



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 125/08

Wednesday, August 27, 2008

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 85 Pike Street, Room 500

## COMMISSIONERS

Howard Aller, Vice Chair

Valerie Bystrom

Joanne Herron

Spencer Howard

Karin Link, Chair

Sara Patton

Susan Zuege

## STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Melinda Bloom

## Absent:

Marilyn Bierman

Susan Lane

Alex Rolluda

Sharron Shinbo

Allyn Stellmacher

Chair Karin Link called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m.

## **082708.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE APPROVAL**

082708.11 Taj Mahal  
1501 Pike Place #513, Leland Building  
Varendra K. Dhingra, Rani Dhingra

Application: Change of ownership. Proposed ownership structure: sole proprietorship. The owners will be Varendra Dhingra and Rani Dhingra. Neither has a financial affiliation with another business. Varendra Dhingra will be onsite most days; Rani Dhingra will come in when needed.

Staff Report, Use: Ms. McAuliffe reviewed the relevant background and said the space is located in Zone 1, below street level, Food a-e and Retail a-b uses permitted. The space is 190 square feet. The existing use approvals, MHC 140/86

and MHC 356/90, describe an Indian import shop that sells brassware, housewares, Indian food, jewelry, and clothing. The shop's inventory has changed over time is not currently in compliance with the use approvals. The applicant proposes now to clarify the use to reflect the current inventory. Indian dry goods/food are not currently being sold and it is proposed that they be deleted from the use. The proposed clarification of use is as follows: "Indian import store selling traditional Indian items such as jewelry, clothing, tapestries, scarves, shawls, bags, purses, religious and other cultural statues, incense, incense burners, henna, oils and oil burners. All items must be made in India and reflect the traditional Indian culture." Former use was Food c & d, Retail d; new use would be Retail d. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, written description of ownership interest and role in the business operation, MHC 140/86 and MHC 356/90. The relevant guidelines included: 2.10, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 2.10.1, 2.10.2, 2.10.3, 2.10.4, 2.5.4 d, 2.7.2 b & c and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Applicant explained they were working hard to increase sales.

Landlord Comment:

Brittney Farrow from the PDA spoke in support of the application, stating that it will be helpful to have the language in the use permit clarified.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Herron stated she was in favor.

Ms. Bystrom asked when the applicant stopped carrying food.

Applicant stated it had been about two to three months since they had carried food.

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

MM/SC/HA/SP                      7:0:0   Motion approved.

**082708.2      APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE/DESIGN APPROVAL**

Bead Zone  
1501 Pike Place #413, Fairley Building

Ram Menon

Use: Change of location to 1501 Pike Place #326. No change in use or ownership.  
Design: Paint interior; install slatwall; install furnishings and displays; install track lighting; install business signage.

Application: Change of location to 1501 Pike Place #326. No change in use or ownership.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the request for a change of location and provided the relevant background. The Bead Zone is currently located in the DownUnder and is relocating to another space in the DownUnder. Proposed location is in Zone 1, below street level, Food a-e and Retail a-b uses permitted. Existing use approval for the Bead Zone, in summary, is for a retail business specializing in the sale of loose beads and other items related to jewelry making, and also “old silver” and finished jewelry (see details per Use Approval MHC 216/02). No change in use is proposed. Space is currently vacant and was last occupied by Pike’s Asian Art, an Asian antique store (a Retail d use). New use would be Retail c, e and Other Uses c (all existing approved uses for this business). Space is 595 square feet. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan and use approval MHC 216/02. The relevant guidelines included 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited Guidelines 2.1.4, 2.4 Zone 1, below street level, 2.5 Retail c, e and Other Uses c: all non-permitted uses. She clarified that all the existing non-permitted uses for the business were previously approved. The application was in conformance with 2.6 and 2.7.2 b, c & d. The Committee recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Ram Menon explained they had been in the existing space for six years; the new space is more regular in shape.

Landlord Comment:

Matt Holland, PDA, stated there is a lot of unusable square footage in the applicant’s current location.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioners determined they had enough information to make a decision.

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

MM/SC/VB/SH

7:0:0 Motion approved.

**DESIGN:** Application: Paint interior; install slatwall; install furnishings and displays; install track lighting; install business signage.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for design and said that all furnishings and track lighting are being relocated from former location. All off-premise signs are being installed in locations that were approved by the Commission for the previous tenant, Pike's Asian Art. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, photos, floor plan, sign details, color sample. The relevant guidelines included 3.1, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6.

Relevant Guidelines:

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited Guidelines 3.1, 3.4.1 a, 3.4.2 a, 3.4.3 a, b & c, 3.5.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.6 a (1) and (2) and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Ram Menon explained they will use "bone white" paint which will contrast with the beads. They will reuse existing fixtures. All consoles have lights inside; the existing lighting in the space consists of drop lights. Track lighting will be added in back. Mr. Menon provided photos of signs.

