



The City of Seattle

# Pike Place Market Historical Commission

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

## MINUTES

MHC 153/08

Wednesday, October 22, 2008

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 85 Pike Street, Room 500

## COMMISSIONERS

Howard Aller, Vice Chair

Marilyn Bierman

Valerie Bystrom

Joanne Herron

Spencer Howard

Susan Lane

Karin Link, Chair

Alex Rolluda

Sharron Shinbo

Susan Zuege

## STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Melinda Bloom

## Absent:

Sara Patton

Allyn Stellmacher

Chair Karin Link called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

102208.11

### Michou

1904 Pike Place, Stewart House

Ralph & Noriko Castellino

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for change of ownership and change of use. The space is Zone 2, street level, Food a-e and Retail a-d uses permitted. The former use was Food c, d and e and the new use would be Food c, d and e. The space is 1,008 square feet. The business includes some on-premise seating. The proposed ownership structure is a corporation. Noriko Castellino will be onsite regularly. Neither owner has a financial affiliation with another business. The Use Review Committee reviewed the proposed menu and cited concerns that it did not appear to reflect a specialty as an Italian deli. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed menu reflects the current menu selection, which has strayed from the original specialty but sells well. They would like to use this same menu and add some additional retail items. The applicant has decided to seek a change of use instead of continuing with the existing approved specialty. The new use would be a delicatessen serving cold salads (pasta, chicken, vegetable, etc.), sandwiches, pizza, soups, entrees, desserts and beverages. The business will continue to

offer catering services. The applicant is also seeking a minority use approval (20%) for grocery items such as pastas, olive oils, vinegars, olives, chocolate, honey, cookies, nuts, crackers, condiments and food related items such as cookbooks and kitchen wares (tablecloths, napkins, etc.). Exhibits reviewed included a site plan; existing use approval, MHC 73/01; sample menu; application for Master Business License; and written statement of ownership and role in the business operation. Guidelines that applied to this application included: 2.10, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the committee cited guidelines 2.10.1, 2.10.2, 2.10.3, 2.10.4, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4; confirmed the zoning, asked for clarification on specialty per 2.6.4; cited application's conformance to 2.7.1. She said that the application of 2.8.1 was no longer relevant because the business was now asking for a change in use. The Committee recommended approval with discussion of specialty/menu per 2.6.4.

*Ms. Bierman arrived at 4:40 p.m.*

Applicant Comment:

Owner Ralph Castellino said he appreciated the chance to clarify the changes.

Landlord Comment: Matt Holland stated the PDA approves of the change of use; the business has a great following in the Market and they think this clarifies it perfectly.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

A concern was raised by Commissioners that the business would become a generic deli or grocery rather than a specialty Italian deli.

Mr. Aller stated he had no concern that the Italian deli is being changed to a more general deli but he was concerned that the additional items to be sold make this more of a supermarket than a specialty deli and fail to meet the requirement of a specialty per 2.6.4.

Ms. Zuege cited 2.7.2 and said by adding the new items changes the use from the deli that Michou has been. Because there are a number of similar businesses in the Market, she expressed a concern that it might create an undesirable concentration within the District.

Ms. Link stated that in the present configuration Michou sells oils and vinegars etc. and it might be the percentage is high but this reflects exactly what it is. She didn't see it as much of a change.

Ms. McAuliffe read the existing use approval which was for an Italian deli specializing in prepared foods, including meals, hot or cold grilled sandwiches, and including catering service. They already have approval for pasta sauces, sauces, salads, sandwiches, antipasti, cheeses, condimenti, peppers. She didn't think it was much different.

Mr. Castellino stated the items being sold will complement what is being done in the kitchen. It is a very small space and a small percentage of sales will be from the retail items.

Mrs. Castellino said that 85% of sales is from deli items.

Ms. Link cited 2.7.1 and said this will not cause an adverse physical impact nor is it an undesirable mix.

Ms. Lane stated it doesn't change historic use but continues it; it is not an undesirable mix because it is essentially the same product line; there is no adverse physical impact because it is a continuing business. She sees this as a permitted use.

Ms. Link stated that given the small space the retail items are more likely 10% to 15% at the most than 20%.

Ms. Bystrom asked if everything was cooked on site. The applicant stated it was.

Ms. Zuege said she loves the food there but expressed a concern that there are a number of other businesses that do the same thing. She had trouble tying the retail items to what it being made in the deli.

Ms. Shinbo thought the tablecloths and napkins were such a small percentage of the business and there is such limited shelf space that she wasn't uncomfortable with the application.

