



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 101/08

Wednesday, July 9, 2008

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 85 Pike Street, Room 500

## COMMISSIONERS

Howard Aller, Vice Chair

Valerie Bystrom

Joanne Herron

Spencer Howard

Susan Lane

Karin Link, Chair

Sara Patton

Alex Rolluda

Sharron Shinbo

Allyn Stellmacher

Susan Zuege

## STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Melinda Bloom

## Absent:

Marilyn Bierman

4:34 PM A quorum was present and the meeting was called to order by Karin Link, Chair.

## **070908.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE APPROVAL \***

070908.11 Athenian Inn  
1517 Pike Place, Fairley Building  
Scott Rogel

Change in ownership. Scott Rogel added as a 50% owner.

**Application postponed at the request of the applicant.**

## **070908.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE/DESIGN APPROVAL**

070908.21 PDA – street banner  
James Haydu

**Use:** Temporary street use approval for a banner to be installed across Pike Street through October 31, 2008. **Design:** approval for banner design.

**Application postponed at the request of the applicant.**

070908.22 US Bank  
1525 First Avenue, 1<sup>st</sup> & Pine Building  
Herbert Gabales

**Use:** Application: Expansion of use for an ATM machine to be installed through the wall into hallway of the 1<sup>st</sup> & Pine Building, outside bank.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the applicant request for expansion of use for an ATM machine to be installed through the wall into the hallway of the 1<sup>st</sup> and Pine Building. The business is located in Zone 2 at street level where Food and Retail a-d uses permitted; former use was Other Uses b; and new use would be Other Uses b. A site plan was provided. The relevant guideline was 2.8.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee reviewed this application and determined that it was a minor change of use. The Committee cited its conformance to Guideline 2.8.1 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Herbert Gabales, representative for US Bank, explained the ATM will be located within a wide corridor and would be installed per ADA requirements.

Landlord Comment: Brittney Farrow from the PDA indicated support for the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

*Susan Lane arrived at 4:37 p.m.*

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Aller reminded the Commission that the corridor in which the ATM will be located will only be ADA accessible until 6:00 pm.

Ms. Herron spoke in support of the application, stating that the bank is used frequently by residential tenants and Market businesses.

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

MM/SC/HA/VB

10:0:1 Ms. Lane abstained.

**Design:** Application: Approval for design of ATM machine.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for design of an ATM machine. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, floor plan, elevations, photo and specifications. The relevant guidelines were 3.1 and 3.6.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe stated the Committee reviewed the application and cited Guidelines 3.1 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph), 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, and 3.6.5 and recommended approval. The applicant verified that the sign which is normally backlit on the machine will be turned off.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Gabales advised US Bank to get the model without signage. The ATM will be located between the relites; the width of the hallway is more than 6'8" and the user won't take more than 2'. The ATM has been specified with no lighting on signage; it is a newer model and uses LCDs. He provided a spec sheet for review.

Ms. Patton asked if the ATM would blink or flash.

Ms. Link said it would not.

Landlord Comment: Brittney Farrow from the PDA indicated support.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

The Commission determined it had enough information to make a decision.

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

MM/SC/JH/SJ

11:0:0 Motion approved.

070908.23

Café Campagne

1600 Post Alley, Inn at the Market

Tran Nguyen

Application: **Use:** Increase in size of outdoor seating area from 160 sq. feet to 236 sq. feet.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained that the existing commercial space is 1010 sq. feet (interior is 850 sq. feet and outdoor seating area is 160 sq. feet); expansion of seating area would add 76 square feet. Total commercial area would

be 1086 sq. feet. She explained that the seating area will widen; outdoor seating is out all year. Plans were provided for review. The relevant guideline was 2.6.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited the application's conformance to Guideline 2.6.10 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Gordon Kushnick, representing Campagne, explained the proposal to expand the seating so they could seat tables for four instead of just two. By expanding the patio and leveling the area they have the opportunity to make outdoor seating accessible to more guests. They will expand the alley in width by removing the flower boxes from the other side.

Landlord Comment: Tran Nguyen, Adatto Construction, stated he talked to Bob Thurston at the Inn at the Market and has a letter of support from him.

Public Comment:

Paul Dunn, neighbor, stated it was hard to talk about the use without also talking about the design. This proposal restricts the pure use of Post Alley as a fire lane and auto bypass and removing the flower planter would also diminish the pleasantness. He expressed concern about expanding the patio when it wasn't usable much of the year and that it would be there all the time as an obstruction.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Aller expressed concern with the non-removability of the platform and the removal of the flowers.

Ms. Zuege asked how to support use when one can't get through the alley walking because of motorcycle parking. She stated other issues exist that must be addressed because at times there is no access even for pedestrians.

Ms. McAuliffe explained the Commission is reviewing the change in business area at this time.

Mr. Stellmacher cited 2.11.4 "sidewalk cafes may be approved by the Commission according to the principles of these guidelines provided conformance with applicable design provisions of these guidelines". His interpretation was that use approval is contingent on design approval.

