



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 3/15

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 93 Pike Street, Room 307

COMMISSIONERS

Lisa Connelley
David Guthrie
Murad Habibi
Bob Hale
Donald Horn, Chair
Karin Link
John Ogliore
Christine Vaughan

Staff

Heather McAuliffe
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Frank Albanese
Marika Cialdella
Hseong soon Park
Jerrod Stafford

Chair Don Horn determined that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 4:33 pm.

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

011415.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE/DESIGN APPROVAL

011415.11 MarketFront Building
1901 Western Avenue (PC-1 N site)
Ben Franz-Knight

Mr. Habibi recused himself.

Staff Report, Use: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for proposed mixed use building to replace existing Desimone parking lot. She said that the space is located

in Zone 3 - all uses permitted. New building will include Daystall space, low income housing, retail/commercial space, parking, recycling and tenant storage: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.4 c and 2.5.5 c uses. Specific commercial uses will be reviewed as separate applications later. Exhibits reviewed included overview of proposal, study of uses – Market entries, and plans. Guidelines that applied to this application included 25.24.010, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, and 4.0.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited 25.24.010, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.4, 2.5.4 c, 2.5.5 (c), 2.7.1 a, b, c. The Committee recommended approval of the application, with clarifications on existing truck parking and load/unloading for vendors. Ms. McAuliffe recommended that the Committee review Guideline 4.1, which was missed in the review.

Applicant/Landlord Comment: Ben Franz-Knight, PDA, David Miller and Steve Doub, Miller Hull presented a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed uses in the new building [presentation in DON file].

Public Comment:

Joan Singler, Friends of the Market (FOM), asked why FOM members on the Commission were initially told to recuse themselves.

Mr. Horn said that it didn't relate to Use but that her comment was duly noted.

Sara Patton, Friends of the Market, supported the proposed use and design and enormous foresight had been shown to get this going before the viaduct comes down. She said it is an excellent plan and she applauded the plan for the low income housing which is a major piece and a primary goal of the Market. She commended the proposal and the team.

Jerry Thonn, Friends of the Market, said he endorsed the proposal. He said that he wasn't sure that it was the front door to the Market – that it is the back door to the Market. He said that representatives from various parts of the community participated in the process.

Jeanne Falls, Food Bank and Senior Center Director, said she applauded the PDA and Market Foundation for the collaborative way they established Use.

Peter Steinbrueck commented on the 'remarkable outcome and solution to an intricate puzzle'. He commended all team and Historic Commission participants for the remarkable outcome. He said that it is one of the most challenging sites in the City. He said there is a good mix of uses that forward the mission of the Market – senior services, low income, commercial, farmers, access to back door of Market, improvement to circulation, improvement to retail and commercial. He said the view enhancement is outstanding. He supported the mix of uses.

Alex Rolluda, former Commission member, supported the application and said it was nice to see the progression. He said that he had issues with missing uses such as the children's play area that was lost and a Native American gathering area which was displaced. He asked Commission members to bring it up.

Sharon Mukai, Market vendor, commented on the massing and design and noted that the uses will make the original Pike Place Market – views, street, access to park – disappear. She applauded the depth of design but said she was afraid of the original Market would be lost.

Joan Paulson said the original building never burned down – it was under demolition when a torch ignited materials. She said that the connection from the project to Victor Steinbrueck Park is unresolved and not spoken about. She said the viaduct changes and westward expansion were not spoken about and not all space has current uses. She said that of eight Commission members in attendance recusals will diminish MHC voice.

Bob Messina supported uses as explained.

Uli from Uli's Sausage supported the uses and said old will be connected to new.

Tara Babette supported the Market Foundation and PDA and the Market community and said the project will benefit all.

Howard Aller, resident and former Commission member, said he brought up Commission Guideline issues throughout the process. He said that it is the biggest project ever to come through the Market. He said there will be errors and mistakes but that they have done a superb job.

Austin Dienst supported Use.

Murad Habibi, supported Use.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Horn, responding to public comments, said that with the exception of one recusal all Commission members will vote and that he as Commission chair would vote as well.

Ms. Vaughan disclosed that she was part of the Friends of the Market when a resolution was made to support this project. She said that she was not yet on the Commission and that her decision would be made based on Historical Commission Guidelines and Ordinance.

URC members confirmed that the application met Guideline 4.1.

Ms. Connolley expressed concern that vendor truck parking was not addressed and asked where they will be able to park.

Mr. Franz Knight said that there will be a separate project to address truck parking but that they will be allowed access to the top open deck to the south.

Ms. Connolley said to make sure it is official and that it will happen.

Mr. Horn said that the Commission is conscientious of storage needs and access to garage for vendors. He questioned how refuse will be collected from Western.

Ms. Vaughan asked if the elevator is shared with residents.

Ms. Connolley asked if the Heritage House elevator will still serve public.

Mr. Franz Knight said that the existing elevator will still serve and the new will augment that. He said that it will operate similar to the one in the Fairley Building.

Ms. Connolley asked about the construction schedule for access to Waterfront when the Viaduct is down.

Ms. Connolley asked how change in parking will impact the Food Bank.

Mr. Franz Knight said it will significantly improve the way they can deliver food.

Mr. Ogliore noted the lack of disabled parking spots.

Mr. Doub said they have complied with Downtown zoning.

Mr. Horn asked about access to Victor Steinbrueck Park.

Mr. Franz Knight said there is not direct access and a separate process will be followed. He said they are working on all access routes and functions within the confines of the property.

Mr. Horn asked about the children's play area and Native American area.

Mr. Franz Knight said that significant play components have been incorporated to the overlook walk.

Mr. Miller said that play slopes, slides, climbing rocks are incorporated. He said that there are other play areas in Aquarium Plaza and another significant area in Waterfront project.

