



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 276/08

DATE: November 19, 2008
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Doug Ito
Lorne McConachie
Ryan Hester
Ann Brown
Adam Hasson
Catherine Person
John DeLanoy

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Erin Doherty

Chair Doug Ito called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

111908.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
November 5, 2008 Deferred.

111908.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

111908.21 **Choi Shoe Repair**
Drexel Building
219 James Street

Installation of new business signage

ARC Recommendation: Mr. McConachie said ARC reviewed the photos and drawings provided. ARC recommended approval of the signage package under the condition that the open sign is set to not blink.

Ms. Nashem explained the signage meets the rules for letter height. Board should review the window sign for compatibility of colors and transparency. Blinking signs are discouraged per SMC 23.66.160. C.6

Mi Ja Choi explained the Open sign will be set to not blink.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca noted that the Pioneer Square Deli in the Interurban Building also has a blinking light and should be brought into compliance as well.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for signage including a blade sign, window lettering, a sandwich sign and a neon open sign under the condition that the open sign is set to be constant rather than blink.

Code Citations:

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

- A. Transparency Regulations
- B. General Signage Regulations
- C. Specific Regulation
 - 1. Letter Size
 - 3. Projecting Elements
 - 4. Blade Signs

SMC 23.66.160 C. 1 and 6

MM/SC/LM/AB

6:0:0 Motion carried.

111908.22

DSA Holiday Decorations

Pioneer Square and Occidental Parks

Temporary installation of seven lighted wire sculptures, two in Pioneer Square Park and five in Occidental park

ARC Recommendation: Mr. McConachie stated ARC reviewed the samples and locations provided. ARC had questions regarding safety of pedestrians and vandalism. Ms. Tabler said that they would be able to place the lighted sculptures close to plug-ins and near trees so that there would not be a trip hazard. She said the artist that is making the lighted sculptures said that he would repair them if damage occurred and that the Metro employees would check them daily. She said they also could weight the sculptures down so that they weigh 200 – 250 pounds instead of 150. ARC and public comment supported the extra weight. It is proposed that the sculptures go up November 23rd and be taken down Jan 6th or 7th. The light displays are planned for the next three years

Eileen Tabler explained up to five sculptures would be placed in Occidental Park and two in Pioneer Square Park. Sculptures are roughly 8' tall x 2' to 4' wide steel design with LED rope lighting on a 40" x 48" base. The lights will be solid and will not blink.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Nashem explained the Board may want to approve the lighted sculptures for a period of time for each of the next three years rather than reviewing the same display and locations yearly. However it is expected that the number and type of image of the lighted sculpture will change year to year.

Ms. Tabler noted at the end of three years there would be a total of 120 sculptures; in Pioneer Square they can stick to the current number of sculptures or add more.

Ms. Nashem explained they would have to come back to the Board to add more sculptures.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for temporary lighted sculptures to be placed in Pioneer Square and Occidental Park from approximately November 24 to January 7 each year through 2010 per

Code Citations:
District Rules II Certificates of Approval for Use, Design and Demolition
A. General Requirements

MM/SC/RH/CP 6:0:0 Motion carried.

111908.23

Metropole Building
423 Second Ave Ext S

Installation of a conduit in the areaway.

ARC Recommendation: Mr. McConachie explained ARC reviewed the revised proposal. Mr. Murphy said that they looked at two other alternatives. One was going under the building and the other was placing the conduit on the street side of the areaway wall. Mr. Murphy said that City Light would not agree to either plan and the cost of streetside plan being \$350,000 made it too expensive. He thought the new proposal was a compromise because City Light allowed them to make an extra bend and the location at the base of the wall leaves more of the areaway wall exposed. Some ARC members asked if there were other location for the vault so that the routing was not necessary. Mr. Murphy said that because there has to be 24 hour access to the vault the proposed and previously approved location was best because the areaway was already altered, the access did not destroy historic features. He said that locating it elsewhere would likely require removal of historic fabric beyond the effect of the proposed routing. ARC identified that the most significant features are the barrel vaulted ceiling, and rubble wall. ARC requested additional photos showing where the side walls will be affected. Some ARC members agreed that this was a better solution than what was originally proposed.

