



The City of Seattle

## Pioneer Square Preservation Board

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

### MINUTES OF MEETING

PSB 167/08

DATE: July 2, 2008  
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

#### Board Members Present:

Doug Ito  
Ann Brown  
Adam Hasson  
David Strauss  
Ryan Hester

#### Staff:

Genna Nashem  
Karen Gordon  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

John DeLanoy  
Catherine Person  
Lorne McConachie

**070208.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Draft minutes from June 18, 2008  
MM/SC/DS/AH 4:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Hester abstained.

### **070208.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

070208.21 **Jimmy Johns** Willard Park  
104 First Ave S

Signage: Install applied letters to a painted background in the sign band

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans submitted. ARC members found the letters and painted background to meet district rules for signage in the sign band. ARC asked Mr. Park to provide drawings of the lights showing the J boxes being the cut sheet said the lights would need to be attached to four inch J boxes. Mr. Park said the conduit would be inside. ARC asked him to research if the J boxes could be inside as well. ARC recommends approval of the signage but did not make a recommendation on the lighting.

Staff Report: The signage meets the District Rules for letter size and individual letters in the sign band.

Applicant Comment:

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Willard Park explained the application for surface applied letters to be applied in the sign band; the opening they are fitting is 1'6" tall; 10' long; the letter height of the capital "J" is 12" and all the other letters are 9 1/4". The escutcheon that comes with the light fixture is 4" tall; he can't get a smaller one. If the light is brought down onto the sign band the sign gets very small. They haven't drilled a hole yet to see if they can run the gooseneck straight out of the wall with the box behind.

Mr. Ito said the escutcheon plate that comes with the lamps is 4" round that fits on a 4" round J-box so even if the J-box was not forward, you'd still have a 4" round plate that would do the exact same thing.

Mr. Park concurred and said it would sit a little closer to the building but would still drop below the piece of trim. Mr. Park said the 3" flat piece of trim with a 3/4 quarter round is existing.

Mr. Ito stated ARC felt the painted on Jimmy Johns sign was OK but that is up for Board discussion along with the lighting.

Mr. Strauss thought it met the Ordinance.

Mr. Hasson asked if the lights on the building now are lower but they want to move them up because of the new sign.

Mr. Park concurred and said they want to put the lights up at the top on the piece of trim so they shine back on to the letters; they can't go up any higher because the trim above is even smaller. They are using the same fixture but a different gooseneck; a cut sheet had been provided to the Board.

Mr. Hasson thought it was not ideal it is better than where they started.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: There was no further Board Discussion.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the application for applied letters in the sign band and lighting per

Code Citations:

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

B. General Signage Regulations

C. Specific Signage Regulations 2. Sign Bands

SMC 23.66.160 Signs

MM/SC/RH/AB

5:0:0 Motion approved.

070208.22

**E.N. Fobes Building**  
558 First Ave S

Sam Parks

Facade Alterations: Repaint entire facade, in-fill bulkhead, remove existing awning, fix vent

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and samples provided. ARC thought the alteration to the bulkhead would be an improvement and also supported removal of the

awning. The applicant explained that they would remove the transom pivot window and build a new frame with a wire grid and screen behind to match the grid of the window. ARC asked for a drawing that demonstrated the plans for the grill and how they were going to match the existing windows. Mr. Ito said he would only support removing of the window if the window would be removed intact and stored. Mr. Ito noted that the purple transom glass is an important architectural feature but that he understood the need for air. ARC agreed the solution that exists is not desirable. ARC reviewed the color scheme. They asked Mr. Park for a rendering with the colors dropped on the so they could get a better feel for the colors and to be prepared with a back up color proposal. ARC was concerned that the body color was too dark and asked the applicant to consider highlighting the architectural features of the building. ARC did agree that a color in contrast to the neighboring brick buildings is appropriate. The applicant said there is a letter "F" in the existing painted blue triangle as well as the word Fobes in the white area but neither of these features is evident in the photos. During public Comment at the ARC meeting, Sara Jane Bellanca brought up the fact that the building goes through to Occidental and most building's First Ave side and Occidental sides are painted the same. Mr. Park believes that the owner is only proposing to paint the First Ave side which is more weathered. ARC recommends approval of the bulkhead in-fill and removing the awning but has withheld recommendation on the vent and painting pending more information.

Staff Report: The Board should consider the Secretary of Interiors' Standards when considering the removal of the window.

