



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 119/07

DATE: May 16, 2007
PLACE: City Hall, Room L280
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Rick Friedhoff
Sara-Jane Bellanca
Lorne McConachie
Adam Hasson
Tina Bueche
Sonja Sokol Furesz
Doug Ito
John De Lanoy
Alex Bennett

Staff:

Genna Nashem
Joanne Walby

Absent:

David Strauss

051607.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes from May 2, 2007
Mr. Hasson suggested a wording change.
Moved to adopt the minutes as corrected.
MM/SC/AH/SB 4:0:2 Minutes adopted. Mr. Friedhoff and Mr. De Lanoy abstained.

051607.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

051607.21 1016 First Avenue S Shane Smith
Install an equipment room and place four panel antennas on the roof.
Application Tabled.

Sonja Sokol Furesz arrived at 9:02am

051607.22 1020 First Avenue S Rob James
Signage: Install new copy on wall sign.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the rendering of the sign copy and recommend approval.
Applicant Comment: The applicant was not present.
Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board determined that they had enough information to make a decision.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project as presented per:

Code Citations: SMC 66.160 Signs

MM/SC/SB/JD 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. McConachie arrived at 9:03am

051607.23

612 Second Ave
Alaska Building

Brenda Barnes

Application: Change of Use: From retail /office to a hotel, restaurant, and fitness center. Façade Alteration: Renovation of existing building.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the photos, drawings and samples provided. The applicant, Miriam Hinden of Clark Design Group, said that they determined that the storefronts were not original and were part of a 1980's renovation. She said that the proposed storefronts are similar to what appeared in old photographs so they are altering four storefronts to match the other existing storefronts. The applicant proposes to replace the front door with a sliding glass door so the marble interior will be visible from the street and will be functional for the customers hauling in luggage.

Ms. Hinden said the existing awning will be removed. She said that alterations to the building at the areaway will include removal of one of the stairs and replacing the in-filled storefront area with glass. The white brick will also be replaced. She indicated a storefront with a door would be installed where another window is currently in-filled with plywood. Ms. Hinden presented color and material samples to be used. She said that the wood windows and wood storefronts would be painted blue. Ms. Hinden confirmed that the original historic paint color is unknown but that the old black and white picture indicates it was a dark color. She showed a sample of the double glazed low-E glass that will replace the existing single glazed windows. She said this glass is improved for energy conservation but is not energy conservation rated. Ms. Hinden confirmed that the original wood frames would be used and could accommodate the two panes of glass. Ms. Nashem asked the committee to review the low-E coating and determine if it met the guidelines. An ARC member examined the glass sample and indicated that it was in conformance with the guidelines. The applicants said they would consider cleaning and re-pointing a section of brick façade and said they will provide the specifications at a future meeting. The applicants asked if the hotel desires a higher level of noise buffer in the future, whether the Board would consider a total replacement of the windows. ARC said that was a significant alteration that would have to be reviewed by a larger contingent of the Board than was in attendance today, but that it would be a hard sell because the windows were original and in fair condition. ARC recommended approval of the project as proposed. Ms. Sokol Furesz reported that the ARC did not make a recommendation on the addition because the code change is pending.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem said the code amendment pertaining to the addition has not been finalized therefore the Board is only able to make decisions on the façade alterations to the existing Alaska Building and Change of Use. She said the Final Design of the addition will come back to the Board for approval following adoption of

the code amendments. Ms. Nashem reported that on May 23, 2007 there will be a public hearing to discuss a proposed Code amendment.

Applicant Comment: Brenda Barnes, Clark Design Group, said the existing building is 175' tall and if they add seismic bracing it would be taller than the existing code height limit. She said the code amendment would allow in-fill additions to match the top of the existing roof levels and the mechanical penthouse.

Miriam Hinden, Clark Design Group, said this building was designed by Eames and Young and is clad in terra cotta and brick. She said the back of the building's utilitarian façade has a rough red brick facade. She said there are two painted signs that say, "Alaska Building" on this rear facade.

