



The City of Seattle

## Pioneer Square Preservation Board

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

PSB 57/10

**MINUTES** for Wednesday, March 3, 2010

### **Board Members**

Ann Brown  
Erin Doherty, Vice Chair  
Adam Hasson  
Lorne McConachie, Chair  
Willie Parish  
Elizabeth Read

### **Staff**

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

### **Absent**

Ryan Hester  
Jeremie Lipton  
Catherine Person

Chair Lorne McConachie called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

#### **030310.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

February 3, 2010 February 17, 2010

MM/SC/ED/AB 5:0:3 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. McConachie and Ms. Read abstained.

February 17, 2010 Minutes deferred.

#### **030310.2**

#### **APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### 030310.21

#### **IMO Asian Bistro**

Scheuerman Block  
704 First Ave

Tabled by applicant.

##### 030310.22

#### **EN Fobes Building**

558 First Ave S

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

### Painting the façade facing Occidental

ARC Report: Mr. McConachie reported that the ARC found the proposal appropriate and he expressed appreciation for the building being taken care of. He said that ARC recommended approval.

Ms. Nashem pointed out that the Board had previously approved the same color scheme on the on the First Avenue façade.

Sam Park explained they were replicating the paint scheme on the First Avenue side and provided material samples. He noted the lighter color would be used for the body and all the trim and other systems would be painted the darker color.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Brown complimented the applicant on the job.

Ms. Doherty said the color palette was nice and perfect for the district.

*Mr. Hasson arrived at 9:04 a.m.*

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for painting of the façade facing Occidental as proposed per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction  
D. Color

MM/SC/ED/AB                      5:0:1      Motion carried. Mr. Hasson Abstained

030310.23

### **Borenstein and Sons Warehouse** 562 First Ave S

### Painting the windows doors and fire escape on the façade facing Occidental

ARC Report: Mr. McConachie reported that the ARC reviewed the application and recommended approval.

Sam Park said they would not paint the natural brick or natural concrete portions but all the painted elements would be painted the same as the First Avenue side. The dark color would be used for the trim and stairs and the bright brick color would be used at street level.

Ms. Brown noted that the fire escape would remain intact.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said the application was consistent with the colors of the building next door and with the character of the district.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for painting of the façade facing Occidental as proposed per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

D. Color

MM/SC/ED/ER 6:0:0 Motion carried.

030310.24

**King Street Station**

300 S Jacksons Street

Rehabilitation of the building and site

Demolition of non-original addition

Rehabilitation and alterations to windows and doors

Rehabilitation to canopies including canopy lighting

Rehabilitation and repair to miscellaneous exterior elements

Alterations to the Jackson Street streetscape and plaza

Alterations to the King Street streetscape

Lighting – Building and Site

Mr. McConachie said that the ARC noted a couple concerns but was supportive of the application. He noted concerns about traffic patterns.

Ms. Nashem explained that ARC also reviewed the project on January 13<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup> and February 10. On January 13<sup>th</sup> ARC thought that the enclosures had no historical or architectural significance and their removal was appropriate to restore the building and will reveal the original material. ARC still wanted to discuss, painting of the roof vents to match the roof, the proposed tree at the terminus of King Street, the historic light fixtures and the planters but found the rest of the proposal to meet code, District Rules and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The final design of the vent and cover is withdrawn from the application to be re submitted at a later time.

Tim Williams and Carlos Bress, ZGF, presented the application.

Mr. Williams presented using a PowerPoint (available in DON file) and explained they are in the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of work and that this would complete the exterior restoration. He said the work would proceed in stages and included:

- Seismic upgrade to the building
- Restoration of exterior
- Restoration of interior
- Rehabilitation of tenant spaces
- Reconstruction of Jackson St. Plaza
- Improvement to the King Street drop off and pedestrian space

He explained their intent to return the building to its original condition as best they can. He said they intend to remove the 1950's addition that enclosed the

escalator (referred to as the “carbuncle”) to expose original material. They intend to reopen bricked-in windows and any windows to be replaced will be replaced with historically consistent wood windows that will match original windows. Mr. Williams said they will restore the canopy and restore the fascia with copper that has been salvaged and stored completing with new copper when they run out.