Applicant Comment:

Sam Park explained the triangle is a slight relief with an "F" and suggested it be painted the same as the window for a subtle contrasting. At the bottom Fobes will be painted the accent color. There is no work planned for the Occidental side. The owners still feel strongly that the darker color is richer but he was able to get an alternate color that is lighter. The Gunmetal is the owner's original choice and he pointed out the owner's second choice.

Mr. Strauss asked what the earlier colors of the building were.

Mr. Park said there were no early photos to indicate the original color.

Mr. Hester asked if the mullions, bulkheads and window frames will be the black bronze.

Mr. Park said the cornice elements will be the body color.

Mr. Ito stated the change of color was an ARC request.

Mr. Hester preferred the new colors but he wasn't sure of the historical impact.

Mr. Ito explained ARC did not want to see a brick colored building. He said the proposal also includes store front changes to replace the expanded metal grate that is below the window storefronts; replacement of an odd vent situation that is currently in the storefront.

Mr. Park said there are six leaded glass windows above the storefront; at some point a mechanical intake vent was installed and fixed the window open. They need to keep the air moving so can't put the window back in; they will store the window for future restoration but in the meantime they will mimic the pattern of the window frame.

Mr. Hester asked if there was any chance of relocating the louver; he thought the original character of the storefront is integral part of the building.

Mr. Park thought that mimicking the shape will read the same.

Mr. Ito asked if it would be possible to move the vent over the door.

Mr. Strauss said if it is an exhaust vent it can't go over the doorway.

Mr. Park said he would check to see if it is exhaust or venting.

Mr. Ito said there is a vent below and above; the frame is rotting out. Since there is an existing vent, ARC said to remove the current window, restore it, put it in the basement for future use. To express pattern change a vent with steel pieces and some mesh.

Mr. Hester said if it can't be relocated this is probably the best alternative.

Mr. Hasson asked what piece of equipment is being vented and said he would be curious to see if it could be vented out the back of the building.

Mr. Park was not sure. He said they did look at removing it but that was not an option.

Ms. Brown said the back of the building is a whole series of fire escapes and it would probably be an expensive job to paint but down the road it would be good to consider that.

Mr. Strauss stated he was fine with the color but he wished for some historical context. He didn't see an option in terms of the vent but he is concerned the glass will get lost. He said he preferred the lighter paint color.

Mr. Hasson said the windows will be starkly black and thought the two darker colors blended better. He was concerned about losing detail; it is an elegant building and while simple the things they did are quite nice. By not painting the lower cornice a lot of character is being lost.

Mr. Park said he can recommend to the owner that they do something with the cornice.

Mr. Ito stated the application can be approved stating the cornice on the lower band being painted; both cornices should be painted to same darker color as trim.

Ms. Brown suggested highlighting the "F" and "Fobes" being highlighted as well.

Action: I move to approve the application as submitted, the lighter paint color "Wet Cement", the triangular "F" and "Fobes" on the building be painted with the accent color and with the amendment that the lower cornice is painted the trim color per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III. General Rules for Rehabilitation and New Construction  
C. Building Materials  
D. Color  
E. Building Base  
SMC 23.66. 180  
Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9  
Guidelines for the Treatment of Storefronts

MM/SC/DS/AB 5:0:0 Motion approved.

070208.23

**Bornstein and Sons Warehouse**  
562 First Ave S

Sam Parks

Façade Alterations: Paint window frames and sill; paint all street level elements, in-fill bulkhead

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and samples provided. ARC also felt the in-fill of the bulkhead was appropriate for this building. ARC reviewed the colors for this building and found some of the colors to be to similar to the brick color. ARC felt that parts of the building that are not brick should not be painted to look like brick. ARC thought that the sill looked like unpainted concrete and asked if the cornice was metal or terra cotta. The applicant did not know. ARC informed the applicant that they would not approve painting of cement, stone or terracotta that was not already painted and that painting them could lead to damage. The applicant said they would remove the green awning as well and likely replace with an awning to match the trim. ARC reminded the applicant that the awning replacement needs to be included in the application.

Staff Report: The Board should consider the Secretary of Interiors' Standards when considering the removal of the window.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Ito said ARC recommended the colors not be brick colors and the awning should be changed out to match or be removed.

Mr. Park said the awning will be removed. There will be no work on the Occidental Avenue side. The concrete will not be painted but a sealer will be applied; if the sill element is terracotta they will keep it as is; the area indicated Brick Red will be painted the Dark Wine color.