Ms. Link conducted a straw poll; eight Commissioners were in favor of the application.

Ms. Lane made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the proposal as submitted.

MM/SC/SL/AR            8/2/0    Motion carried. Ms. Zuege and Mr. Aller opposed.

082708.21

Café Campagne

1600 Post Alley, Inn at the Market

Tran Nguyen, Adatto Construction

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for revised design for expansion of outdoor seating area. Exhibits reviewed included plans, use approval for increase in size of outdoor seating area, MHC 97/08. Guideline that applied to this application was 3.7.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 3.7.1 and 3.7.2 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Tran Nguyen explained they want to extend the outside seating area and plan to expand the rail 2'.

Paisley Gordon, a member of the design team, said because the planters have to be removed to accommodate the change concerns had been raised about the greenery. He showed photos of what the railing looks like now and stated they had a local artist design boxes to hang on the railing but these were removed due to vandalism and car traffic. Flower boxes can be put on the ends of the railings on the north and sides for greenery. The railing will be bolted in; there is no other change to it other than extending out two more feet.

Ms. Link confirmed that it would be the same amount of time to remove it and that SDOT was okay with it. Mr. Gordon concurred.

Landlord Comment:

The landlord is in support of the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Zuege clarified that the rail was being expanded 2' into the alley and that the planter boxes that are across the way would be removed. The applicant concurred.

There was discussion about the potential for added clutter in the alley and increased car traffic. The applicant thought there wouldn't be any net change and suggested the removal of planters would discourage motorcycles from parking there.

Ms. Zuege noted the planters have acted as a buffer to other buildings in this working alley and concern was expressed that without planters trucks would hit buildings.

Ms. Link stated the applicant is conforming to the Guidelines and are not responsible for things beyond their purview.

Mr. Aller noted the applicant proposed removing planters and installing wall art on a building they don't own. He cited 3.7.2 and said this is not removable and would take three hours to remove which he sees as a permanent structure.

The applicant stated that the art is not included in this application.

Ms. McAuliffe explained the platform that was previously proposed is what required three hours to remove and it not being proposed anymore. The railing is not approved yet; she stated it is typical of seating areas to be bolted. SDOT does not consider it permanent if it is bolted; it is permanent if it is cemented in.

Mr. Nguyen stated they are just asking to extend the east-west pieces 2' and mount them the way they are currently mounted.

The Commissioners took a straw poll with 7 members in favor of the application as submitted.

Mr. Rolluda made a motion to adopt a resolution approving the application as submitted.

MM/SC/AR/SH            7:3:0    Motion carried. Mmes. Zuege and Bystrom and Mr. Aller opposed.

102208.31            Svedala Bakery (former Garlic Garden space)  
93 Pike St. #3, Economy Arcade  
Kristina & Claes Bavik

**Use:**

Ms. McAuliffe explained the application to establish use for a bakery specializing in Swedish pastries, cookies, bread and seasonal/holiday fare. The business will include sale of brewed coffee, tea, cocoa, fruit juice and water. She reviewed the relevant background. The space is in Zone 2, at street level, where Food a-e and Retail a-d uses permitted. The space is vacant. The former use was Food c (Garlic Garden) and the new use would be Food c and f. The space is 105 square feet. The proposed ownership structure is a Limited Liability Company (LLC). Kristina Bavik and Claes Bavik each own 50% of the LLC. Neither has a financial affiliation with another business. Kristine Bavik will be onsite regularly, operating the business. They currently sell their products wholesale and at farmers' markets, but do not have a permanent retail location. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, written statement of ownership interest and role in the business operation, sample menu, and the LLC renewal form. Guidelines that applied to this application included 2.1, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.

URC Recommendation: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4, confirmed the zoning and determined that the application conformed to Guideline 2.6. The permitted uses (bakery products) conform to 2.7.1 and non-permitted uses (beverages) conform to 2.7.2 c, d. The Committee recommended approval.

**Applicant Comment:**

Claes Bavik explained they are a small business that has been in business two years. They have a strong following at farmers' markets.

**Landlord Comment:**

Matt Holland spoke in support of the application and stated it was a fantastic product that ties well to the Market.

Mr. Bavik informed Commissioners that his wife does the cooking and baking; they use all natural products. They want to revitalize Scandinavian baking in the area.

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

**Commission Discussion:**

Commissioners expressed excitement about the bakery coming into the Market; it met all the guidelines and would be a great addition.