Action: Ms. Link made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/KL/DG 7:0:1 Motion carried. (Mr. Habibi abstained; recused).

Staff Report, Design: Ms. McAuliffe noted that exhibits distributed and reviewed included overview of proposal, plans, renderings, cut sheets, and color/material samples.

New building:

Ms. McAuliffe noted that the project includes proposed modifications to the Desimone Bridge. Guidelines that applied to this application included 25.24.010, 3.1, 3.2., 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 3.9 and 4.0.

Fundraising design elements: Charms, hoof prints and fish tiles:

Ms. McAuliffe stated that the applicable guidelines were 3.1, 3.2 and 3.8.

DRC Report:

New building:

The DRC cited 25.24.010 – conforms; 3.1 – 2nd paragraph and 3.1.2 – conforms; 3.2.1 – conforms; 3.2.2 – conforms; 3.2.3 – vinyl windows to be painted – acceptable, but color should not look like aluminum; 3.2.4, 3.2.7 – verify HVAC equipment location and height of cooling towers; 3.2.8 – marquee along street conforms; 3.2.9 – canopy on rooftop plaza conforms; 3.2.11 – floors conform; 3.3 - canopy and operable doors will be used for new Daystall area; 3.4.1 b, c & e; 3.4.2 d – vinyl on windows should not be painted to look like aluminum; 3.5.1, 3.5.3, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.8.7, 3.8.8, 3.9.9, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5. Specific citations: 3.4.1 b, c & e; 3.4.2 d – vinyl on windows should not be painted to look like aluminum; 3.5.1 – color temperature of non-incandescent lamps should be 2700k; 3.5.3 – conforms; 3.8.1 – public seating conforms; 3.8.6- enhances pedestrian movement and accessibility; 3.8.7 and 3.8.8: conforms; 3.9.9 – conforms; 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 – conforms to all these guidelines. The Committee recommended to approve, with different paint color/finish requested for windows and lighting plan requested for lighting design.

Fundraising design elements: Charms, hoof prints and fish tiles:

The DRC cited 3.1- the charms do not meet the intent of 3.1 in maintaining [the Market's] integrity and association – the rest of the Market does not have names all over it; 3.2.1 – charms will interrupt the rhythm of the railings and will read as a relatively solid wall; 3.8.3 - charms should not be placed on fence facing the water or sections of fence next to stairways, but okay on other fences; hoof prints - their relation to the stairs should be reconfigured, but otherwise, acceptable; fish tiles - there should be no names on the mural at the main landing – too prominent;

they should be placed on the sides of the stairway instead; 3.8.7 – charms will diminish the view for children and people in wheelchairs and also for other people from other view perspectives. The Committee did not recommend approval of the fundraising design elements as presented and requested revisions to the building's renderings to show the charms.

Applicant/Landlord Comment:

Messrs. Franz Knight, Miller and Doub presented a PowerPoint presentation [available in DON file] and went through color and material samples.

Mr. Franz Knight said he wanted to walk through donor recognition/donor art projects. He said that while this is a small project it is a critical part of the overall fundraising effort. He said he wanted to make sure that all the Commissioners have had a chance to review and read their letter of November 23 – you have a copy of that if you don't have copies I'll provide it to you. He provided copies of the December 19 letter and the response they gave on December 23. He said that he wanted to walk through some key points because this has been a subject of great debate and that he is sure the Commission will spend some time talking about. He referenced two letters that were included in the process of trying to complete the application.

He referenced their December 23 letter and said he wanted to highlight some of the key components. He said that one of the first questions [from Commission staff] in the December 19 letter was to show a proposed pattern for the maximum charms that will be installed on the fences along the rooftop plaza. He said that over the course of the last year they have provided a number of renderings that show potential installation patterns of these charms in particular. He said they have taken to heart feedback into ensuring pockets for children, folks in wheelchairs to be able to look through those railings and those changes have been represented in updated renderings. He said he wanted everyone to note that final installation of the charms is not worked out as part of construction but rather this is an effort that they manage on an ongoing basis. He said what they are seeking approval for is the material type and proposed possible placement of these but it is not an act the construction crew will engage in. He referenced renderings in the application materials that show some of the potential patterns. He said there have been questions about the maximum number of charms that are proposed. He said the scenario they are proposing in this application is 13,653 and he said it is important to note it is a reduction from an original proposed amount of 18,000. He said that ensuring that they add pockets in each of the railing spaces to allow for views through does significantly reduce the amount of fundraising potential for this specific item but is something they are comfortable with and still allows them to achieve their goals. He said there is also a diagram that shows the proposed placement for those railings. He said there are several renderings that show the placement of these charms in the project and how that looks from a view perspective. He said there were questions about alternatives that they have pursued related to these donor recognition elements and to highlight some of

those. He said the letter on page two the third item notes that they have undergone exhaustive analysis of alternatives including the initial briefing in January of last year with the Commission's modifications in August of 2007 which were presented to the Commission and further refined December 10 presentation last month. He said he would share some further refinements that they are proposing today. He said that no further alternatives are being explored at this point and they are asking for Commission review and approval of this and the entire application tonight. He said that each presentation has included alternatives and options for donor recognition and the process for refinement was outlined in a November 17 letter we submitted to the Commission that detailed some of the compromises and some of the changes that were made to that point. He said he wanted to be clear that charms are included on the vertical railings only which include railings surrounding the central plaza, the mezzanine level, the central stairs, and the level railing at the L1 lobby. There are no charms proposed on the westernmost lower railing of the project or on the railings to the stairs from Western Avenue up to the rooftop plaza, or on those angled railings going down to the commercial level or the plaza on the north. He said the future design of that westernmost railing is subject to their MOU and the Waterfront collaborative.