Mr. Ito clarified that Copper Red and Bright Brick were both thought to be too close to the color of the brick by ARC.

Mr. Park confirmed Chocolate Brick is for the window frames.

Ms. Brown asked if the address would be painted on the building once the awning comes down.

Mr. Park said it will still be the same white color.

Mr. Ito asked if they would keep the same "562" that is on the vertical.

Mr. Park indicated they would.

A discussion ensued about colors and the difficulty of making a determination based on the information provided. It was determined that Mr. Park would come back with a Photoshop version of the storefront to see the color.

Mr. Strauss asked the applicant to make a determination of if the sills are terracotta or concrete.

Ms. Nashem stated the Board also needs to know what kind of sealer would be used on the cement.

Mr. Hasson suggested a close up photo would help.

Mr. Ito stated this application would be tabled for now.

Ms. Nashem advised that she would continue this item on the agenda in two weeks.

070208.24

**Imperial Parking**  
112 Occidental Ave S

Ed Danyluk

Signage: Install new business signage

Applicant did not attend the ARC on June 25<sup>th</sup>. ARC Report from June 11th: ARC reviewed the photos of the signage. The signage was put up prior to getting approval. ARC reviewed the rules concerning letter size and found some of the letters to be larger than ten inches. ARC compared the original signs to the old signs and found that there was the same number of signs but that the over-all square footage of signage might be less. Mr. Danyluk explained that a sign that was in the alley was impeding traffic so they relocated it to the side. ARC questioned if two signs on Washington were necessary. ARC agreed they would recommend approval of the "Pay Here" sign and the A Board Sign if the size of the numbers was reduced to 10 inches. ARC did not make a recommendation on the other two pole signs.

Staff Report: The District Rules talk about signs applied to buildings including limiting the letter size to ten inches. The District Rules are silent on parking signs for parking lots. The Board can use to determine the appropriate size of a sign for this location SMC 23.66.160 C.3 *Signs not attached to structures shall be compatible with the adjacent structures and with the District generally* and 4. *When determining the appropriate size of a sign, the Board shall consider the purpose of the sign, the character and scale of the buildings, the proposed location and the total number of signs.* SMC 23.66.160 C also gives guidance about undue proliferation of signage and competing signs. SMC 23.66.160 A which prohibits free standing signs does not prohibit parking lots from having signs.

Applicant Comment:

Ed Danyluk said they currently have the same number of signs as the previous operator of the location but now there are two signs on the same street. Mr. Danyluk said they are willing to change the size of the lettering to meet the standards.

Mr. Hasson clarified that Mr. Danyluk proposed reducing the letter size from 14 down to 10. Mr. Hasson thought there was repetition of signage and that one of the signs should be eliminated from Washington. He said the original signs that were there were not in compliance and now they are gone so this is starting over.

Mr. Danyluk said if he removed the sign that is visible on Washington it would reduce it to one visible sign on Washington and still have the same affect for that driving track. He said he would remove the north-south blade sign on Washington.

Mr. Hasson asked if the lot had a problem with business.

Mr. Danyluk said the whole area has a traffic volume issue.

The Board discussed how much is too many signs and what would appropriately work in this district.

Mr. Danyluk said the purpose of the signage is to help people make quick decisions from a moving vehicle.

Mr. Hasson said there was so much going on at the corner – the lamp post, the trash can, there are beautiful Pioneer Square details – and the sign just crowds it. They used to have a sign toward the alley to encourage people to come in through the alley. He thought it less intrusive to have the one in the middle than to have the one on the corner competing with the street signs and the street furniture. Coming from Occidental Park, the one sign is in the middle of the view from the park and is more obtrusive and doesn't add to the neighborhood.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Strauss agreed with Mr. Hasson but without the Ordinance addressing it specifically he wasn't sure how the Board should review it. He said Mr. Hasson's point was compatibility with the visual character in the neighborhood.

Mr. Nashem read 23.66.10 C, C3, and C4.

Mr. Danyluk said he can revise the application and come back. He will revise to reduce the cluttered look. He said that parking is an amenity for the District and clear signage is needed.

The application is tabled until the applicant is ready to come back with a new proposal.