David Murphy provided a photo showing placement of the vault to show the impact it would have. They have looked at multiple options before deciding on this one but there is still one option they will explore: putting it lower into the ground, but they won't know until they get started if it is do-able.

Mr. Ito noted that the applicant has done some mitigating since the first option was presented. He added that historically areaways were used for routing of civic services. He thought this a good option.

Mr. Murphy explained they would not use a brick veneer on top of the shelf to match the areaway because this is not part of original fabric and he preferred to leave it as it is designed. In response to Board question Mr. Murphy explained the vault would be embedded in 3" of concrete that will be a slight red color.

Mr. Ito and Mr. McConachie agreed with Mr. Murphy that the vault represents a different time and will be finished in a utilitarian way.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Sara Jane Bellanca complimented the applicant on the photo of the areaway as it is a beautiful areaway and shows how important it is to save them.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for routing the conduit through the areaway, as proposed per

Code Citations:

District Rules XVIII Areaways

Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 2, and 5

MM/SC/JD/LM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move a friendly amendment to allow the applicant to lower cable if they are able to.

MM/SC/JD/LM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

111908.24

Areaway 1301B

105 S Washington

Tabled to December 3, 2008

111908.3

BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Nashem explained ARC looked at the reduced size of the light fixture at Trinity and approved it.

Mr. McConachie noted that a number of businesses near his office have violated the rules for transparency by having closed curtains over their windows and one has applied a translucent scrim. There is a martini bar with an inflatable beer bottle on the sidewalk.

Sara Jane Bellanca knows the martini bar owner and offered to provide a friendly reminder about District rules.

Ms. Brown noted a large “for lease” sign where the record place was and Ms. Nashem stated it was not approved nor were the myriad of Seahawks beer signs that have appeared in the District; she is going through all the liquor license applications and will send all a letter at the same time.

Ms. Nashem reminded Board members of the Buttnick Building areaway tour Wednesday November 26, at 9:00 a.m.

111908.31

Code Text Amendments for North Lot

Briefing regarding a text amendment concerning development on the North Lot

The text amendment includes provisions for: maximum allowable height and density, development standards to address building massing and the relationship with

the surrounding Pioneer Square neighborhood, general site design issues, street level use standards, and bonus programs.

Susan McLain and Dennis Meier, DPD, provided handouts to the Board: Draft 23.49.180 PSM 85/120 text Amendment/North Lot Version #3A; Provisions for the North Lot Development: PSM 85/120; and two maps of the North Lot and Pioneer Square Preservation District. Copies of the full documents are on file. Mr. Meier went through the handouts with the Board.

Ms. Nashem asked if it was still considered one lot even though a street runs through it.

Mr. Meier explained that technically there is no street – it is a private street or an access corridor that extends through the lot but it is not a street. It is still treated as one single parcel for the purposes of calculating density or applying any of the development standards. It is different from other situations where a public street right of way would be dividing a property. When there are development standards that apply to a street in terms of retail etc. he advised to recognize this is not a street but in many respects it is intended to function like a street.

Mr. McConachie asked what happens if part of the development doesn't happen and if there is prioritization as to what is built first.

Mr. Meier explained there is no prioritization. As the project is reviewed the commitments would be made to some degree. We can't dictate; the only assurance is that if certain things don't happen then the only available option would be that this can only be used for residential use in the future. To the extent that there are specific commitments made as part of the major mixed use development agreement that would provide one general outline of what is expected to occur. Some of the reality is if there is no market demand, nothing is going to happen. With regard to height Mr. Meier went on to state that features such as elevator penthouses, rooftop features, and common recreation area on rooftop would reference the Downtown Code in terms of how those features are treated.

Ms. Nashem asked if they would be eligible for the common recreation area enclosed on the roof.

Mr. Meier said the Downtown Code allows for that; it also allows for taller elevator penthouses and a number of other things that are functionally related to the fact that these are much bigger, taller structures. It does include a number of things that over the years have typically been incorporated into taller buildings and are addressed in that section of the Downtown Code.

Mr. Hester asked if the 240' height could potentially become 255'.

Mr. Meier said in limited sections 23.49.008D talks about limitations.