Mr. Stellmacher made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve this application as submitted.

MM/SC/AS/AR                      9:2:0 Motion approved. Mr. Aller and Ms. Zuege opposed.

**DESIGN:** Application: Design of expanded seating area; change in design of awning.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe provided plans, photos and a color/material sample for the Commission to review. She clarified that the existing planters in the alley were approved by the Commission and were installed by Café Campagne a few years ago. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.2, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee reviewed this application and cited Guidelines 3.2.10, 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.8.1, and 3.8.6. The Committee recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Tran Nguyen stated that the seating area would be extended into the alley by two feet; the existing planters opposite the seating area in the alley would need to be removed. There will still be an 11' clearance in the alley. The awning will increase by 2' to cover the seating area. The fence will have the same character as existing; they may reuse the existing and add a few extra sections. The awning is retractable and will look exactly like the existing awning but with side covers. When it retracts, it doesn't cover the windows above.

Gordon Kushnick said they felt the platform was necessary explained that it was designed to conform to SDOT specifications. He explained that the platform consists of 6' modules that can be bolted down. It can be unbolted and removed in three hours. The awnings can retract in a matter of minutes.

Mr. Nguyen stated he talked with the Fire Department about alley access and they responded there was no reason for them to even attempt to go through the alley with a truck. They cannot make the swing to get into the alley with the trucks so they would service the hook and ladder truck from Pine and Stewart streets. The Fire Department further stated an aid car needs to have at least 11' and this proposal provides that.

Ms. Link asked the current width of the alley with the planters.

Mr. Nguyen responded that the required clearance is a couple of inches less than what is proposed.

Mr. Kushnick stated that there will be more space/clearance. He said that SDOT informed him that the motorcycles are not allowed to park in the alley. Since it is not permitted, they could be towed at any time.

Mr. Nguyen stated the proposal is not 100% ADA compliant but it is very accessible.

Landlord Comment: Annie Delucchi from Inn at the Market stated that the landlord approves of the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Aller cited Guideline 3.7.2 which states, "Tables and chairs with no structural elements around it are preferred; if some structural element is necessary, movable structural elements that can be brought back against the building wall or removed when not in use are required". He expressed a concern that the platform elements were not readily removable and would not be removed. He cited Guideline 3.8.1, which says, "Public seating is a desired amenity for visitors in the Market. Plants and flowers add color and appeal and are a desired amenity". He stated that Café Campagne put the planters in to increase the attractiveness of the area and now they want to remove them; the Guidelines state to remove plantings is not a good idea. He said there are enough negatives that the Commission should not approve this application.

Mr. Stellmacher asked if the drawing presented today is a new one.

Ms. McAuliffe confirmed it was; it incorporated the SDOT drawing.

Mr. Stellmacher asked the applicant to clarify heights of the platform on the west elevation.

Richard Adatto from Adatto Construction explained the heights of the platform. He said that the alley was supposed to have been put in at a 4" maximum pitch both ways; it has an 8% or 9% grade in parts. SDOT said normally they would not allow the platforms, but because the alley was not built right to start with and because the alley guidelines are exceeded in both directions, SDOT thought this would be a good solution. Because the swale of the alley changes, in 6' it drops almost a foot; it is considered steep. He explained that their existing seating area has a step up and showed the entrances to it. In the proposed design, it will be level at the restaurant threshold and the other gate will be tapered off to almost level so someone could just roll into it.

Mr. Aller said the main entrance to the restaurant is badly skewed for disabled persons.

Mr. Adatto said SDOT will not allow them to change the entire alley although he would like to do so.

Mr. Aller asked if the ADA accessibility is limited to the north half of the deck.

Mr. Adatto explained the ADA accessible areas and routes.

Mr. Aller stated that once a disabled person is able to get in, it is easy for them to get out onto the deck.

Mr. Adatto concurred and said while not perfect, it is better than it has ever been.

Mr. Stellmacher stated no definitive dimensions were shown on the plans.

Mr. Adatto said the custom deck will be built to fit. Each one of the panels top screws together so that each panel can be unbolted and moved; two people could lift each piece and remove it. They believe that with the new awning that offers better coverage, they will be able to serve longer periods of times.

Ms. Patton expressed confusion about the design and asked the opinion of DRC members regarding the platform design to 3.7.2.

Ms. Link stated that it is removable; it just takes longer.

Ms. Patton said the Guideline says “removable that can be brought back against the building or removed when not in use”. If it takes three hours to remove, she said, it is not removable when not in use because it isn’t practical.

Mr. Stellmacher stated the DRC most likely overlooked 3.7.2; the DRC didn’t cite that piece and it is applicable.

Ms. McAuliffe explained that the Committee did not have the leveling details at the time of the DRC review; the Committee requested that the applicant return with these details. She asked for clarification that the issue is the leveling part cannot be unbolted quickly.

Ms. Patton discussed Guideline 3.7.2 and said when she reads “structural elements around the space” she thinks of fencing because it is around the space as opposed to beneath the space and it is hard for her to understand how the application meets this Guideline.