He said the fourth point that was in the letter on December 19 was to provide the alternative that would have the charms only in an 8" band and the comment was to make sure it was unobscured and would comply with 3.8.7. He said that point 4 in his letter of December 23rd said the project provides access to views that don't exist until construction of this building is completed. He said it has been acknowledged we are providing substantial new public views. He said the building contains over 30,000 square feet of newly public accessible view space. He said that at the edge of these spaces where required by code the design includes railing at 42" high. These railings include a link metal design below the railing height for recognition charms that do not obstruct views. He said the proposed charms and proposed placement has been designed with view preservation in mind. Guideline 3.8.7 says 'views of, into, and through the Market are cherished public amenity and shall not be diminished'. He said the Guideline does not address new views but rather the preservation of existing views; he said that is a really important point in this context especially given the tremendous new views this project is creating.

He said that lastly placing charms in an 8" band around the posts is not a viable solution because it would reduce the charms to 4,176 and would severely hamper the community based fundraising needed to support this project. He said we provided a number of drawings that provided the scale of the donor names installed on mosaic mural – the fish, vegetables and flowers – and will show some further refinement based on what was seen at last week's committee meeting. He apologized for not being present at the meeting – he was home ill.

He said that point number 6 in the letter requests that we provide a design alternative that would include donor names only on the murals that are on the side of the main stairway in better conformance with 3.8.3. He noted that they have a

long standing tradition of civic engagement in the Market including members of the public participating in fundraising campaigns and as part of that receiving recognition of their names within the actual physical structure and halls of the Market. He said there are 55,000 tiles in the Market today with donor names. He said that if there was ever a time or a moment that called for and justified that sort of civic engagement in a project he said he has to believe that its completion of a 40-year long vision for the Pike Place Market for finally being able to build and accomplish all of their goals for the PC-1 North site.

He said he wanted to address a concern that in general plaques or other forms of public display for purposes of memorial, award, or recognition are discouraged per Guideline 3.8.3. He said the proposed donor recognition elements reflect this long held tradition; these donor recognition elements do not single out individual solitary award, memorial, or recognition. Rather, these elements reflect the names of many members of the community ensuring the direct integration of community involvement that has and continues to make the Pike Place Market a great public space. He said that Guidelines 3.8.3 references plaques, public displays and awards, calling out distinctly individual acts for recognition not the type of broad community engagement inherent in this proposed project.

Mr. Franz Knight said he was also asked in this letter provide specific response to a number of questions raised by Commissioner Habibi and want to highlight those as well. He said they want to be sure they are thorough in their response.

Question #1: Guideline 3.1 Explain how the public displays or recognition will keep the Market anonymous. He said we often talk about the importance of the words ‘humble’ and ‘anonymous’ when talking about the Market as a whole but that it is important to note in this sentence the question refers to the word ‘anonymous’ entirely out of context. He said this word is contained in the following sentence: the buildings with their marketing activities residential uses combined form a distinctive area focusing on the Central Market buildings which although humble and anonymous in character are an example of intriguing dramatic architectural space servicing and adjusting to the varied and varying marketing activities. He said that when taken in full context this sentence is referring to a diverse set of uses as well as an underlying acknowledgement that the spaces are to adjust and be in service of varying characteristic Market activities. In this instance the characteristic activity is broad civic engagement and public participation in the funding of an important public market project. He said the donor recognition program is fully compliant, in keeping with this general guideline which to further clarify this guideline does not imply that the Market itself be anonymous given a 100 years of history and worldwide notoriety this would be impossible.

Question #2: 3.1.2 How will public displays of donor recognition maintain the character of the Market? He said the Market exists today due to significant public engagement through preservation and the process of governance, day to day operations and literally embedded in thousands of tiles that reflect the deep

community investment in the physical construction, restoration of the building. The proposed donor recognition continues this tradition of broad civic engagement thoughtfully integrated within the design of the new Market project.

Question #3: 3.8.7 Explain how public displays of donor recognition will not diminish the public views. He said to refer to point #4 the tremendous new public views that are created by this. The Code requirements that we actually have kinds of places and efforts to modify the way the charms in particular will be placed – there are windows that children or folks in wheelchairs will be able to look through. He said that specific to the guideline 3.8.3

Question #4: 3.8.3 List the reasons why public forms of donor recognition should be exempt from this guideline. 3.8.3 states that the recognition should be discouraged by the Commission. In regards to 3.8.3 list reasons why public forms of donor recognition should be exempt from this guideline. In addition list all the other opportunities for non-public forms of donor recognition that have been considered. Provide details to explain why non-public forms of donor recognition are not viable which warrants a need to be exempt from guideline 3.8.3.

First Guideline 3.8.3 does not say “should be discouraged by the Commission” rather it states “Plaques or other forms of public display for the purposes of memorials, awards or recognition are discouraged.” “Are discouraged” is a statement of fact pertaining to the disposition of the guidelines in general related unchecked proliferation of memorials, awards and recognition; it is neither a prohibition on such activities nor is it a duty or obligation of the commission as would be implied if the word were actually “should”. Given the scrutiny the commission has applied to this particular feature, the process has been consistent with this guideline. However as outlined in point number 6 under requests for additional information we believe this question assumes an inaccurate interpretation of Guideline 3.8.3. Given that this guideline does not prohibit such activity, the commission may exercise its discretion in approving this component of the project given its critical importance to both community engagement and project funding as well as the successful and thoughtful integration of these elements into overall building design.

Regarding “all the other opportunities for no-public forms of donor recognition that have been considered,” it is important to understand the extent of annual fundraising conducted by the Market Foundation. Last year, the Foundation raised \$1.2 million to support existing social services in the Market, this includes the Senior Center, Foodbank, Medical Clinic, Pike Market Child Care, and Heritage House Senior Assisted Living. In addition, the Foundation provides funding for RN outreach to low-income senior Market residents, supports food access programs to help residents and community members eat healthier food and maintains a community safety net that provides emergency support for farmers, crafters, workers and residents in need. Donors to this annual fundraising effort generally received recognition in several forms such as participation in events like Arcade Lights, Sunset Supper and Annual Luncheon, letters of appreciation,

recognition in annual reports and on the Foundation website. These annual fundraising efforts are far from routine, but are critical to supporting and growing existing services. Given the annual nature of this fundraising the 'less-public' nature of the recognition is sufficient.

