



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 84/08

Wednesday, June 11, 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

Sara Patton

Alex Rolluda

Sharron Shinbo

Allyn Stellmacher

Susan Zuege

### STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Karen Gordon

Melinda Bloom

4:32 PM A quorum was present and the meeting was called to order by Karin Link, Chair.

Ms. Link announced that the Hillclimb presentation would take place at 5:05 pm and suggested moving approval of the minutes up to expedite the meeting.

Ms. Link presented a clarification of her comments at the May 28 meeting.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Commissioners reviewed minutes of May 28, 2008. Ms. Link moved to adopt a resolution to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/KL/SS

7:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Stellmacher and Ms. Patton abstained.

*Mr. Rolluda arrived at 4:35 PM.*

**061108.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF DESIGN APPROVAL \***

061108.11 Le Panier  
1902 Pike Place, Stewart House  
Kristi Drake

Ms. McAuliffe explained the request to change the color of hanging sign. Exhibits reviewed include site plan, photo, and a rendering of new sign. Guidelines that applied to this application are: 3.6.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the plan, photograph and other materials relating to the application and reported that the Design Review Committee said the application complies with Guidelines 3.6.1.

Applicant Comments: Kristi Drake stated they are updating their logo and will change the color from red and gold to gold and black; she felt the red and gold was hard to read.

Landlord Comments: There was no landlord comment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion: The Commission concurred that they had enough information to make a decision.

Ms. Patton made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/SP/HA 10:0:0 Motion approved.

**061108.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE APPROVAL \***

061108.21 Victor Steinbrueck Park  
Kate Soden

Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for temporary use approval for four “Out to Lunch” series concerts in Victor Steinbrueck Park, to be held August 12-15, 2008 from 12-1:30 p.m. The relevant background is: Zone 3, street level, all uses permitted, stage is 20’ wide by 20’ tall and includes a backdrop for weather protection; stage will be set up Tuesday August 12 through Saturday August 16. Exhibits reviewed were supplemental written information from the applicant, letter from the Mayor’s Office of Film and Music. The relevant Guidelines were 2.9 and 2.11.

Applicant Kate Soden corrected the event’s duration and said the final date will be Sunday August 17; the stage will remain up for the Market’s 101<sup>st</sup> Birthday

celebration. There is no music event on Saturday August 16, just Sunday August 17.

Ms. McAuliffe asked Ms. Soden to clarify exactly which days music would be scheduled.

Ms. Soden said music for “Out to Lunch” will occur Tuesday through Friday with the only other use being the Market one – day birthday celebration Sunday August 17.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe reported the Use Review Committee determined the application would comply with 2.9, 2.11.5 and recommended discussion by full Commission because the Committee had concerns about potential view blockage by backdrop.

*Ms. Bierman and Ms. Lane arrived at 4:40 pm.*

Commission Discussion:

In response to questions by Commission members Ms. Soden confirmed the backdrop would be rolled up when not in use; just before the concert it will be rolled down and immediately after it will be rolled back up. She circulated a plan for Commission review; the green is the proposed area for the stage and the plan is to scale. The stage will be on the grass and would remain until the series is over; the sides and back would be removed and rolled up when not in use. The stage is 20' x 20' and is raised 2'.

Ms. McAuliffe asked what style music the bands will play.

Ms. Soden said four bands have been scheduled: The Randy Oxford Band (Americana/Blues), Jonathan Harris (Contemporary/Acoustic/Country); Barcelona (Indy Pop/Rock) and Clumsy Lovers (Folk Rock). There would be amplification and they have gotten a variance from the Parks Department.

Landlord Comment: Victoria Schoenberg, Parks Department, said they are happy to have the event; it is a great contribution to the effort to activate the park.

Ms. Soden said the concerts this year are focused in the parks to include them in the urban city and show the uniqueness of Seattle.

Public Comment:

Ms. McAuliffe read an email from Dave and Cheryl Martin who support the series.

James Gerless, Mayor's Office of Film and Music, said they are presenting partners of the concerts with DSA and the Parks Department; they support the activities.

James Haydu, PDA, said they have been engaged with the Out to Lunch concert series and DSA; they are very supportive. The stage is a postage stamp compared to what they did last year in the park; it is smaller in scale, size and presence.