Ms. Lane made a motion to adopt a resolution approving the application as submitted.

MM/SC/SL/KL            10:00            Motion carried.

**Design:**

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for design to install cabinetry and equipment and to install signage. Exhibits reviewed included floor plans, photos, catalog cuts, cabinet finish information, and a sign rendering. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1, 3.4 and 3.6.

Relevant Guidelines:

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 3.4.2 c; 3.4.3 a, b, d & e; 3.6.1, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Bavick explained the layout which includes two-part display case which is a refrigerator on the lower portion and then a dry display above, a speed rack on wheels to transport in baked goods, dishwasher and hand washing sink, convection oven and storage. Plumbing already exists. They will use existing fixture for the sign which will be their logo. The fixture will be painted wood. They will keep the Market Green on the floor.

Landlord Comments:

Matt Holland stated he has no issues with proposed design.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Howard noted it was very straightforward.

Ms. Bystrom made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as submitted.

MM/SC/VB/SH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

102208.32 Butterworth Building  
1921 First Avenue  
Patrick McAleese

**Postponed by applicant.**

**102208.4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**  
October 8, 2008  
Ms. Link made a motion to approve the minutes as written.

MM/SC/KL/AR 5:0:5 Minutes approved. Mmes. Bierstrom, Lane, Shinbo, Zuege and Mr. Howard abstained.

**102208.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** There was no report.

**102208.6 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES:** There was no report.

**102208.7 STAFF REPORT**  
Ms. McAuliffe stated she has received an application for preliminary design approval of Phase I of improvements to the Market; the application is not yet complete. She provided copies on CD to Commission members.

Ms. Link recommended Commissioners read the text at the beginning and if one is not familiar with reading plans, she advised against trying to read the topographical maps.

Ms. McAuliffe said the PDA agreed to have the windows reviewed at a separate meeting. She offered to work with any member who wanted assistance to go over plans. The plans are on file and available for public review at the Historic Preservation office.

**102208.8**      **NEW BUSINESS**    There was no new business.

102208.81      Homeless Place of Remembrance  
Clark Wiegman, Kim Lokan, Karen Kiest,

Briefing on conceptual design for Homeless Place of Remembrance in Victor Steinbrueck Park.

Kim Lokan, architect, explained the concept as this would be a place where homeless who have died on the streets to be remembered. She explained they have already had two public meetings and there will be three. She has attended Park Levy meetings. They looked at two sites and Victor Steinbrueck Park is the preferred site because of the character of the park, the quality of the Market and the honoring of the low-income community. The design team thinks there are opportunities for improving views and access to the park. Through the public process they learned that people want this to be a place of hope, beauty and security in opposition to isolation and lack of safety that the homeless feel. She said that dichotomy between the two became an integral part of the experience they developed as a concept. Out of that they determined this needs to be a place that inspires people but also includes an experiential part to it that would be a little uncomfortable or a little tightening. She introduced artist Clark Wiegman, who would present the concept they have come up with.

Mr. Wiegman explained a challenge of trying to create a place where people from all backgrounds could be comfortable. He said Richard Haag, original designer of the park, talked about the idea of a democratic promontory and Mr. Wiegman wanted to accentuate that. He noted there is a “promontory moment” that accentuates and calls attention to the view that is already there; he said that would become the focal point for this gathering place. He said there would be a processional that leads up to it. They kept hearing from the homeless about the sense of isolation they felt in the experience of homelessness so the design concept attempts to reflect that in terms of a narrowing path that is a “memory path” that would lead to the vista/promontory. He said they want to preserve certain aspects of the park because they know a lot of thought and consideration went into it. They will preserve an existing tree. Currently the use of the space is that there is an eddy that occurs at that corner and there are a lot of problems that go along with that lack of “flow” in the southwest corner of the park. They propose to soften the edges and to try to get better “flow” going so that people would start to move through that area rather than it becoming a place to gather and to open things up and to create better flow, better sight lines and better ability to deal with some of the issues that the site is dealing with. They propose informal seating – stump seating - which would echo some of the things that are already in the original design.

Ms. Bystrom asked Mr. Wiegman to locate the pavilion [pergola] on the plan. Mr. Wiegman said it is gone and pointed to where it was formerly located.

Ms. Lokan noted the hill gets shaved off on the north side and becomes more oval than what is currently there.

Mr. Rolluda asked if the southwest corner curved like the existing is curved.

Ms. Lokan stated now it is square but a railing is proposed in that area.

