:0 Motion carried.

060618.22

Burke Building

Leicht YS Built
314 Occidental Ave S

Installation of signage

ARC report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC thought the location of the sign, attachment to the wood column and color of the sign were compatible with the building and the District. Because internally lit signs are prohibited ARC requested that the applicant provide alternatives to the full Board. The applicant said that neon signs are not their brand's aesthetic. ARC suggested either a halo lit sign that otherwise complied with the regulations for the neon sign, i.e. 6 square feet or to have a non-illuminated sign or illuminated with an external source that complies with the regulations for a non-illuminated sign in which case they could keep the size at 8 square feet. ARC did not make a recommendation.

Nathaniel Martin explained they looked at push through lettering where only the edges will be lit. He said they looked at NOLA and saw halo-lit lettering there. He said reducing their sign to 6' would be a disadvantage for them, the surface area of the letters is 3 square feet and only the letters would be lit. He asked for an exception and noted a Cherry tree in front and the minimal vinyl letters in the window.

Mr. Donckers asked for clarification on what they are asking for.

Mr. Martin said the sizing is the same, the lighting method is different.

Yuval Sofer said that at night, only the letters will be seen; it is a cleaner design.

Mr. Donckers agreed but noted the Code language is clear. He asked if there are any other blade signs in Occidental Mall.

Mr. Sofer said Copal has one. He noted the mid-block location of his shop and said he wants a blade sign for visibility. He said he wants a minimal but well-designed sign.

Mr. Martin said that Cherry Street Coffee has an exterior sign. He said that the regulations were written in 1993 and there have been many changes since then. He said this is softer and quieter.

Mr. Donckers read District Rules C7; he noted that internally lit signs are typically associated with chains and strip malls.

Mr. Sofer said strip malls are one extreme and the proposed sign is on the other; the Code is in the middle.

Mr. Kralios read District Rules C4; he said the applicant is asking for two exceptions – size and illumination. He said non-illuminated signs are limited to 8 square feet.

Mr. Sofer cited the NOLA sign and said it is internally lit inside letters.

Mr. Kralios said light does not come through letters; it is coming from the back and is halo lit.

Mr. Alsobrook noted the North Lot has different rules that are not applicable here.

Ms. Nashem said that the applicant is aware that internally lit signs are prohibited but intends to ask the Board to make an exception for his sign. She said that Pilchuck Glass originally applied for this type of sign, the Board indicated that they would not approve the internally lit sign, so they changed it to neon sign but demonstrated that their company logo could not be recreated with neon. Because of that, only the company logo was allowed in acrylic lit from an internal source. Schoenfeld Furniture had a halo lit wall sign. Stadium Place has halo lit blade signs, but they were allowed larger blade signs per the North Lot guidelines. Other businesses such as Evergreen, Starbucks, Jimmy Johns and others have originally applied for internally lit signs but have changed their application after being reminded that internally lit signs are prohibited. Neon signs date back to 1920 and is typically considered a historic sign type, which is why, although brighter, are allowed.

Mr. Kralios noted that the North Lot is like a sub-district and has its own Guidelines.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules. He said the method of attachment is consistent with past installations on the wood column and when removed would be easily repaired. He said power will be provided through horizontal stanchion and will not be visible. He said the materials are attractive and high quality, durable and compatible with District. He said the hang-up is the size and the internally lit element. He said they could do it if they reduced the size to 6 square feet and used neon or if there was just one sign for the business.

Mr. Rolluda agreed with the Staff Report and was not in favor of back lit sign. He said when the Rules were crafted it was kept general and broad to include modern type lights. He said sign has to meet the character of the District with no size variance or internally lit element.

Mr. Donckers had concerned with exception language and said the Rules are clearly worded. He questioned how it could look with fixture sticking out and how it would fit with the rest of Occidental Park. He said that back lit is cleaner option than fixture. He suggested a smaller sign size with back lit option for sign only if it is consistent with what is around it.