Mark Barbieri, Co-Chair of Marketing for DSA, supports the effort. He said it allows people to wander through downtown experiencing the entertainment events in what use to be largely private venues which have now been converted to parks. He said that people begin following events and will wander from park to park and reacquaint themselves with spaces that they haven't had a chance to appreciate.

#### Commission Discussion:

Ms. Aller said when the Use Review Committee looked at this application they had a problem with the view blockage because of the backdrop. What the applicant failed to tell the Committee is they have a proscenium piece that is wider and taller than the stage and taking up much more visual space than just the roll up. He expressed concern that the location they've chosen for the stage is the corner that is in the middle of the park, and will be left there a full week.

Ms. McAuliffe cited Guideline 2.11.5 state views shall not be diminished or obstructed. She asked how long the wall is.

Ms. Shinbo stated she is right across from Victor Steinbrueck Park and has seen large tents and even a large inflatable cow and wondered how these were approved.

Ms. McAuliffe said it hadn't gone through the Commission; if it is three days or less the Commission won't review.

Ms. Schoenburg said in response to Ms. McAuliffe's earlier question, the west wall is approximately 220'; the tent is 20'.

Ms. McAuliffe asked how long the stage was in actuality, not just the surface area but the structure than encompasses it. She asked if the structure goes in front and not to the side.

Ms. Soden said the structure goes in front of it.

Ms. McAuliffe asked if the Commission was clear.

Ms. Patton said Mr. Aller was referring to the proscenium which is a big open rectangle that has all kinds of signs on it and frames the stage.

Ms. Soden said it is about 2' x 2' at the bottom trussing so it is about 2' from the stage and is what they put the banner on so they need to have it.

Mr. Stellmacher cited 2.11.5; said the view along the park frontage is immense and there are a number of vantage points from where to maintain the view so his sense that since it is just five days and the back rolls up, he wasn't concerned with the view blockage issue.

Ms. Shinbo agreed and said people do go to different venues; this will help the Market and the park. She is supportive of the application.

Mr. Aller stated he is a fan of the Out to Lunch series but is concerned with the view blockage.

Ms. Schoenburg said the proscenium doesn't make tent higher, the 20' is the top of the peak of the tent; the trussing only affects the width by 2' on each side.

Ms. Patton said under the City Attorney's interpretation on temporary uses the Commission can approve this even though she agreed with Mr. Aller that the plain language of the restrictions, "views shall not be diminished or obstructed" is clear. She doesn't agree with the City Attorney's interpretation but will go with it since it is a definitive, authoritative interpretation. It points once again, to the need to consider revising the guidelines to clarify the scope of the temporary approval and to revise the Steinbrueck Park section. She agreed with Mr. Aller that if there wasn't this "temporary use exemption" they would have to vote no based on the way the Guidelines are written now.

Mr. Stellmacher made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/AS/SS 10:1:0 Motion approved. Mr. Aller opposed.

**061108.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR** There was no report.

**061108.5 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES:** There was no report.

**061108.6 STAFF REPORT**

Ms. McAuliffe stated there was a hearing on Monday regarding evening concerts at Victor Steinbrueck Park. The Hearing Examiner has ruled that the Appellant's assertion that the noise code is triggered by this has been dismissed; the rest has not been dismissed and will be heard on Monday. The Guideline Revision Committee will meet June 26 then whatever they come up with will go to the City Attorney's office for their perusal and once it has its check box there, the Commission will be briefed; if the commission does not have further changes it would be put up as a link

on the website to advertise to the community, a notice would be put in the paper, all landlords notify community. The Commission will hold a public meeting at which point public comment is taken.

Ms. Patton said especially in the arena of Victor Steinbrueck Park the Guidelines, it is really clear that public policy is changing and the focus on how to use Victor Steinbrueck Park is changing. Many people on this Commission do not understand where the Guidelines come from; she thought it would be helpful if in the guideline revision process people came and explained why they are so stringent and specific.

Ms. McAuliffe said Washington Mutual has turned the backlights off in the ATMS.

**061108.7 NEW BUSINESS**

061108.71 PDA Briefing  
Terry Plumb, Pike Place Market PDA

Briefing on proposed capital renovations: changes to Pike Hillclimb.