Mr. Ito stated the problem he sees is it is sloppy because the Pioneer Square Code has very specific limits on that and the Board has to go by what PSPB regulations say and the Board could have the potential of saying "this isn't allowed". The code is written for this specific area; in going from the general to the specific, our specific area has some regulations that don't necessarily allow those things. He didn't think

that one would be off the hook just by referencing it and that the code would have to be cleaned up.

Mr. Meier said it would basically say in situations where height is governed in 23.66 this would be the provision that would prevail.

Ms. McLain stated that in this particular instance the Downtown provisions would apply instead of the Pioneer Square provisions for rooftop.

Ms. Person asked why?

Mr. Meier said it is structured to lay out a very specific circumstance that is uniquely defined and this is the only instance where these measures would apply.

Ms. McLain thought that what the provision would do is to reference a mapped area in the code that would specifically map this particular area within this zone so any of the standards including the 240' height, or the rooftop features and all the other FAR limits etc. would only apply to this particular area.

Ms. Person asked if they would map out exactly how high the elevator penthouses can go.

Mr. Meier explained it is defined in the code; it is the same rules that apply to any development Downtown.

Mr. DeLanoy asked about Map A.

Ms. McLain stated they are developing Map A and they will share it with the Board when they have it.

Mr. Meier stated the map will be in the Code. He said there is a similar provision in the South Lake Union code that there is a map where under certain circumstances that area that was previously governed by an 85' height limit will go to 160'.

Mr. Ito asked why they didn't just make "A" PSM/240 instead of PSM 85/120 with a map.

Ms. Meier said there was a debate about that and the issue was creating a whole zone that is one single lot only. Legalistically that would be viewed differently than a text amendment that is providing additional flexibility to a lot within an area that meets certain conditions.

Ms. McLain thought that some concern was expressed about allowing some of the other provisions that applied to this area "A" for the North Lot expanded to other areas. She stated the intent is not to create a zone that will be used in different parts of Pioneer Square but just in a specific area in the North Lot.

Mr. Meier explained that if this doesn't work then one is subject to PSM 85/120; there is a base there that applies. All these other conditions are granted because of the developer's willingness to go along with a whole set of standards that would not otherwise apply to developing that site. He said it is just focusing on a very special case situation as opposed just a general zone condition that any development could be

divided up into independent parcels. The intent is to regard this as a very special package of controls that apply to this one particular lot. He continued to discuss the handout. In response to Board questions he said when you get to street frontages those are addressed as part of 23.66 Special Review Conditions.

Mr. Ito explained that as part of the Pioneer Square history a limit has been placed on the size of retail or commercial space that can be on the first floor of a building to prevent a “big box” store from coming in and knocking out smaller businesses in the area. He expressed concern that this provision would allow a Target or similar “big box” store to go into the center of this project although he noted that a grocery store would be okay. He thought the intent of the Pioneer Square Preservation code didn’t jibe with language that would allow a “big box” store to come in.

Mr. Meier explained there are mixed objectives and there is a specific interest in the grocery store. The intent is to reference the provisions that apply in the special review district for the frontages that face King Street and Occidental. They have looked at 23.66 and recognized the language is more in the context of buildings that are built as infill or street level spaces going into existing structures. In this case they are dealing with street frontages that exceed 300 feet. He thought some of the standards try to regulate individual businesses rather than a type of use. They want to make sure they are not creating a contradiction between having a new development that has a different set of conditions that typically don’t apply to the more typical development in the core area of the Square. He said they are not showing 23.66 yet and that is a section where they will need to touch base with staff to make sure that the intentions of having the rules apply to the frontages of the building but also to make sure they the unique circumstances are met.

Ms. McLain recommended looking at street frontages along Occidental and King rather than the 2nd Avenue extension which is the access corridor.

Mr. DeLanoy said the handout is full of differences from Pioneer Square and he understands why they wouldn’t follow 23.66 with respect to the street because in the end the developer clearly has in mind a larger tenant – like a grocery store – which makes sense. To chop it up into individual retail spaces wouldn’t be good use. On the other hand he wasn’t aware the door was being opened to a fundamentally different type of use because it could be a grocery store or it could be a Target.