Mr. Rolluda said he is in favor of backlit, not through-lit.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if edge illumination was proposed.

Ms. Nashem said that no proposal shows that; only externally or internally illuminated. She said she has to have exact plans.

Mr. Donckers said lighting details isn't shown clearly and requested detail.

Mr. Kralios said a specific package is needed; options are shown but nothing is specific.

Mr. Sofer said it is a simple and Code compliant drawing.

Mr. Alsobrook disagreed; he said the Code is clear, backlit and internally lit signs are prohibited. He said the language in the Code is strong. He said it is not about what the board likes, it is about what meets Code.

Mr. Martin said the fabrication has electrical internal; they are looking at potential future changes in the Code and how their sign could be easily changed.

Mr. Alsobrook said it could be considered with a provision that it not be internally lit.

Mr. Kralios said there was no approval for sign as proposed at ARC.

Mr. Donckers said he doesn't see fixtures like this anywhere else on Occidental Park providing light over sign. He was concerned about compatibility with rest of block and said that Occidental Park is an important part of Pioneer Square.

Mr. Alsobrook said the board has to review what is proposed. He said the only alternative is to use spot lighting from source mounted high in the store front, so the fixture is not visible.

Mr. Donckers said no other businesses have lit signs; the London Plane has a lit clock face.

Mr. Sofer said the light is slim and specifically rated for outdoor use. He said the light temperature is 27 Kelvin; lighting on the sign is better.

Mr. Kralios said that the fixture is unobtrusive and will provide direct light with not a lot of spread. He said it is modern, but the business brand is modern; it is reversible.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for installation of blade sign **as revised** with mounted light fixture illuminating the face of the sign per the June 6, 2018 revised rendering.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 6, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

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.

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.

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

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

B. General Signage Regulations

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

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

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

C. Specific Signage Regulations

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

Blade signs incorporating neon of any kind shall not be permitted unless all of the following conditions are met: a) the neon blade sign is sought as part

of a reduced overall sign package or plan for the business; b) neon blade signs shall be limited to six (6) square feet in dimension with letters not to exceed eight (8) inches in height; c) the sign meets the requirements of Neon Signs - Paragraph 3 for the number and type of colors of neon; d) the sign meets the requirements of Signs - Paragraph 5 (above) for installation of a blade sign; e) electrical connection from exterior walls to the blade sign shall be made using rigid, paintable electrical tubing painted to match the building facade and all bends shall closely follow the support structure; f) all signage supports shall be fastened to the exterior wall by the use of metal anchors at existing grout joints only; and g) the sign taken as a whole is consistent with the scale and character of the building, 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 regulations. (5/96)

7. Internally Lit Signs. Internally lit or backlit signs are prohibited. (8/93)

MM/SC/AA/AR 4:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Donckers opposed.

060618.23

Lippy Building

Evergreen Salads

Installation of additional signage

ARC report: Mr. Kralios reported that ARC reviewed the drawings provided. ARC requested that they provide a rendering that shows the total sign package all on one page, so they can better judge if there is proliferation of signage. ARC had concerns about the size and placement of the logo in the door. They thought it seemed proportionally large and blocking transparency into the space. The applicant indicated that it is more transparent than it looks and will provide a photo of the same sign installed at other locations. ARC did not make a recommendation.

Staff Report: Evergreens Salads previously received approval for a sign in the sign band, a hanging sign in the window and a blade sign and the hours on the door. This application is in addition to the those requested. The board should consider the total amount of signs and consider at what point is the message lost through undue proliferation of signage.

Applicant Comment:

Ryan Suddendorf proposed die cut letters for the storefront windows, a round logo on the front door and 'salad three ways' branding.

Mr. Kralios said the board previously approved a vertical blade medallion, sign band signage and lighting.

Mr. Suddendorf said the board previously recommended adding hours. He said that 'salad three ways' was added to their branding.

Mr. Donckers said the piecemeal approach to signage is concerning.