Mr. Wiegman proposed doing some mosaic work in the circle. They have done previous community mosaic projects with the Department of Neighborhoods. They have included benches for informal seating; there is informal seating on the retaining wall. They thought of putting in some text, poetry in. The railing would have a transparent quality and there might be words in it; one could see through it but also create a sense of safety and reduction of noise. The railing would be 8 – 10' and would be made from a tempered glass.

Ms. Lokan stated the material still needs a lot of investigation because the notion of it being a “basket/nest” that creates safety is part of the concept they want to develop but they also want to develop the feeling of openness. They want to maintain the view between the Market and the Park and the Park and the Market.

Mr. Wiegman stated it is overlaid on top of the existing parking garage; there would be some cantilevering out.

Ms. Link asked why the concept of barrier?

Mr. Wiegman said there were a series of concepts that developed out of “holding hands”, a basket weave of fingers. That the place would be an embrace for people; they can enjoy the view of the City and of the water and feel safe.

Ms. Link expressed concern that it is blocking the view; the guidelines talk about preserving the views and this doesn't do that.

Mr. Wiegman said their intention is to preserve and enhance views.

Mr. Aller expressed concern that Victor Steinbrueck Park was intended to be a living room for Native Americans and the only shelter in the park has been eliminated in this plan.

Mr. Wiegman stated there are concerns with how the shelter is currently functioning. He explained the evolution of the proposed sculptural element and said the initial thought was a tree of life and one of the issues here is they can't place names within the park. They said that leaves with names on them would be scattered in sidewalks throughout the City. He said metaphorically it is a shelter that doesn't shelter. It functions as a tree, as a house, a pair of wings. They propose it to be 12-14' high. They have thought of using stainless steel or recycled metals.

Ms. Lane cited 3.8.3 which states that “plaques and other forms of public display for the purpose of memorials, awards or recognition are discouraged.” She said the park is within this Historic District.

Mr. Wiegman said they are specifically steering away from it becoming a memorial. It is a place that will be available for all. He said this will function as a place of memory but it is not literally a memorial because there will be no names.

Mr. Rolluda asked what other site had been looked at.

Ms. Lokan said Fortson Square in Pioneer Square.

Mr. Wiegman said they had looked at a list of about 20 different sites; the criteria were availability and appropriateness, and it became clear this was the most appropriate site.

Ms. Link stated that visibility is a big issue and cited 3.8.7 which states “views of, into, through and from the Market are a cherished public amenity and shall not be diminished.” She expressed concern that the basket may be a diminishing element and she was concerned about the leaves as well.

Ms. Bierman asked who has been working on this since 2000.

Ms. Lokan said it is made up of religious community, homeless people.

Carol Cameron, chairperson of the committee said they have been working since 2003. The committee is made up of religious leaders, design professionals, members of the homeless community, social service community. They have done briefings and public meetings and anyone is welcome to give input. The committee meets once a month and the next meeting is November 12.

Mr. Aller said he is bothered by the elimination of the shelter and the addition of individual seats. Right now there are tables and places to meet, eat, play chess; the “living room concept” has been eliminated [in the new proposal].

Mr. Wiegman disagreed.

Mr. Rolluda agreed with Mr. Aller; the shelter is sought after, especially in inclement weather, and not just by the homeless.

Ms. Lane said by selecting Steinbrueck Park they have created a challenge. It is within a Historic District that has guidelines. The Commission has gone out of their way to brief themselves to make sure they understand the original design as Richard Haag intended. She suggested finding another location. It is a small park, there is not a lot of ground and within the Historic District there are all kinds of guidelines that represent hurdles to get over. In the resolution from the City Council it is specifically states “a place of remembrance designed to memorialize the homeless who have died.” She thought it best for the applicants to widen their view and find another place that would be easier.

Ms. Lokan stated she went through the guidelines and noticed view, pedestrian access and accessibility are the purview of the Commission and asked what other guidelines might be hurdles.

Mr. Aller stated “historic use”.

Mr. Rolluda read the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of 3.1, Principles of Design in the Market: “The Commission is responsible for making those judgments of design to make sure that the character of the Market is preserved and the architectural, cultural, economic and historical qualities of the District are maintained.” He also cited 3.1.1 “in the District it is generally better to preserve than to repair, better to repair than to restore, better to restore than to construct.” He said this is bringing a totally different element to the Market.

Ms. Lokan said it was her understanding the park was not an historic element of the District and wouldn’t fit under the need to be “restored.”