070208.25

**Butler Building**  
114 James St

Steve Zamberlin

Signage: Install a blade sign with neon

**Tabled at the request of the applicant.**

Sidewalk café: Install a wood platform with railings on the sidewalk

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the plans and photos provided. Mr. Porowski said that the sidewalk has a 10% slope so they are proposing to have a platform on the side walk for the side walk café. Mr. Porowski explained that he is proposing a 6X6 beam for footings instead of the cement pillars that they had previously used. He said the rest of the deck is the same and it is built of pressure treated wood. ARC asked for photos of the deck in order to assess the color, condition and quality of the deck. Mr. Ito suggested the bottom be framed in with a fascia board. ARC also asked to see photos of the proposed furniture and reminded the applicant that we do not have a record of a previous approval. ARC did not make a recommendation.

Staff Report: District Rules say that *“Movable structural elements that can be brought back against the building wall or elements that can be removed when not in use will generally be required if some structural element is necessary.”* The only other platform that has been approved was for a café on a hill. If the Board finds this platform appropriate because of the sloped sidewalk, then the Board should state that that is the reason for allowing this one.

Applicant Comment:

Gaye Anderson said they have taken the platform down; she said the tables and chairs have never been mentioned.

Ms. Nashem stated she advised Ms. Anderson that the Board would want to see photos of the table and chairs.

Mr. Ito said it is considered street furniture and in the Board Rules and Regulations it has purview about the quality and type of chairs and tables that are out on the sidewalk.

Ms. Anderson said she has a permit from SDOT and PSPB for 20 years and she needs to have the platform for public safety. She said SDOT took photos.

Mr. Ito stated it was the applicant’s responsibility to provide photos to the Board.

Dean Banish, New Orleans manager, said the tables are slanted and stuff falls off the table because of the slant of the sidewalk.

Mr. Ito explained the Board needs detailed information on the design, construction and materials.

Paul Gillingham, Ms. Anderson’s attorney, asked what exactly the Board needs.

Mr. Ito stated providing photos does not equal approval; the Board needs photos of street furniture, benches, chairs, tables and existing deck show the condition and quality of materials.

Applicant will come back with the photos requested.

070208.3

**BOARD BUSINESS**

070208.31

**Discussion on the South Downtown Livability report comments**

Ms. Nashem provided the Pioneer Square Livable South Downtown Draft Land Use Recommendations dated May 2008. She reviewed the issues she covered in a draft letter from the Board: TDRs, Incentive Zoning for Residential, Heights, development pattern at WOSCA compared to the Historic District, and sustainability issues including some of the suggestions that have not been reviewed. Ms. Nashem said she would specifically like discussion on the heights because the Board has stated before they would like to see the lowest height possible that still gives incentives for development. 240' was the highest height of all the proposals.

Mr. Ito said it was a mix of heights in the proposal, lowest in the core, highest at the edges; above the train tracks is pretty high.

Ms. Nashem said along the train tracks: the upper one is 150' and the lower one is 180'. The Triangle Parking garage height with incentives it could go up to 130'.

Mr. Hasson said the Triangle Parking garage blocks Occidental Park so you have to go around the building. He thought advocating for pedestrian breezeway between 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Occidental would allow people at 2<sup>nd</sup> and James to get through if it were redeveloped. He wondered how some of the smaller lots would look at 130' especially mid block structures with no windows and CMU concrete blocks on sides.

Karen Gordon wondered if the small parcels were really developable because it is too expensive. She thought the Board's issue is we didn't want to do anything as incentive to demolish a historic building. The TDR is there so that people can't acquire three to four historic buildings, tear them down and build to the sky.

Mr. Hasson asked if they had one of those buildings (and tore them down) would they have TDR rights.

Ms. Gordon said only air rights over historic buildings can be sold.

Mr. Hasson wondered if the height could be different on a smaller lot than on a bigger lot.

Mr. Ito said structurally you could build a 130' tall building that is 30' wide, 80' deep. He expressed concern that we would potentially have large blank party wall next to short historic buildings; he asked if that is something we want to see. Economics today doesn't govern that; but in the future as land prices go up the potential for a 130' building is there.

Ms. Nashem passed out a map that showed potentially developable sites. They either have a non-contributing building or they are parking lots.

Mr. Ito said in the current code it is managed by some language that says you can build up to the height limit but you can't go over 15 feet of the heights of adjacent buildings.

Ms. Nashem said that code applies only in the core area.

Mr. Ito asked if the Board thought that having to take adjacent properties into account should be left in and say they can go 20' above which is something.

Ms. Nashem said the problem with variable height is that almost every block would have a different height and trying to figure out which height a newly constructed building can be is a problem.