Mr. Suddendorf said the 'salad three ways' is not intended to be permanent and will probably be changed as branding changes. Responding to clarifying questions he said they have sandwich boards temporarily.

Mr. Kralios said that sandwich boards require board review.

Mr. Suddendorf said they were temporary and the landlord doesn't want them.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kralios went over District Rules. He said that what is proposed borders on over proliferation. He said the proposed medallion on the door and the blade medallion in the window seems redundant. He said 'salad three ways' seems more like advertising than business signage but that it maintains transparency.

Mr. Donckers concurred.

Mr. Alsobrook noted the signage is on-premise so is not at odds with Code.

Mr. Rolluda concurred that it should be either/or medallion, not both.

Ms. Collie agreed.

Mr. Alsobrook agreed and said having both would be visually distracting.

Mr. Suddendorf said the window, blade and marquee are more important than the door and said he would concede the vinyl on the door. He said he wants the 'salad three ways' on the window.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for the reduced signage package as amended to remove the vinyl door medallion and retain hours

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 6, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

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

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

1. Signs Attached or Applied to Structures.

- a. The relationship of the shape of the proposed sign to the architecture of the building and with the shape of other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
- b. The relationship of the texture of the proposed sign to the building for which it is proposed, and with other approved signs located on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
- c. The possibility of physical damage to the structure and the degree to which the method of attachment would conceal or disfigure desirable architectural features or details of the structure (the method of attachment shall be approved by the Director);
- d. The relationship of the proposed colors and graphics with the colors of the building and with other approved signs on the building or in proximity to the proposed sign;
- e. The relationship of the proposed sign with existing lights and lighting standards, and with the architectural and design motifs of the building;
- f. Whether the proposed sign lighting will detract from the character of the building; and
- g. The compatibility of the colors and graphics of the proposed sign with the character of the District.

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

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

B. General Signage Regulations

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

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

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

C. Specific Signage Regulations

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

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

060618.2 PRELIMINARY DESIGN BRIEFINGS

060618.21 74 S Jackson St

Briefing regarding possible demolition and new construction

Jerry Garcia and Tom Kundig, Olson Kundig, presented via PowerPoint. Full report in DON file; following are board and public questions and comments.

Mr. Garcia said they have taken board comments to heart and are working through the SDCI process. He said SHPO advised the height bulk and scale are consistent with historic district. They have started refining building to address experience at street level. He said they want input on canopies, alley treatment and loading berths. He said they want waiver to reduce canopies, keep historic alley width and said smaller loading berth is better scaled for district.

Mr. Kralios asked if a compilation of departures has been requested.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, said it will be part of the Certificate of Approval package.

Mr. Kralios appreciated the briefings and said it is helpful to know comprehensively what the exceptions are. He asked if direct SDCI review is needed for loading berth width.

Mr. Morrison cited SMC 23.66.170 B, and said the DON director may waive or reduce size.

Mr. Kralios asked about anticipated deliveries.

Greg Smith, Urban Visions, said they reduced the berth size at 200 Occidental and it has been more than adequate. He said this building will be adequately serviced.

Mr. Kralios was concerned about blockage of right of way because the smaller berth isn't sufficient. He requested a letter from transportation consulting showing decision making and assumptions. He said it looks great but questioned if it would work.

Mr. Smith said they are comfortable with what they are proposing.

Mr. Morrison said SEPA is going through all that. He said Urban Visions will have a dock management plan. He said waste will be managed on interior, so things will not be in alley.

Mr. Kralios said to provide information to Ms. Nashem. He said the board has supported alley departures in the past, so it is consistent in the district. He preferred healthy tree canopy in the district over building canopy; he supported elimination of canopy on Jackson Street. He said that sidewalks on Alaskan will be wide so there shouldn't be any conflict; he preferred retaining continuous canopy along Alaskan. He asked about Alee Elm.

Mr. Garcia said it is more columnar with less spread than the London Plane.

