



The City of Seattle

## Pike Place Market Historical Commission

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

### MINUTES

MHC 116/21

Wednesday August 25, 2021  
4:30 p.m.  
Virtual meeting via WebEx

### COMMISSIONERS

Chris Bown  
Michael Hammond  
Grace Leong  
Golnaz Mohammadi  
Lisa Martin, Chair  
Lauren Rudeck, Vice Chair  
Stephanie Young

### Staff

Minh Chau Le  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Sam Farrazaino  
Christine Vaughan

**In-person attendance was prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation was limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on the agenda.**

Chair Lisa Martin determined that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

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

**082521.1 PUBLIC COMMENT**  
There was no public comment.

**082521.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - DESIGN**

082521.21 Piecology  
1920 Pike Pl, Soames Dunn Building  
Alyssa Bleifuss and Paul Beveridge, Business Owners

Ms. Le explained the proposal for storefront signage, storefront walk-up window, hanging neon sign, interior displays, bar, and sliding door, interior finishes, and pie production equipment. Exhibits reviewed included photos of existing conditions, existing and proposed floor plans, elevations, signage information, furniture and equipment details, and color and materials information. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.6.2.

Landlord Comment:

Susan Brems said the applicants have done a great job in putting together the design packet. She said it is a simple idea that will work for the two spaces.

Applicant Comment:

Alyssa Bleifuss and Paul Beveridge presented the application package.

Ms. Bleifuss provided clarifying information on the slides presented.

Mr. Beveridge said they wanted black ceilings throughout but heard black ceilings are not favored. He said they want black ceiling in the speakeasy but a lighter color in the pie shop. He said the ceiling is currently white and they would paint it a creamier color. He said there is no visibility into the speakeasy from the street. He said there will be no changes to back of house.

Ms. Young asked if they considered lightening up the ceiling color.

Ms. Bleifuss said the ceiling doesn't have to be black.

Mr. Beveridge said they could leave it the existing white.

Ms. Bleifuss said there is a demising wall between the two spaces, and she noted she is OK with the light color paint. She said reclaimed wood will be on the wall between the brick. Above the brick will just be paint.

Ms. Young noted the signage is changed in the rendering shown.

Ms. Bleifuss said she was OK with the previous version with "Piecology" signage on left.

Ms. Leong asked about boxes on demising wall.

John Turnbull, PDA said it is ductwork that will remain.

Ms. Leong asked if the stools from Bavarian Meat will be reused.

Mr. Beveridge said they plan to save them and hope to be able to use them.

Ms. Leong asked about window coverings.

Mr. Beveridge said there will be no window coverings but there will be ribbon signs along the bottom.

Ms. Leong asked if there is a summer heat issue at this location.

Mr. Turnbull said there will be, and the best product is the infrared resistant film. He said from 4:00 – 6:00 pm in July the sun is very strong, and they will likely need a rolled down curtain or shade. He said the awning is too low to hang anything on.

Ms. Martin asked the size of the neon sign.

Mr. Bleifuss said it is 1/8" x 4'8".

Mr. Beveridge noted another neon sign at adjacent Turkish Delight.

Ms. Leong asked why there is no pie on their icon. She said it would be nice to see pie to show that food is available.

Mr. Bown asked if internal lighting is a problem.

Mr. Beveridge said this is classic neon.

Ms. Young noted the blade sign will obscure Seattle Cutlery.

Mr. Turnbull said he is working with the owners and will work out placement of both signs. He said Piecology is DownUnder and harder to find and night signage makes sense.

Ms. Rudeck asked how the walkup window will work – would it slide up or to the side.

Ms. Bleifuss said she didn't know.

Ms. Rudeck said the rhythm of window is mentioned in the Guidelines and accurate details are needed. She said the window changes the rhythm of the windows with the center mullion.

Ms. Bleifuss said she wants the window to slide up.

Mr. Turnbull said the PDA does review drawings; he said sliding up would be more consistent. He said they have tried many ways to get a door on this façade but the elevation slope is too great so the window makes sense.

Ms. Rudeck asked if the Marmoleum is imitating stone.

Mr. Beveridge said it is a charcoal color.