Periodically during the Market's history, exceptional fundraising efforts require a higher degree of donor engagement and recognition. This was true for the market-wide tile campaign undertaken in the mid-80s to support much needed market repairs and is certainly true for the PikeUp! Campaign to support the MarketFront project today. Absent a higher degree of donor engagement and recognition fundraising efforts for the MarketFront would compete directly for the same dollars that we rely upon to support existing services. Trading existing fundraising techniques of less public nature that support existing operations is not an option we can seriously consider thus necessitating a distinctly different more public level of recognition to ensure success. The PikeUp! Campaign has been carefully developed with fundraising best practices balancing community feedback and Market Historic Commission input.

He said moving forward with mosaic art recognition some modifications based on input and consultation with the Market Foundation and balancing with the fundraising goals they had with this particular element. He said that this was the prior proposal layout with donor recognition included on tiles in all of the blue highlighted areas. He said now they are proposing upper area highlighted in green actual mosaic reduced in size at that upper landing no donor recognition names at that level. The two other highlighted blue location are areas where there would be donor recognition names included on the mosaic tiles. He showed a rendering of what that would look like – done in the last few days. He provided a sample of that type of fish and aquatic samples that would be included in parts of the mosaic. He said it is a work of art that they commissioned specifically for this purpose. He provided samples of flowers and vines and other planted elements to be part of the mosaic proposed by the artist and said he believed the Commission has seen a rendering that shows the significant reduction on any of the individual pieces going back for example – very small name on sample. He said the name is not viewable until you actually get up to the piece itself.

With regard to the charms Mr. Franz Knight said that just for the sake of clarity these are the railings in which the charms are proposed to be installed – consistent with the pattern that has those varying windows that allow for small children and those in wheelchairs to see through. He said there has been a lot of discussion regarding potential view blockage. He provided a photo of an installation on existing HillClimb. He said they firmly believe there is significant obstruction of views. He said these charms are not 3' in diameter – they are very small in diameter. He said that renderings were requested and this is a rendering of one of the railing with pattern they are proposing. He said you can see the pockets that are maintained for children and those in wheelchairs to see through below the railing. This is the rendering looking to the west to Western Avenue – you can see the pattern being maintained there and you will see clearly through the railing

area to the day stalls underneath the canopy. He said that here – difficult to see – rendering includes the same pattern applied to the railings and you can see through those railings to the plaza.

Regarding the hoof prints he showed the detailed plan that shows the path of the hoof prints which he said is not out of character of Market to have a little bit of whimsy present. He said they believe the journey of Billie from down on Western where she sits today up the street and through the plaza is an appropriate whimsical way to layout the hoof print patterns. He said they infer gait, size and girth of Billie. He said that although they do not have those hoof prints going up the steps – they stop at the bottom of the steps and assume a small gallop to the top of the plaza. He said this is work that will be done when that concrete is installed – the full extent of hoof prints will be put into place which is a far more effective way to do installation. He showed another view of Billie adjacent to the Desimone Bridge and you can see the hoof print pattern.

Public Comment:

Sara Patton commended the team for not opening up to Victor Steinbrueck Park and for preserving the tribal gathering spot. She said that with regard to donor recognition she struggled while on the Commission but noted the Guidelines discourage not prohibit. She said it is an affordable way to support the Market and have recognition. She said it preserves the communal and popular nature of the Market and proposed pockets for viewing will solve visual problem.

Ms. McAuliffe read Jeanne Falls' letter (letter in DON file) that was supportive of the donor recognition elements and applauded the Market Foundation.

Peter Steinbrueck said he was not prepared to comment on details but it was to MHC role and discernment and judgment; he urged the Commission not to cede any decision making to the City. He said the design departure respects the humble and anonymous aspect of the Market. He said he liked the way housing is shaping up and said it is a backdrop building. He said the design is true to its time and harmonizes with the eclectic set of buildings here. He said he had some issues with the materials. He said the vinyl windows are irksome and that painted wood should be used and the Ipe wood from the Brazilian rainforest should be replaced with local and reused wood where possible; he said the materials should be as sustainable as possible. He said authority over Victor Steinbrueck Park should not be ceded and that hopefully plans will include repair to the park and planting of blueberry plants in honor of Richard Haag, park designer.

Mr. Steinbrueck said that in the old days charms wouldn't have been needed but now that level of support is needed to keep from privatizing the Market. He said that donor recognition items should not be flashy, gimmicky or cutesy. He said that the patterning of the tiles has achieved its result. He cautioned about overdoing it and said that it is populist in expression that allows for support from

people and communities as well as a sense of pride. He said to maintain it and keep it simple and integrated.

Alex Rolluda, former Commission chair, commended the design team for their work and noted the preservation of the view corridor. He cited Chapter 1 – Purpose and Procedures – Preserve and Protect Market district for entire market including PC-1. He recommended that the Commission consider if proposed designs would be allowed in other places such as the Arcade, DownUnder, etc.

Bob Messina said he supported the whole design as presented. He said that regarding the donor features he originally didn't like the tile wall because he didn't like the names but said he saw that it's been reworked. He said he was skeptical about the charms but noted they have been redistributed and view pockets have been provided. He said that there is a solid concrete wall at Victor Steinbrueck Park now.

Uli said the charms are like buying a season ticket to last forever; he noted his support.

Haley Land supported the proposal. He read from 3.1. He said that lots of people come through the Market. He said it is a grassroots market. He said that all names will be with the same font. He noted the participatory nature of the charms.