Mr. Williams explained the ledger angles on the tower had corroded over time and they proposed the terracotta and brick would be removed, steel replaced where required and terracotta reinstalled. He noted salvaged brick from the tower or from the addition was available if they needed replacement bricks. He pointed out a window in-filled with a vent on the north elevation immediately adjacent to the Compass Room that would be changed to a door for egress for a new emergency stair exit. He said that on the east elevation all windows would be restored or repaired or replaced with historically accurate wood windows where necessary.

Mr. Williams went over proposed changes to the Jackson Street Plaza noting this would become open space and the structure could not support parking. He said in the Plaza they would add a copper color brick paver walkway; provide ADA access to the elevator; add trees in planters and an air intake for which they will come back with a final design. They proposed to use salvaged granite or new granite as a containment device with the main field material being decomposed stone. The planters are proposed to be of Ipe wood installed to a seating height to also act as a bench.

Mr. Williams went over proposed changes to the King Street level pointing out the adjustment to the curb line to keep it out from under the canopy line. The sidewalk would be of same copper colored pavers with a granite element as proposed at the Jackson Street Plaza level. He said they proposed a curbsless environment and that the slope would be easier for pedestrians to maneuver with luggage.

Mr. Williams went over lighting and noted the desire to relocate the five Chief Seattle lights to new locations on King Street. They proposed to provide more effective under-canopy lighting in their place. He went over proposed planting material and elements and pointed out that the proposed London Plane tree is similar to others in the district but eliminated the one at the end of King Street to be replaced with a planter. He brought a sample of the precast planter material for the new planters. He said they propose a green screen in the current dumpster location.

He went over proposed lighting at the Jackson Street Plaza level noting that step lights would light up the walking surface of the pathway that leads down to the Compass Room and fixtures are under the canopy. He noted that there would be consistency in the color of the lighting. He said they want to replace the historic 3-globe fixtures (referring to them as “Gumby” fixtures) with exact replicas but that it is a budget issue. He said the bases of the “Gumby” lights were rusty most beyond repair and they proposed removing them and safely storing them so they could be replicated in the future. He showed photos depicting the level of damage. He said

they proposed to put a copper cap over the area of attachment awaiting replacement of the fixtures.

Mr. Williams went over the vent roof and provided photos showing the subtle difference in the tiles. He said the vent element matches the profile of the existing roof tile and can be painted to match.

Carlos Bress explained that because these tiles will be located behind the parapet they will not be visible to pedestrians.

#### Board Questions:

Responding to Board questions about the “Gumby” light fixture Mr. Williams explained that the proposed cap over the hole would sit up about ½”. He noted the original stone balustrade is 46 – 48” tall. There was some discussion about the safety of removing the railing but Mr. Williams pointed out that the current configuration would not prevent someone from climbing over and if Amtrak has some additional requirements for “hardening” that area they would come back.

Mr. Bress responded to Board questions about the granite proposed for the Jackson Street Plaza noting they have multiple sized planks and would determine the viability of all the sizes. The granite is preferred but the precast concrete paver has been proposed in case the granite won’t work.

There was discussion about the intake vent at the Jackson Street Plaza; applicant will submit an amendment to the application when the design alternative is finished.

Mr. McConachie asked for more information on the windows and Mr. Bress directed Board members to a diagram in the package which detailed windows. He said all windows have same profile and elements as original.

In response to a Board question about the canopy fascia, Michael Sullivan, project consultant from Artifacts, explained the replacement pieces could be found in a sheet metal catalog and said the top of the fascia looks different without the original cresting.

Mr. McConachie expressed concern about the durability of the paint on the roof vent tiles and Mr. Bress responded that over time the paint would fade but the tiles would be located low enough so the parapet would conceal them from pedestrian view. Mr. Williams explained other options that were explored and that this was the best option and least impactful way to accomplish the venting.