Ms. Leong said she wished the man and woman round signs were used more as it is a more iconic graphic. The logo they have now is too similar the Pike and Western Wine shop logo. She said the logos could be potentially confusing especially with the close

proximity of the two businesses. She said the signs would fit in with Meet the Producer and would be nice from street front / public to have owner personalities.

Ms. Bleifuss said she had the brand created and she would like to use it in the shop.

Ms. Le asked for clarity in what was being proposed.

Mr. Beveridge said to stick with what is proposed per application; they will come back later with a revised signage package.

Ms. Rudeck said she agreed with Ms. Leong, that the proposed logo looked similar to another wine shop in the area. She liked the idea of using round signs with images of Ms. Bleifuss and Mr. Beveridge.

Ms. Mohammedi agreed and said using the images is a great idea.

Ms. Young supported the applicants coming back with sign modifications.

Discussion ensued while Commissioners worked out language for amended motion.

Motion: Ms. Rudeck made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as amended with pie neon inside moved to the left; take out window will open up and down; ceiling to remain existing white; and exterior paint will match existing green.

MM/SC/LR/SY 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**082521.3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

July 14, 2021

MM/SC/CB/GL 5:0:2 Minutes approved. Mr. Hammond, Ms. Rudeck abstained.

July 28, 2021

MM/SC/MH/GM 5:0:2 Minutes approved. Mmes. Rudeck and Young abstained.

**082521.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

There was none.

**082521.5 STAFF REPORT** Ms. Le said she continues to review applications that are not complete enough to make it to meeting. She will review those eligible for administrative review including El Callejon and Rabbit Box.

Ms. Leong asked if both were eligible for administrative review.

Ms. Le said yes and noted the application included paint, restore existing wood surface, exterior paint.

Ms. Leong said given the amount of confusion with the application it should come back to the Commission.

Ms. Rudeck said it is a substantial amount of work.

Ms. Le said the way the Code is written as “interior finishes”. The exterior work is repair in kind. She said the application was confusing and disorganized, but she considers both to be finishes.

Mr. Bown noted the issue about the space in the alley as well as the place next door; he went there that night and saw it.

Ms. Le said the applicant had not applied for a patio and that is a compliance issue.

Mr. Bown said the patio is there, what happens when something just shows up.

Ms. Martin asked if the patio was applied for, would Ms. Le approve it administratively.

Ms. Le said the Code is the law and what we are working under now is any project that comes in falls under ‘shall’ be reviewed administratively. She said the way she reads that is she has to and the business would have legitimate recourse; she is trying to strike that balance and continue to have meetings so the new people have a chance to get experience but it is a fine balance.

Ms. Leong asked if this application would have required a meeting except for the exterior repairs.

Ms. Le said the Commission may not have had to meet . She said Commission meetings would not be required for the majority of applications, but she understood that the Commission wants to meet and didn’t want administrative review. That the Commission wanted the engagement so she has been working to accommodate that and it is great for people to have that.

Ms. Rudeck asked what the point is of having a Commission if everything can be reviewed administratively.

Ms. Le said to keep in mind that it is an Emergency Order that speaks to Covid; temporary to accommodate a point of time we are in. She said every district is unique, a lot of what the Commission does qualifies as eligible for administrative review. She said that yes, we do need a Commission and she will always defend that but the nature of what the boards are dealing with varies district to district. She said if the Commission would prefer not to meet, she would be open to that but she heard loud and clear from the Commission they want to meet and to please limit your use of administrative approval authority.

Ms. Young asked if administrative review could continue even after the Emergency Order is over.

Ms. Le said the that officials would be making decisions on these processes and they will seek input from staff, Commissioners, business and property owners among others.

Ms. Martin noted that each board is handled differently even though they are under the same guidelines.

Ms. Le said more MHC meetings are being held.

Ms. Martin said that is because the Commission goes over smaller items than other boards i.e. looking at the color of the ceiling, but a lot more items.

Ms. Le said she looks at the word “shall”. She said if she were a business owner it would be pretty clear it should be handled administratively.

Ms. Martin asked if handling more things administratively is Ms. Le’s plan going forward.