Paul Dunn said he didn't make comments after 6:30 pm.

Sarah Lippek said she worked in produce row for 20 years and now supports the Market as a shopper. She said she supports the expansion but was not keen on adding thousands of names. She said that years ago tiles were sold as an emergency measure to save the Market; guidelines were added later to limit this type element. She said that unfortunately no other forms were looked at and she said that it is problematic that they are already selling the donor recognition items. She said it shows a disregard for the Historical Commission and the public comment process. She said they have been selling donor recognition items before Commission approval, steamrolling the process. She said she is disappointed in the way the process has been handled. She said that people would want to support the Market even without a keychain hung on a fence. She said that thousands of corporate and donor items cheapens it; it contradicts the process and the Market. She said she supported the major construction but said to decline the donor approval.

Howard Aller, resident and former Commission member, said he is happy to be able to put his name on the Market. He said that people come back to Seattle and visit their tile in the Market. He said that the charms do it in a humble and anonymous way. He said the charms will move and add sound and visual interest. He said that he is in a wheelchair and he can see over. He said the charms are very much 'the Market'. He said they erred in not coming here first.

Austin Dienst, Market Foundation, said he supports the project as presented. He said he strongly supports the physical representation of support because it gives and encourages people to feel connected to the Market. He said it is an elegant way of learning from the tile experience. He said the Guidelines were well-considered and he supported.

Murad Habibi, resident, spoke as a citizen who lives in the Market and is a volunteer on the Historical Commission. (He read from a letter he submitted; full letter in DON file). He said that he supported use and design of the building – except for the public displays of donor recognition. He said the donor recognition does not meet 3.1, 3.1.2, 3.8.7, 3.8.3. He said that the guidelines were put into place after the 1980s sale of tiles to save the Market and subsequent attempts by the PDA and Market Foundation to sell items to raise money. He said that by the mid 90's the Commission was concerned about the overrun of donor recognition. He said that the Commission felt so strongly they create guideline 3.8.3 protecting the Market so that both future commissioners and applicants can use them as a touchstone to ground their decision making in the application and voting process. He said that today's application is precisely why guideline 3.8.3 was created. The reasons why the Commission created the guideline should be the same reasons used to uphold it. The goal was to make future Commissions stronger and more vigilant in preserving the Market. If they did not do it then, now is the time to act.

Mr. Habibi said that the PDA and Market Foundation have knowingly pre-sold charms and hoof prints without the approval of the Commission. They have circumvented the process and ignored the guidelines which are in place to protect the Market and maintain the trust of the public. He asked that Commissioners do what the guidelines require – which is to discourage the public displays of recognition for this project.

10 minute break.

Commission Discussion:

New building:

Mr. Hale said the DRC asked for and received: detail on the gate; 3-D view of charms; and rooftop mechanical. He said that DRC asked about paint on vinyl windows with more discussion needed.

Ms. Link said that there has a long careful process and analysis and the DRC went through just about all of the Guidelines. She said that DRC thought they could concede on the vinyl. She said they presented a clarified design with nice contrast in materials. She said it is nice and overall she was pleased. She said that there are more questions on the donor recognition.

Mr. Horn said that all plans were brought in. The DRC asked that the presentation be condensed; what has been provided has been helpful. He said

there were questions about alternatives marked in the set and said that the Commission can't approve two schemes; only one can be approved. He said that if they have to make a change they will come back to DRC.

Mr. Franz Knight said to ignore the single A sheets.

Mr. Horn said he had questions on the security gates and exactly where they will go.

Mr. Doub explained how the gate will operate – closed and deployed – and said it is on page 55 of the PPT.

Mr. Horn said that that space would be closed off by two gates. He asked about lighting in the planting area.

Mr. Doub said the free standing elements are about 1' above plants.

Mr. Horn asked about the recycling and waste pick up on Western.

Mr. Franz Knight said that the trash will be moved out for pick up – when the truck comes; he said there is a roll-up door.

Mr. Horn expressed concern about the durability of the vinyl windows and the paint. He cited the Guidelines and said that painting the windows to look like metal is vinyl imitating metal.

Mr. Miller said that they will use matte finish gray instead of silver.

Mr. Hale said that the metallic silver was submitted.

Ms. Link asked if painting the vinyl windows had been done before.

Mr. Miller said that he has talked to others who have done it. He said that he prefers not to use vinyl but noted budget considerations.

Mr. Horn said to show the change of sample of window paint to DRC.

Mr. Hale asked how the light fixture recessed into paving would work.

Mr. Doub said that it will light adjacent vertical surfaces; he said they are meant to be point sources you see rather than for illumination. He said they will be used on the upper wood deck and the upper terrace.

Ms. Connolley asked about safety of the wood surfaces in rain.

Mr. Doub said it will be on the terrace in front of the retail spaces. He said they are the same as used at CenturyLink Stadium; 4” diameter lights that are ok to walk on.

Mr. Franz Knight said it is a large area and they looked at how to light the area to be safe without lights on.

Mr. Guthrie said it is a great idea – the point sources of light will allow light movement and shadow play.

Mr. Horn asked about security; he noted the gates and asked about the stairways.

Mr. Franz Knight said they will retain the same philosophy; they will not close off all of the Market – only a few areas. He said they have been working with a security team and do not plan to lock down after hours.

Ms. Vaughan asked about a light pole shown on page 26.

Mr. Franz Knight explained that it is in the way of construction and will have to move.

Ms. Vaughan asked where the cooling towers will go.

Mr. Franz Knight said that they are not sure yet.

Ms. Connolley asked if water and drainage will be provided for farmers.

Mr. Franz Knight said that hose bibs will be provided and that the whole plaza drains.

Ms. Connolley asked about load and unload zones on Western

Ms. McAuliffe said that is not part of this project and it is an SDOT issue.