Mr. Bress went through the material samples for Board members to review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

#### Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said concerns that had been raised at ARC had been addressed. She said this is how projects should be approached with regard to rehabilitation, preservation

and restoration. She said the palette and the approach to it was consistent with District Rules and the Guidelines. She commended the team for a good job.

Ms. Brown agreed with Ms. Doherty's comments.

Mr. McConachie agreed and encouraged the applicants to have a conversation about traffic patterns around the station.

Ms. Doherty asked the design team to be mindful that if they encounter things that are inconsistent with what has been presented that they come back to the Board.

Mr. Bress agreed.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Rehabilitation of the building and site including:

- Demolition of non-original addition
- Rehabilitation and alterations to windows and doors
- Rehabilitation to canopies including canopy lighting
- Rehabilitation and repair to miscellaneous exterior elements
- Alterations to the Jackson Street streetscape and plaza
- Alterations to the King Street streetscape
- Lighting – Building and Site

Under the condition that the final design proposal for the air intake and cover on the Jackson Street Plaza is brought back to the Board for approval.

All as presented per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III. General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

**2.** The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

**6.** Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

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

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

Guidelines for Setting

MM/SC/ED/AB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

030310.25 **Pioneer Square Hotel Annex (Old Firehouse)**  
110 Alaskan Way S

Demolition of the Old Fire House building also known as the Heffernan Engine Works building built in 1918. Use and Final Design Approval to construct a new 4-story building above ground and 39 parking spaces on the basement, entry and mezzanine level and containing 910 square feet of retail use on the ground floor and 30 hotel rooms use on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors.

Ms. Nashem read the Staff Report reporting that the original December 1998 Certificate of Approval was for a design alteration to the existing building. By November 2001, five additional Certificates of Approval were issued for additional changes to the building. In December 2006, Department of Neighborhoods staff was notified that portions of the front façade were being removed and the applicant was issued a Stop Work order since the COA had expired and the applicant was informed that a new application was required to be submitted. A new application was submitted in January, 2007 and after a series of reviews where Board members found errors and conflicting information, the applicant changed architects. In March, 2008, following a recommendation from the Board, a Certificate of Approval for use and rehabilitation of an existing building was issued. On September 3, 2008, notice was given to DPD that the building had been demolished without a Certificate of Approval. On December 17, 2008, a new application for demolition was submitted and the application was determined complete on January 7, 2010.

The applicant's proposed new construction is similar to what the Board previously approved in March, 2008 as a "rehabilitation of the existing building." The building structure, including the structural frame and floor plates, were not identified as planned for demolition in the March 2008 application and approval is now required for a replacement structure. The Board should therefore, consider the application as a request for new construction. The proposal being considered in this application is for the exterior of the building and will include the same materials that were previously approved under the March 2008 decision. And similar to the previously approved application, the applicant is proposing to reuse what remains of the original bricks taken from the original front façade and noted she thought there may be some change in materials.

She said that a Certificate of Approval for demolition and for new construction is, therefore, required by SMC 23.66.030. The Certificate of Approval is necessary for any new construction to move forward. SMC 23.66.115 identifies the conditions for when a demolition Certificate of Approval can be granted. The Board should consider if the building has architectural or historical significance. The building is listed in the National Register as "historic and contributing." Now that the building has been demolished the architectural and historic integrity has been lost. Notwithstanding that the building has been demolished, the Board may choose to consider: the exterior of the building is the same as what the Board previously

approved under the March, 2008 rehabilitation application; what was demolished without Board approval was the structural elements and floor plates, which would likely not have been visible components of a rehabilitated building; and approving the current application instead of maintaining a vacant lot furthers district purposes of enhancing the district's character and economic climate, and encouraging pedestrian uses.

Ms. Nashem said that because financing is likely not available at this time, the applicant has proposed that a report of the owners efforts' to obtain financing will be submitted on a six-month interval. The property owner has committed to building within two years of obtaining financing.