Ms. Shinbo cited 3.7.2, “if removable structural elements are required” and that they have met that requirement because the part following “elements” is just a modifier.

Ms. Patton stated the “removable structural elements” is modified by the phrase “it can be brought back against the building or removed when not in use”.

Ms. Shinbo thought it was removable even though it takes a while to do so; it doesn’t state they are required to remove it.

Ms. Zuege cited 3.8.1 and thought the planters and flowers look nice and help connect upper Post Alley to lower Post Alley. She expressed concern about the movement issue and even if the motorcycles were not there, it is still a stretch of

working alley and there are still delivery trucks that stop there. She was concerned about adequate flow of people getting through.

Ms. Bystrom expressed concern about the loss of greenery although greenery doesn't necessarily require fiberglass planters. She asked if there were plans to restore or keep any greenery.

Mr. Kushnick said he started at Café Campagne in 2005 and wasn't aware that Café Campagne had requested to put the planters in. They have maintained them to some extent but it is not their responsibility to maintain them.

Ms. Bystrom pointed out that the new proposal would remove the opportunity to have plantings in the alley.

Mr. Kushnick stated that if they choose to neglect the plants they would be neglected. He wasn't aware that they were responsible for them but he has had his staff maintain them. If no one else will be a shareholder in the alley he stated he didn't know how they could be held responsible for being the sole "greener" in the alley.

Ms. Bystrom responded they were not being held responsible for being the sole "greener"; but they are removing the possibility that anyone else can.

Mr. Adatto pointed out that there would still be potted plants adjacent to the site, on the Inn at the Market property. He said there is a big tree, a pot with plants in it, flowers on the tables, and large planters that sit on the hotel's property that dot that lower area. The alley side greenery will go away but the interior greenery will not.

Ms. Zuege stated it is a working stretch of alley and asked if trucks are permitted.

Ms. McAuliffe said trucks are permitted for brief periods of time.

Ms. Herron said per Guideline 3.7.2, the railing has already been approved and is already there. It wouldn't be something new, just a bit of an extension.

Mr. Stellmacher said he thought the platform looked larger and that it seems to be an impediment. He asked if the applicants if they had considered putting tables on sloping ground; 3.7.2 would allow for a traditional sidewalk café which could be removed by the end of the day.

Mr. Aller stated there are any number of cafes in the Market with chains and stanchions; tables move in at night along with chains and stanchions.

Mr. Adatto stated there is a fixed metal railing there that is bolted in and was approved; adding 76' to a 200' structure is an enhancement. Because the pitch is unusual and doesn't meet code, they thought this was a good solution.

Ms. Link suggested a straw poll on the entire application; three Commissioners were in support.

Ms. McAuliffe informed the applicant they could consider revisions to the application or come before the Design Review Committee to get some feedback on an alternate idea.

Mr. Adatto stated they would like to come back but asked for a vote on the awning.

Ms. Patton made a motion to adopt a resolution to accept the awning portion of the application as submitted.

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

**070908.3                      APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF DESIGN APPROVAL**

070908.31                      PDA – Economy Arcade crowd control at Daily Dozen Doughnuts  
Cecelia Hall

Application: Install two black belt stanchions in front of Daily Dozen Doughnuts during peak hours and days to reduce congestion in the Arcade. (*Postponed from June 25, 2008 meeting*)

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application to install two black belt stanchions in front of Daily Dozen Doughnuts during peak hours and days to reduce congestion in the Arcade. Exhibits provided included a site plan, written information from the PDA, photos, and design details. The guideline that applied to this application was 3.8.

DRC Recommendation: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited Guideline 3.8.6 and recommended full discussion by the Commission.

Applicant Comment:

Matt Holland, PDA representative, stated that Daily Dozen Doughnuts is very busy on Saturdays and Sundays with a long line. They propose to help mitigate the conditions by setting up two stanchions that will come out 5 ½ feet from the existing Daily Dozen stand; the employees would direct the customers to form a double line. The intent is to cut the line in half allowing passage for people to walk behind the line as opposed to trying to weave through. There have been several security incidents and there is tension in the Arcade with surrounding tenants.

Cecilia Hall from the PDA said that stanchion is removable and will be out only as needed. It will be managed by the staff at Daily Dozen. They would like to

continue a free flow of pedestrians and have heard from other tenants that this is a problem; they are trying to find a happy medium for all tenants.

Public Comment:

Ms. Yaeger, a nearby business owner, suggested Daily Dozen switch places with another tenant.

James Haydu from the PDA stated the long lines started back in April which is not peak season. During the height of the season security is very busy anyway and it is counterproductive to have security manning a donut line. Splitting the line helped when it was tried; he supports use of stanchions to help control dividing the line.

Dale Wittner, a Market resident, suggested taking a number and that perhaps people could go shop while waiting for their number to be called.

Mr. Holland said he had thought of that but the speed of the transaction is so quick it would not be workable.