Ms. Le said no, that she seeks to accommodate Commission preferences but noted the lack of preparedness and how people seem really strained. She said things go back and forth and she can’t set a meeting unless there is a proper level of detail. She said she needs to get rid of the backlog. She said people are at the three-month mark and need to get their businesses going.

Ms. Martin asked if it would be better is the Commission had smaller meetings in between.

Ms. Le said she is not against that but it wouldn’t solve the problem because the nature of the problem does not lie in the absence of committee meetings, it is people’s capacity.

Ms. Rudeck said the application has always been the same, there should be some threshold how the Commission is reviewing the applications.

Ms. Le said we really want to uphold those; it is taking people three, four, five months to open a business during a pandemic. She questioned if that is something we want to see as a result of our actions. She said although the rules are very important and the application is the same. She said the administrative approval is helpful in times like this. She said it is a balancing act.

Mr. Bown said El Callejon was woefully ill prepared and wanted to make up for it with the Commission just approving it. He said he left with a bad taste in his mouth because it was like they wanted the Commission to sympathize with them in order to make up for their lack of preparedness. He questioned the use of administrative review for people who don’t read the guidelines.

Ms. Rudeck said that in the past she has heard administrative review is only for small things, and now she is hearing that a whole design packet can be reviewed administratively.

Mr. Bown asked what the Commission is for.

Ms. Le encouraged Commissioners to read the Code and noted she had sent it before. She said it is not required reading but is available to those interested.

Ms. Leong said the Commission should have been told it was required. She said she appreciated Staff's balancing act and not wanting things to be onerous to applicant but said she was confused about the role of the Commission if this isn't the law. When someone is so ill-prepared and their second attempt is just going to be an administrative review. She said Staff is clearly diligent and thoughtful but part of the purpose of the Commission is it is an opportunity to have a discussion and administrative review circumvents that process and is not a public process.

Ms. Le said it will expire at some point but for now it is what we are operating under. She said she stands by her assertion that she does not consider it required reading unless there is special interest; it is not the Commissioners' role to decide what is available for administrative review and what is not.

Ms. Leong said she didn't mean to make it sound like she was criticizing Ms. Le and said Ms. Le is just trying to follow the Code and law. She said Ms. Le has done a great job but asked what the point of the Commission is.

Ms. Le said she appreciated hearing thoughts and comments and appreciated the Commission's trust to share thoughts and concerns with her. She encouraged the conversation to always be alive. She said she would again send the Ordinance to Commissioners. She said it is a lot of legal language but in a nutshell it says we are in this emergency time so these changes will be made to boards and commissions, there will be this thing called 'administrative approval' and a long list of things that fall within that, that are eligible for that, and should be handled administratively.

Ms. Young said she appreciates looking at as much content as could be passed to the group so it could be reviewed as a group. She said she is doing this because she cares about the flavor and character of the Market. She said it is an important resource to be conserved. She said she would like to see that the Commission is not marginalized in the future just because we had a Covid emergency. She said the work is important and she appreciates being part of the process and would like to continue to be part of the process as much as she can from a practical standpoint of reviewing as much as the Commission can.

Ms. Martin asked how the Commission can help the process move faster.

Ms. Le said the applicants are responsible for bringing information to us.

Ms. Martin said it is more on them to get information to us.

Ms. Le said it is sometimes hard for designers and owners as experienced at today's review.

Ms. Martin said it isn't the Commission's fault.

Ms. Le said no.

Ms. Mohammadi said early in the pandemic her business got signs approved administratively and she was impressed with Ms. Le. She said she trusted her, she followed the guidelines, and she understood the situation. She said at the same time it frustrates her, as the rest

of the commission mentioned, and asked what is the point of the committee. She said there are so many blade signs that are large and are up without approval. She said no one said anything about the Can Can – all their signage was approved and they already have more signage there. She wondered if approvals matter at all since some just go ahead.

Ms. Le said she does refer compliance infractions but there is such a volume of infractions right now and she wasn't sure if it is because of limited capacity of inspectors to review and issue fines. She said may be disheartening and unsatisfying, but it is what we have to work with.

**082521.6      NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

Minh Chau Le  
Commission Coordinator  
206-684-0229