Carol Binder explained where the levy and its projects are in the City process. Tomorrow the City would present the Mayor's Market Levy to the City Council. They've sent down the Legislation Ordinance and memos to City Council and will present an overview of plan; she passed out an overview of the plan to the Commissioners. There are four phases of the project with the Hillclimb being the first. The process schedule:

- 6/23 City Council meeting considering the legislation
- 7/1 Senior Center Public Hearing
- 7/3 City Council vote on proposal

The vast majority of the project dollars will be spent underground, in basements and things that won't show but the Hillclimb will be the largest built element. 1% of Hillclimb costs (\$10,000,000.00) have been put in for art, which comes to about \$100,000.

Joe Paar from the PDA said he has been in dialog with the DRC and the Commission regarding their plans and said they want to continue to get feedback from the Commission. He introduced Rhoda Lawrence from BOLA Architecture + Planning.

Ms. Lawrence asked that Karen Gordon, City Preservation Officer, speak first about an element of the Ordinance that allows the Commission to do a preliminary approval; she said that this is what they would eventually like to come back to do.

Ms. Gordon explained that the district ordinance was changed about ten years ago to allow applicants to seek preliminary design approval (in addition to final design approval) after a situation was encountered with a number of the other review Boards where project proponents wanted some certainty in order to get their

financing and other types of review but they didn't have final details. All the ordinances were amended to include a preliminary approval step; this Commission rarely sees this because 99.9% of what this Commission looks at is pretty detailed. This will allow for concept approval so the applicant can proceed with the plans for permitting, understanding they still need to come back for a lot of details. It has been envisioned that this project will be one that will require preliminary approval. Ms. Gordon referred the Commission to the relevant section of Seattle Municipal Code 25.24.060 C. She explained that Historic Preservation staff is required to review applications within 28 days; when a project application comes in under this provision they waive the timeline for the Commission's decisions on the subsequent phases. The other significant item is that interested parties can appeal a preliminary design but it is when the Commission takes action on preliminary not final stage. This particular project is categorically exempt from the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) because of the size of the project. Often in other projects, the applicant has to complete their SEPA process and then come back for approval but in this case, DPD has determined the SEPA threshold is low enough that it isn't necessary.

Mr. Stellmacher asked when the approval will be requested.

Mr. Paar said it would likely be the middle to the end of summer. They want to work with the Commission to present ideas and get feedback for the preliminary approval and would then move ahead with the final approval process once they have their construction documents completed. This is an interactive dialog to listen to what the Commission has to say as they refine their ideas and work through the design.

Ms. Lawrence explained there have been some changes in the design since the last time the Commission saw it. They presented at the Design Review Committee in May; they got comments at that meeting and hope they have been able to address some of those. She said this is not a done deal at this point; the team has attended many public meetings, they have shown it to the Commission, there has been input from tenants, residents, PDA and they are trying to gather the information and present a concept that reflects that. They will remain in that dialog for as long as it is necessary to come up with a concept that everyone can buy into.

Ms. Lawrence said there are three components to this project: 1) the electrical vault which is one of the primary reasons for the change, 2) the modification to the Hillclimb area with the introduction of a new stair in the central location between the LaSalle and Leland Buildings, and 3) an elevator. Previously there was a proposal to remove the skybridge from the city side of Western Avenue; it is no longer a part of this proposal.

Ms. Lawrence stated the vault location is still in the central location of the Hillclimb area; it has been shrunk down to about 1000 square feet and contains only electrical components. The second component is the Hillclimb stair; the major difference in this new configuration from what has been shown before is the play area for the child care center will be a contiguous space with no pedestrian access. The stair that

once zigzagged through the space will now jog around the play area; the play area will be wrapped by the pedestrian walkway. The stair will provide access from the waterfront up to the main arcade and back down. This provides opportunities to open this space up to pedestrians and to move people through the space and experience the Market in a new way. Ms. Lawrence provided historic photos and said there has always been some kind of access up through that portion of the Market; they felt it was important to continue to provide that access. The elements will provide able-bodied pedestrian access to different levels of the Market; missing elements are vertical access and handicapped access in the same way they are providing opportunities for pedestrians to come up through the space.