Paul Dunn, a Market resident, said he likes the idea and is pleased the PDA is paying attention to its tenants' lease line agreement. He said he thought the fish company a bigger problem than the donut shop.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Bystrom said it is removable and can be brought out when needed and put away when not. If it doesn't work they could try a number system.

Ms. Link thought that it may not solve the problem but it is worth a try.

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

MM/SC/AS/SP 11:0:0 Motion approved.

**070908.4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** June 25, 2008 deferred to next meeting.

**070908.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

**070908.6 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Ms. Patton provided information from the Guidelines Revision Committee meeting.

**070908.7 STAFF REPORT**

**070908.8 NEW BUSINESS**

Ms. Lane said in touring possible sites for elevators with the PDA, she walked across the Pike Hillclimb footbridge to the elevator which is a City elevator. She noted damage on the footbridge such as broken windows and a broken floor, and suggested the Commission write a letter to SDOT to ask that it be brought up to serviceable and appropriate standards for the City.

Ms. Lane made a motion that the Commission go on record in letter to SDOT requesting that appropriate repairs be made on the footbridge including repair of broken glass, repair of wall and floor so the bridge is maintained for safety and for visibility.

MM/SC/SZ/SP 11:0:0 Motion approved.

Ms. McAuliffe will draft the letter and Ms. Link will review and sign it.

070908.81 Seattle Parks Department Briefing  
Susanne Friedman, Seattle Parks Department

Briefing on results of public meetings about potential physical improvements to Victor Steinbrueck Park.

**Postponed.**

070908.82 PDA Briefing  
Joe Paar, Rhoda Lawrence

Briefing on proposed capital renovations: changes to Pike Hillclimb.

Carol Binder, PDA, presented updates for design concepts for the Hillclimb and also provided an update on the Levy. Victor Steinbrueck Park was removed from the levy legislation; the Levy Proposal is \$73 million. It is scheduled for a full vote on July 14. \$68.6 million will be allocated to Market improvements and \$4.4 million is for financing costs. The Market has committed to complete the core projects within the budget and will take the cost overrun risk. The City will provide cash to the PDA as needed at the interest rates they have estimated. The work is described in a general way in the legislation since there are no details yet.

Ms. Binder explained they were responding to the Commission's requests for design alternatives to previously presented elevator locations and for more information about the process they went through to come up with the current design, a proposed elevator from Western Avenue through Flower Row. She provided the following background and goals:

- Attempt to accommodate increasing numbers of people visiting the Market by improving access and circulation, and providing alternative routes. Putting in an elevator increases the vertical capacity and brings people to different ends; the stairs were designed attempting to drive circulation to all

levels. The elevator will stop on all levels; the stairs will direct toward the building. The existing is service and passenger elevator and is overused, has limited capacity and breaks down regularly.

- Improved accessibility. Ms. Binder said they understand ADA compliance is not attainable in many areas of the Market; “accessibility” does not refer to ADA compliance but they will improve access to as many areas as possible. Improved access for wheelchairs, people carrying groceries, those who are tired and those who can’t climb multiple flights of stairs.
- Retain as much existing tenant space as possible. They will relocate elements in unoccupied areas as much as possible.
- They have not have not done a large construction project since the last Market renovation; the impacts to the existing historic structures and their uses is an overriding consideration.

Any change has some impact on structure, tenants; they want to find the right balance to address the objectives. In this current design they think they have made a good balance. Ms. Binder introduced Joe Paar, PDA, who would provide specific information on the different locations considered. She said there were seven possibilities and some were rejected early on because they either didn’t address any of the major principles or goals or just very few of them.

Joe Paar provided a matrix of the locations considered that showed the pros and cons:

<b>Location</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<b>A. Fairley Elevator</b>	Passenger and service No impacts to tenants Doesn’t alter exterior	Adds only 5 people per trip Does not engage Hillclimb Does not serve Level 5 Alters Loading Dock Not highly visible Next to garbage chute
<b>B. Leland Building</b>	Minimal change to elevator Creates a direct, accessible path to all levels Doubles capacity to 14 Down about 2 ½ stories	Impacts 7 tenant spaces Invasive construction Alters apartment security Significantly more expensive
<b>C. Flower Row – open south</b>	Impacts one tenant Highly visible Engages with Hillclimb	Impacts one stall Requires transfer for ADA Impacts Flower Row view Alters building exterior
<b>D. Flower Row – open north <i>PDA Preferred</i></b>	Impacts no tenants Highly visible Engages with Hillclimb	Requires transfer for ADA Impacts Flower Row view Alters building exterior
<b>E. Freestanding Hillclimb Elevator</b>	Impacts no tenants Highly visible Connects to Hillclimb	Violates agreed open Hillclimb design concept Requires new terraces

<i>Not Feasible per PDA</i>	Creates direct, accessible path to all levels	Impacts Hillclimb views Conflicts with playground Conflicts with new vault
<b>F.</b> <i>Not Feasible per PDA</i>		
<b>G. LaSalle Building</b>	Does not alter building exterior	Prohibited by use covenant Displaces residents Impacts retail tenant space Does not connect to retail

Mr. Paar said that Option A would include expanding the size of the cab of the Fairley Building elevator within the existing shaft. Option B would require enlarging the shaft of the existing Leland Building elevator and extending it down two floors to access Western Avenue.

