



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 195/18

MINUTES for Wednesday July 18, 2018

Board Members

Adam Alsobrook
Lynda Collie
Kianoush Curran
Brendan Donckers
Alex Rolluda
Felicia Salcedo

Staff

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Dean Kralios, Chair
Carol O'Donnell, Vice Chair

Alex Rolluda called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

071818.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

June 6, 2018

MM/SC/AA/BD

4:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Salcedo abstained.

071818.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071818.11 Quilt Building

316 1st Ave S

Replacement of the stucco and windows on the penthouse
Painting and repairs to other windows,
Masonry cleaning, repointing and sealing

Ralph Allen proposed replacement of penthouse level stucco, windows and doors; masonry cleaning, repointing, sealing, and repair and repainting of wood windows on the west façade. He said the windows on the west façade are painted shut; they will

not restore operation, just paint what is there. He proposed repainting the balcony railings at the penthouse level and the window recesses. He said they will repaint the fire shutter system on the north and south walls.

ARC report: Mr. Alsobrook reported that ARC reviewed the plans and specifications provided and thought that the colors were appropriate. ARC preferred the new grey color for the penthouse compared to the pink that matches what is there. ARC acknowledged that the pink has likely faded from the original color but that the proposed grey coordinated better with other elements of the building but provided differentiation. ARC discussed the alternative to stucco and thought that that the penthouse was minimally visible from the primary façade and the material would not be recognizable from the pedestrian level. However, the Board wanted to see an assemblage sample. ARC thought that the proposed water pressure was too high and wanted them to start with a test of a lower water pressure and try to keep it below 400. ARC also did not want them to use the chemical or the water pressure near the ghost sign. ARC discussed that the plan for window repair on the original wood windows on the west façade was appropriate. They said that if any of the windows called for repair beyond what is in the repair plan or replacement, that they will need to return for a COA for the repairs.

Staff report: Ms. Nashem explained this project had elements that she felt needed Board review instead of administrative review including the replacement of the stucco with an alternative material that may be considered as synthetic stucco, changing color, window replacement and the existence of the ghost sign as well as the application of sealant. Typically, when reviewing a cleaning as in-kind maintenance a test area is requested and site review performed. Same with the sealing to assure the product does not change the appearance of the brick.

Mr. Donckers asked if there is a plan for accessing the windows on the north and south side windows.

Mr. Allen said one building is providing roof access for the work; the other is still in negotiation.

Mr. Donckers asked about the ghost sign.

Mr. Allen said that they are repointing as needed and will match color on grout as appropriate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rolluda went over District Rules.

Mr. Alsobrook reviewed the sample stucco and said it appears like a three-coat stucco and is not like the soft spongy product used before; what is proposed operates as rain screen.

Mr. Donckers was concerned about color and thought the grey would appear startling. He said retaining consistency is important with regard to the District and the buildings along 1st Avenue. He said that most of the building is a pinkish color and he was afraid the differentiation will pop.

Mr. Allen said they are open to either color – pink or grey.

Mr. Rolluda said ARC thought the grey was neutral enough.

Mr. Alsobrook said the color is faded. He said it is of its time period – 1980. He said paint colors change, it can be repainted. He said both options are suitable.

Mr. Donckers said he could support change if he saw color renderings but that he was concerned about the stark differentiation.

Mr. Alsobrook supported matching the existing color.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for replacement of the stucco amended to match existing color, Auburn; replacement of the windows in the penthouse; painting and repairs to other windows, if repairs are needed beyond what they current scope of work is then a new COA application will be submitted for the additional repairs or replacement; masonry cleaning, repointing and sealing with staff review of cleaning and sealing. The cleaning will be done at the lowest pressure possible. Testing a small area at up to 100psi and only increasing in increments up to (400) if the cleaning can't be achieved with a lower pressure.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 18, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those

portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

New construction must be visually compatible with the predominant architectural styles, building materials and inherent historic character of the District. (7/99) Although new projects need not attempt to duplicate original facades, the design process ought to involve serious consideration of the typical historic building character and detail within the District.

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

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

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

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/BD/AA

5:0:0 Motion carried.

071818.12 **Schwabacher Building**
103-105 1st Ave S

Painting the storefront

Applicant Comment:

Mike Norman proposed to paint a portion of the façade along 1st Ave side above Kigo and Delicatus; the existing tile band and sheet metal soffit are currently painted, and they are changing the color. He said the storefront and soffit are both aluminum.