Landlord Comment:

Matt Holland, PDA, expressed approval of the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Menon stated the ceiling would be white, the flooring would remain the same and the exterior would remain the same.

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

MM/SC/JH/SP

7:0:0 Motion approved.

**082708.3 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF DESIGN APPROVAL**

082708.31 Café Campagne  
1600 Post Alley, Inn at the Market

Tran Nguyen, Adatto Construction

Postponed by applicant.

082708.32 PDA – new neon sign in DownUnder  
James Haydu

Withdrawn by applicant.

082708.33 Market Security Office  
1500 Western Avenue, Leland Building  
John Macklin, Cecilia Hall

Install sign above entry door.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application to install a sign. Exhibits reviewed included photos and a sign rendering. The relevant guideline was 3.6.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited Guidelines 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 and recommended approval. DRC commented that the sign might normally be too considered too large in relation to its location but agreed that the larger size is needed for officers and medical personnel to be able to find the office.

Applicant Comment:

The applicant and the landlord both stated the application was straightforward.

Public Comment:

Paul Dunn said the sign is already up and recommended adding 24-hour security phone number.

Ms. McAuliffe recommended putting the number on paper in the window; if it is put on the sign, they would have to come back to the Commission.

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

MM/SC/JH/VB 7:0:0 Motion approved.

**082708.4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Commissioners reviewed the minutes of August 13, 2008. Sara Patton asked for a change to the minutes. Mr. Aller made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/HA/SH 7:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

**082708.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

City Council has voted to change some rules on sidewalk cafes which shouldn't change anything within the Market Historical District. DPD is giving it over to SDOT; Ms. Link heard an unsubstantiated report that problems with a sidewalk café design could not be sent to the Hearing Examiner. The City does accept comments from neighbors; it is online if anyone wants to review and it is still open for public comment.

**082708.6 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

Guideline Revisions Committee:

Ms. Patton stated the Guideline Revisions Committee (GRC) met and have divided tasks into two sets of amendments. At the last meeting she discussed the amendments related to Victor Steinbrueck Park. Mr. Aller has been leading the questions on the other set of amendments. The GRC wants the Commission to come to consensus on the proposed guidelines. The Commission got close to consensus on the proposed changes to the Steinbrueck Park guidelines except 1) the level of restriction on amplification and, 2) what kind of restrictions in use there should be in the park. The GRC is proposing to eliminate some guidelines that don't make sense, such as the loading standards. They want to add one about the view restriction or they could operate through zoning.

Commissioners indicated that they would like to hear from Richard Haag, the architect for the park. Ms. McAuliffe said that she would invite him to the September 10 meeting. Ms. Patton said the GRC would wait to further consider amendments to the Steinbrueck Park guidelines until after the presentation by Mr. Haag.

The second set of amendments was sent out to the URC and DRC; the GRC received individual robust comments; they want to bring that back to the full Commission to see if we can come to consensus in a larger conversation. They thought it might fit into the September 10 agenda although that might be unlikely given the number of applications and the presentation by Richard Haag.

Ms. Link thought the Victor Steinbrueck Park amendments are the reason we are revising and the other items were just minor add-ons to the process.

Ms. McAuliffe explained that if the Commission desired she could send out the documentation that shows the options that were based on Committee feedback and ask for comments or the Commission can have a discussion.

Ms. Patton stated the GRC wants to have a discussion.

Ms. McAuliffe recommended doing this at the October 8, 2008 meeting.

Ms. Patton explained that Ms. McAuliffe agreed to write up the Victor Steinbrueck Park suggested change to make it 2.12 as a whole new guideline with options in amplification and say nothing about use or zoning until after the presentation by Mr. Haag. Once they have Commission consensus they can send revisions to Law Department for review.

Design Review Committee:

Mr. Howard summarized the PDA's briefing at the August 10 DRC meeting about window replacement on the west façades of the Fairley and Leland buildings. He explained that the PDA is looking at how to comprehensively deal with all the windows; they were coming at it from the standpoint that existing conditions were meriting replacement of the windows. They had two drawings; one showed all the façades with all the existing window configurations and then a second drawing that showed all the façades with the proposed window configurations. The replacement windows would have replacement windows of aluminum clad wood windows and the lower stories along Western Avenue would be repaired wood sash windows. There were a few areas of specific design changes within banks of windows on all the façades based on interior functional needs such as the daycare and restaurants. Awnings were shown on the drawing; they would be installed either on a select basis or as needed and would be made of cloth and designed to either roll out or fold out. They based that on historic photographs they had that set a precedent for awning use.

The DRC raised concerns and asked questions. The DRC wanted to see a condition survey for the existing windows that substantiates that new windows are warranted. There was general support for the use of awnings but more detail was needed - how they would be designed and attached. The DRC encouraged the PDA to treat the façades as a collective body rather than doing anything piecemeal with individual sections. The DRC asked for a rendering of the windows showing what their original or historic configurations were to set a baseline for how the Commission makes decisions going forward.

Ms. Link said they asked for a drawing that would show what the façade looked like circa 1912.