Mr. Paar said that A, B, and D were the viable options. The capacity for Option D is 17 people in addition to the existing elevator. He introduced Rhoda Lawrence from BOLA Architects.

Ms. Lawrence reviewed the Market Design Guidelines that she believed would apply to this project:

- 2.3 Pedestrian Qualities: Ms. Lawrence cited this guideline where it says, “The Commission shall seek to maintain and enhance pedestrian qualities in the Market....incorporating public amenities such as restrooms, walkways, viewpoints, eating areas.” She explained that any of the design proposals that have been shown do this: they enhance pedestrian qualities and create viewpoints, add walkways and open areas for new activities. She said there is no accessible route into the Market from the Hillclimb; an elevator would help.
- 3.1 Market Design: Ms. Lawrence commented that the spaces are unique in form and have adapted over the years as changes to the Market have occurred and as proposals have come before the Commission allowing the Market to change with the time especially to serve low income customers and to adapt to special needs of the public. She cited Guideline 3.1 where it says, “Many of the elements that established the quality and character of the District must adapt harmoniously to changes in Market activities.” She stated that many of the Market elevators are utilitarian; some on the parking lot site (Market parking garage) are not utilitarian but just don’t serve all the services they think are important to the Market. More vertical transportation is needed especially for elderly, disabled, and visitors with strollers and shopping, and for those who don’t do stairs.
- 3.1.2: Ms. Lawrence cited this guideline where it says, “Any additions or changes to the buildings must maintain the character of the Market.” She noted that, as they move forward with design, this is one of the guiding principles that are important for any design that is selected.

- 3.8 Public Ways and Amenities: Ms. Lawrence pointed out that this guideline reinforces the need for pedestrian movement and accessibility. She said there is a need to get from top to bottom and bottom to top; it is important to provide that transportation for everybody.
- 3.8.6: She cited this guideline where it says, “Because the Market’s tradition is to emphasize face to face transactions, new construction, additions, remodels, and other changes shall enhance pedestrian movement and accessibility. She said this proposal provides that connection from Western and provides a visible elevator; it is a valid attempt to remove barriers where feasible and is architecturally appropriate.
- 3.8.8: She cited this guideline where it says, “Pedestrian connections to the Market are integral to the relationship of the Market to the City.” She said this will add to the urban utilization of the City.
- 4. New Development: She cited this guideline where it says, “Utmost emphasis shall be placed on design solutions that preserve and enhance the visual and physical pedestrian connection to the Market, Historical District and the Central Waterfront.”
- Guideline 1.4: She said this guideline states that, “The Guidelines should stimulate harmonious and orderly development, while allowing gradual adjustment to varying and changing Market activities. She pointed out that the Market has changed over time.
- General principles of uses: the significance of the culture of the region for drawing together a broad spectrum of people. This is an opportunity to allow much more connection between Western Avenue and all the other elements down under as well as the Arcade.
- 3.2 Major structures and Architectural elements; 3.2.1: She cited the section of this guideline where it says, “Market buildings, structures and other architectural elements, individually and collectively, are a physical expression of the activities and function of the Market.” She said the stair especially will add new openness to the breezeway to the Leland Building, open up the public elements on each level, and will allow people to move more freely through that space.

Ms. Lawrence said the Market Guidelines were based strongly on the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Public Comment:

Dale Wittner asked if the PDA had considered a two cab elevator and spiral staircase with stations at two or three levels and a two or three level sky bridge from the opposite side of Western into the market. He said there would be room to operate and it would eliminate a dangerous pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Paar said the area across Western belongs to the City and not to the PDA; he said the City has made it very clear they are not for sky bridges.

Ms. Binder said they had been banned but have been built since then.

Mr. Paar said the City's view isn't positive toward sky bridges.

Mr. Wittner asked if it was a concept that had even been thought about.

Mr. Paar said no.

Mr. Wittner said it would save money and provide a good Western access and the City might work with the PDA on it.

Mr. Paar said he thought the cost would be more.

Ms. Binder said they were looking at changes and improvements to their (the PDA) property.

Mr. Wittner said it seemed they were having a hard time finding a place to do it and there is a lot of room there. There is one good top to bottom elevator in the garage at the north end; there are two that come from the garage to the Market.

Mr. Paar said it just services the Arcade.

Ms. Binder stated that one of their principles was to engage another area and to serve all levels of the Market and improve circulation.