Mr. Horn said that conditions would be attached to the motion to include coming back for review of all public areas inside the building, use and design for all individual tenants and signage as future applications, and that a paint color sample for the vinyl windows be submitted to DRC for review and approval.

Action: Mr. Guthrie made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application for design of the building with the conditions that the Commission review all public spaces inside the building, use and design for all individual tenants, and signage as future applications; and that a paint color sample for the vinyl windows be submitted to DRC for review.

MM/SC/DG/KL 7:0:1 Motion carried. (Mr. Habibi abstained; recused)

Fundraising design elements: Charms, hoof prints and fish tiles

Mr. Hale noted his recent appointment to the Commission and said that he doesn't have the same history as the rest of the board and doesn't have the same feeling of resignation or the responsiveness of their comments. He said that Mr. Franz Knight did a good job of rationalizing the proposal and said there are good arguments for and against which make it a difficult decision. He said that initially he thought the donor recognition was overdone in the past and can see where the Guideline is coming from but that there is room for it without overdoing it in this new chapter. He said he appreciated they scaled it back and eliminated it from staircases and are eliminating names on mosaic on upper landing. He said that on one hand it is democratic and inclusive and shows support from the community. He said it could be interesting and is kinetic with their movement in the wind; he said it could be clever and very nice. He said that it might be verging on being overdone.

Mr. Guthrie said he has been on the Commission from the start of the conversation and the Commission has followed 3.8.3 pretty strictly. He said that initially there were 25-30 proposed ideas that through numerous meetings and feedback were whittled down to three options and even these options have been whittled down to a point where the Commission has done its due diligence to discourage it. He said the guideline doesn't say we have to prevent it but the Commission has done its job to discourage some more flamboyant ideas. He said that was well done on the Commission's part. He said they did that partially because we liked the democratic ways the tiles were – everyone who paid got the same tile, same font, and same size. He said that is part of the charm of the donor recognition; there is more of a mix and 20 years into the future with the funding and the world we live in today doesn't allow for that but they have create different levels for that funding. He said he was worried that someone with a lot of money isn't going to choose the little 'finding Nemo' fish on the wall and will want a big whale. He said in a democratic society we are all supposed to be contributing and we know the guy with the big fish will pay the most. He said that funding is needed and that the PDA has come and accommodated the Commission and he said he would support it.

Ms. McAuliffe said that donor recognition samples were needed. Ben Franz Knight provided samples of the charms, the fish tiles (including a photo showing a revised size for the text) and the hoof prints.

Mr. Horn asked for information on the fish. The drawing of the fish doesn't give any dimension; information is still needed on how high the letters are.

Mr. Ogliore said he is a new Commissioner and commented on his days as a tour guide and asked people at the end what they were most impressed with. He said he would go through the donor recognition that was out there and tell them the tiles were X amount and the hoof prints were X amount. He said they were

impressed with the democracy of the tiles and he said he bought one for his in laws. He said that along with the authenticity of place, he was concerned that there would be a new Market and an old Market but that he thought by looking at the materials that that it would be integrated in a way that is positive. He said that there were comments about the vaudeville type lighting and that is impossible to duplicate now and he thought the team did a good job. He said that as far as the donor recognition – there have been good comments from the public both pro and con – he said he tended to go with the democracy of this that it is a public way to have a lot of people be involved in the Market. He said that he is not happy the fundraising items were being sold prior to Commission approval.

Ms. Link said that she was one of the people that groused that she felt this thing was being railroaded through. She said she is still a little bothered by the western side of the fence. She said that that plaques are discouraged but it doesn't say that you can't do it. She said that money is needed and she would tend to concede. She said the pros and cons were compelling.

Ms. Connolley said that 30 years ago she sold tiles – she loved the interaction and thought it was wonderful. She said that while she had reservations it was not about the charms; she said the charms are charming. She said that the design is 50 shades of gray rather than the warm tones of the Market so it will be very distinguishable. She said the mosaic is the one warm piece that is there and it is there for the wealthy and is a tragedy. She said she could support name recognition only if a random lottery system for purchase of donor recognition items and expressed concern that the wealthiest can buy something better. She said that she likes the mosaic and would not want to get rid of it but that it should be by lottery. She said you might get people who would have bought two charms by four in attempts to win the lottery. She noted the idea that areas would be segregated and there would be places for special people. She noted that her friend Lena donates produce to the Food Bank which amounts to thousands of dollars over the years but she won't have the cash to buy a charm. She said the primary goal of the Market is that is a place for low income people. She said that 3.8.3 is distinguishable – recognition for those who have money. She said that when everybody has an opportunity it is not such a concern but when you can say the fish are \$5,000, the hoofs are \$2,000 and anybody can afford the tiles it makes a difference.

Mr. Horn said it relates back to the general qualities of the Market and cited 3.1.

Ms. Vaughan cited 1.4. She said that while all changes to be considered in light of these guidelines and historical precedent she said the Commission has discretionary power as may apply to individual applications; she said she thought that is what gives the Commission the authority to decide. She said she liked the charms. She said historical precedent to her is the tiles and they are all the same; they are out there they are down there. She said she thought the charms do that. She said she would put them on the back wall where there aren't the views. She said she is glad there aren't charms on the front. She cited 3.8.3 and said the one

that stands out to her just because of her history is the Sam Buckley memorial. She said the first time she heard about memorials in the Market was the Sam Buckley sculpture and she said that part of this was so we wouldn't memorialize every executive director that came through. She said the ones that are called out are historic: the Desimone Bridge, the Goodman Library, and for the rest we just kind of go along. She said that the tiles are an economic fact and reality – some have more and it is good that they will give. She said she would address that by the size of the name on the tile. She said that names will be small – that she didn't even see the name on the picture until it was pointed out - and it is a way to say 'thank you'. She said they will have to look for them so only those who know who their fish is will see the name. She said that regarding the concern they would be used as advertising she doesn't think it is practical so doesn't buy the argument. She said that the hoof prints will be in back and there needs to be a way to distinguish the Market from the Waterfront when the Viaduct comes down.