Alex Bennett arrived at 9:08am

Ms. Hinden said there is retail use on the Second Avenue ground floor and the upper floors are currently empty. She said they propose to renovate the building to accommodate a 250-room Marriott Hotel. She said the lobby and restaurant on the ground floor will add vibrancy to the street. In the basement there will be a fitness center and pool. She said they propose to build an addition to the rear, alter the existing storefronts and replace glass in the windows and make some changes to the alley façade. She explained that the upper floor windows are double hung, single-paned glass. She said the 15th floor windows are porthole windows. She said they propose to re-glaze these upper floor windows with two layers of insulated 1/8" clear glass and repaint the windows with Hale Navy. On the Second Ave/Cherry street façade the brick will be washed with medium and low-pressure wash and the Alaska Building sign repainted. She said the cleaning specifications are based on Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

The applicant presented proposed paint samples for the upper windows. She said she did not know what the original paint color was. She added that they want it to be a "natural" color and therefore chose blue and green because they agree that it will "liven up" the storefront and picks up the color in the marble.

Ms. Bellanca asked what the District guidelines say about repainting historic signs. Mr. Ito said repainting a building sign is ok, but repainting old advertising sign would not be appropriate. Ms. Hinden said they would include more information on this when the proposed signage package is presented to the Board. Ms. Nashem read from the SOI standards and said they seem to allow for interpretation and could provide more information later if that part of the application was tabled. Ms. Hinden said they could include the painted sign with their sign package application.

Ms. Hinden said the Second Avenue storefronts are not original and were built in 1980. She said they propose to remove four of the storefronts and replace them to match the adjacent storefronts with in-kind materials and the same trim. Ms. Wirsching said they would use the same color. She said they propose to remove the existing wood entry because it doesn't match the other storefront style and replace it with a fully glazed door that will increase transparency into the marble floored and walled lobby. She said the recess gate is for egress purposes. She said the awnings on the Second Avenue façade would be removed because they are in poor condition. Ms. Wirsching noted that the transoms would remain.

On the Cherry Street storefront, Ms. Hinden said they propose to remove one stair from the areaway level and replace the vents and louvers with glazing. She said the areaway storefront would be restored and the glazing replaced.

Board Questions:

Mr. Bennett asked if the areaway stair leads to the original street grade. The applicant said no and explained that it was added as an egress for a restaurant at one time.

Mr. Ito asked if the proposed window panes would have any coating. Ms. Hinden said no, but it would be Low-E.

Mr. Hasson asked where the trash would be stored in the alley. The applicant said there is a roll-up door that covers the trash door. She said they would add an egress stair, too. She said the gas meters and the fuel port for the emergency generators will also be recessed and fenced in this area. She said they have to rebuild the concrete wall because the shoring has to go down three levels. She said it will be refaced with brick.

Mr. McConachie asked if the proposed changes on the primary façade replicate the original fenestration. Mr. Ito answered, no, stating that this was not original.

Ms. Hinden said they only have photographs of the original storefront and she said she believes their proposal is in keeping with the style of that period.

Mr. De Lanoy asked what the size of the restaurant will be. The applicant said it would be 3,580 square feet, which exceeds the preferred street level use maximum square footage limit for restaurants. She said the original use was as a professional office building for Scandinavian Bank and the Alaska Gentlemen's Club.

Mr. McConachie asked for more information about the window profiles. The applicant said they would match the existing profiles, which are from the 1980s. The applicant said the existing gates swing into the right-of-way and would be moved back because the City requirement.

Mr. Ito asked if they would have a door man. The applicant said no, but said they would probably have a valet or bellhop.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Several Board members expressed concern with the proposed new sliding doors.

Mr. De Lanoy noted that sliding glass doors were approved for the Foster White Gallery.

Mr. Ito said that was different because it was done as part of a modern update to an aluminum storefront.

Mr. McConachie said he felt the proposed sliding door is not in keeping with the façade design.

Mr. Hasson said he might approve sliding glass doors inside the vestibule, but not for the main entry doors. Mr. Freidhoff said he agreed.

Mr. Ito said he would like to see detailed drawings of the proposed sliding doors and suggested that a transparent door would be ok if the propose details designed to transition between the modern and existing storefronts.