Mr. Meier stated they have no intention of opening the door for a Target here. He asked if there was an interest in a maximum size of use limit.

Mr. Ito explained in the Pioneer Square code there are recommended uses, there are not recommended uses and there are uses that are not allowed so it could be done that way.

Mr. DeLanoy stated that while uses couldn’t be prohibited, they could be discouraged. He encouraged a grocery store.

Ms. McLain stated there was no intent of changing the overall approach to uses but one of the things that is not contemplated at this point is the size of use and how those might be regulated.

Mr. Ito expressed concern that it is so vague that anything could be allowed.

Ms. Nashem stated the PSPB code allows exceptions and it calculates it as not being more than 50% of the block front.

Mr. DeLanoy said restricting the size of the store here where you want a grocery store may not be a good thing.

Mr. Meier said there are a lot of things – parking – that would be associated with a Target that would make this not an attractive site for that type of development.

Ms. Person mentioned an article in the Times about downsizing the size of grocery stores to 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Meier concurred and noted local markets that are smaller but full service. Some of the flexibility that is suggested on the interior border is recognizing the functional needs of much bigger buildings that will have lobby spaces, access requirements that are different and will treat the street frontage a little differently in terms of how uses are oriented. The intent is that the public streets rights of way of King and Occidental are treated like any other street would be treated in the core area.

Ms. Person explained she represents retail businesses in the core area and parking is a huge concern. She asked if the Downtown parking codes different from Pioneer Square's.

Mr. Meier explained that non-residential parking is one space per 1000 square feet; there is no maximum limit on residential parking. This project is providing parking that is currently available on the surface lot and they are also required to provide parking for King Street Station.

Ms. Person explained that at a recent meeting with the developer they said planned a specific number of places in mind for the residential part but were thinking of scaling that back.

Mr. Meier said from the City's perspective they would be encouraged to minimize the amount of parking provided for residential units.

Mr. Ito asked for clarification on "Page 10 B. Parking above street level".

Mr. Meier said the provision is that parking at street level is separated from the street by another use along all street frontages. Above street level all residential parking has to be screened from all street frontages. Parking associated with commercial structure and replacement parking and public parking only needs to be screened from street frontage on those levels above 20'.

Mr. Ito asked what is to prevent someone from parking a car and saying they are parking at the "street edge".

Mr. Meier said if it is in the structure and the structure abuts the street, wherever the parking is in that structure, it has to be separated from the street by another use. They have included a provision that on the access corridor that is the extension of 2nd Avenue they can have surface parking that replicates curbside parking that typically isn't allowed in downtown.

Mr. Ito asked if the parking would have to be screened above 20.

Mr. Meier stated if it is enclosed in a structure and if it is above street level and is facing to the south along the street that is not a property line, to the east or the interior 2nd Avenue corridor and is above 20' then it only needs to be screened from view.

Mr. Ito confirmed it would be screened by a decorative element.

Mr. Meier concurred and said it should appear like a continuation of the structure and is part of the architecture and should be designed in such a way as to appear as if it is occupied space.

Mr. Ito stated it is confusing.

Mr. DeLanoy cited page 10 and asked about the LEED ratings and said it isn't clear what the rating will be for here. He said he would like to see minimum core and shell.

Mr. Meier said all Downtown development that takes advantage of using bonus to commit to meeting the LEED Silver standard. He explained there are different LEED standards: residential, multi-family valuation, and then standards that apply to larger scale development. He said this would be pushing it higher than general standards for bonus projects downtown which are only required to meet LEED Silver. This is similar language to what was applied to the Amazon site at South Lake Union where the intent is to push toward the Gold but that LEED Silver is adequate.

Ms. McLain stated they can bring in 23.49.020 which describes the LEED standard for Downtown and it can be more fully discussed.

Mr. Ito stated that display window requirement is vague; the PSPB requires 3' deep.

Ms. Nashem stated that the guidelines state that "transparency should be maintained on the ground level therefore windows should be storefront window types and should be non reflective and non-tinted". She explained the handout states that tinted is okay and the PSPB guidelines say it is not. She said PSPB transparency doesn't specify the depth of transparency but it has been the rule of thumb for transparency that the store front needs depth.