Ben Kirchner, a Flower Row merchant, said that a couple options had been missed, one being the elevator across the street with the sky bridge. He said it is City property, but when the Market was remodeled in the 1970s, that was a solution that the Historic Commission and the PDA came up with. Originally there was a wood stairway all the way to the waterfront. The Leland elevator was part of that solution and they opted for concrete in the stairways but they saved the wooden flats. The Market has had elevator issues and made poor elevator decisions and the public and vandalism prevent them from solving them. The other option is no elevator at all anywhere for the same character issues; it has worked 100 years with what it's got and doing nothing should always be an option when making plans. He cited Guidelines 2.7.2d, 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.8.7 in particular against the proposal to install an elevator through Flower Row. He added that changing the stairway is a major change to an historical building. He cited 3.9 as relevant. He said that as much as his business in Flower Row can benefit, he looked at it from the standpoint of historic preservation and that this should be considered carefully. He said people will ride every elevator straight to the top. Everybody makes it to the Fish Market, he said. He wondered how many people can fit and how many people do we actually want in the Market. Everyone who comes here makes it there, he said.

Ms. McAuliffe said she received a letter via PDA staff from Golden Age Collectibles. She read aloud the letter from the owners, Ron and Colleen Dyke. In the letter they said they support the Hillclimb elevator and are strongly opposed to the backup plan being presented today because: 1) it will be more expensive and

will be hard enough to get votes for full funding of all renovation as it is; and 2) major business disruption from ripping up multiple floors of business and it would decrease the retail space needed to stay viable financial; and 3) the back up plan doesn't make sense and the original plan takes away very little existing business space and they appreciated the views that would be gained from the glass walled elevator. They asked to be notified of any and all possible changes in the future.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Shinbo asked what the letter writer meant by "back up plan"?

Mr. Paar said it references the Leland elevator.

Ms. Link said that since the Commission had not discussed a back-up plan, there was obviously some gossip or scuttlebutt.

Ms. Bystrom asked where one with a disability gets off when taking elevator D.

Mr. Paar explained he would show on the board and that he took people there on the walk.

Mr. Aller said he went on that walk and didn't go there; he said he knows where it is because he is disabled.

Mr. Paar said one gets off at level 4 and showed where one would travel to the Fairley Building and get on Elevator A to go to the top.

Mr. Aller asked if Elevator A would be unchanged.

Mr. Paar concurred.

Mr. Aller asked what would be done if they went with the alteration to Option A.

Mr. Paar said the shaft would remain the same, but that the cab would be enlarged.

Mr. Aller asked if Option B would require making the shaft bigger.

Mr. Paar confirmed that it would.

Ms. Zuege asked if any of the "pro" plans were more sustainable/green than others, in terms of the work that will be done.

Ms. Binder said that is being considered in all construction; the elevator alternatives don't reflect that. They are looking at energy use issues and sustainability in ventilation and electrical.

Ms. Lawrence said it is more likely that they would get a greener solution by purchasing a new elevator than by renovating an old elevator.

Mr. Howard said one elevator in the parking garage was not shown anywhere in the map. He cited Guideline 2.1 where it says “Uses that serve the needs of the immediate community and regional shoppers have priority over those that are tourist oriented”. He expressed a concern that the elevator in the Hillclimb area is responding to tourist pressures. He cited Guideline 3.9.2 which says, “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. He cited Guideline 3.9.5 which says, “Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic property shall be preserved”; he explained that this pertains to the ceiling area, lighting, all the columns and capitals in Flower Row. He cited Guideline 3.9.9, which says, “New additions, exterior alterations and related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.” He cited Guideline 3.9.10, which says, “New additions and adjacent new construction shall be undertaken in a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired”. Regarding Option D, he wondered if under the cons a line shouldn’t be added that includes impacts to interior elements of Flower Row just because that is such an iconic space.

Ms. Lawrence concurred that it was a valid point and that it was important to balance those elements in relation to things like Guideline 4, which talks about new development. Connecting the Market to the Waterfront speaks much more to the visiting tourist activity than other parts of the guidelines do.

Mr. Stellmacher said he opposed Options C and D and said it is difficult to support an elevator through Flower Row because of the Pike Place Market guidelines that have been cited. Especially as it destroys a historic element, Flower Row, as well as blocks public views in its placement. It is especially difficult to view any approval in this area as the solution does not provide a solution which, in a single elevator, offers complete ADA access to top/bottom and the intermediate levels of the DownUnder. He suggested that the Commission consider what is best for the Market in the long term and the success of these improvements over time. He asked if there was a way to emphasize the restoration and retention of Flower Row as a highly visible and historic part of the Market and the retention of the open space in the Pike R.O.W. and the Flower Row view retained. The Hillclimb stair improvement would be a nice addition to enhance the natural movement of people and encourage people to move into the middle levels of the arcade and experience those levels of the Market. He suggested that a strategy that might be “invasive” for some of the tenant spaces on multiple floors, “for the greater good” could actually create a highly visible and effective vertical transportation solution with no impact to the Flower Row. All the potential work that will be done for mechanical services that are going to go in as part of the massive Market renovation are going to go in, will impact the

architecture and will impact the tenant spaces. Why is this potential massive impact not a part of the thought process?

The best end result is a circulation system that would work well to provide the best possible disabled access, to retain Flower Row, and retain the open space and view. A half solution in trying to put it somewhere where it is not quite right seems as a waste and short term non-solution. He hopes there would be a solution that might be a little more difficult for some people initially that might provide the best long term service strategy for operations and the historic, view and open space of the Pike Place Market.