ARC report: Mr. Alsobrook reported that ARC reviewed the plans and color samples provided and thought the colors were compatible with the building and the District. The applicant explained that the tiles are currently painted green, and the black color would match the metal windows. ARC discussed that the entire storefront appears to have been altered and the tiles appear to be from the 80's and definitely not consistent with tile from the building's era. ARC supported painting the tile.

Staff report: Ms. Nashem was able to find a photo taken in 1972; the storefront had been remodeled by that time including the tile and the soffit. The alteration did not appear to be there in an earlier photo.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rolluda went over District Rules.

Mr. Donckers said the blonde color is striking but it is subtly placed on soffit.

Mr. Rolluda concurred.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Painting the storefront Tricorn Black SW6258 and (blonde) SW6128 as proposed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 27, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

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

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

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

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

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

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

071818.22

Drexel Building

Andro
219 James St

Painting the storefront, installing signage and installing windows curtains

Kelli Wimbley-Dinh explained they will paint and the proposed curtains will be on the main windows; the door will remain open. The sign is on the existing bracket.

ARC report: Mr. Alsobrook reported that ARC reviewed the drawings and the samples provided. ARC thought the signage complied with the letter height and size of signs. The blade sign used an existing bracket. They thought the color was compatible with the building and the District and that it was an improvement over the red that was there. They discussed the proposed curtains. ARC asked for a larger sample, so they could get a better idea of transparency. ARC thought base on the small sample

provided that they curtain still maintained transparency but also saw the need for sun filtering. The applicant indicated that they intended to pull the curtain for solar blacking and after hours. Overall ARC thought that the package was well coordinated and attractive and compatible.

Staff report: Ms. Nashem said the existing conditions photos show a curtain on Il Corvo. These curtains have not been applied for or approved. The Board has allowed curtains in certain circumstance such only allowing them to be pulled when sun is creating glare or being allowed to be pulled part way.

Mr. Alsobrook held the curtain sample up to windows and board members noted the transparency.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Rolluda went over District Rules.

Mr. Donckers said the sign package is small and figures into transparency; he said it is a minimalist package so there is latitude with curtains.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Painting the storefront Bosc Pair SW6390, installing signage and installing transparent window curtains all as presented.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 18, 2018 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

SMC23.66.160 Signs

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

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

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

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

E. 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)

XX. RULES FOR TRANSPARENCY, SIGNS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIE

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

A. Transparency Regulations

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

B. General Signage Regulations

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

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

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
4. Blade signs (signs hanging perpendicular to the building). Blade signs shall be installed below the intermediate cornice or second floor of the building, and in such a manner that they do not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. Typically, non-illuminated blade signs will be limited to eight (8) square feet. (12/94)

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

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

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

071818.2 PRELIMINARY DESIGN BRIEFINGS

071818.21 Occidental Park

Briefing on proposed pavilion

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

Beth Purcell, Seattle Parks Foundation, provided an overview of the project and noted they have done robust outreach. She said project partners include Seattle Parks Foundation, Downtown Seattle Association, Alliance for Pioneer Square, and Seattle Parks Department (SPAR). She said the project will be funded by Park Foundation and public funding.

Carl Leighty, Alliance for Pioneer Square, noted the good design and siting and said they have done outreach via open house, online survey and park ambassadors. He said there is general support for the pavilion and kiosk.

Jen Cassius, Downtown Seattle Association, said this park is one that has been identified as turning into a liability. She said they looked at how to activate and program it and have used a 'flood the space' approach. She said they have seen a positive return. She said they are trying new things. She supported the pavilion noting it would be inviting for guests and would allow diverse programming.

Edward Lalonde, Olson Kundig, went over design process and how the design relates to the proposal and character of the park. He said the project is funded by timber families. He said they want to exhibit the timber history of the area and its future. He said the pavilion will be non-sided, transparent and open. He said it will be a functioning covered

space for events and lunches. He said originally, they looked at including public bathrooms but scaled back due to budget. He said they want to pay homage to the timber history and the area before that. He said they explored the Coastal Salish dwelling which was made to be taken apart to move as needed and used it for inspiration for the design. He said this area was known as “Little Crossing Over Place” in what was a marshy area. He said they are working with Spearhead, a Canadian company that designs using contemporary timber technology. He reported that a historic canopy structure was in the proposed location and noted other canopies in district – the pergola, 200 Occidental.

Mr. Lalonde explained they used the 17' Pioneer Square datum for the 30' x 80' canopy structure which would nestle in where there is a slight level change; it would span over onto Occidental. He said they want to use as light a touch as possible and would restore the existing pavers. He said the structure would be constructed with a glu-lam system married with steel for structure, with a glass canopy above. He said graffiti treatments and maintenance are being explored. He said they will use fritted glass and are looking at char black versus natural wood for the kiosk. He said the roof will be single slope and will drain off roof or via downspout.