Mr. Ito cited page 9, item B, "for all street frontages there is a minimum of 60% of street level façade shall be transparent and for all other frontages, minimum of 20% of street level façade shall be transparent". He assumed that "other" is not the street but the backside toward stadiums and the interior street-like access area.

Mr. Meier stated this does include the access corridor line with 2nd Avenue.

Mr. Ito asked if 60% is what is in the Downtown Code. Mr. Meier stated he thought it was.

Mr. Ito said 60% seemed low and preferred a higher standard with allowing the Board to have some purview about having some ability to lessen it if there is a good reason for it.

Mr. Meier stated that one of the principles they did try to apply is the length of some of the frontages are extensive and it is likely to be different than the standard situation.

Ms. McLain added that a higher standard be applied with the ability to waiver, modify.

Mr. Ito stated the different thing between this project and what would be going on in Downtown is that Downtown would go through Design Review; this project goes through the Pioneer Square Preservation Board. There is nothing in here (the handout) that states we have governance over what they can and can't do. Mr. Ito recommended not doing two Boards.

Mr. Meier said they are trying to see how they can address what they suspect will be the need for flexibility since these are similar to the Downtown standards.

Mr. Ito stated the PSPB is federally mandated board over the Historic District so this Board should be the one to govern versus allowing another Design Review Board to come in.

Mr. McConachie agreed.

Ms. Nashem said the Board has the ability in the Code to make recommendations even if it is not specifically directed to the Board to give a waiver.

Ms. Person asked about the pedestrian passageway widths.

Mr. Meier explained the average width is 10' and the idea is the passageway could expand and contract across the whole length of it but it would have to add up to that average width.

Ms. Nashem asked if on King and Occidental the sidewalk crosses over the property line but this code allows the sidewalks to be kept wide rather than requiring the building to be built to the property line which would narrow the sidewalk.

Mr. Meier stated that in some instances they may even widen the sidewalk to accommodate the utilities and there is a provision to require a wider sidewalk width along Occidental. A new edge would be established for the street wall. It would read as a continuous street wall.

Ms. Nashem stated that is consistent with the Design Guidelines where they expressed the desire to keep the wide sidewalks.

Mr. Meier stated the design guidelines suggested upper level setbacks in the 5th, 6th, and 7th story range and they settled on 85' as capturing that threshold in terms of translating that into something that is specific in the code.

Mr. Ito asked if modulation was being required and if they had defined what modulation is.

Mr. Meier agreed for street facing facades. He referred to Item 6 on Page 7 and said that basically an expanse of a wall wouldn't exceed 120' without having to have some interruption which is minimally defined.

Mr. Ito said façade modulation in the Square is a texture thing and is not necessarily a modulation of space. In the Square there is pretty much a street wall that goes all the way through with a rhythm developed by structure because of piers, windows etc. There is not every 100' or 85' a big notch in the building or a bay in the building. He said flexibility would be good for modulation because a requirement for modulation doesn't necessarily get us what we want.

Mr. Meier stated it doesn't kick in until 85' and above.

Mr. McConachie said in the model the Board saw a couple weeks ago there are elements of the larger structures coming down to the street and being part of that modulation of a façade. He asked if there is an 85' cap to a street face and then any modulation can occur back from that. He cautioned against modulation being arbitrary because Pioneer Square has been built over time there are small buildings that serve their purpose of modulating the façade. Here this is a big, brand new building constructed at one time and he worries about "facadism". He hoped that part of the development would allow the towers to "talk to the street" at times because they become major entry-ways. It is not the same as what exists in Pioneer Square but neither is this development.

Mr. Ito agreed that when one says "every 85' you have to have modulation" it doesn't mean you will get good architecture.

Mr. Meier said the upper level setbacks which have been written in such a way so they aren't mandated across the entire site to allow some flexibility. Modulation is basically where when you are above 85' and the structure extends beyond 120' in length something ought to happen to break it all up. They tried to keep it loose and to only the street facing facades.

Ms. McLain directed the Board to Page 7 Item 4 that discusses upper level setbacks.

Mr. DeLanoy stated this is where Paragraph J might come in handy as it would give the Board flexibility to look at interesting design that isn't totally in conformance.