Mr. Hasson wanted to look at how high a building in Occidental Park should be. Shade studies were done early on and he thought light and air in the park is important.

Ms. Nashem said with a code amendment Pioneer Square got a trolley barn and residential for the 130 feet but with this new code Pioneer Square would get just residential or TDR.

Mr. Ito asked what height the Trolley Barn was demarcated at.

Ms. Nashem said it is 130' with an additional 15' common recreation space.

Mr. Ito thought code amendments were an eroding away of the zoning height limit. Is it 130' or is 130' plus 15' then that means it is actually 145'. That needs to be stated clearly in the draft amendment code.

Mr. Hasson thought something should be included about the light quality in the park being important; perhaps if a building was higher on the north than on the south, more light would get into the park. He said there are a few small lots and he expressed concern about 130' buildings on those small lots.

Mr. Strauss asked the height of the building that replaced Campbell Fuller.

Mr. Hasson thought it was around 110'.

Mr. Strauss said one of the criteria has to be light on the street for determination of building height as well as scale of street corridor. The documentation he has seen doesn't address either of those. He said the bird's eye view of heights is not helpful to him.

Ms. Nashem asked if he would prefer "street level view".

Mr. Strauss agreed. He said he can imagine reasonable buildings at 130' in the district without adverse impact. Enclosure of street corridor, enclosure of Occidental Park may benefit from that increase in height but he hasn't really seen enough to convince him one way or the other.

Mr. Ito asked if throwing height at it is the best way to incentive development of vacant lots in Pioneer Square. If the City wants to incentive, one way to do it would be to give them a 5- year break on their property tax to develop in the district.

Mr. Hasson said the Florence Building looks like it is non-contributing and would we want to see a 130' abutting the Smith Tower. He asked if there are other incentives aside from height to encourage the desired infill. He thought there are few enough lots that we could look at each one to how inconsistent would 130' be at each of these sites.

Mr. Strauss said the one lot that really sticks out is the one along First Avenue and King and that would be kept at 100'. Consideration should go back to what happens on Occidental Avenue because there is not a significant impact on the district between 100' and 130' feet. He thought that if the street corridor is maintained or improved; scale is established within first 50' of height.

Mr. Hasson said to add the small lot behind the pink furniture building or perhaps the tiny lot off Occidental Park behind where the trolley barn was going to be; those would be mistakes if we were to allow tiny towers with the concrete walls on two sides.

Mr. Hester didn't think a blanket approach for everything is smart; the thought for the smaller sites, height based on square footage of site would be appropriate

Mr. Ito said the benefit of the blanket approach, 130', gives you the height to buy TDRs to incentivize the historic properties to be saved.

Mr. Hasson said 130' are given away for residential so there is no reason to buy any TDRs so really no incentive has been created. The developers of new construction have no incentive to buy TDRs from historic properties because they already have 130' if they just do residential or 100' for office. There is something missing there; how does development in the district support another historic building.

Mr. Ito thought it was desirable for historic buildings in Pioneer Square to get TDR funds and get remodeled whether the height bonus goes to Belltown or wherever.

Mr. Hasson said where there are no incentives on the new construction to purchase TDRs someone has to do a project outside the neighborhood to purchase TDRs.

Mr. Hasson asked why Pioneer Square isn't creating a market for TDRs

Ms. Gordon said the purpose of expanding it was so there is not the same development pressure in Pioneer Square; you can sell your TDR and go to Belltown or the Central Business District. There is not necessarily a link between new construction in Pioneer Square and the renovation/rehabilitation of historic buildings.

She agreed that the maximum becomes a property owner's minimum.

Ms. Nashem asked with the existing TDR program if there has been incentive for people to buy TDRs.

Ms. Gordon said it is very cyclical and depends on the market and the placement within the tiering system of TDR because it is so focused on affordable housing that unless there is a requirement for open space or preservation, which there is now, it is really market driven. There is a bank now with money in it. When the housing TDR bank was set up it had money and the Landmarks was set up it didn't have any money.

Mr. Ito said if TDR could transfer and be in effect for the vacant lots it might incentivize those developments and also lower height developments in those lots.

Ms. Gordon said the height increase and the purpose of selling the TDR are not necessarily connected. The reason it is said you can sell to anyone within a particular area because the purpose of a TDR is for owners of particular buildings to sell their development rights to use the money to rehab their buildings. The issues Mr. Ito

brought up are distinct issue in terms of the affect on the street, on public parks and whether to limit those heights in certain areas based on the lot size because of the juxtaposition to the scale of historic buildings. That is something that can be crafted into comments and suggestions. She cautioned not to tie the TDR program to new development in Pioneer Square. With regard to lot size two or three locations could be talked about as not being appropriate for that type of rezone. If you are looking at lots on the periphery, it would be different. Some of the issues like pedestrian connections where the sinking ship is that could be included in development standards.