Mr. Horn said it is interesting here at the last minute to get the names going away from the main wall. He said it is a great place for art but not for the names. He said the name on the fish should be small as in the photo and not as in the ceramic sample.

Mr. Franz Knight confirmed that as correct.

Mr. Horn said that it is a huge difference and not noticing it until you get up to it is not so bad. He said the hoof prints are no big problem. He said that even with the options they had initially the charms were pared down he said they weren't necessarily following Commission recommendations in paring them down; the Commission was given just these options so when it came down to tiles and charms it was not the feedback coming from the Design Review Committee. He said to talk about thousands and thousands of names it is the quantity of charms everywhere on every railing. He said that is the other thing that back in June when presented to Design Review Committee 9,000 charms were proposed for and that doubled at some point and now they have scaled back to 13,500 but it is still greater than the 9,000 shown before. He said they also had a drawing that showed the density of tiles: he said the preferred options were 40 – 50% medallions and everything shown since then has been 85% medallions. There is not a scaling back there is an increase and it has continued to increase every time it came back to us. He said he guessed it was to meet financial goals but financial goals should not trump Commission guidelines.

He said that how they were rendered shows light tiles against the light sky and were not noticeable and they are actually going to appear much darker; he said that the more there are especially from an angle where you are not looking straight through it looks more like a solid wall. He said that he was not concerned about views for children or views from wheelchairs because he thought you could see over or around or find another place. He said that he thought it degrades all the views for all people. He said that no matter where you are or where you look

you are not always just look up at the mountains. He said he walked around looking at the views watching other people watch the views before the meeting and the views – down and through – are just as important. He said he thought it really degrades the view from the Market and yes new views are created – that is why they fought so much to keep these new views because they are an important aspect. He said that a lot of other views are being given up by building the building on Western. He said that actual mockup of charms was not up long enough to see in person and it was not realistic either because there was a dark building behind the mockup; the fence has larger chain link squares and doesn't appear to be the same size and the charms read very small. In these you only have five diamonds up and in the drawings you have seven diamonds up. He said it doesn't appear to be the same. He said he thought the density is much greater than what depicted. He said that something that is not objectionable is that from Western DRC mentioned that along the east side these are all fine. They are not obscuring the view out the sound that people come to look at and it is good because it helps to block the view of the vendors and their boxes and set up they have as they do business. Saying you can see through it anyhow is like the buses with ads – yes you can see through them but it is really annoying because 65 - 75% of the view is blocked by dots. He said that if someone asks what you would rather see at Victor Steinbrueck Park – the railing or the charms – he said he would rather see just the open railing. He proposed there not be any charms on this particular railing (points to area). He pointed out what was originally proposed (part of 9,000) all of them have continued to be added. He point out some that were added last week at design review. He said it has been months talking about this and it is discouraging that it continues to grow. He said in this area it is nice to know they are not on the actual stairs. He said there is an issue of congestion people looking for names and moving around. He said he could not get into charms along (pointed to area) to western side of the main view. He pointed out planter boxes that are benches that encourage you to sit and when sitting you are looking at the charms right in your face. He asked the distance between planters and rail.

Mr. Franz Knight said it is 6'.

Mr. Horn said he could not support the main rail across the west.

Mr. Franz Knight said that the planters have a metal edge and you cannot sit on them.

Mr. Horn clarified the wood decking area.

Mr. Franz Knight said yes.

Mr. Horn said it was presented to us the other day as a place to sit. Sitting on benches on this side you are at the same level looking across. He suggested more discussion.

Mr. Miller said that the wood bench along the ramp on the east side is 30' from the rail. He said there aren't any benches built into planters.

Mr. Horn said that the drawing misrepresents because when you fill in the # of charms it becomes a near solid wall. He said that if there are 41 sections of railing it is 111 per section or 4,550 charms just on the west rail. He said the said the hoof prints have to be put in when the concrete is poured.

Mr. Franz Knight said they will be engraved later.

Mr. Horn clarified that all the hoof prints are going in at once and the installation of the charms will be ongoing. He said that last week has asked how many are already sold; he suggested a condition on where they be installed first and if needed they can expand someplace. He noted the condition that the western edge be a charm-free zone.

Mr. Hale suggested a uniform density of charms throughout the project.

Mr. Franz Knight said that is the intent – so that it is really integrated and is not lopsided one way or the other and there is a uniform balance throughout the entire project.

Ms. Vaughan said she was thinking the same thing because the view blockage is such an important thing. She said that on the basis that there are 170 medallions would make it solid. She said that what if you made it solid so there was no view and then if that is not enough and needed more why don't we put them on the on the east-west rails. She pointed to areas and said there are little sections here and that leaves these areas (points to plan) unadulterated. She said it is positive on doing them solid in areas where there isn't a view. She said the view is fine when you are above but it is more solid and that can relate to 3.2.1 – uninterrupted views. She preferred solid installation where there is less view than a pattern because she said that people will be trying to figure out what the pattern is. She said the pattern is a design element and she thinks it is simpler if solid where there is no view. She said the back railing – depending on whether the lines or segments are accurate – even along that easternmost she said she came up with 4,250. She said if you put in all the east-west facing it is somewhere in the neighborhood - she said she counted 43 of them and if they are solid that is 7,000 charms. She said she thought the charms are an important integral part having the evenness of the design, the repetition is a good thing. She said there is a way to do it without doing any one of those western rails. She said if the rest of the Commission felt strongly that this is okay she said she thought it is consistent with the guidelines and would be alright with it as well. But if there is strong resistance – the western views, if we allow a bit more density – it is possible to do the same number of charms with using fewer railings.