Mr. Rolluda said that though the design team has gone to great lengths in studying this and after going through the tour earlier today, he has been looking at the different options, Option A specifically now. On level 5 where there is a really narrow point and not being able to get a large crowd through that in a good manner especially with the dumpster there; it doesn't lend itself to good vertical circulation. He didn't think Option B was a viable location because of how it impacts other tenants on multiple floors, reducing their spaces – one so much so that it becomes unviable. After seeing the elevator in location D, he thought it would open up areas at different levels for different types of activities on the east side of that elevator also increasing another two possible tenants on Flower Row just east of that elevator. He commented that 3.9.9 says that “New work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale and architectural features” and said the design could be handled in a way that does not compromise the structural elements. He said the elevator could be done in a way that the architectural elements of the original architecture are expressed but then the elevator technology is exposed. He spoke to the need for vertical circulation, making the Market tie with the Pier and getting pedestrians there. Today (on the tour) there were a lot of people coming up that were taking Elevator A; it was almost embarrassing to see them go by the dumpster and the bad smells. After looking at that and seeing the need for an elevator at the north and south portions of the Market he is more convinced now that Elevator D can work if they work with the Design Review Committee in making it so that it doesn't conflict with the guidelines.

Ms. Patton echoed Mr. Howard and Mr. Stellmacher and stated the Market (Historical Commission) Guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines have pretty strong protection for the exterior of the building, for views in and out of the building, and for how additions are supposed to be handled. They seem to be the subjects of this Commission's responsibility. She said she has a great deal of sympathy with the fact that some of the other options that have fewer impacts to the exterior, certainly Elevator B, are going to have some really negative consequences. It may be more expensive and have an impact on tenant spaces but those are not the subject of this Historic Commission's responsibility. She said that leads her to think that adding a glass elevator, which she thinks will be a huge change to the exterior of the building plus puncturing Flower Row, seems to be really difficult for the Commission to approve given those guidelines. She acknowledged the one she thought was strongest on pedestrian access is 3.8.8 but added this is not the only

place with pedestrian access. She is sympathetic with the problems that Option B would cause but they're not the ones the Commission is responsible for.

Ms. Zuege said understanding the importance of the Commission and looking at the Market for local people; tourists are a big part of the Market. She cited Guideline 2.1.4, which speaks to the diversity of small owner operated specialty businesses. She said in order for the small owner operated specialty businesses to stay in business, tourists are needed, so there must be some way to have a flow and some way to make the Market look appealing and safe when people are going onto an elevator. She said small businesses do not want the tourists to go away. It is a question of balancing it all and also taking that need for the small businesses to have tourists also shop in the Market; they're here, people love the Market and it is known worldwide.

Ms. Lane spoke in favor of Option B even though it creates some dislocation for some specific businesses. She said the entire project is going to be dislocating for the entire Market and probably the larger community. She suggested looking at it from a longer term perspective and said that we need to be planning for a duration of time that will hopefully exceed our lifetimes; it is a larger issue. She said this is not just about us; it is about our children, grandchildren and successive generations. She asked what kinds of decisions need to be made and what is the scope of those decisions and for that reason she favors Option B. Though it will have impact on tenant spaces, ultimately it creates a minimal change to the historic elements of the buildings. It does create a direct, accessible path to all levels and provides good circulation and flow and access for everyone.

Ms. Shinbo appreciated the thoughtful analysis about the pros and cons and said to think about the Market as a whole. She favored Option D because the impacts of Option B would displace too many tenants.

Mr. Aller stated that 3,000 – 4,000 tourists visit the Market every Saturday and Sunday; he didn't think a substantial percentage of tourists would be lost if the elevator is a little less convenient or if we have only one less bathroom. He said any decisions the Commission makes should be based more, even according to the Guidelines, on the local people. To spend millions of dollars on a proposal that guts a historic part of the Market but fails to provide a local person access to each level but makes one get off the elevator to get to the top or off the elevator to get to the bottom. Either way it would have to be transfer from the local to the express and vice versa; were that the only option one would do that. To create a new situation that fails to address the inadequacy of the local and ipso facto destroys a part of the Market is unconscionable. He said he prefers Option B and thinks it is the only real option because it goes to every level of the Market; one can get on and get off – people with wheelchairs, with strollers, with bags, disabled, walking, running, tourists, locals – everybody can use that elevator. He acknowledged it would disturb people; when the Market was last renovated a lot of people had to go and come back but upon return came back to a better Market. He believes a space can be found for

displaced merchants. He said he can't see destroying a part of the Market and failing at the same time to maintain the Guidelines; it doesn't make sense.

Ms. Bystrom asked if Elevator B stopped at all floors.

A PDA representative stated it doesn't stop at Western or on 2.

Ms. Link added "currently".

The PDA representative concurred and said that it would have to be excavated. It also doesn't stop at 6.