Ms. McAuliffe has gotten copies of the 1916 drawings and copies of changes that were made to the addition where Lowell's is; it was added in 1921 when it was Manning's Coffee House. She found that is why the Arcade is so squeezed because they made a number of changes at the time. There were a couple different sets of windows, in 1921 and 1946 up on top. The top floor is not proposed to be changed out although the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors of Lowell's are proposed to be changed out.

Ms. Link said both she and Mr. Stellmacher were concerned that the rhythm of the windows that had been there previously was being lost in the new design. She added that there would be the repetition of the same window at the top two levels, which is not what it is like now. There is a little too much of an attempt to regularize everything and she did not think this was a great idea.

Ms. McAuliffe said one thing the Commission should know about the capital renovation that occurred in the 1970s versus what is happening now is that the Commission adopted a lot of comprehensive preservation guidelines since the 1970s renovation; in particular, in the year 2000 a lot of preservation guidelines went into the Commission's guidelines. The standard is different now and there are a lot more cues and instruction on how to review changes to the buildings. The Commission should also be reviewing preservation briefs from the National Park Service that apply.

Ms. Patton said when there was an overall presentation it sounded as though they were proposing to go to something more like the original which was a number of different designs for the windows as opposed to what happened in the 1970s which was they all became much more similar.

Ms. Link said the first four floors are OK but when you get to the top it is starting to be all the same; it seems to be inspired by the Leland windows that were approved around 2000 and for which, we now know there is no historical basis.

Ms. McAuliffe thought that is what prompted Mr. Howard's comment about wanting to see where they are coming from in the beginning. She is trying to provide some support on that so they don't have to send people to research that.

Ms. Link said they didn't go over profiles, muntins, mullions because they aren't there yet.

Ms. Bystrom asked about the Commission's previous position on the aluminum clad.

Ms. McAuliffe said the Commission was split and there was question about more information needed as to how long they last and what is required in servicing them because they are not service-free.

Ms. Link said the assumption is that they are service-free. She saw some PDA renovation committee minutes; apparently the warrantee for the metal clad is 20 years and the warrantee for comparable wood windows is for 15 years. The idea is that the metal clad don't need to be serviced as much and the wood would have to be painted.

Ms. McAuliffe explained that the application has not come in yet; the PDA is just doing briefings at this time.

Mr. Howard reiterated that a condition assessment report is necessary to answer the fundamental first question of "do they need to replace the windows or can they repair them?" The question for the Commission is in terms of how we view the life cycle of materials that we have in the Market and how we are approaching this; if we are approaching this in terms of life cycle values in terms of switch out or in

repairing it and how that factors in. Hopefully they will provide that information and that will be the basis to provide a better discussion for the Commission and where the threshold of repair versus replace is.

Ms. McAuliffe said the condition survey is mandatory.

Mr. Howard said there wasn't a lot of information on the elevator; one rendering was shown within the Leland Building down on Western Avenue level they show pulling back on the storefronts on the corner where the Security office is not.

Ms. Link said one bay was opened up on each side on Western going in so that it would open to allow an entrance into the Leland Building.

**082708.7 STAFF REPORT**

**082708.8 NEW BUSINESS**

Dale Wittner said after the last PDA renovation meeting he invited the panel to have a tour of the Leland Building. He is willing to provide a tour of the Leland elevator and where it is going to go to anyone who is interested. Three members of the PDA council came.

Ms. McAuliffe said the Commission would have to schedule the tour in small groups; it would have to be a transparent process.

Mr. Wittner said he isn't trying to influence anyone. He is opposed to that use because that is his residential elevator. He is opposed to the elevator in Flower Row also. He spent a day counting people coming up from Western and in an hour 1,034 people came up the HillClimb going up into the Market. The PDA have said the elevator is for disabled but there are no disabled or practically no disabled on Western Avenue at that point to come up because there is no way for them to get there. There are perfectly good elevators at the north end in the parking structure and that should be the main vertical transportation. The Leland elevator, from the PDA, is a frightfully expensive operation; it means digging out the floors down in the former parrot shop, an enormous amount of structural work. They are spending \$40,000 more on a structural study to see if it can even be done. If you look at the landings where the elevator will get out in the Rotary Grocery and the Miniature Car Shop, it is a lousy place to have people come. The Car Shop is where the elevator opens to a wall; he is sure there used to be a landing there because there is a door there and not just a shaft. The elevator is tiny now and they proposed putting in a larger car.

Mr. Aller said they were told the shaft was larger than the car; the car was undersized for the shaft.

Mr. Wittner said they plan to enlarge the shaft from what it is now.

Mr. Aller clarified that they are making it even larger.

Mr. Wittner said yes.

Mr. Aller said the figures they quoted the Commission was \$750,000 for the Flower Row elevator and \$1.5 million – twice as much – for the Leland elevator.

7:00 P.M. Mr. Aller made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Howard seconded the motion.

Heather McAuliffe  
Commission Coordinator