Mr. Donckers preferred tree growth to building canopy. He wanted more information about alley. He cited SMC 23.53.030 and said nine conditions are looked at. He said to make sure pedestrian ingress/egress are as called for on #9.

Mr. Morrison said the primary subsection is number 5, if widening would be detrimental to district. He said they would retain more historic brick.

Mr. Donckers asked if the berth size is connected to the alley width.

Mr. Morrison said that losing 2' impacts program of building.

Mr. Kundig said it is important to meet the experience of Pioneer Square with scale, pedestrian friendly scale and history of alleys.

Mr. Donckers noted the historic construct of Nord Alley and Pioneer Passage.

Mr. Garcia noted the value of maintaining the width and texture of the alley. He said the owner has a history of larger buildings and narrow alleys that works.

Mr. Smith noted that at 200 Occidental they stayed with the rhythm of the historic district and how it works.

Mr. Kralios asked about garage door materials and said to be mindful of alley activation.

Mr. Kundig said they aren't at that level of detail yet but was aware of importance of alley activation.

Ms. Nashem cited SMC 23.53.030, items 5 and 8. She said buildings are supposed to go to full lot line; all new have done alley waiver.

Mr. Alsobrook supported no canopies on Jackson but wanted to keep canopies on Alaskan. He supported alley departure. He noted the peculiarity of the C & H Building and wanted to honor that. He echoed Mr. Kralios' comments on the loading berth and asked for the applicants to provide as much information as possible especially about handling of waste.

Mr. Garcia agreed and said they assume some loading dock permeability, but they aren't there yet. He said the trash will be tucked away from the alley experience.

Mr. Rolluda agreed with Mr. Alsobrook's comments. He supported no canopies on Jackson but wanted to keep canopies on Alaskan; bus shelters are far enough away. He supported alley to lot line.

Mr. Smith said there is a huge bus stop there but when there is a canopy and bus stop, people stand under the canopy which ruins the retail experience.

Mr. Rolluda said the board look at architectural character; retail economics are not part of purview.

Mr. Morrison said the Waterfront Project is sensitive to bus stops and that will be worked into the conversation.

Mr. Donckers said he isn't convinced that canopies work for retail as they darken the space.

Mr. Kralios encourage the team to avoid solid doors at retail and encourage as much transparency as possible. He appreciated how the brick wraps the corner. He reiterated requested for DAHP letter and SEPA comment letter.

Mr. Morrison said he will send to Ms. Nashem.

Mr. Kralios said there is board support for 2' alley departure, loading dock departure, and removal of canopies on Jackson but not on Alaskan.

Public Comment:

Adam Michelson, C & H ownership, supported departure for alley width and narrower loading berth. He said a wider dock won't help blockages, the alley is blocked a lot. He was concerned about disruption of flow of traffic to residential entry. He wanted to hear more about pavers for alley. He supported the project.

Mr. Kralios asked if any alley improvements are required.

Mr. Garcia said yes.

Dave Bricklin, Save Our Square, said the height, bulk, and scale were not mentioned. He said the issue that needs attention is the existing garage structure.

Mr. Kralios said the board reviewed demolition of existing buildings several times and the board consensus was to approve demolition.

Mr. Bricklin said they will collect addition information.

Mr. Kralios said height, bulk, and scale was reviewed previously; board was supportive.

Carl Leighty, Alliance for Pioneer Square, said the team has done a great job on design. He like the more columnar trees. He supported the smaller loading berth and noted that deliveries already happen on the street. He was OK with no awning on north part of Alaskan elevation.

Jeff Davies, Save Our Square, appreciated the effort Olson Kundig has put into the design and that they appreciate the fragile nature of Pioneer Square. He was concerned about height, bulk, and scale. He hoped Olson Kundig and board will be sensitive to that. He said the keep the unique and special older feel of the district and to do nothing overpowering. He thanked the board and Olson Kundig for their work and looked forward to proposals going forward.

060618.3 BOARD BUSINESS

060618.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Dean Kralios, Chair

060618.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem