



The City of Seattle

Pike Place Market Historical Commission

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

MINUTES

MHC 61/15

Wednesday, April 22, 2015

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 93 Pike Street, Room 307

COMMISSIONERS

Frank Albanese

David Guthrie, Chair

Murad Habibi, Vice Chair

Bob Hale

Donald Horn

John Ogliore

Jerrod Stafford

Christine Vaughan

Staff

Heather McAuliffe

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Marika Cialdella

Vice Chair Murad Habibi determined that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

He reminded Commission members to announce any conflict of interest or ex parte communication prior to review of applications.

042215.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF DESIGN APPROVAL

042215.11 Market Foundation – pole banners
Patricia Gray

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application to install banners on 25 light pole banners within the Pike Place Market Historical District from April 23, 2015 through January 2017. She noted that the request includes three 5' x 8' flags and 11 3' x 5' flags on existing flag poles in the Market. Exhibits reviewed included renderings, sign details, photos, and a site plan. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1, 3.2, 3.6 and 3.8.

Administered by the Historic Preservation Program Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited 3.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.7, 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.7, 3.8.3 and 3.8.7 and recommended approval, with modification to pole banners to conform to 3.8.3, and photos of flag pole locations requested.

Applicant Comment:

Patricia Gray, Market Foundation, explained the temporary signage to promote the Market Front that will go on alternating light poles. She said that existing light poles will be used as will holders that are on many storefront awnings. She said there are five banner designs that share information about the Market Front work.

Mr. Guthrie arrived at 4:37 pm.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Horn said that DRC reviewed the application; applicant responded to requests.

Mr. Ogliore said there is no view blockage.

Ms. Vaughan said that the poles have been used before and noted the nice rhythm of poles.

Ms. McAuliffe said the poles have been used before but the flag poles have not been approved for use before.

Mr. Hale asked about the American flag.

Ms. Gray said that the Pike Up flag is already there. She said that three new locations are 1st and Pine, Corner Market, and Sky Bridge elevator.

Action: Mr. Horn made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/DH/JS 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Guthrie abstained.

042215.12 Market Foundation – public art bench
Lillian Hochstein

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for proposed art bench to be installed on rooftop plaza at MarketFront Building, 1901 Western Avenue. Exhibits reviewed included list/photos of existing public art in the Market,

detailed description, renderings, and color/material sample. Guidelines that applied included SMC 25.24.010, SMC 25.24.040, SMC 25.24.060, 3.1, 3.2, 3.8, and 4.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited SMC 25.24.010, SMC 25.24.040 D, SMC 25.24.060 E, 3.1.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.8.7, 3.8.8, 4.2, and 4.4. There was no consensus on the DRC for a recommendation (Don Horn and Jerrod Stafford were present; the third member of the DRC, Bob Hale, was not there). The DRC requested dimensions for the letters, the width of separation between letters, how the material would be treated, and the material sample, which was not available.

Applicant Comment:

Lillian Hochstein, Market Foundation, said they will spend a few minutes on the facts – that it was an extensive process and they are required to put a project of art at the Market front. She said the piece being reviewed was the people’s choice. She said that this is a piece called “Reflection” and it was intended to serve as a catalyst to activate the new area for patrons of the Market, citizens and visitors alike. She said the Pike Place Market is the heart of Seattle and they think this is a key thread that will weave the fabric of the City together. She said that since Seth (Grizzle) was also recently briefing the Commission on the process that the artists came to create this piece of art. She said that Jonathan (Junker) and she will strive to answer questions how it relates to the Guidelines.

She said that 3.1.2 states that additions and changes shall maintain the character of the Market and she said that clearly that has been the most challenging for them to address but it has led to a very interesting discussion of how they all define the character of the Market. She said that she has learned that everyone in the room has a different understanding, definition and interpretation of that. She said that they know that most of the Commissioners actually like this piece of art but are constrained within the definition of the Guideline of character. She said that as said a few weeks ago this piece was created to reflect all of those definitions of character and become an intriguing and dramatic piece to maintain the character of the Market. She said that they have heard Commission concerns about 3.1.2 related materials, 3.8.7 about public views, 3.8.6 about the interactions and the flows and accessibility to the art and that they will address them as they walk through some of the slides and present some of the numbers that the Commission has asked for.

Jonathan Junker, one of the artists, said they would focus on some of the changes they made and some additional info.

He next showed a slideshow. He showed a rendering of the original design, shown in August 2014. He said this is the concept which everyone remembers and it shows the kind of reflectivity and the concept in use. He said this is an original

rendering before some changes were made which shows the scale and the materiality and the reflection you get in the piece.

He said that one of the first things that has always come up in these discussions is the material. He said people want to know why they chose shiny steel and actually there are a lot of functional reasons for that. He said that basically it comes down to function more than anything.

He showed a different rendering and explained that the piece has been scaled down and abstracted a bit. He said that stainless steel is just the best material that could be used in this location. He said it is a salt water environment, there is harsh weather, there is graffiti; it is going to get keyed or scratched. He said it needs to be something that is durable that can constantly be refurbished over time. He said it will last forever and can always be polished back down to the shiny finish. He said it is the most durable material they could use and they have considered other materials. He said that they reduced the scale about 10% in response to Commission comments. He said that each letter is about 5 ½' tall and are based on a sphere. He said the t's and l are a little taller. He said the railing behind is about 3 ½' tall; the letters are about 2' taller than that. He provided a new rendering which he said shows the bench in use. He said you get a sense of what it will really look like coming out onto the plaza – people using it, sitting on it, having conversations. He said the scale is not overwhelming and the rendering shows it a bit too far to the left. He said they really opened up the space around it. He said it also gives you a sense of the mirage effect that they are going after. He compared old and new scaled down renderings. He said that each individual letter is a double sided bench. He said that each letter has been rotated to make it more conversational; each letter picks up individual views. He said they are spaced so you can walk between them; he said the letters are 5 ½' and the space between them is 6". He provided a visual of what he said are all the beautiful things surrounding this piece and the things they want to reflect: the bay, the mountains, the sunsets, the park, the City itself, the Market itself, Mt. Rainier, etc. He said that this is one of the most effective ways to look at it because this is the entire plaza looking down in plan view. He said you can get a sense of how many people can use the space and the busyness of it and the materiality of it. He provided comparison of old and new versions and said that you can see how the plaza has been modified a little bit; the piece relocated to a different orientation; it has been scaled down; it has been moved away from the main entrance on to the plaza so there is a wide opening to accommodate the same views. He said there is plenty of space all the way around it. He said that before there were just a few pinch points concerning; when you look at it now the main entry on to that plaza is about 22' and you have 11' around it. He said that on the actual water side there is 8 ½'. He said it puts the whole project into perspective in a good way. He said you can see the scale of the plaza, the materiality of the plaza – concrete, wood, glass, and steel – and the materiality of the bench itself. He said to finish a few views of usage of the bench and compared earlier renderings – he said now it is a bit more abstracted and a little more reflective of the colors around it, its

placement on the plaza itself. He said this would be an angle where you would be entering the plaza from the Market.

Mr. Junker said to recap it has been relocated, scaled down. He thinks the materiality is a good fit for what it needs to do; it is more abstract now and more about the people and the conversations and how people use it. He said another thing to talk about is the actual seat height which will be 2' – 2 ½' and said that if you look over at the railing it is about eye level from regular seat height but from 24" – 28" seat it is actually down about chest level.

Mr. Guthrie clarified that the seat level is actually 24" – 28" in height.

Mr. Junker said it is and it is still being perfected but it is definitely taller than a normal seat and it is based on the height of the railings. He said that is from approximately 14' away from the railing.

Mr. Guthrie asked for landlord comments.

Ms. Hochstein said the landlord does not have any additional comments. She said they love the way that the deck has changed a little bit. She said if you remember the decking that was in that spot was the Ipe – a hardwood. She said the way it has changed to accommodate a lot of people on that site and yet allow them to understand the view and experience the plaza. She said it is a good fit.

Mr. Guthrie thanked the applicants for their presentation.

Public Comment:

Paul Dunn said he looked at the Guidelines and said he didn't find any mention of materials except wood, glass, paint, brick, concrete; stainless steel wasn't mentioned anywhere. He said the Commission is free to express its own judgment of whether stainless steel or polished stainless steel is in character of the Market or not. He said that character is defined by everybody; it is hard to define but you know it when you see it. He said to take a characteristic icon – Rachel the pig – and how that would have gone if she was a mirror polished sculpture; it would be easy to clean but it wouldn't be the Market.

Kathy Allen, day stall vendor, said at that she was at the first meeting when architects gave their concept of what this new area should be and from that point to where we are now it has truly been a community effort. She said she is privileged to play a small part. She said that accessibility to this proposed piece of art has no boundaries as to the level of education or income or social status – it is a bench. She said it is easily recognizable, it is welcoming, it is shiny and people are drawn to shiny – they will see their reflections in it as they reflect on time shared with us. She said it reflects the view with the Market behind them and also in front of them that is reflected off the bench. She said that it gives everybody access to the most remarkable view – the busy port, ships coming and going,

views, stadiums, and sunsets - all of this with the Market at their backs. She said the ever changing Market still maintains its character of its humble origins. She said that every business that chooses to share this Market with us takes on a bit of that character but each business and activity and piece of art leaves its mark and becomes a part of the future and part of that current character. She said that the piece is accessible to all, it is easily defined and its reflective quality is a transition from the old to the new as people continue their walk down to the waterfront or the other way around. She said that it is an appropriate juxtaposition.

Haley Land, craftsperson, said he has been involved in the PC-1 North discussion since 1998. He said that he has attended almost every WRC meeting as well as creating and running the stakeholders group – business owners, craftspeople, PDA Council, Foundation, staff. He said from the start this has always been about activation and if you are not activating the plaza we are failing in our mission. He read from a quote from Project for Public Spaces and said that what attracts people most is other people. He said that the Market community fought for art that would be there 365 days a year because not everything can be there on the plaza day and night. He said they felt it was important to activate the plaza. He said it was important for commerce. He said that it is important to meet the obligations of our charter and for public safety. He said the development agreement with the City Council forged with the Market emphasized that they wanted the plaza activated and that we needed to do what we needed to do to activate it. He said the design from the beginning that it was going to be something that would draw crowds there. He said with the changes they made they actually made improvements. He said that it is now much more about locals and much more about community and much less about spectacle even though it includes all that still. He said that if we have a plaza that is not active it becomes a sick plaza which becomes dangerous and a waste of money, energy.

Mark Barbieri, Market Foundation, supported the work and said that physically it is at a spot where it serves as a welcoming point for those in transition from the outside world into this amazing magical place as well as a good bye as they transition out. He said that it is geographically physically separated enough from the heart of the historic market to where aesthetically it seems to work surrounded by new materials and construction and concrete. He said that he believes it does support this notion of the character of the Market as a place where people are welcome to interact, gather – where all are welcome and where in fact together we can all experience Market life in a very meaningful way. He said that the materials – it struck him before he even thought about historic context – the first thing that struck him when he saw it the design was how brilliant when it comes to materials it basically it comes down to what you are looking at. He said he saw this piece that was so brilliant to him that what you see is the reflection of what it is that makes the Market unique and special – our natural environment, the historic Market buildings, and the humanity including yourself and all those around you. He said that he thought the choice of materials was brilliant and he thought the sculpture is brilliant and it supports the notion of what supports the essence of the Market.

Lisa Harris, merchant, provided her written comments to staff (comments in DON file) in support of the application.

Ms. McAuliffe read from a letter submitted by Alex Rolluda who did not support the application.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Guthrie said Commissioners will ask questions of artist or landlord. He reminded Commissioners to put all personal opinions aside and keep comments based in the Guidelines.

Mr. Horn, DRC member, said he and Mr. Stafford could not come to consensus. He said he would not recommend approval. He said in general he can go back through all the Guidelines again how the piece is not compatible with inherent character. He said one of the main things is we spent a lot of time getting the new building to fit within the Guidelines and the Market and reflect the character of the historic district. He said it could have been some soaring sweeping new modern building but the final design fits within the character of the Market. He said they spent a lot of time looking at materials, the size, the rhythms, everything about that. He said to put in this shiny word is not in keeping with what we are trying to preserve in the Market – it is not in the character of the Market. He said as mentioned it would look great in Sculpture Park or down the hill or some other place in Seattle, Westlake, but just not in the Market. He said that to him it is almost a Disneyland type of thing that they are bringing into the Market – the shininess, the brightness – yes it reflects the trends of today but it doesn't reflect the Market. He said the Market is changing and adapting; there are other alternatives that we could accept – we have given lots of suggestions and ideas. He said as it is it comes down to two things – the lettering, the word 'Seattle' – 39 ½' long; and the reflectivity of it, the shininess. He said that depending on the discussion he might say more.

Mr. Stafford, DRC member, said that his understanding and taking the Guidelines into account that 3.1 – "...elements must adapt harmoniously..." He said that the 'harmoniousness' of that is what he sees is that if you block you see a reflection. When he looks at this he sees it as more transparent. He said he hears the word 'shiny' and it probably is that but he said he doesn't see it as shiny. He said that 3.2.3 the functional quality is obvious – it is in an outdoor environment in harsh weather over time and this material solves for that. He said that back to the reflectiveness he said he didn't see it as a destroyer he sees it as a reflection of everything that is already been approved and activated in the Market and it also reflects the changing market every day. Whether it is a moment in time or stretched out over decades that it is reflecting those changes.

Mr. Albanese said looking at 3.1 – reflecting changing conditions in the Market – if you look at PC-1 North versus the actual Market building architecturally there

is not connection whatsoever to the two buildings. He said that we have brand new construction over there and 100 year old here. He said that the bench fits perfectly in that space. It is steel, glass, there is wood – it is a very contemporary feel of that building. He said to put something over there that is painted surface that would fit in this part of the Market would look ridiculous over there as this piece would not fit in this building. He said that it is appropriate for the architectural significance of that building. He said he agreed with Mr. Stafford that the reflectiveness opens up a lot of sight plans where you can see from different angles. He said he likes the fact that it will attract a lot of people and ultimately it can become as iconic as the clock.

Mr. Hale said that this is an application that he has struggled with and that our Guidelines in a lot of ways are silent on art. He said that it has been suggested that we could apply the criteria of signage because it says ‘Seattle’; he said to him it is not really a sign. He said that it is not a building. He said that it is accessible to the general public and that is a good thing – it is populous and apparently it was the people’s choice. He said that it is a flawed process that we end up at the tail end after they give it a thumbs up or thumbs down when it has been a process and the artists have put a lot of work into this – probably years. He said that it is a big space – a big plaza – and that a big piece of art could work and that he is not so concerned about view blockage because in many respects it can frame views and sometimes an unobstructed open view is monotonous so that doesn’t offend him. He said that materials – it is polished and probably very little of the Market you could call polished. He said that on the other hand Mr. Stafford makes a point that it is kind of transparent in that it reflects the sky and views around it. He said that he is not so sure that where it is located that it really helps to reflect the historic Market because of where it is. He said that also his daughter is an artist and is involved in public art so it makes it awkward for him to judge someone else’s work. He said that his first reaction was that ‘Seattle’ seemed a bit like a cliché in the market and it is something you would expect to find in a tourist shop on a tee-shirt. He said that it has been abstracted in a fun way. He still has a hard time with the broad name of ‘Seattle’ when it really might be better if it was focused more on the Market. He said that he thought of all the art pieces – the examples of art in the Market this is unique in how polished it is. He said that a lot of the other pieces show farmers, and street people and vegetables and flowers and this is a different approach. He said that it is functional which is one of the purposes of functional design – a bench. He said that when talking about the spacing of the letters that you talk about people climbing on it almost imagining people slipping down and getting wedged between the letters. He asked the artist to address that.

Mr. Junker said that 6” has room to play. He said the concept is what it is – they are really happy with where they got it to. He said that but minor details like that – they want it to be as functional as possible.

Mr. Hale said he imagines a kid getting his head wedged in there. He said that one of the purposes of the Market or the Commission is to promote tourism and

the economy and he thought that if that can help to draw tourists – his first thought is that this shouldn't really be for tourists it should be for the people who live and work here - the locals. He said that tourism is a big part of the success of the Market. He said it is tough. The Guidelines are pretty silent on art.

Mr. Ogliore said that he was involved with Friends of the Market art project and he took a lot of those pictures and put together a history of the art and did a lot of research and ended up funding the restoration of the high stalls sign. He said he has been a tour guide for Friends of the Market for over ten years. He said that he has been around these things – tourists and locals too – so he has seen the artwork. He said he spent time going through other art work and made copy of guidelines he thought were there. He said that something else he picked up in 2.1.2 in Victor Steinbrueck Park – there is a little part that says that the features in the park include utilitarian design elements as well as deliberate and harmonious integration of...within the context of the district.” He said that as Mr. Hale mentioned there is nothing really concrete quantitative in the guidelines about size, materials. He said they mentioned a couple size requirements to signs and reader boards. He said it comes down to each person's interpretation of the context of the district and is it harmonious. He said that in a previous life he was an appraiser for US Customs and when they didn't have anything concrete like a bill of sale or a bill of materials we went to something called 'such or similar' where we would appraise on. He said he looked some of the things he could consider similar and the Web Fixtures were mentioned, the Market Inn Sculpture, the Squid, the Oren sculpture and the Swanson bench. He said he compared those in his mind to what this is and are they such and similar and do they compare to what is in the guidelines. He said that the one that comes most close would be Tree of Life. He said it is massive; it is metal – not shiny but the Commission turned that down unanimously. He said that and the Squid were most such and similar. He said in making a decision – we all have individual decision as to whether it does come character of market – someone brought up take up the whole market in context – not just the new or the old it has to be the market in a complete context so that is what he used.

Mr. Habibi said he has seen this come back a couple times and nothing much has changed even though the size of the lettering. He said that at the highest point it is 7' tall and the railing is only 42". He said he thought it would block the views 3.7. He said just the size of a 40' bench that is shiny – if he was going to take that and place it other places in the Market – he questioned if it would maintain the character of it. He said that even though it is a brand new building it does fall within the guidelines under New Development 4.5 so it must comply with. He said any piece would have to be able to be picked up and be put into other parts of the Market and would it feel natural there. He said that he said he didn't think it meets 3.1.2. He said he didn't think it was a harmonious change – it is too much of a change compared to other pieces of art that are currently existing especially other benches which are really just wood and concrete. He said that for those reasons he didn't think he could approve this. He said they gave some feedback at the DRC last week about changing the color and making it less shiny – many

more dull – and he said he didn't see any of that feedback incorporated into the design.

Ms. Vaughan said she started thinking of the Ordinance and the Guidelines and cited "...humble and anonymous in character..." She cited 3.1. She said this development in this architectural space is a prime example of serving and adjusting to varying Market activities. She said that is what they have been struggling with. She said that we have let go of the old and decided we would not try to recreate the building that was there. She said we are not replacing the old building. She said that we have been really careful that the new building complements the old building in materials, color and form. She cited 4.2 "...should not mimic the style..." and she said that brought her back to the bench. She said that for her "Seattle" – it is a word but not a sign. She said that it provides a public amenity – 3.8.1 - but it is more than a bench. She said that art of its nature for her is not humble and anonymous; it is celebratory and calls attention to itself by what it is. She said the art becomes a part of the view; it enhances the view (4.4) while providing a public amenity for enjoying the view. She said that it is not a sign – it is art. She said that public recognition is not a problem with this particular art piece. She said that it is shiny but 3.2.3 says 'inherent products are preferred to painted surfaces' – it is stainless steel; it is what it is. She said it is an inherent color to the material that it is. She said that matches with 3.2.3. She said that it is not like any other art but there have been firsts in the Market before – the Webs, character, shortcut and said there is nothing like that. She said the colors in some of the materials on the garage –she could only imagine what the commission struggled with those too because some of them are very brilliant and some of the forms are different. She said that is consistent with the market in terms of can you pick it up and put it anywhere else – no because there isn't any other place in the Market like the plaza. The only place big enough to hold it is the street. She said that the plaza is – it is Market consistent but it is a new element. She said it needs to be compatible with the Historical Market character of the district and yet today is part of the history of the market. She said we have a pause over the buildings and all the materials have been woven into the character but it is also reflective of where we are now. She said it forms a progression – it is a living market. She said it is not a museum – it is a living market. She said the piece is a fit.

Mr. Horn said there is nothing in the guidelines about tourists or tourism. He said that is the problem – this is a sign for tourists – it is all about tourism and promoting things and people and not the Market. He said that if you go back to Ordinance and why the Market was created, the purpose of the historic commission it talks about families, farmers, merchants, shoppers, market activities...he said it is not about tourists. He said that is the whole issue is that this art is a destination point for tourists and it doesn't belong. He said that the benches being 6" apart does become a barrier across that way so if you have a lot of tourists the only way to get around it is walking around and not through. He said he thought that was too close.

Mr. Albanese said that when you say it was meant for tourists he disagrees. He said that a wedding party coming down for photographs are not tourists; graduation pictures are not tourists. He said you will find a lot of locals coming down there that are celebrating special events in their time that will use that as a background for photos as much as they use Rachel, the clock, and the sign above city fish. He said to say it is for tourists only is not correct.

Mr. Stafford cited 25.24. He said he said he wasn't sure how that fit in with the guidelines but that his interpretation is that this district was created so that harmonious outward appearance and Market uses be preserved.

Ms. Vaughan asked if the material has been taken out on to the plaza area to see that it will do what it is assumed it will do.

Mr. Junker said yes they spent a lot of time out there. He said they continue to test it.

Mr. Guthrie said he has had a hard time with this application and gone back and forth if this is art or a sign. He said he came to conclusion it is art. He said that he has done his best and due diligence to discourage subject matter and promote something that is more pike place market oriented. But being a piece of art he said could understand the artist holding fast. He said that there are many instances in the guidelines which say that we need to keep to natural materials. He said that stainless steel doesn't mimic any other material - it is what it is. Pedestrian qualities -2.3.1. He said he can't think of a more appropriate location for something of this size. He said the gist that he interpret guidelines is that each building is its own time capsule in history and we creating new building that is supposed to be harmonious with existing historic district. Is it happening gradually? No unless we take a hundred years to build it. This piece is coming along with the building. We can't ask any more than to have it come together with this package. He said that commission responsibility is to preserve the Market primary function – the sale of locally grown produce etc. He said the new development shall preserve or enhance public views into through the market....read Guideline. He said that he has gone through that in his opinion if he stands behind a light pole my view is obstructed but if he moves around to the other side his view is not obstructed. That is the same case. He questioned where does commission draw line at view obstruction. You've got 14' 2" to the outer most railing and 8'3" to the closest railing. 21' to the south size 11' to the steps on the north 11 1'2 to concrete ramp. They have provided enough pedestrian movement and access around the sculpture to provide views. He said the seating area at 24". I'm still not convinced that it is appropriate. Pike place market is in desperate need of benches seating. It will provide views. It is an active object. It is a piece of art. I would approve this application.

Mr. Habibi said that we spent a lot of time 2 1/2 – 3 years to come up with the right design for this building. That has been said and done - building is a building. It does flow in its natural materials. He said that at the same time this

part doesn't have to go with this application. They are separate for a reason. They are meant to be voted on individually. Do I think a 40' bench that blocks a good chunk of the promenade maintains view in 3.8.7? We spent a lot of time to protect those views and now we are considering putting a big bench there. There could be other opportunities; it doesn't have to be this one - perhaps other designs that don't block views. It doesn't have to be this or nothing.

Mr. Horn said that it is not necessarily about blocking the views as it is about degrading the views. The guidelines talk about preserving and enhancing views so even with the space between letters it is still degrading that. He said the one illustration that shows the fence doesn't show the fence filled in with tags. He said we have already degraded all of that up to 42" and then you are adding another 2' all the way across with 4' for the tallest letters. He said that one other question they had was what the width of the 'l' and the 't' are. The drawings don't show the fence filled with tags and then add a bench to that.

Ms. McAuliffe asked if the drawing had been updated at all from what the DRC was presented last week.

Mr. Junker said yes; it has more dimensions.

Ms. McAuliffe said she will need that.

Mr. Horn said it doesn't have the width of those still.

Mr. Junker said it does on a different slide. He said the 'l' is 2 ½'.

Ms. McAuliffe said this would be like inserting a mirror in a public space and asked how it might reflect places people should not see, for example, up skirts.

Mr. Junker said that is where the sphere came from. Basically what you are going to get reflected mostly are from the top half of each letter up it will reflect up. It is going to be directly at you, the sky, the mountains, and everything from that point up would upward. He said the bottom of each letter is kind of the opposite. He said they have also done a lot of reflection studies themselves because there are concave areas they are looking at minimizing reflection in. He said they don't want to create a magnifying glass scenario so they are doing specific studies around that.

Ms. McAuliffe asked about amount of glare to eyes as a mirror.

Mr. Junker said they have thought quite a bit about that and he thought you could do. It doesn't have to be 100% mirror on 100% of the area - there are specific area where you might want to minimize it or you could do subtle differences to the finishes that minimizes that. He said the sample is uniform so if you look at the back of the sample it is very matte - it is not polished to the same level shine.

Ms. McAuliffe said that there could be differences in how it appears – the overall finish might not be entirely different. If the Commission approves this, you would make adjustments to the finish, is that right?

Mr. Junker said he wasn't sure; he would find out.

Mr. Guthrie said if the motion is conditioned for them to come back they will.

Ms. McAuliffe said the Commission could approve it with the condition that the applicant return to the DRC for any changes to the finish.

Mr. Guthrie said that with regards to continuing that line of thought – he asked how the seating areas going to drain.

Mr. Junker said through the form they will drain out the sides; he said they are not going to do any holes into the actual pieces. He said they have sculpted it in a way so there aren't bowls of water sitting there – it won't fill up.

Ms. Vaughan asked how easy it would be to get on a 24" seat.

Applicants demonstrated what 24" looks like. Ms. Nisly provided an exercise ball that is 24" high.

Ms. Horn said that the t's and l's are flat surfaces and would be mirrors – they are not curved in any way.

Mr. Junker said correct. He said that on the t's they start to curve a little but they are flat toward the top.

Ms. Nisly said they are the same on both sides.

Mr. Horn pointed out which surfaces and where.

Ms. McAuliffe said that questions about the heat and came up earlier.

Mr. Horn said it has been compared to the bean in Chicago and that is a surface where people can't touch the top of it. Here people can touch and sit on this surface that is going to sit in bright sun all day long – July, August – and he thought it would get pretty hot and you won't be able to sit on it.

Mr. Guthrie said he thought it was a safety issue.

Ms. McAuliffe said that they talked about how they would address it and wondered if they could provide more explanation as far as the type of heat sink.

Mr. Junker said there are many types of heat sinks and also there are coatings. He said they still use stainless steel on playgrounds. He said it has come a long way

and it is actually one of the metals that dissipates heat much more quickly than other metals. He said that copper does that as well. He said that it can be done and he is totally confident that issues like the heat and the glare can be successfully mitigated without losing (inaudible).

Mr. Horn said that copper absorbs the heat really well which is why they use it in tubes for solar hot water. He said that if you have ever touched one of those it only has to be in the sun for like 30 seconds and it is too hot to touch.

Ms. Nisly said the contract that the Foundation has with Graypants specifically identifies maintenance plan and heat studies. She said that they have allocated the funds and they wanted to make sure it passed the Commission. She said they are identified specifically in the contract.

Mr. Habibi asked if there is a temperature limit on the bench.

Ms. Nisly said no but that there has to be a heat study done and they have to approve it; there has to be a maintenance plan.

Mr. Habibi said that the Commission could approve something today that may not necessarily be sensible as far as that study goes.