Mr. Meier said that however they structure "J" many of the features are similar to what is applied to Downtown so that any feature that is currently departable for Design Review in the rest of Downtown would also be departable here.

Mr. Ito added "in J".

Ms. McLain agreed, "In J, by the Board".

Mr. McConachie drew a design on the Board to illustrate set backs, modulation and towers that "talk to the street".

Mr. Meier thought they had accommodated that on the ground level by not mandating an absolute property line/street wall the whole length of the project. Some is required because of the easement situation but there are percentages where you

could deviate and in certain other areas that are provided as public open space could set back to provide for that public space. There is an area where we say “you can’t do that” and that is where 2nd Avenue crosses over; they wanted to make sure those corners were held as it is an important transition connection.

Ms. Nashem said 120’ would be a great proportion for the length of the building so this would mean they were required to modulate at least once.

Mr. Meier said they figured the blocks were 240’ x 250’ so typically the bigger, boxier Pioneer Square brick buildings are about 120’ without interruption and they either have an alley or another building. Mr. Meier confirmed the modulation is required above 85’.

Mr. McConachie left at 10:40 a.m.

Mr. Ito said it looked like they wanted 15% of the lot area for open space at ground level and asked if it is only accessed from the street right of way or if it can be accessed from the street-like 2nd Avenue extension.

Mr. Meier said that anything at ground level that is accessible as long as it has public access. He said they encourage some be provided along 2nd Avenue.

Mr. Ito suggested that because it is private property it is public open space but if it is within the property there is much greater control and cited Harbor Steps. He said it goes back to having a street façade on major streets and it would be good to maintain those rather than putting a giant open space on the corner of the property.

Ms. Nashem said where the sidewalks are wider than the property line the space will be counted towards that.

Mr. Meier talked about the LEED requirements and said they are all standards that are being proposed to be part of the general standards for all South Downtown.

Mr. Ito said the green factor one is something that is not normally found within Pioneer Square however there are some good elements of the green factor but there are things that don’t make sense. He doesn’t like when the green factor is allowed to be used on a property line condition where a building will eventually go in and the plants will just die. He also mentioned places where planters have been put in where they will not be maintained. It is not necessarily that the green factor is a bad thing but there are a lot of instances where they put the green factor meet this requirement even if it is not going to work. If it does a good thing – that is good.

Mr. Meier said their next steps are to continue to refine this and to touch base with staff on some of the issues with how this relates to 23.66 to make sure there aren’t any proposed changes that result unintended consequences.

Public Comment:

Sara Jane Bellanca explained she was on the Board when the Design Guidelines were done for the North Lot and wanted to make sure they parallel each other and that we are not doing things here that are totally against all those guidelines.

Mr. DeLanoy and Ms. Peron left at 10:42 a.m.

Mr. Meier said as they work on “area J” there would be some reference to those guidelines.

Ms. Bellanca stated it is difficult to figure it out right now and is hoping that it will be clearer later on. She wants to make sure that some of the things that are held near and dear to Pioneer Square are not discounted.

Ms. McLain said they used the guidelines extensively.

Ms. Bellanca said it would be helpful to see how those parallel each other.

Mr. Meier said the test if granting departures would be “does this provide a solution that is more consistent than what the guidelines call out for.

Mr. Ito would like to see as the intent of “J” is that we get good architecture not necessarily that it is departures because of planning. In the end we want architecturally a good building.

Ms. Bellanca said the Pioneer Square Association wants that as well.

Alan Cornell, Nitze Stagen said where Pioneer Square guidelines suggest five to seven floors, Mr. Meier has put it into an absolute term of how many feet. He thought it was represented in the code. He found the retail discussion interesting; they have no intention of “big boxes” and said the whole thing started when they thought the current guidelines would not allow a grocery store. He said they asked the architect about the street wall as brought up by Mr. McConachie, and it is his understanding they can do that; it is limited in scale which is great.

Mr. Bellanca said she represents Pioneer Square Community Association and reiterated how important this project is to the Square and to their neighborhood plan and the quicker this project is up and moving the better for Pioneer Square.

111908.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Doug Ito, Chair

111908.6 **STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227