Ms. Nashem said the applicant's attorney contacted her regarding clarification on the building permit. She said the building permit has expired and once a Certificate of Approval has been issued the applicant can submit what is approved to DPD.

Mr. McConachie explained the ARC's review. They discussed that this was a "new building" and they previously approved "rehabilitation". They discussed whether or not the Board should approve the demolition given that the building had been contributing and the dilemma that the building had already been demolished. He said they discussed that they would like to see alternatives given that this is a new building and should be differentiated from the old building.

Public Comment given at the ARC review: Sara Jane Bellanca said she had been a member of the Board when the project was reviewed and wanted to express her dismay at demolition. She thought that the building could have been saved. She acknowledged that the Board is now in a difficult position to have to consider demolition after the fact. She said she didn't think it should be easy to demolish a contributing building and that the applicants saying "I thought so" is not enough.

John Hartung, David Strauss and Melissa Glenn from SHKS Architects presented.

Mr. Hartung explained that this architectural firm took over the project in 2007. He said they did not look at the project as a whole re-design but just to make the plans that the previous architect had done cohesive. He reviewed the design changes that they had previously reviewed with the Board and what had been approved in the COA.

Mr. Strauss said since the building had been demolished they were looking at designing a new one and explained that they looked to surrounding buildings as a cue to the design. He said the original building was an anomaly in the district and described it as "quirky". He explained in the new building they wanted more transparency at the base for retail and spoke to the future character of Alaskan Way. He went on to explain the different glazing which he said recalled the quirky character of the original building. He explained the way the brick veneer would hang from the metals studs and would provide shadow lines, detail as well as provide protection to the windows.

Mr. Strauss said they propose to use a blend of recovered brick from the demolished building and new brick on the front facade. He said the brick on the north and alley

sides would be new. Responding to questions about alley fenestration he said that they were punched openings.

Mr. Strauss said the base of Scheme B was cast vertical board formed concrete. He pointed out that retail was proposed at street level and pointed out the secondary entrance to the hotel. He pointed out the windows that corresponded to sleeping rooms, corridor space and living room/kitchenette area.

Mr. Hartung said the interior floors plans are the same.

Ms. Brown noted 30 rooms were proposed and that only three had window openings.

Mr. Hartung said that three rooms face Alaskan Way but the rest face the light court between the two buildings or the alley.

Mr. McConachie clarified that the new structure would be concrete base and steel above that.

Mr. Hartung explained that it would be a concrete base, concrete columns, and concrete post tension slabs.

Mr. McConachie asked why the large cornice was proposed in Scheme B.

Mr. Strauss said that based on the proportion of the block the scale was appropriate.

Asked about the character of the middle opening Mr. Hartung said it was along a corridor and Ms. Glenn passed out additional plans showing the corridor.

Mr. Strauss said he liked to think of this as the Pioneer Square Hotel for the foreseeable future but he said he also recognizes the value of most of the buildings in the district is the adaptability to a variety of uses. He said this building design could accommodate a variety of uses.

Mr. Hartung said it is expressing what they feel they should be doing for a new building in a historic district. He said that Scheme B is contemporary and is not trying to replicate the old. He said they are trying to respect the scale of the neighborhood, the quality of the materials, colors etc. He said Scheme A does may be a fun background building.

Mr. Hasson said the buildings provide contrast that indicate it is new construction

Mr. McConachie said that he appreciates these designs that do not pretend to be the building that used to be there. He noted that one of the characteristics of many of Pioneer Square buildings is the vertical character of the façade and the horizontal nature – that there are bays. He said that in Scheme B the entry bay doesn't resolve itself with the upper windows above it and the windows above become rather horizontal in character. He asked how the more horizontal openings and the asymmetry of the façade deals with the more common character of the district.

Mr. Strauss said this building differs in that it is more about skin and the tension in the skin. He said the horizontal character of the windows is part of that pulling.