Ms. Nisly said if they changed anything in the bench they would come back to the Commission.

Mr. Hale said that being a reflective surface that the surface would actually reflect the heat as opposed to a metal bench that is painted black.

Mr. Albanese mentioned the dragon in International District Children's Park and said it is stainless steel. He said he was told that it was filled with sand and the sand helps dissipate the heat.

Mr. Junker said that you can also do that with liquid, with sand, concrete.

Mr. Albanese said it is a stainless steel piece that children are sliding up and down on. He said that what they are saying is that they can fix that and he didn't think it is up to the Commission to get involved in that other than there is heat retention.

Mr. Guthrie agreed and said that all of us have burned out thighs on a stainless steel slide. He said that he has sat on a concrete wall and it has been too hot. He said our tolerance level probably ranges across the board and there are no specific guidelines that address that.

Ms. McAuliffe said they can put in the results of the design changes

Mr. Guthrie said right – those design changes – right now you are proposing them to be hollow spheres.

Mr. Junker said yes.

Mr. Guthrie said that any other design changes would come back for approval – anything other than what we have here including finishes, spacing, height, location.

Ms. Vaughan asked if it would matter to the Commission if it were hollow or not because it isn't visible.

Ms. McAuliffe said it is only the appearance.

Mr. Guthrie said it is only the appearance but it needs to pass their evaluations, test, reflectivity before it moves forward. He said that anything they have to do to make that happen that changes the design would have to come back to the Commission. He said that is understood. He asked if there are other comments. He asked if Commission understands application and is ready to make motion.

Action: Mr. Albanese made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application with assumption that if there are any design changes or position changes or material changes that it come back to DRC.

MM/SC/FA/JS 4:4:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Ogliore, Hale, Habibi, and Horn opposed.

Ms. Nisly asked if there is anything aside from removing the bench from the plaza that would make this approvable – size, further apart, different reflection - and asked for direction. She said that otherwise they won't make changes and this moment has passed. She said at this time the Commission has fewer members than it has had in some time and if there is any direction that could put them in a place they could find a way to get to approval.

Mr. Horn said that every review since August they have given suggestions. He said he suggested to research the Guidelines to try to make it seem like it is more in keeping with the more down to earth character of the market and the other buildings and new building. He said if it were a pitted surface, or darker, duller it might be acceptable. He said they have talked about the men in the light sculpture in the Hill Climb and Rachel and other metal finishes. He said that something that maybe, kind of, grows from the surface and is shiny only on the top, or whatever, so you still have your bit of reflection that you are talking about, but the entire object is not shiny. He said the shininess for him is a major issue that doesn't fit in with the character. He said that the other thing is the length – 39 ½'. He said it is a large plaza but particularly that you cannot walk through – 6" is just not enough to allow circulation.

Ms. Nisly asked if they want people to walk through it.

Mr. Horn said he would think so.

Ms. Nisly said it would make the bench longer.

Mr. Horn said one of the suggestions was to shrink it down so that it is not a literal “Seattle” – more abstract in terms of form. He said that one idea – although he doesn’t like the idea of letters – was to take away the t and the l and e . He said if you insist on having a word maybe if it was only “Seat” – and people could form the others – then it is not as long, it is not saying “Seattle.” It is not the destination for coming to take their wedding pictures. He said that his major objections are that it is a word and that it is so reflective.

Mr. Guthrie did a recount on the vote.

Ms. McAuliffe asked for Commissioners to make a suggestion.

Mr. Habibi cited 3.8.7 which talks about diminishing views and said that something that is not a 40’ bench that is blocking them. He said that materials that are not as shiny, things that maintain the character of the Market. He suggested looking at other materials that were in the new building as inspiration that would help to maintain the character and be a natural harmonious change.

Mr. Hale said he is struggling with the Guidelines and said the Commission enforces the Guidelines. He said that the bench doesn’t say ‘Market’. He said it is a great piece and there are probably lots of places in Seattle where it would be great but torn and he could have gone either way.

Mr. Ogliore agreed with Mr. Horn and Mr. Hale and said he couldn’t reconcile the size of it – the immensity. He said that the ‘Seattle’ to him is touristy it is not the Market. He said if it had said “PPM’ or something like that. He said he has a basic objection that went back to August when someone brought up the ‘Seattle’ not reconciling itself with the Market. He said he didn’t know if he had suggestions but said if it was toned down and wasn’t as massive. He said one of his main objections is ‘Seattle’. He cited 1.1 – protect uses and design in the Market.