Ms. Lawrence said the idea is to incorporate an elevator. There have been a number of studies done where there are opportunities for vertical access through the Market. An elevator in the location they show provides everyone an opportunity to start in the same place and experience different levels of the Market all the way up. They have been talking with an accessibility consultant who said there is no way every pedestrian space can be made accessible but this is a good attempt. They are trying to get general concept approval so they can move forward with the actual design elements. She provided a map of the Market with existing elevators identified as well as proposed; one proposed is in the Hillclimb area, another in the north end of the Market and another in the Corner Market that will come later. She said the major portions of the elevator connections are in the north end of the Market; it is very easy to get from the parking areas to the arcade level with an elevator.

Ms. Lawrence said questions have been raised about why certain elevators can't be used. There are a number of Guidelines that are applicable to this proposal; they have been carefully looking at the Guidelines trying to make sure what they present meets them. She said the proposal she has presented is the best for all the different elements and factions for this element in the Market; the need for the central electrical vault, the ability to get from Western Avenue up to the Arcade and back down again, and providing the ability to get to different levels of the Market and get the same experience via elevator as one does via stairway.

Mr. Paar said they have not begun design development on any other phases of work except the Hillclimb, Leland and Fairley; these are just generalities and they have just put in placeholders.

Ms. Lawrence said images have been provided that are the outcome of meetings with the DRC.

Mr. Aller stated the applicant is proposing the elevator at the Hillclimb to come up into Flower Row where it will encounter a ramp that is too steep for disabled people yet they are selling it as disabled access.

Ms. Lawrence said where the elevator comes up it is level and there will be complete accessible access to the public seating area. When she talked to the accessibility consultant, the concession was that it was not accessible but she thought it was a

good opportunity to have proper signage, have people exit the elevator on level 3 or 4 and with signage come through the space and utilize the current existing elevator that is in the Fairley Building.

Mr. Aller said the elevator is being sold as a handicapped elevator and yet telling handicapped people not to use it, they have to transfer. He asked why not put in an elevator they can use and said to find a place that works.

Mr. Paar said he is aware of people with needs in this condition and said that they are providing access not just for ADA but for people with strollers, people who can't do stairs, the elderly. He said they are providing the same Market type experience; it is a wandering place and not a direct route from A to B but at the same time they want to provide for people with special needs the same general experiences. They'll come up the Hillclimb and transfer when they get near the top, wander to another elevator and come up.

Mr. Aller, who uses a motorized scooter, stated that is what he has to do now and it is possible for him to get anywhere he needs to in the Market by transferring and moving about; he said they are putting a hole in the middle of Flower Row and selling it as an ADA use project when it is not a handicap use project.

Mr. Paar said that wasn't their intent.

Mr. Aller stated it was what Ms. Lawrence just said.

Dale Wittner, member of the public, agreed with Mr. Aller and said in the Mayor's press release, in everything Ms. Binder put out, it is called a handicapped elevator. He said people aren't going to read the signs and get off the elevator to transfer; they will go all the way up and they will get to the landing and they will look for someone to help them or they will try themselves and wheelchairs will cascade back down and people will get hurt. It is a bad plan.

Ms. Link said the Commission is still in Commission discussion and will accept further comments from the public after Commission discussion.

Mr. Rolluda asked Ms. Lawrence to show the transition and traffic pattern at the elevator at level 5 to the Fairley elevator and to level 4 to transition.

Mr. Paar said the elevator she pointed to at the corner does not go all the way down.

Ms. Lawrence said no, it is what is known as the residential Leland entrance; it goes to level 2 and doesn't engage the area.

Mr. Rolluda clarified that the elevator stops on 3, 4, 7 and 8. He asked applicant to address the reasons why that elevator couldn't be used.

Mr. Paar said the Leland residential elevator is a residentially designated elevator; they have separated residential from commercial use.

Ms. Lawrence said the elevator proposed for handicapped use is the in the Fairley building, the one that currently goes down to Western Avenue.

Mr. Aller asked if they meant the little elevator that goes to the steep ramp.

Mr. Paar said on a busy summer day the Market is very busy and they need more vertical transportation; they get a lot of overpacked elevators and they need more.