Mr. De Lanoy also asked for additional details to better understand the proposed transparency of the new storefront.

Mr. Bennett said he likes the proposed design.

Ms. Sokol Furesz said she would also like to see the design details for the proposed sliding glass door.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for change of use from retail /office to hotel, fitness center, and restaurant over 3,000 square feet per:

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses

SMC 23.66.130 Street Level Uses B.a. and C.2.

MM/SC/AH/RF 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for renovation of the Alaska Building, on the condition that the double-entry door details be reviewed and receive final approval by ARC, per

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

B. Design

C. Building Material

D. Color

E. Building Base

XX. Rules for Transparency, Awnings, and Canopies

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10

MM/SC/AB/JD 8:0:0 Motion carried.

051607.24

Seattle Plumbing
589 Occidental

Mark Blatter

Application: Amend final design approval: Add one floor of residential units to the addition to the existing building for a total of seven floors. Add 16 units of residential units for a total of 82 units plus three live/work units. Change cornice profile and add decorative details to exterior façade at new floor level. Install two windows on the ground floor at location of original windows. Replace one window with a grille for an electrical vault. Remove steps in the parapet of the existing building. Request a waiver for reduction in amount of common recreation area.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings provided. Mark Blatter of Historic Seattle explained that they had not started on the project because the rise in construction cost no longer made the project feasible. He said they began looking at alternatives and found

that a concrete frame which also allowed them to build above the 85 foot height limit for wood framed buildings, while still remaining below the area height limit. Mr. Blatter explained they are proposing to add one floor to the building which will add 16 residential units. Mr. Blatter explained that because they are increasing units their recreational area requirement also increases and they are asking for a waiver for this additional common area requirement. He added that today's proposed design revision reduces parking by three stalls.

Mr. Strauss suggested the applicant bring photos of the surrounding buildings as he suspects that the increase height will help have a stronger presence in context of surrounding buildings. The Applicants explained that they would like to make some design changes to the building particularly to the top so they are just seeking approval of the additional floor and will come back with final design.

Ms. Appleby said that when the existing Plumbing building was being cleaned they found additional original windows on the interior which had been covered and they propose to re-establish those windows. The applicants said the electrical vault would be re-located and a vent installed at an existing window opening.

The applicants explained that they would like to remove the stepped parapet in order to provide a consistent view opportunity from each unit. Ms. Appleby explained that if the stepped parapet remained, it would require bracing that is costly and difficult to construct. ARC members agreed that they would prefer the steps to remain because they contribute to the irregular character of the architecture. ARC recommended approval of the additional floor, additional windows and conversion of window to a vent.

Applicant Comment: Mark Blatter of Historic Seattle and Krista Appleby of Johnson Architecture, presented the application. Mr. Blatter said they are requesting approval for the addition of one floor with lofts, reestablishing windows and converting a window to a vent and a common area requirement waiver. Mr. Blatter said he believes the addition would be in-scale with the surrounding building. He presented two comparison renderings of the previously approved design and today's revised design. He said the height limit in the zone is 120' and the proposed height is only 111'.

Ms. Appleby explained that they want to do further design on the upper floors and cornice as traditionally the design of upper floors is treated differently than middle floors in Pioneer Square. She noted that the horizontal elements on Railroad Avenue are different from the setback façade on Occidental.

Board Questions:

Mr. McConachie asked if the addition was one floor or two. Ms. Appleby said although it is technically one floor, there is a stair to a second level within the units.

Mr. Ito asked why the parapet would be 5'6". Ms. Appleby explained that they have a lot of mechanical equipment to screen and this would be proportionate to the building's height.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Silver Cloud Hotel at the end of the block is taller. Ms. Appleby said it is.

Mr. De Lanoy asked about the common recreation area waiver and parking. Mr. Blatter said that 5% of space is required to be used for common recreation area. Mr. Blatter said they are not able to provide that because structural changes required them to fill in the courtyard, thus, reducing the amount of common recreation area. He added that they

had to add columns inside for structural reasons and as a result lost some parking spaces. He noted that there is no required parking on the site.