Mr. Aller stated the park is not 100 years old but it is historic. Victor Steinbrueck design it and was involved in the design. Now that the Commission has a better understanding of what was intended we have an obligation to maintain the historicity even though it is only 20 years old. The Commission has an obligation to maintain what Mr. Steinbrueck intended that park to be.

Ms. Lane said it looks like a redesign of the park and it is hard to accept.

Ms. Bierman said it is a redesign but it has a message; it is a memorial.

Ms. Lane said the memorial part of it is difficult as well as the redesign.

Ms. Herron stated the park was designed with great care. Mr. Steinbrueck designed it with the mounds, which was purposeful to buffer noise and also to add some spatial division and separation. He specifically wanted the southwest corner to be preserved for Native Americans to gather. This proposal seems to dispel that; she thinks it is a fantastic idea but this is not the place.

Mr. Wiegman said he has spent time there and it is not safe. He said he is concerned that the response has been to put cameras there which he said is a sign it is not working as a space. It is historic and he has great respect for what Victor Steinbrueck was trying to do. He said this is living history – trying to respect the vision and trying to help the parts that are dysfunctional.

Ms. Link said they are blaming the park for something that is a social problem and she thought that unfair. She said in Seattle there are several examples of modernist landscape design, one being Occidental Park, which has been altered. This is one that has not been altered yet. She cautioned about being too quick to do something radical to this park which isn’t very big to begin with. This park is a gem – part of the District as it has evolved over time and an example of a modernist park. She would be more open to ideas that were less radical and more respectful of the park; this is too radical and the basket it too tall and appears to be pretty solid and view-blocking.

Mr. Lane agreed.

Ms. Shinbo said it changes the whole scale in that corner completely. 10’ tall glass and 14’ tall structure is massive.

Mr. Wiegman said the circle is around 30 – 35’.

Ms. Link said it is a nice design but to alter the park this much is too much.

Ms. Bystrom appreciated the comments about increasing flow and thought it would be interesting to explore.

Mr. Aller stated if the park has problems he wasn't sure this was the solution.

Susanne Friedman, Parks Department, said the Homeless Place of Remembrance was an element that was incorporated into the larger public process they did this year. It is one element and is not meant to fix a social ill; it is an artistic element that they are introducing into the park. She said she respected the Commissioners' comments and opinions but asked the Commission to assume now that the Homeless Place of Remembrance is going in at this site and asked what would be acceptable within the site if this configuration is not and asked for more feedback.

Mr. Aller said the "Homeless Place of Remembrance" and "Artistic Element" are two different statements. He said assuming they cross barrier that the "Homeless Place of Remembrance" is permitted in the park, he recommended having a better design that has more respect for what is there now that keeps the living room aspect that keeps more of Victor Steinbrueck's original design intact. He said to remember the design is important, it is a Victor Steinbrueck original.

Ms. Friedman stated it is not a memorial, they have been very careful about that. The group has gone above and beyond and has met all the requirements for the Park Superintendent's and the Mayor's office. It is not a memorial; it is a Homeless Place of Remembrance. It is a very sensitive issue and the consultant group has been more than studious about meeting all the requirements and regulations that have been put in front of them.

Ms. Lane asked if a decision has already been made that a memorial would go into the park.

Ms. Friedman said the decision has been made that this is a Homeless Place of Remembrance and not a memorial. There is strong feeling that it belongs here.

Ms. Lane reiterated her question if someone has made the decision.

Ms. Friedman said the Superintendent of Parks is very favorable with having it at Victor Steinbrueck Park.

Ms. McAuliffe advised it has to conform to the Commission Guidelines.

Ms. Bystrom shared her thoughts about in-ground memorials she has seen and said they can be moving, profound and of highest order without the height.

Mr. Wiegman said this would block the view less than the current canopy that is there.

Ms. Zuege said when Richard Haag was here he explained the berms were an important design element to the park as well as being function; she asked about shaving the berm.

Mr. Wiegman said they would just round the edges for more flow.

Public Comment:

Dave Martin, owner of the Champion Building across from the Park, explained he has a problem with the definition of “memorial” versus “remembrance”. He said one of the issues with the Parks Department is how they define what is going to go into Victor Steinbrueck Park; it cannot have names, it cannot be called a memorial but it can be called a remembrance. He said the definition provided in the dictionary is similar. He cited 3.8.3 that states “plaques and memorials are discouraged”. He said if any memorial would be considered for the park – he said he is against any memorial as are the Friends of Victor Steinbrueck Park – the door is being opened for what kind of memorials. He said this is a small park and asked what memorials are acceptable. He expressed concern about how many people would turn up for a gathering for a homeless memorial.