Mr. Aller said they clearly need more vertical transportation, not half a vertical transportation where he would then have to transfer over to another vertical transportation and wait from one crowded elevator to another crowded elevator in order to get anywhere. It is OK if it is a predesigned building, a historic building, but this is something new that is being built and he suggested to find a way to do it right.

Mr. Stellmacher asked if each Commissioner could get a legible copy of the exhibits to review and, who was contracted to do the work that has been outlined in the budget.

Mr. Paar responded SRG is working on the overarching architectural/mechanical aspects of the project and BOLA is concentrating on the historical aspects of the project. He said it is important to him that this project is woven into the historic fabric of the Market; the Market is over 100 years old and that is an important factor.

Ms. Lane asked what other solutions have been considered in coming up with this design.

Ms. Lawrence said in the earlier ones where there was an elevator in the Hillclimb area; the team received some comments on that and took those comments back; there have been 12 locations for elevators considered. They are trying to determine wherever the vertical transportation will go, what the disruption to all parts of the Market will be: the architectural features, the retail elements, the residential elements and trying to balance all those pieces to try to come up with a solution which may not solve everything but will work for the majority.

Ms. Lane asked what kind of impacts Ms. Lawrence saw at Flower Row to the merchants, the flow of traffic; she asked what assumptions they made in coming up with this proposal.

Mr. Paar said the from a business perspective they'll get a lot more clientele through there so those would become more desirable spaces.

Ms. Lane stated that it eliminates some retail space.

Ms. Lawrence said the current scheme adds two spaces because they would take out the stairs and add a couple more stations.

Ms. Zuege clarified the applicant's comment about the goal being for people being able to wander the Market; she had trouble reconciling that with what sounds like making more direct access.

Ms. Lawrence said the elevator wherever it ends up being ideally would stop at each floor; currently it doesn't do that. The concept with the stair that wanders up through the Hillclimb, you get to each level, see signage and are directed into the down under spaces so you have the opportunity to go all the way up. Because of the proposed design of the elevator with glass doors, you can see as you are going up and can see people going up the stairs. There is a clearer, more obvious route into the Market unlike what it is now. The elevator access on Western is a daunting slope.

Ms. Herron said she doubted that elevator congestion will help the salespeople because the stalls next to the elevator may be hurt; people wanting to look won't be able to get close.

Mr. Paar understood and said the elevator is kind of down toward the end so that could be true for the new spaces but the existing spaces are far enough away. He said they looked at that.

Mr. Aller said except for people in wheelchairs who will never get to go by any of those places.

Ms. Bierman asked if they had considered signs and that it might help the problem.

Mr. Paar stated they had a lot of signage but they would need more.

Public Comment:

Ben Kirchner, Flower Row merchant, said in the discussion for preliminary approval the applicant has presented the electrical vault, elevator and stairs but has not discussed the fact that they are changing the Leland stairway down under. He asked if they were asking for approval for that.

Mr. Paar said they were not asking for approval on anything; they are just working through a process. As they get ideas refined they want be collaborative and open and work with the Commission and present those ideas as they get them refined. As they progress he said they would come back and present more ideas; by mid-summer they will have all the ideas presented.

Ben Kirchner said it has been included in discussions before and it is not now.

Joe Canavan, business owner in the Market, said the applicant talked about the transition from concept to approval to final design; he relates that to some of the meetings he has attended the last couple months. In particular when the manager at Lowell's wanted to do something about his windows; even with the Duncan's help it took a number of meetings to get approval for something that simple. He wondered if once construction starts and they are getting into detail obstructions will be prolonged by having to get that much detailed approval.

Ms. McAuliffe stated a complete application has to be turned in before it can be scheduled for review by the Commission; she can't liken the case of Lowell's windows to this as it is different. Generally, as far as preliminary design goes, they can come back as many times as they need to for the final details; largely it has to do with what they are presenting. The Commission reviews it on a set schedule; it goes before the Design Review Committee and then it goes before the Commission. In the case of Lowell's there were some other things that happened so it was not the same.

Mr. Canavan asked if it would be the same attention to detail throughout.

Ms. McAuliffe said yes.

Mr. Paar stated they would work with the Commission; as they get further along they will have more dialog and will be here more. It is in the applicant's best interest to do this as expeditiously as possible and it is in the tenants' best interest; what is in their tenants' best interest is in their best interest.