Mr. McConachie asked if these proposed changes were a result of economic considerations.

Mr. Chaney said, no. He said that Historic Seattle is very proud of this project, but they have had many constraints within the Code in regards to material type and the number of floors. He said this loft design pattern was a result of this. The original wood frame design would not have allowed them to develop fully within the permitted zoning and they have decided to change to a concrete frame. He said today's discussion was related to design, not finance. He stated that this building will be in keeping with the scale of other historic buildings at the end of the block.

Public Comment:

Elaine Spencer, resident from the Provident Building next door said she is upset that the Certificate of Approval was granted because she believes this project is in violation of the Secretary of the Interior standards which discourage additions to historic buildings. She said the addition of more floors changes the scale. She said the Pioneer Square Preservation Board is tasked with guarding the historic charm of the District, not simply acting as Design Review. She noted that the building at the end of the street with two floors is no longer eligible to be added to the National Register because it is no longer a "contributing" building in the District. She noted that King County had two developers propose design alternatives for the Plumbing Building, but only one of them would work within the SOI standards; she said this developer did not receive the contract. She said she was concerned that this building would become a precedent for Board decisions on issues related to additions to historic buildings.

Robert Weaver, architect with a background in anthropology, said he served six years on the Landmarks Board and the King County Landmarks Commission. He said today's proposal exacerbates an original mistake that allowed such a massing on a warehouse building. He said this misconstrues the character of the building and the surroundings. He said it also breaches the Secretary of the Interior standards that prohibit additional stories that radically change the historic appearance of the building. He said the Plumbing building is in a transition zone between industry and commercial aspects of Pioneer Square. He said the massing of the proposed addition is simply too big.

Sandy Glanzrock said she works for the Committee for Children in the adjacent building. She presented a letter from their Executive Director along with signatures from neighbors requesting a delay in the proceedings so the community can comment, as she only learned of this meeting last Monday.

Mr. Alan Cornell of Nitze Stagen, Historic Seattle's development partner on this project, explained that the south side of the Provident Building is a party wall subject to a 1919 agreement that allows the Johnson Building to expand upward. He said the Provident Building wants to preserve views from the windows that were installed under this agreement.

John Chaney said it is good to discuss these issues, especially precedence. He noted that if development was guided by "precedence", there would be no Campbell Fuller Building, nor an addition on the Tashiro Kaplan building. He said change occurs and

the Board is tasked with monitoring this change that allows the District to remain vital. He noted that the problem with the two-storey addition referenced by Ms. Spencer is that the addition is not differentiated from the original historic building as it should be, per the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Sokol Furesz said she feels the new addition is over-scaled when viewed in the context of the rest of the block.

Mr. Bennett said he felt conflicted but would approve the design.

Mr. De Lanoy said he was also conflicted since the Board has already approved the addition although he is not thrilled with the increase in height. He pointed out that the Board is tasked with maintaining the vitality of the District along with its “historic charm”.

Mr. Ito said he agreed with Mr. De Lanoy regarding the height and the addition, but would like to revisit the design on the new floors.

Messrs. Freidhoff and Hasson agreed that since the massing has changed the Board should also review the design of the entire project.

Ms. Bueche asked the applicants if they would like to table this application and return with more details on their proposed design changes for the new massing, or simply vote on the application as presented.

Mr. Chaney said that he recognizes that the design will need to change but he said they would like the change in height and scale approved today.

Mr. Freidhoff said he felt the addition overwhelms the building and he said it would be difficult to approve of the massing without seeing how it could be mitigated by design changes.

Ms. Bellanca noted that the Stadium is across the street and the Board should keep this in mind when considering the context of the proposed massing.

Mr. Chaney stated that the project would not be feasible without the additional height. He said they would be happy to return to the Board with a revised design application.