Mr. Donckers asked maintenance strategy.

Ms. Purcell said that SPAR will be responsible for maintenance of building and they are involved with design to make sure what is installed is maintainable by them.

Victoria Schoenberg, SPAR, said SPAR owns and maintains all physical parts of the park.

Mr. Rolluda asked if a retractable roof was considered.

Mr. Lalonde said they are concerned with camping beneath it. He said they could do a rotating system like a jalousie, but it is very expensive. He said the glazing is 5' x 8' pieces and is removable.

Ms. Purcell said rotating glass would be problematic for maintenance and a simpler approach is needed.

Mr. Lalonde said they want it as transparent as possible.

Ms. Nashem noted that in a 2005 re-do of the park a pergola was approved; the kiosk was put there temporarily until the permanent structure was designed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Cassius said that sometimes the pavilion would be supplement with tents etc. for larger events.

Ms. Collie asked about power.

Mr. Lalonde said they will bring in power via electrical box and there will be power in bollards.

Ms. Collie said she manages the Grand Central Building and noted concern with people sleeping beneath the structure as well as security and maintenance issues.

Mr. Rolluda asked about when the Sounders and Seahawks put up their stages.

Ms. Cassius said they may use the pavilion but they might want to put up their own.

Mr. Rolluda said he thought the size and scale of the proposed building blocks more of the openness than he is comfortable with. He didn't think many people will use the public covered space and it will be used for transient shelter if not fenced off and locked down at night. He said he understood that oversized Jenga, maps, and basketballs need to be stored somewhere. He said he would hold the designers to Secretary of the Interior Standards for New Construction 9, and give special emphasis on historic materials, size scale, and proportion to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. He said he thought a square / plaza is extremely valuable real estate in a city environment. It works because it is a void, providing a variety of uses to urban dwellers. The more structures you add to a square the more you deprive users of walking and gathering space. The size of this proposed structure's canopy seems disproportionately large to its use, that of information kiosk, operated by one or two people. He said the roof should only cover the kiosk, which itself could be narrower and sited towards the edge of the plaza, in order to delineate the space with less intrusion. Open Space should be open. He said a structure like this should be a little more delicate, like the pergola. He said that one of the comments they got for the first concept for the Weller Street pedestrian bridge was to lighten it up, make it "light and lacy." The same could go for this design. He said the existing info booth has nice scale and detail. He noted the trolley platform and said it has been unused for many years. It is compatible in terms of materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing. He wondered if this structure could be relocated modified and reused in the square. He said he has heard comments about the proposed pavilion; that they would not be comfortable walking thru the park at night with a large covered pavilion unless it was locked and closed at night.

Ms. Collie asked if there are lighting plans.

Mr. Lalonde said they intend to light the glass and illuminate the structure. He said they could control lighting as needed for events. He said the kiosk will be lit as well. He said they have brought in a lighting designer to work with them.

Mr. Donckers said it is a unique proposal and he noted the investment of programming and activation in the park.

Ms. Cassius said they will be flexible and temporary; things can be moved around to interrupt negative activities. She said parks staff will get there early and will move people along; after a couple days they will move on.

Mr. Rolluda said when the original canopy was in the park there was sleeping there; any opportunity for encampment will be taken advantage of. He was concerned with overpopulation of the park. He said when it is open space, things happen organically. He said he would like to see it all reflected in the rendering, so the board can relate the structure to the overall park.

Mr. Alsobrook was concerned about the view shed down Occidental which used to be a street; he said the structure would take away emphasis from view shed. He said the design of Occidental Square is approaching historic age. He said to look at preservation of it. He said it could be an amendment to the National Register listing and could be a contributing resource. He said the proposed structure looks huge in the park and that it looks out of place. He said the burnt wood is trendy now but wondered how it would fare with graffiti issues and white paint. He noted long-term maintenance concerns. He noted concern with glass canopies or roofs, fritted or not, as they look dirty.

Mr. Lalonde asked about scale issues with canopy or kiosk.

Mr. Alsobrook said it is just big and hearing about all the other things that may show up, he wondered when 'enough is enough'. He called it the 'clutter-fi-cation' of public space.

Mr. Lalonde said it is an active park; this would capture the bulk of activities, but not all.

Ms. Cassius noted First Thursdays, Urban Craft Uprising, etc. where tents are used and said they are rarely up overnight.

Mr. Alsobrook said the pavilion is an elegant structure which fits the architectural legacy of the firm, but the kiosk is a hydraulic bento box. He said the pavilion is being financed by timber families yet now it is a glass and steel extravaganza which takes away from the dynamic of wood. He said he understood the structural limitations but wondered if it is everything or nothing.

Mr. Lalonde said they can show how wood is being partnered with steel. He said they want to show wood technology now.

Mr. Donckers appreciated the kiosk in the canopy but wondered how the larger canopy fits in with bigger picture and how it could dominate the park. He wondered if there are opportunities to simplify it. He noted the glass structure at Swannie's as an example of what is not wanted in the park. He said that being subtler could be an effective addition to the park. He appreciated that they are looking at maintenance issues now so as not to incentive negative activity.

Ms. Salcedo encouraged the DSA to think of homeless not as problematic but to think of alternatives and options for these people.

Mr. Alsobrook appreciated the comments. He said historically Pioneer Square has served as a shelter of last resort of many people.

Ms. Purcell said they have talked with Parks about that. She said there are more shelters in Pioneer Square than any other part of the City. She said they are working with all stakeholders.

Mr. Rolluda wanted to see a rendering or plans that shows all the items on the site. He said the canopy looks large and could be lighter. He noted concerns with glass. He said the beauty of the park is the square and the surrounding buildings; he didn't want this structure to be the focal point.

Mr. Donckers asked why the structure needs to be so large. He expressed concern with closing off the alley south of the park. He suggested reducing the cover and the scale.

Mr. Alsobrook wanted to see Code citations and District Rules and how the design fits in with them.

Ms. Salcedo left at 10:38 am.

071818.22 **100 S King Street**

Briefing on proposed alterations to the existing building and penthouse addition

Detailed handout in DON file.

Greg Schiffler, SHED, explained the plan to convert the building from office use to hotel. The hotel will have 180 rooms and a penthouse. There will be seismic bracing.

Loading Docks

He requested feedback on their ideas to improve the space including use of loading docks on the north side of the building and addition of dining platform there. He said the dining platform will connect to interior restaurant. He said the electrical vault will be sited beneath the dining platform with louvers and fan for exhaust. Responding to questions he said service will be conducted on east side. He said trash pickup will be along the north-south alley; service provider will come into building to collect.

Mr. Rolluda asked about deck setbacks at the penthouse.

Mr. Schiffler said the deck is all the way to the north edge, everywhere else it is more than 15'.

Mr. Rolluda asked if diagonal bracing will be used.

Mr. Schiffler said there will be structural brace frames on all sides which impacts street level glazing options. He said originally there was loading use on the front façade; what they are conceptualizing harkens back to that original use in a modern and active way. He proposed a roll up door that leads to a restaurant or lobby; the space will be highly activated.

Mr. Alsobrook asked if a guard rail would be needed where the floor level is below street level.

Mr. Schiffler wasn't sure but will look in to that.

Mr. Alsobrook said if it is less than 30" a guard rail is not needed.

Mr. Schiffler said if viable they would provide a bench or rail depending on operator and use. He said they propose modern industrial garage door language, referencing the original function of a loading door; they are mindful of National Park Service allowance.

Alley

Mr. Schiffler said the alley is private property; there is no right of way issue. Historically the alley was for loading. He said they need to bring gas into the building and said the meter installation is proposed on the buff brick

Mr. Donckers said the garage doors were appropriate.

Mr. Donckers left at 11:07 am.

Mr. Schiffler said that NPS does not support nano walls. He said they will find a door that would operate as a canopy when open. He said they are reviewing egress issues with the west portion of the dining platform; he noted the adjacency of the gas meters. He said the gas meters will be visible and that he would look at screening. He said bollarding will be required as well. Responding to questions he said locating the gas meters under the platform is not possible due to safety requirements that would make it very expensive.

Dining

Mr. Alsobrook noted the area is trashy and unsafe; activation fits with other improvements planned. He said more eyes on the alley is a good idea. He said the glazing approach is sound and he appreciated the doors hearkening to the historic condition of loading doors. He said to stay with NPS guidelines on north elevation glazing.

Ms. Nashem noted there is a rolling door at 619 Western which were approved by NPS.

Mr. Schiffler explained the lower floor is classified as basement, so they don't need to do MUP/SEPA.

Mr. Rolluda said to review SMC 23.66.130 for allowed square footage.

Mr. Schiffler said the use will be loosely defined and will be under the umbrella of one operator, but it won't be tightly demised.

Ms. Nashem said use needs to be identified and there needs to be commitment to it.

Mr. Rolluda said it is overall a good project that he would support and that it is a good location for a hotel.

071818.3 BOARD BUSINESS

071818.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Dean Kralios, Chair

071818.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227