Mr. Canavan said it is obvious this construction will be an obstruction to normal business for everybody in the Market; if it is going to be prolonged because the attention to detail wasn't thorough enough in the beginning then that is a bad thing for all the businesses in the Market.

Mr. Paar said they don't want that to happen and they will work collaboratively with the Commission to make sure they are getting the right detail on the drawings.

Ms. Lawrence said a building permit won't be issued until the Commission approves the design so it is unlikely there will be construction before the major design elements are approved.

Mr. Canavan clarified the applicant wouldn't be asking for a Hearing Examiner to go over this at any point.

Ms. Lawrence said it is important that all those things get worked out now.

Dale Wittner agreed with Mr. Aller and said the elevator is going to be an albatross on this organization for all kinds of reasons and that it would be a nightmare. He expressed a deep interest in the proximity of the childcare playground and the

electrical vault; he is concerned about the health of the kids and the possibility of an explosion in the vault.

Mr. Paar said they will do electro magnetic shielding of the vault so it will be safe; if Seattle City Light doesn't do it the applicant will have their engineers do it. They will have it reviewed and will ensure it is correct. There will be a 1' thick concrete box with steel rebar and will be heavily reinforced so will be safe.

Mr. Wittner asked if the plan now is to have the entire playground there; the roof is out and they won't be across the street. He asked the square footage of the playground and if soil, trees, grass, flowers will be part of this.

Ms. Lawrence said it is 1,520 square feet; part is outside and part inside.

Mr. Paar said planter boxes are planned; they are working with a landscape designer as landscaping is a very important element.

Mr. Aller said the drawings show no trees at all.

Mr. Paar said the landscape drawings will be added at the end.

Mr. Wittner asked if the large tree that is there will remain.

Mr. Paar didn't know.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Stellmacher pointed out that when the DRC viewed the preliminary plan they expressed strong sentiment about finding other alternatives to placing an elevator through Flower Row. He cited Mr. Aller's concerns about whether it would do a good job of servicing constituents. He also said this would be destroying a strong historic element, Flower Row and the view overlook. Having a strong public view through that area is a component of the Market. He encouraged the PDA to look very closely to preserve Flower Row and to put the elevator elsewhere.

Mr. Howard asked where the traffic from the elevator came from, if it was from walkups off of Western, from the stairway or from the parking garage.

Mr. Paar said all of the above.

Mr. Aller said the parking garage has its own elevator.

Mr. Paar agreed. The parking garage actually has two elevators; one bank of elevators goes up to an overpass, one elevator in the southwest corner comes to grade and those are the people who normally circulate up the stairwell.

Mr. Aller said that is the only elevator available from Alaska to Western unless you go all the way over to Lenora which is outside the purview of this area.

Mr. Howard asked if provisions have been made to manage the vehicle traffic along Western to make it safer for pedestrians.

Mr. Paar said they are working with the City on crosswalks; they need to get some preliminary buy-in on their plans so they can take start working on SDOT issues.

Ms. Link said she was very troubled by the steep slope in Flower Row. She said that it was very unfair to bring people in an elevator to a place that has a really steep incline in one direction and is really bumpy in the other direction. She said it would be really unpleasant for anyone in a wheelchair; it would also not be comfortable for someone who does not like to walk stairs and who was very unsure on their feet. Because of the way the elevator is set up in relation to the view point looking out toward the west, the viewpoint area is also going to become congested and uncomfortable. This is a bad solution.

She expressed concern about the obstruction of the view as seen from Pike Place. As several tenants have mentioned, there would not only be the congestion in the region of the elevator as people get out, but there is already lot of congestion on the other side near Pike Place Fish. This means that there would be a bottleneck at both ends of Flower Row. She said everything else, including the captured space below Flower Row, is great but that the applicant should look at some other solution to the problem of getting people to Flower Row who want to use an elevator.

Mr. Paar said the ADA thing keeps coming up; they aren't trying to say the ADA access is through Flower Row. He asked if it would help to bring the ADA consultant to help present, she is in a wheelchair. She has done the review and said this was the best plan.

Ms. Link said if that is the case, perhaps they could make it a little more indirect and not put an elevator through Flower Row. She said that going through Flower Row was not the way to treat historic infrastructure, that there were other options and that this solution was too invasive. She added that this solution would be doing something to an historic area that need not be done.