Mr. Horn said he agreed with 100% coverage for the east side, north and south 0 anything but west.

Ms. Vaughan pointed out areas for charms.

Mr. Guthrie disagreed and said they worked hard to have this be somewhat transparent and now you are saying that you are saying it would be okay to have solid on east, north and south walls of this which is disturbing because we wanted it all to be somewhat transparent. He said that he understood that you don't want it on looking out. He said he didn't want to have any of the walls be solid; he said that part of our guidelines is that we need to enhance and preserve existing views. He said that making any part of it solid would contradict ourselves. He said that this is also an art installation and he said he thought it was originally proposed by an artist. He said the pattern was put in there to provide views that we kept telling the PDA we needed them to provide.

Mr. Horn said that we are talking about views to the west about opening those up.

Mr. Guthrie said he thought we were chasing our tail around and saying 'it's okay to close these views off as long as we keep those'. He said he thought that having it more as a uniform approach would be better.

Ms. Connolley said that charms will activate the area and people will come and look because they are small they will come and look and stand there. She said that view areas are already attractive to people. If you go to Steinbrueck Park that is where people are – they are standing at the rail activated and don't need further activation; she said the charms become a very useful tool taking people to other parts of the Market so there is good flow and movement all over the space.

Mr. Horn said that the one thing about the density is that this illustration provided is about 75% - 80%; we know it is in this range. He said that he hasn't heard a lot of support for conditions.

Mr. Guthrie said the charms should be installed in a uniform systematic manner.

Mr. Guthrie asked the applicant how they planned to install the charms - whether it was panel by panel or random installation.

Mr. Franz Knight said they want it to be as balanced as possible – that has been their goal all along - and be as uniform installation as we can achieve. He said it will be difficult with 180 and won't be uniform across the entire project but that has been the intent from the beginning and as they work through providing portals for view preservation. He said that it has been a critical principle of all these components that where possible they be integrated fully with the design so they don't stand out as distinct elements that are glaring.

Mr. Horn said he really would prefer they should start on the eastern section or any of the other sections and the western not filled until the others are to whatever

density they determine they are working towards. He said he felt really strongly about that.

Ms. McAuliffe said that could be a condition that the non-west-facing rails are filled first and the westernmost railing is not to have any charms on it until the other railings have been filled.

Ms. Connolley said that maybe it could be another project – in another five years they might need another infusion of money.

Mr. Guthrie said there are two conflicting conditions and asked how to decide.

A straw poll was conducted regarding non-west facing fences being filled first before adding to the west. Five Commissioners indicated support.

Mr. Guthrie said he would have the condition that charms will be distributed evenly.

Mr. Horn said that is not really a condition.

Mr. Guthrie said that it is so as they come in you don't have 20 on this fence and zero on that fence; ten on this fence and five on that.

Mr. Guthrie said we get five hundred and there are ten on each panel and then as it fills in it fills in evenly regardless of whether it is the west wall.

Ms. McAuliffe said she didn't understand what he was talking about.

Mr. Ogliore said to let them put them out as they see fit not the first ones all have to go back here – so it is balanced - and asked if that is what he is saying.

Ms. McAuliffe said it has to look like that rendering – that's what the Commission approves – not like some other pattern.

Mr. Guthrie asked the applicants if they are planning to put the medallions out as they come in or hold on to them for a certain amount of time and then put them out all at once.

Mr. Franz Knight said they will be installed as soon as the building is open regardless of how many they have actually sold.

Mr. Guthrie said that as more come in they will be added.

Mr. Franz Knight indicated yes.

Mr. Guthrie said his condition would be that as the building is finished the number they have – whether that be 10,000 or 18,000 if they have them all – would they distribute evenly and then those get added on in spaces.

Mr. Horn said that he doesn't know that a condition is needed unless you specifically want them all to go everywhere.

Mr. Guthrie said it is not worth arguing about.

Mr. Ogliore asked if it was that condition or nothing that it is up to the applicant to put them out as they see fit.

Mr. Horn said that is the other thing if we don't have the condition of limiting where they are put out then the applicant could put them wherever they want to unless you specifically want to put that condition so they don't all go on the western wall fence first.

Mr. Guthrie said he didn't agree with the condition.

Ms. McAuliffe said she thought they were ready for a motion.

Ms. Connolley suggested that no lettering on anything will be over ¼”.

There was further discussion of limiting the lettering to ¼” on all fundraising design elements.

Ms. Connolley said that everything should be the same and that she said that there shouldn't be something that says 'this is where the wealthy people live' and 'this is where the rest of the folks live'.

Mr. Guthrie said he thought the fish tiles were different because they appear to be people's signatures.

Ms. McAuliffe asked if they wanted to separate out since there is disagreement over the charms and just do tiles and hoof prints and said she didn't think there is disagreement over ¼” letters.

Responding to question about condition Mr. Horn said that in the straw poll five were in favor of the condition. He said that now we have two conditions to approve the application as submitted with the condition that non-west facing fences be filled first and that no lettering be higher than ¼” (plus or minus 1/16” to allow for variation)

Action: Ms. Link made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application for donor recognition design elements as presented with the conditions that non west-facing fences be filled first and no letter height will exceed ¼” +/- 1/16”.

Ms. Vaughan asked for the maximum number of items – hooves, charms, and fish.

Mr. Horn said it is not specifically in any of these documents.

Mr. Guthrie said his understanding is that we don't have the exact number because the mural hasn't been created yet – for the fish and plants.

MM/SC/KL/CV 6:1:1 Motion carried. (Mr. Ogliore opposed. Mr. Habibi abstained; recused.)

011415.2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

December 10, 2014

MM/SC/KL/JO 7:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Vaughan abstained.

011415.3 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

011415.4 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

011415.5 STAFF REPORT

011415.6 NEW BUSINESS

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe
Commission Coordinator