Ms. Bystrom stated there are places it doesn't stop but at one time it did.

Mr. Paar said it never went to Western.

Ms. Bystrom asked if it ever stopped where the Rotary Grocery is and added there is a strange elevator that doesn't stop except where?

Ms. Binder said it was built for residents; it goes to 7 and 8 to the apartments. It wasn't built for accessing the commercial levels.

Mr. Aller said yet it does; it goes to 7 and 8, and goes to 3 and 4.

Ms. Binder said one gets on at 4 and it is turned off at 3.

Mr. Paar said one gets on at 3 and 4 and then it stops at 7 and 8.

Dale Wittner reported as a resident of the building, on floor 5 the door opens and there is a blank cement wall. It does go to 7 and 8.

Mr. Aller said a pit would have to be dug because it doesn't go to Western.

Mr. Howard responded to the earlier public comment about the City elevator and the sky bridge; he said a precedent has been set in the sky bridge elevator that services the parking structure that also services the Pike Place Market. The City owned elevator provides the majority of functions we are looking for in terms of providing access; it doesn't go all the way to the top floor for ADA access but it does provide existing elevator access across and it provides a location with potential expansion and also doesn't incur the same impacts to historic fabric that the expansion of elevators within the district would. He understands the PDA's issue with not owning it, not having an easement on it and not being able to provide security for it. He asked if there was something the Commission can do in terms of facilitating dialog with the City in order to see if the City is amenable to extending the offer of an easement for the PDA for the same way it is set up with the sky bridge to the north. He said the (City's) sky bridge seems at least to provide access, if not addressing all the issues.

Mr. Paar said the elevator to one floor doesn't do any good and doesn't even go to the top and that they already addressed that; he said he had nothing further to say.

Mr. Howard pointed out that the existing sky bridge allows someone to transfer to the elevator in the Fairley Building.

Mr. Paar said it doesn't make any sense.

Ms. Binder said it doesn't solve the principles and the things they (the PDA) want to solve.

Mr. Howard asked if the principal issue was to solve ADA access or mass public movement.

Mr. Paar said it is more the latter than the first; they want to make sure to try to address the first whenever they can.

Ms. Binder stated increased vertical transportation reaching every floor and improved circulation are the major objectives that it doesn't touch.

Ms. Link agreed with Mr. Howard and Mr. Stellmacher and cited 3.9.9 where it says, "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property." She thought that to be a very important criterion and that of all the options, Options D and C met it the least.

Ms. Link cited 3.2.7 where it says, "Additions to historic buildings and structures shall be prohibited unless the Commission determines that extenuating circumstances justify otherwise." She said that she didn't feel that there was anything extenuating about the proposal preferred by the PDA. She felt that the PDA preferred design constituted too much of an invasion and that it would destroy Flower Row.

Ms. Link added that she understood the difficulty of trying to find a solution, but that Option B or other locations in the Leland or the Fairley Buildings were more likely to provide the solution. She expressed concern about the steepness of the Flower Row ramp and mentioned that during the tour of the D option, when they tried to find out what path someone in a wheelchair would have to take, that it was a long circuitous route.

Mr. Paar said that wasn't actually the route. The route was actually on 4.

Ms. Link said definitely there was a lot of circuitous stuff going on and if it solved the ADA problem easily that would be great but it doesn't.

Mr. Paar explained that he took those on the first tour the wrong way by mistake.

Ms. Link pointed out that the PDA's diagram shows that it is a long route for disabled patrons, who have to transfer to the Fairley elevator. She added that there are certainly solutions to this problem and that there are two other options where the route could be somewhat more direct. She reiterated her concern about the steepness of the Flower Row ramp and said it was not a great idea to lead people up to the Flower Row level and leave them there. She said that despite the fact that she was given a tour, she does not support Option D.

Ms. Herron acknowledged that it was an important decision to make, because they are carrying the Market into the future. She said that Option D did not solve all the problems, but that if it did, she could probably find a way to make it acceptable to herself. She added that she could not support it, because it left certain people without access to all floors and because it still forced handicapped people to take a circuitous route around the Market.

Mr. Paar said it was real interesting because when they were there multiple times there were many people, Howard (Mr. Aller) and many people in wheelchairs that are using that and go up and down Flower Row. There are also people with strollers so they use the term ADA; ADA applies to a small sliver and so he thought they were mixing issues and really people can get off on that top level and 99.9% of the people can go right up; there's no problem.

Mr. Aller stated he was in a power chair and his father walks with a cane; he said he can take it but his father can't.

Ms Link stated that relying on signage to indicate to someone, who is in a wheelchair or unsure on their feet, that they should not try to travel up the steep ramp in Flower Row, is a very bad idea. She added that some people would be able to deal with the ramp, others not, but that it was a poor system.

Mr. Aller said he would like to see the sign in the elevator "Disabled Persons must depart at floor 4 and not go to floor 5".

Mr. Stellmacher made a motion to adjourn.

MM/SC/AS/SL

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Issued August 15, 2008

Heather McAuliffe  
Commission Coordinator