Mr. Paar said they have looked at other options.

Mr. Aller said four or five other elevator locations were considered and this is the one the applicant is presenting to the Commission. He has seen this one and also one in the separate tower that said "Market" in big letters which he thought was gorgeous. Someone decided this was the right one; he wants to see the others. He said this is not the right one; it will not work.

Mr. Paar said the other ideas affect a lot more people. They chose what is best for ADA, for historic [preservation] and for other tenants.

Ms. Patton asked about the elevator going from Western to the level just below Flower Row which would then provide the same path, with wandering included, for people to go up another flight on an elevator or, if not in wheelchairs, take the stairs. That avoids the ADA problems; it avoids the disruption of the view and the congestion. There will be a pedestrian egress on that level so there will be some traffic there. She asked what the problem would be with that scenario that makes it less attractive than penetrating Flower Row.

Mr. Paar said he has heard people say it is a great place in the Market and it should be a place for everyone to experience. If you stop one level down you provide no ADA access to the end of Flower Row.

Ms. Patton said ADA access is not being provided now.

Mr. Aller said ADA people can't get into Flower Row period.

Mr. Paar said once the elevator is in ADA can have access to the bottom of Flower Row.

Mr. Aller added that ADA people could get to the bottom of Flower Row but they can't get out of the bottom of Flower Row without getting on the elevator again. It is an historic structure with a bad ramp; it is non-ADA, it will never be ADA.

Mr. Paar said they aren't planning to make it ADA but you can get ADA access to the scenery down there.

Ms. Herron asked how they plan to let people in wheelchairs know they can't get to the top and if they want to move into the Market they will have to get off at the floor below; the only reason for them to go to the top would be to look out the window. She said the floor is very uneven and tricky.

Mr. Paar said they will rework ramps and make it ADA accessible. They will have a lot of signage and a link on their website so people can see where the ADA accessible routes are.

Mr. Rolluda said the Commission has only seen two locations and has not been part of the design process. If the Commission is to do due diligence, the Commission needs to review all elevator options. The Commission is not here to design it for the applicant, but wants to see the process the applicant went through to make this choice.

Mr. Paar said the process is set up for them to come and present ideas; they want to work collaboratively with the Commission but they present information that they determine is the best information.

Ms. McAuliffe clarified that the amount of information to be provided by the applicant is a collaborative staff and Commission determination. The Ordinance allows staff to ask for additional information that is not listed as a requirement for the application if staff determines that information is needed for the Commission to make a decision. The DRC asked the applicant for additional information during the process; it is in the applicant's best interest to hear them and what they need.

Mr. Paar said they are happy to do that. Some ideas are just back of the napkin sketches and when they look at feasibility they don't go put all the dimensions and detail on it, some is just sketches in meetings and some are proposed ideas. He said they can sit down with a whole collage of different things but if they wanted to set up a working walk meeting and then a meeting to review some of the different ideas and why they haven't pursued them they are happy to that.

Mr. Rolluda said it is a one hour exercise; take a site plan and show where they propose the elevator and pluses and minuses of why that did or didn't work. It is something that you use to evaluate that the Commission can review.

Mr. Paar said he could do that.

Mr. Howard said the character of this elevator seems to be departing from the character of the other ones; it is more externalized and more prominent a feature where all the other elevators are more hidden and internalized. He asked how that relates to the overall character of the Market and is it too much of a departure or is a compatible design change relative to the full Market.

Ms. Lawrence said from a design perspective that is one of the dilemmas they face with providing ability for everyone to use whatever historic structure the same way as everybody else. They want it to be as transparent as possible; the other elevators are much more solid and appear more utilitarian and that fits with the industrial character and uniqueness of the Market. The dilemma with this elevator is they want it to be something opposite from that; they want something people can see through and won't obstruct the views. They wanted Commission feedback to learn if this would work in any configuration or none at all.

Ms. Lane asked if they had looked at putting the elevator on the other side of the Hillclimb, next to the LaSalle building.

Mr. Paar said the LaSalle is a corridor loaded residential building; the whole outside is wrapped in residential units.