Responding to board member question Mr. Hartung said the base units would be an aluminum store front and the upper he assumed would be the Anderson casement product.

Mr. Hasson said the windows on the south side are different and noted the unusual treatment not seen in the district and suggested the design be a little more towards the normal pattern in the District.

Mr. Strauss said the question they faced was that the Heffernan building had been an anomalous building whose windows were not seen elsewhere in the district. He noted they were dealing with a changing front with the viaduct removal as well as the historic neighborhood.

Ms. Doherty said she appreciated the alternatives proposed. She asked if the applicants had any more information about the building's integrity was prior to demolition related to its architectural and historic significance or character to supplement what the board had received. She expressed concern that there was not sufficient information in the application to determine the architectural or historical integrity prior to demolition.

Pat Schneider, attorney for the owner, said they had provided all the information that was available.

Responding to a board member comment and question Ms. Nashem said the applicants are asking for direction on alternative designs for the replacement building and will come back to the board. Ms. Nashem clarified that in order to approve demolition the board has to approve a replacement project.

Mr. Schneider said that there is a difference of opinion. He said that they submitted an application for Certificate of Approval for demolition and he said that the application clearly said that they satisfied the criteria for the replacement building by the Certificate of Approval that had already been issued. He said that they are willing to do a different design as ARC requested but that is procedurally different from the demolition approval which he said the application had been submitted for. He said that their request was that the Board vote on demolition approval and the applicant was willing to come back with a replacement design if that is the desire of the board. He said from his point of view these are two distinct issues.

Ms. Nashem referred to the conditions outlined in the demolition Ordinance one of them is to determine if the building has architectural or historic value, and the second is approval of a replacement structure. She said the board had previously approved a rehabilitation of an existing building, this is no longer rehabilitation. She said they could consider approval of a new construction building that looks like the previously approved rehabilitation or as the Board is requesting to look for alternatives that further differentiate the new construction. The Board should also determine if there are any parts of the building that should be salvaged – they are offering the brick; and the applicant in lieu of being able to provide documentation of financing have offered to provide reports on six-month intervals their attempts to get financing for the project and has committed to build within two years of obtaining financing. She said all of these conditions have to be approved in order to approve demolition.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca, resident and former Board member, said demolition of the building occurred after the board already had gone through the earthquake and the debacle of the Cadillac Hotel. She said the building was demolished over a holiday weekend when there were few people around. She stressed the importance of keeping historic buildings around. She said that this cannot continue to happen and that she took great exception to the building being demolished.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hasson noted that the demolition was done and he didn't want to see a hole in the ground. He was glad to see alternatives presented by the applicants. He said that the building had been a contributing building in the district and now it is gone; he asked what the consequences were and noted that one shouldn't be able to demolish a contributing building.

Ms. Doherty noted her struggle with the process and reiterated that there wasn't enough information to say the building should have been demolished. She questioned how the board would be able to approve the demolition of a contributing building in the district. She said that the building is gone and can't be put back and noted it was a significant loss. She cited Mr. Strauss's description of the building as an anomaly and said it was that uniqueness that was important. She said the vernacular, industrial, utilitarian style was interesting and part of the building's story and character.

Ms. Read agreed with Ms. Doherty's comments. She said she would like to engage in a conversation about moving new construction forward in a way that is beneficial to the entire community but she said she did not think she could approve demolition.

Mr. Parish agreed and said he couldn't approve it until something was resolved around the consequences and that it was an injustice to the Code.

Board members discussed how to move forward noting the need to resolve the legal issues but also if approving demolition with conditions might be an option.

Mr. Schneider said the legal matter is on hold until this board rules. He said the demolition was not done over a weekend but was done over months and was completed in July prior to the Labor Day weekend. He said the only way to move forward is to follow the existing Code. He said by not taking action they can't move forward and there will be a hole in the ground. He agreed with the suggestion with doing a motion with conditions in order to allow them to move forward.

