



The City of Seattle

## International Special Review District

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

ISRD 19/10

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, January 26, 2010

Time: 4:30pm  
Place: Bush Asia Center  
409 Maynard Avenue S.  
Basement meeting room

#### **Board Members Present**

Brien Chow  
Misun Chung Gerrick  
Robert Ha  
Bill Lee  
Rich Murakami, Vice Chair  
Josh Osborne-Klein, Chair  
Marvin Rosete

#### **Staff**

Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### **Absent**

Chair Osborne-Klein called the meeting to order at 4:38 p.m.

#### **012610.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*January 12, 2010*

MM/SC/BC/RH Motion to amend minutes carried.

MM/SC/RH/MCG 6:0:1 Minutes approve as amended. Mr. Lee abstained.

#### **012610.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### **012610.21 Unicone Crepes**

421 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

*Applicant:* Jino Yoon, business owner

**Signage:** Proposed revisions to existing business identification signage, including the addition of decorative window film.

Ms. Frestedt explained that this is a request for retroactive approval to replace the sign face of an existing neon business identification sign and to change the graphics of an existing poster-size sign. The proposal includes a request to install decorative vinyl window film on the S. King Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. facades. Exhibits included drawings, photographs and material samples.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the Board approved a Certificate of Approval for Signage, including a window-sized menu sign in March 2009 (ISRD 92/09). She said that the content of the poster sign does not conflict with SMC 23.66.338; however, the size prevents visibility into the space and limits transparency. She noted that the window leads into a storage space. She added that the Board discussed the amount of existing transparency and took that into account when deliberating on the last proposal.

Jino Yoon, business owner, explained the proposal was the result of new logo and branding. He explained the two proposed alternatives for the window film and colors shown in the packet. He noted that his preferred option would be the film with the small lettering on it.

Board Questions:

Mr. Chow said they way the graphics are set up looks nice.

Responding to Board questions Mr. Yoon said the poster on the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue side will remain. He said the writing relates to the products for sale.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked if the color band was being calculated in the overall percentage of the store front and Ms. Frestedt explained that the window film was not calculated as signage. She said interpreted it more as an exterior design feature but that the text would be calculated as signage. She said the transparency requirement states that the window must remain 50% clear and transparent. She said that the applicant's preferred option for the window film is the option with the text on it. She cited SMC 23.66.336 B4 and noted her interpretation was that the film is within the appropriate limit for transparency.

Responding to questions about the material samples for film and letters Mr. Yoon said the material is not transparent but you can still see through it. Board members looked at the material samples and located where each would go on the drawings.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted there were other examples of film in the District.

Ms. Frestedt commented on the message on the sign and cited SMC 23.66.338 Business Identification Signs A. Message. She said that Mr. Yoon is not distributing this product elsewhere in the District so the text meets code.

Mr. Rosete commented on the artistic value of the way it was worded – noting it was like poetry - and that it was complementary to the business.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said the design and color are attractive. She supported the text on the store front noting that it added graphics and design element to the store front.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked for Board thoughts specifically on the sign that covers that whole window. He said covering whole window with opaque doesn't comply. He said there are clear provisions that prefer transparency.

Mr. Rosete said it is nice that the posters are all coming down and are being replaced with something that opens it up more. He said it the information is organized on the sign.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted the poster hides a storage area noting that it is an improvement.

Mr. Yoon pointed out that his space is all windows.

Ms. Frestedt summarized the discussion by the Board when the poster sign was first approved. She said the amount of existing transparency was a factor in the Board's approval. She said it would not be appropriate on other store fronts and noted the importance of approvals on a case by case basis.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage and design, as proposed including the preferred option of window film with text.

This action is based on the following applicable sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and District Design Guidelines:

SMC 23.66.030 – Certificates of approval – Application, review and appeals

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

B. Asian Design Character District

4. Transparency

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

A. Message. Signs shall be limited to those that identify the name of the establishment and/or the primary business or service provided by it. Advertising related to businesses or services not provided on the premises or products not manufactured on the site are prohibited; provided, that product name signs that are incidental to other signs on the premises may be permitted when the establishment or use on the premises is the sole distributor of the product in the District.

E. Illumination

ISRD Design Guidelines for Façade Alterations  
II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs  
II. A. Buildings with multiple tenants

**MM/SC/MR/BL 7:0:0 Motion carried.**

Ms. Frestedt reminded the applicant that the Land Use Code requires approval before changes are made and to consult her prior to future changes or to submit an application for Certificate of Approval.

012610.22

Milwaukee Hotel

672 S. King St.

*Applicant:* Paul Wu, Wu Architecture

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for: installation of seismic braces and rosettes; alterations to three storefronts on S. King Street and one storefront on 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.; construction of a new storefront and storefront window system in the alley; installation of a mechanical garage door in the alley; and storefront paint colors. She said the Milwaukee Hotel (also historically referred to as the Goon Dip Building) was built in 1911, is located in the Asian Design Character District, and is a contributing building in the National Register Historic District. She summarized recent Board approvals for the building, as noted in the staff report.