Mr. Cornell stated that they would like to have the Board vote on the application as presented.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the addition of one floor and the alterations to the historic façade including the additional windows and conversion of a window to a vent with the exception of removing the steps from the parapet under the condition that final design details are returned to the Board for approval per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

SMC 23.66.120 Permitted Uses

SMC 23.66.140 Height

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design
Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10

MM/SC/AB/JD 4:5:0 Messrs McConachie, Hasson, Freidhoff and Msses.
Sokol Furesz and Bueche opposed.

051607.25 Seattle Hardware Building Ryan Smith
83 King St

Application: Façade Alteration: Removal of stucco soffit and replace with glazing to match existing and install a fresh air supply grill.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed the drawings and photo provided. The applicant explained that they found the structure of the soffit to be in the way of an interior remodel and since it was not an original feature they desired to remove it. Mr. Strauss asked if they had considered putting in a blank-out panel above the other door to balance although he noted he preferred the asymmetry. ARC asked applicant to provide a color sample and specifications of the glass and vent if possible. The Applicant confirmed that the color matches the existing window frame. The ARC recommended approval of project as presented.

Applicant Comment: Ryan Smith said that during the remodel, structure of the soffit was in the way of the interior remodel and they proposed to remove it and replace the opening with glass and framing.

Board Questions: The Board suggested the applicant make the opening thinner and more symmetrical over the door. The applicant agreed to this.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board determined that they had enough information to make a decision.

Action:

I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the project on the condition that the opening be thinner and more symmetrical over the door, per:

Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

B. Design

C. Building Material

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10

MM/SC/SB/SSF 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. De Lanoy and Mr. Bennett left at 10:55am

051607.26 Areaways 903 and Areaway 1806 Rudolph Jones
108 First Ave S and 122 S Jackson St

Application: Design Change: Changes to areaway repair include: Limited fill of one section of Areaway 903

Staff Note: The Light pole portion of this application was removed after the ARC meeting on April 25, 2007.

ARC Report: The ARC reviewed the drawings regarding moving the street light poles back four feet. Mr. Jones, SDOT, explained it is City Light policy to move the light poles four feet back whenever there is work in the sidewalk or areaway, such as has been done on Jackson Street and during the eminent reuse of First Avenue during construction of the viaduct replacement. Sara Jane Bellanca commented that this proposal would prevent there from being outdoor seating, which is encouraged in the District. Ms. Bueche said she thought this was not in keeping with the character on First Avenue. Mr. McConachie agreed that he would like to have a broader understanding of the relocation of all the lights and would like to know if there are alternatives. Mr. Ito said that moving the brighter light bulbs closer to the buildings and its residents may cause problems. Mr. Hasson said he did not understand the need to move the light poles since there was could be no parking on First. He said he thought it would have a big impact on businesses. Ms. Bueche asked why this was suddenly a problem. Mr. Ito asked how fast they expect cars to be going on First Avenue. Mr. Jones said he didn't have answers to the Committee's questions. Mr. Ito said he would like to see traffic accident data of cars hitting poles on First Avenue compared to Fourth Avenue where the poles are set back. All ARC members agreed that they would not approve the moving of the light pole at this time.

ARC reviewed the plans for the in fill of one section of the areaway. This would be in addition to the work that was already approved including rebuilding of the street wall. Mr. Ito asked if it was possible to build a wall next to the failing wall. Mr. Samir Chudgar, Engineer consultant from Chudgar Engineering, explained that the vault arch is also failing so it needs full support. He said that putting in the Controlled Density Fill (CDF) material would not preclude it from being rebuilt at a later time.

ARC Public Comment: Dutch Duarte, owner of the City Club Building said that he works with Colliers Management for his building. He said that neither of them had seen a car knock a light pole down since 1977. He said he would rather see the money go to drivers education. He also said that he was concerned about the brightness of the lights and supported the comments made by ARC.

Mr. Duarte said that he thought vitality and street use was important and that it may be only 25% of the sidewalk but he thought it would feel like more. He was also concerned that the infill in the areaway would create a dam and block water in. He said that he wants to work with the City but would like them to look at this more comprehensively. He said although the light poles on Jackson Street have been relocated, he said it does not mean it would work on First Avenue.