Ms. Doherty asked about the language, if it would have to be a Certificate of Approval for demolition or if it could be a Certificate of Approval that acknowledges that the building has been unlawfully demolished without a Certificate of Approval.

Mr. McConachie said the Board needs City guidance in how it might be stated to acknowledge what happened but also allows the process to move forward.

Karen Gordon, City Preservation Officer, said that every Board action is a recommendation to the Director of Department of Neighborhoods and that all comments can be included in a motion and the Director can impose conditions. She said resolution of the legal issues is a lengthy process. She cited 23.66.115 and said it is a package – can't get demo approval without an approval for new construction. She suggested not voting on the application today and encouraged the board to come up with recommendations to the Director on a range of issues including new construction.

Mr. McConachie commented on the schemes presented by the applicant and noted he preferred Scheme B. He said it was a quirky building pointing out the utilitarian and straightforward character. He said it was a 21<sup>st</sup> century building but in the context of a historic district. He said he liked that the alley was brick. He noted the clarity of the base and the modern horizontality. He expressed concern about the fenestration and the lack of clarity between the horizontal bays versus the verticality of the building and asked for more options.

Ms. Doherty said she appreciated Scheme A but that Scheme B was a better direction to go. She said it was a fairly quiet building with a simple palette. She said the windows and concrete base work well between the two neighboring buildings, but that the base needs further study. She expressed some concern about the strip window character at the upper levels. She said that the designs are not trying to be historic-looking but are being responsive to proportion and materials consistent with the character seen along that edge which will become the front door to the City when the Viaduct comes down. She said she would not approve this on First Avenue but for this location it is appropriate.

Mr. Hasson said it was a step toward differentiating old from new. He thought some of the design was too edgy and he suggested the designs be more timeless.

Mr. McConachie suggested tabling the vote and that he heard a desire from the Board for crafting language for the Certificate of Approval regarding demo. He asked the architects to continue developing their ideas.

Ms. Nashem explained that this application would be for final design and that preliminary design approval is for bulk and scale which has not been an issue in the discussion. She said the final design approval is needed for demolition approval.

Mr. Strauss agreed to table the application and would come to ARC to continue the discussion.

030310.26

**Courtyard by Marriott**

Alaska Building  
618 Second Ave

Installation of business signage including two neon wall signs, a neon blade sign and two neon window signs

Ms. Nashem reported that the applicant indicated at the February 24, 2010 ARC meeting that they would like to table the blade sign and the restaurant window signs in order to provide alternative designs, but would still like to have the Board consider the wall

signs. She said the sign met the square foot size and that the applicant proposed to paint the outside edges same color as the louvers so it will recess.

Carl Lindstrom explained that there would be one sign on the east elevation and one on the south elevation. He said the colors were the same as what was reviewed at ARC and noted that the finish would be flat matte. He said the red and green were corporate colors. He said they were trying to reduce the impact of the sign by painting the outside to match the louvers. Mr. McConachie said the sides of the letters would be pewter color and not the gold as stated on the drawing.

**Public Comment:**

Sara Jane Bellanca said that corporations are coming and the board needed to respect corporate colors.

**Board discussion:**

Board members discussed the size of the south sign. Mr. Hasson thought it should be in proportion to the façade while Mr. McConachie thought they should be the same size. Ms. Doherty said she was not convinced it was necessary to have two signs. It was noted that this was a large hotel and not a small building and in this case two signs could be considered.

Action: I move to approve wall signs as amended that the edge will be painted pewter gray to match the louvers and the colors will be matte finish.

**Code Citations:**

District Rules XX. Rules for Transparency, Signs, Awnings and Canopies

C. Specific Signage Regulations

8. Wall Signs

SMC 23.66.160 Signs C.

1. Signs attached or applied to structures

2. Wall signs

4. Size considerations

6. Projecting signs, neon signs

MM/SC/ER/WP 4:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Doherty and Mr. Hasson opposed.

**030310.3 BOARD BUSINESS**

**030310.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Lorne McConachie, Chair

**030310.6 STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227