Mr. Hester asked if it was reasonable to state what we want for a site.

Mr. Ito said that a building will be driven by the quality of the building more than anything else.

Mr. Hasson thought the Board should consider the views from 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue towards Smith Tower.

Mr. Ito said just like King Street Station tower is important, Smith Tower's tower is important as well and view corridor needs to be maintained. He asked if there are other significant historic buildings that should be treated similarly.

Mr. Strauss said the character of Pioneer Square is defined by the fabric with signature buildings that stand out; it is the fabric that we continue to return to for which the Ordinance really falls a bit short. When we come to pedestrian space and light and air we are at a loss.

Mr. Hasson said at the North Lot, near the ID, over the tracks there will be some significant opportunities for height; he questioned whether the sinking ship was appropriate for a signature like that because it would really change things. 130' might be really significant there.

Ms. Gordon asked if there is a consensus for support for additional height at the north lot and over the tracks. She clarified that Mr. Hasson's argument was that having that additional height from the periphery to the south and to the east would be appropriate but not to the north at the sinking ship or within the core of the district.

Mr. Hasson said maybe we extend the 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue umbrella up to the Sinking Ship.

Mr. Ito suggested using the Smith Tower as a circle that would incorporate the Sinking Ship.

Smith Tower gets narrower at the 21<sup>st</sup> floor. Mr. Strauss said that is quite a bit higher than the 130' that we are talking about.

Ms. Gordon said if the height is kept lower in the core then it does limit the TDR that can be sold for those buildings. This plan assigns a FAR to the buildings; there is no FAR in Pioneer Square now. It creates TDR to sell; it might be a wash but it is a good vehicle for discussing what we might have missed in the plan.

Mr. Hasson said with regard to the North Lot it is not clear to him what baselines were being used for heights.

Ms. Nashem said they provided different buildings in different sizes when they were changing out the models; some were at 130' some were at 180' and some 240' so it was a mix.

Mr. Hasson asked if it matched what this code is proposing.

Ms. Nashem explained this recommendation is suggesting 240' on the west half of the North Lot.

Mr. Hasson said before they had to come to the Board to show their ideas because none of it is allowed in existing code; by changing the code what exactly is unleashed.

Ms. Gordon said what is being proposed in the plan is what the North Lot developers are designing around; if the plan doesn't move they are prepared to request a contract rezone.

Mr. Hasson asked if our guidelines overlapped; if they were recommendations.

Ms. Gordon stated they were adopted; they are filed with the City Clerk and the Board uses them for the basis of decision-making in recommendation to Director.

Ms. Nashem asked the Board if there was anything in the letter they felt was incorrect.

Mr. Hasson asked if there had been and changes to the WOSCA recommendations.

Ms. Nashem said from talking with Ms. McLain, she advised the Board to seek more information about that WOSCA site and outside opinion before we made our judgment.

Mr. Hasson said the existing building is pretty old but that is the historic fabric.

Mr. Ito said if one looks across the street, the historic fabric is also one long block.

Ms. Nashem said the breaks that exist now weren't there originally and they will likely be built out at some point; we already have a proposal for one of them.

Mr. Hasson said it is not the same shape as the other City Block; they are trying to say we have to get back to the pattern of the neighborhood but it is not the same.

Mr. Ito said that is not what the pattern of the neighborhood is south of the freeway; they are trying to make it the City block pattern of Belltown, without real streets.

Mr. Strauss clarified the Board was talking about the plan with the open spaces every 50' or 100'; parks that dead end etc. It is the role of the Board to articulate what problems might be.

Mr. Ito said it is not for the Board to design only review and say yes or no.

Mr. Strauss said the WOSCA plan was presented in such a way that didn't really argue strongly for that as a pattern and he could see that someone could be convincing with the open space benefits of the plan.

Mr. Hasson said he could appreciate they have to make an argument to the Board but actually they could go right around us and straight to City Council; in this case we have to be really vehement it doesn't work and keep that in the letter.

Ms. Nashem said she would have a new draft letter prepared for Board review.

**070208.4**      **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

**070208.6**      **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227