Mr. Horn noted the comment about ‘blending of the new with the old’ that this is blurring the line between the Market and the waterfront development. He said there used to be a line where you know you are in the district and when you are not in the district – Pike Place Market. He said there are all kinds of other shops and different areas that have been designed as the waterfront development moves down the hill. He said that is one of the things the committee wanted to keep – a point at which you knew you were in the Market. This does bring the new into the Market and blurs that line which we did not want. He said we very specifically try to say this is the point where you enter the Market. He said that art work could go there ... it could still be tall, it could be 40’ tall... it is just the

combination volume, mass and shininess that needs to be compatible with the Market.

Ms. McAuliffe asked Commission members and said if the letters were grouped instead of strung apart therefore never meeting as the word 'Seattle'. She asked if that would be closer to meeting the Guidelines.

Mr. Ogliore said like the Swanson bench down in the stairs which is grouped ...

Ms. McAuliffe said grouped rather than linear so that it doesn't appear as a sign it appears as a group of forms.

Mr. Ogliore wanted to hear from Design Committee.

Mr. Horn said anything that is more of a shape or form rather than a word or sign might be acceptable. He said that this would become, or be seen as, an object together and doesn't lead on as a word – that would help.

Ms. Vaughan said there are lots of suggestions here. She said the theme of the piece is reflection. She said if the artists came back with four flowers – round, reflective surface – would we approve the metal.

Ms. McAuliffe said she understood the reason why Seattle was chosen was because the letters work well as seats – just the fact that they work well as seats. That was the reason given.

Mr. Hale said mixing the letters up might make it less obvious and people can kind of put it together and maybe not have it so linear. He said more grouped instead of being 39 1/2' long.

Ms. Hochstein said that quite honestly it is a piece of art that they needed to present as created and that was their challenge to balance between the piece of art created and all the suggestions. She said that they will find that with each piece of art.

Ms. Vaughan said it would be good to hear from the artist about the suggestions right now. There is a chance to speak about the suggestions.

Mr. Junker said this is what they love to do and they are proud what they have put forth. It is what it is and they love it as it is. He said he is not interested in changing it much.

Mr. Horn said it would be great on the next level down the hillside or on the pier – to put it someplace else because Seattle would love it.

Mr. Hale said it is saying a lot that it is a front door to Market – sorry it doesn't say 'the Market' when you get up to the plaza.

Mr. Stafford left at 6:05 pm.

042215.2 COMMISSION BRIEFING

042215.21 PDA – MarketFront Building
Jennifer Maietta

Briefing on proposed commercial uses.

Jennifer Maietta briefed the Commission on how they are looking for uses for the new MarketFront Building that will keep the Market unique. She said they do not want to dilute that and want to complement existing Uses. She said that they do not want to take away from existing. She said the project as a whole will include mercantile, producer/farmer, and retail which will be huge in the new development. She said there will be lots of public space for events, parking garage, residential and said they are looking at how retail will work within different locations. She noted the challenge of access on Western and said it is difficult to determine how uses will work in different spaces.

She said they would like production-based tenants, tenants that will be a draw and that they want to put like tenants together. She said it is a given that people will want to see the historic Market. She said the tenants will need to generate larger revenue per square foot because there are a lot of expenses (like security) at the new space. She talked about production-based tenants and the need for front of house and back of house and how this fits with the wording of the Guidelines. She said that production space isn't taken into account.

Mr. Guthrie asked if they had taking 2.6 into consideration. He said the Market is a collection of small business and in keeping with historic character it should remain so. He said that production space doesn't address access and difficult to get in to spaces.

Ms. Maietta said they need anchor tenants in order to bring in revenue and sustainability. She said that it isn't traditional retail and the access is difficult. She said that they have preleases – they aren't in stone – in order to move forward.

Mr. Guthrie said that it is up to the applicant to make the argument for 'exceptional circumstances'. He noted the absence of 'production space' in Guidelines.

Responding to questions Ms. Maietta said they have a pre-lease with a brewery that has food production, restaurant, front and back of house; a cannery production and service, retail, food service and production; and Honest Biscuits. She said that when pouring slab they can put in sleeves etc.

Mr. Habibi noted the 2000 square foot limit.

Ms. Maietta said that they can design front and back of house to fit within provisions.

John Turnbull noted the issues of getting into odd spots and that impact on leases.

Ms. Vaughan noted the space being prepared for the brewery now.

Ms. Maietta said they can sell off the equipment.

Mr. Horn said original windows are being destroyed for a brewery that won't be there after three years.

042215.4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 8, 2015

MM/SC/DH/JO 5:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Vaughan and Mr. Habibi abstained.

042215.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

042215.6 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

042215.7 STAFF REPORT

042215.8 NEW BUSINESS

Ms. McAuliffe reported that there are three incoming Commissioners: Anais Winant, Rachel Kitagawa, and Deborah Jones.

Ms. McAuliffe suggested a spring get-together for Commissioners since they were unable to do so during winter holidays.

6:35 pm Mr. Habibi made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ogliore seconded.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe
Commission Coordinator