Ms. Lane said she just wondered in view of degree of potential disruption and possibility. She just wanted to know if it had been looked at.

Mr. Paar said they thought about it but they have to look at all commercial and residential tenants.

Ms. Lane said that is one of the locations that could be shown, to demonstrate what the impacts, pros and cons, at that particular location are so as a collective group look at all the pieces and hopefully come up with one that seems to meet as many criteria as possible.

Ms. Zuege asked the applicant if the elevator would be operational 24/7 or does it shut down at a particular time.

Mr. Paar didn't know; they haven't gotten that far yet. The elevator cab is 8 x 12 and will hold 15 – 16 people.

Mr. Howard asked how the traffic flow fit in with Post Alley in terms of bringing people up to that space and connecting up to First Avenue and then south to the hotel developments; he asked if that was incorporated into the design.

Ms. Lawrence said partly they are using the big open area down on Western; it comes up to the main arcade and is pretty much the same as it is now.

Ms. Shinbo asked for a set of drawings and said she would like a walk-through to see the proposed elevator locations. She would like to see the chart knowing that the applicant went through every elevator and why each one was not chosen. The elevator and handicapped access seem to be the major concerns about this proposal. She said the applicant has come to a decision after months of work and the Commission is only seeing the tip of it.

Mr. Paar confirmed that the Commission wanted copies of all presentations; plans showing all proposed locations considered for elevators including pluses and minutes; and, walk where they will tape out the exterior dimensions of where elevator would go. He asked if the ADA consultant should come.

Ms. McAuliffe expressed concern about the tour with an ADA consultant along, it starts to displace the function of the Commission meeting. She advised that it is OK to bring a Commissioner along on a tour but stick to a tour rather than having a discussion on the tour with an ADA consultant.

Mr. Paar suggested bringing her to a meeting.

Terry Plumb from the PDA responded to Mr. Howard's question about connectivity to Post Alley; the area is a new area of emphasis and the idea is it would draw people through and hopefully their plans will work looking at lighting and other things. He said they definitely saw that as part of the routing when looking at the elevator.

Mr. Howard said when looking at the alternative site elevators he would like to see the rationale why they couldn't be upgraded or expanded.

Ms. Link asked the applicant if there was any other scheme that they actually considered. She said they seem pretty locked in to this idea and she hopes there is something else that can be done.

Mr. Wittner asked why the current elevator where the trash is doesn't work.

Mr. Paar said it isn't bad it is just small and the lines are big.

Mr. Aller said it goes down to a terrible ramp.

Mr. Wittner agreed but wondered if it could be made to work.

Mr. Paar said they would put it in their review of options. He said the entrance coming off Western isn't good.

Ms. McAuliffe asked if the entrance from Western be modified so it is not such a steep ramp.

Mr. Paar said anything can be done but the issue is they need more vertical transportation in addition to that elevator.

Mr. Howard said the new elevator is a major component so it has dominated the conversation but asked if the other items in the proposal would be included in the request for preliminary approval or if those would be reviewed at another time.

Mr. Paar said they would get the major elements to the Commission for Phase I.

Paul Dunn, a resident in the Market, said he has watched a lot of the design work that went on over the last couple years ago; the elevator that is being proposed now is there because at first they thought they could move the childcare center and put the elevator there but they can't. They had several ideas which the Commission will see when the applicant provides the information. Over the years the Historical Commission has been hand in glove with the developers and the construction elements in the Market; in all the reconstruction everything went through the Historical Commission; it has all kinds of expertise in how it's done and is confident of its procedure. The 1<sup>st</sup> and Pine Building was a new building under the supervision of the Commission and all the half block at the Inn at the Market which was not a public building but private; a lot of private capital went into that building that was very antsy about getting it built on time and fast. They worked smoothly with the Historical Commission on that. He said they are not going into new territory that hasn't existed before; you have a new Commission but the same procedures that existed before.

Ms. McAuliffe differed saying the LaSalle addition came through this same Commission; many of these same Commissioners were on it. This proposal is about changes to an historical part of the Market which is different from a new building.

Mr. Rolluda thanked the Design Team for the drawings; the Commission has asked for different perspectives, views and plans and they have been forthcoming.

Ms. Link made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alex Rolluda seconded.

6:45 PM The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe  
Commission Coordinator