Ms. Lokan said she was told fifty.

Mr. Martin asked how many people would show up for a candlelight vigil in the middle of the night and asked if we would have a “Nickelsville” in the park because a homeless element didn’t pass in the City. He expressed concern that rules are already being violated in other places. If the memorial is approved, he asked what is being accepted and are we ready to accept the outfall of what would come with it. He advised that really has to be considered. He cautioned that if this memorial is accepted, we must accept the baggage and that it could involve a lot more than just a memorial in the park. He said he knew Victor and his intent was not a living room for the homeless but the people who lived here in the low income housing. It wasn’t for homeless it was for people that actually didn’t have a living room to go to; this was their spot.

*Ms. Lane left at 6:28 p.m.*

Mr. Wiegman urged the Commission to look closely at the existing use and said that the intention is not to create an exclusive place for just the homeless. It is an effort to create something that is for all people. It is not focused on just the homeless. It is to create a place where people can gather. He said that corner does not serve that function well, particularly in that corner.

Mr. Aller said perhaps it did too well.

Ms. Cameron said they chose Victor Steinbrueck Park because Peter [Steinbrueck] suggested it and said that he would know what his father would want. She said Peter told her the park was designed with the homeless in mind and it is a place for everyone. It is a gathering place but not in the middle of the night. She said they do Women in Black vigils at noon for homeless people who died. They have candle light vigils at 5:00 or 6:00 p.m. on the longest night of the year, which is December 21.

Ms. Friedman stated that can be done in the park now.

Ms. Cameron said Steinbrueck Park is ideal; they have looked at what a memorial is and they have decided they will put there a place of hope, of healing. It will not be funeral in nature nor will it have names on it. It will be a place for someone to come who is remembering someone but also for people to recognize it is a problem that exists in the City. She said they need to do what they need to do to get this done and not block the

view and maybe redesign. This could be anywhere, any place in any park but it should be in Steinbrueck Park because it is meaningful to the homeless community.

Ms. McAuliffe asked how someone will know that it is the Homeless Place of Remembrance if there are no names or anything to bring attention to the issue.

Mr. Wiegman said they have thought of using poetry. He spoke of a place of memory that was created for Columbine and took quotes and engraved them into a “wall of learning”; it can be subtle and create a place that celebrates aspects of life and draws attention to it.

Mr. Aller said Parks is careful to use the word “remembrance”. Anything – poetry – that specifies or identifies it as a remembrance place defines “memorial”. He said it is the memory of the people who have gone; it is a memorial and there are guidelines against it. If we get past that guideline, everyone here has already stated the need to respect the existing park more and not gut a third of the park which in effect is what has been proposed.

Mr. Wiegman said the park needs some refurbishment.

Ms. Link said the concern is to have a little more respect for what is there as well as blocking of the views.

Mr. Rolluda said when we talk about refurbishment here in the Market it is “restore”.

Mr. Wiegman said had worked in the Market and there have been a lot of changes.

Ms. Lokan said if it does get located here, she said the intent is that it improves the views and the use of the park. She believes the drawings have been forwarded to Peter but he hasn't been to any of the meetings. She said they are meeting with Marjorie [Steinbrueck] tomorrow.

Mr. Martin said he knows Peter. He has spoken with his [Peter's] brother Matt who is opposed to the memorial in the park. He said the concept is changing the park so much and is taking away the whole character of the park. He said this is a preliminary presentation and this is not cut and dried. He would like for Matt and Peter Steinbrueck to come and give their opinions.

Jan Gleason, executive director of Environmental Works Community Design Center and a member of the committee said she attended all the meetings. Richard Haag attended two of the meetings and was very clear that he and Victor Steinbrueck designed the park for all people including homeless people. She said Marjorie and Peter are both supportive of this project in the park. She said they plan to meet with Mr. Haag.

Ms. Lokan hoped the Commission would come to a meeting.

Ms. McAuliffe clarified that the Commission is not able to actively participate in such a meeting; Commissioners can come and listen and that is all.

Cheryl Martin said they went to all three meetings and there was a lot of support at the meetings but most of them were from the Homeless memorial and there were very few

people from the Market. By the third meeting most of the people from the Market stopped going because they felt they were not heard and they felt railroaded. She said she liked the idea but the park is too small and is not appropriate.

6:40 P.M. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe  
Commission Coordinator