ARC Board Discussion:

Mr. McConachie asked if the areaway was a safety issue and Mr. Jones said it was. Ms. Bellanca said that she has only seen them responsibly ask for fill so she has no problem with this request. Mr. Hasson asked about the historical ratings of the areaway and Mr. Nashem read the ratings off the survey sheet. Mr. McConachie asked if there was a cost difference of the fill compared to a shot crete application. Mr. Chudgar, said that the standard would be to rebuild and that would require removal of the sidewalk, the cost of that would be five times as much as what is proposed. To reinforce with a new arch would be three times as much. Mr. Ito pointed out that the CDF would be removable but a new wall and shot crete would not be. Mr. Hasson asked if we were losing anything by the fill. Mr. Jones said that

the areaway to the south is already filled. Ms. Bueche said she would prefer fill and would vote to approve if there was an effective outreach with surrounding businesses. ARC recommended approval for the limited infill of the section of areaway.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Chudgar said the south brick in the wall and arch are in poor condition. He said they have removed the light pole portion from the application.

Board Discussion: The Board determined that they had enough information to make a decision.

Action:

I move to approve the limited infill of the section of areaway.

Code Citations:

District Rules XVII Areaways

MM/SC/SB/DI 6:0:0 Motion carried.

051607.27

Howard Building / Table in Gallery
614 First Avenue

Tadd Grinke

Application: Façade Alteration: Install a rooftop railing.

ARC Report: ARC reviewed new drawings provided. The applicant explained that the owner really wanted to have the railing at the edge so they are proposing a more simple style rail but still attached to the parapet. Ms. Bellanca expressed that she was concerned about the effect the railing had on the building. Mr. Strauss said he thought there needed to be more consideration to the design of the railing in relationship to the building, and agreed this was a significant change to the building. He asked for a photograph montage to better visualize this railing or other proposed railing and more photographs from a distance. Ms. Sokol Furesz said she was not concerned with the railing style, but with the railing itself. She said it was not appropriate to attach it to the parapet. ARC said they would need more detailed drawings about how the rail is attached to the parapet to even further consider the current proposal. ARC did not recommend approval of the application as presented.

Staff Report: Ms. Nashem read from SMC 23.66.140.C.2, SMC 23.66.140.C and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 and #10.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Grinke said he worked with the owner and the railing contractor for the revised design. He said they believe this new design compliments the building. He said they will attach five foot (5') sections and fasten them with a bracket on top of concrete. He said it is strong enough to stand alone.

Board Questions:

A board member asked if the owner had received approval from the adjacent building owner to attach the railing to their building. Mr. Grinke said they have not yet received permission.

Board Comments:

Ms. Bellanca said she did not approve of the design because she feels it changes the building's character.

Mr. Grinke said the design was similar to the railing on the Lowman Hanford building. Ms. Bellanca said she disagreed and further, that railing is not visible from the street.

Ms. Nashem referred to SMC 23.66.140.C. Mr. Ito said the application does not meet the code requirement that it be minimally visible from 300'.

Ms. Sokol Furesz stated that it was not appropriate to bolt the railing to the parapet.

Mr. Ito said the owner could have water damage problems and he suggested they would need to seal the railing with a rubber seal before fastening it. He asked for the applicant to bring attachment details.

Action:

I move to deny the application for Certificate of Approval as presented per Code Citations:

District Rules III General Guidelines for Rehabilitation and New Construction

B. Design

SMC 23.66.140 Height C. Rooftop Features. 2. Open Railings

SMC 23.66.180 Exterior Building Design

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 9 and 10

MM/SC/LM/SB 6:0:0 Motion carried

051607.3 BOARD BUSINESS There was no Board business.

051607.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: Tina Bueche, Chair
There was no report of the Chair.

051607.6 STAFF REPORT: Genna Nashem
In response to Mr. Hasson's request that Ms. Nashem follow up on the reported removal of tenants from the First and Cherry building she reported that the Code allows for storage use for a business. Some Board members stated that this commercial use was the rationale for approving the Certificate of Approval so it should be voided since the condition no longer exists.

Issued: May 31, 2007

Genna Nashem
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator
206.684.0227