Ms. Frestedt noted that portions of the work proposed as part of this application were completed without prior review or approval by the ISRD Board, including: installation of the seismic braces and rosettes; construction of the storefronts at 672 and 674 S. King Street; alterations to the storefronts at 664 S. King Street and 417 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue S.; and application of new a paint color (“Village Green”).

She read from the staff report and summarized the applicant’s proposal for the alley façade:

- Proposed revision to previously approved design of a new storefront located on the northwest side of the building, adjacent to the garage entrance.
- Installation of an aluminum frame mechanical garage door (Wayne Dalton Model #451) featuring clear Lexan window openings. Dimensions: 16’ w x 8’ h. She noted that the Board previously approved the paint color black for the metal garage door.

Ms. Frestedt summarized the proposed seismic bracing:

- Installation of seismic lateral bracing in the following locations: 664 S. King St.; 672 S. King St.; 674 S. King St.; and, 417 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. The braces extend from the interior of the basement to the second story and penetrate the building exterior through the windows at the storefront level.
- Installation of seismic rosettes (6” in diameter) as shown in the attached plans.

Ms. Frestedt summarized the proposed storefront alterations:

- Reconstruction and reconfiguration of a new wooden storefront system in the following locations: 664 S. King St.; 672 S. King St.; 674 S. King St.; and, 417 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.
- Alterations to the existing storefront at 662 S. King St., including removal of the awning and new paint colors (ICI 1206 - “Village Green”).
- Installation of a new storefront window system on the alley façade at 662 S. King St.

Ms. Frestedt went over proposed paint colors:

- Revision to storefront paint colors (ICI 1206 - “Village Green”), as shown in the attached photographs and plans.
- Proposal to paint the rosettes on S. King Street and 7th Ave. S. to match the storefronts. Color: ICI 1206 - “Village Green”.
- Proposal to repaint portions of the previously painted masonry to match the original brick color (ICI 10YY 41/175 “English Cottage”), as shown on attached paint schedule (sheet R8.0).

Ms. Frestedt distributed application packets including photographs, plans, specification sheets, correspondence from a structural engineer, and material samples to the Board. She introduced the applicant, Paul Wu, of Wu Architecture, who was joined by property owner Chris Koh and structural engineer, Allen Tucker, of Engineers Northwest.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Wu provided background information on the building, much of which he said has been vacant for 40 years, with the exception of the storefront level. He explained that James and Chris Koh own three contributing buildings in the District: the Alps, the Hong Kong and the Milwaukee. He said they have improved the buildings to attract business and to revitalize the district. He said the Kohs intent with the Milwaukee rehabilitation is to bring in more residents, noting they will have 121 units: one and two bedrooms, efficiency units and some SROs. He said that this application is part of an ongoing project and that most of the interior work is done.

Mr. Wu went on to describe the structural improvements noting that old buildings won't stand major earthquakes. He said that while this building has survived a couple big earthquakes the big one is yet to come. He went over three ways to seismically reinforce buildings of this vintage: sheer wall, which involves creating a diaphragm; moment framing, which makes all of the connections rigid by triangulating forces on fixed joints; and, cross or lateral bracing. He said lateral bracing was their preferred option because it was the most efficient way of reinforcing against lateral movements. He said a lot of high rises use this scheme because it is efficient and that some new buildings may include all three strategies.

Mr. Wu explained the Milwaukee has a deficiency in its “soft story” where the building has less resistant capabilities than on the other floors. He said this typically happens where with buildings have a lot of openings – in this case it is the store fronts. He said in order to brace the openings with steel – the most efficient way is the cross brace – sometimes called a K-brace or a V-brace. He said the strategy is to install diagonal members that will hold the building – especially this type building – against lateral forces. He said they chose the most efficient and economic way of doing this. He said originally structural engineer Pai Lin did the initial engineering which was approved by the Department of Planning and Development. He said for health reasons Mr. Lin stepped down from the project and another engineer took over after the building permit was issued.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the building permit was issued by DPD. She explained that even though the DPD permit was issued review and approval by the ISRD Board is also required prior to any alterations being made. She said issuance of the building permit does not trump the ISRD approval. It is important for the Board to understand that for a project of this scale multiple permits may be required.

Mr. Wu said there was a lack of coordination from DPD where they didn’t require him to go before the board before they issued the building permit. He noted that structural bracing would be required and they had to determine how to address the requirement. He said after looking at different ways to address the bracing they came up with the current design. He said two of the storefronts have already been built. He said the Board can walk by and take a look at the configurations. He said the diagonal brace crossed through the store fronts and crossed through the storefront openings so they moved the store front configuration to accommodate the bracing.

Mr. Wu said they received a red tag (stop work order) on the storefronts because they did work without prior approval. He said this happened two months ago. He said he is coming back to the Board with information to have the Board to take some action. He said that historically the storefronts were not “classical storefront designs” for the building and were not significantly ornate. He referred to a “working” storefront and he summarized some of the changes that have taken place over time. He said the design approach is to go back to try to improve the building and to make the storefronts uniform by using the same details for each storefront.

Mr. Wu said they had to make the building safe and to halfway – not 100% - meet ADA standards. He explained that ADA requires that entrance doors have to be a certain width so that a person in wheelchair can operate the door. He said the end result of the alterations is shown in the photos and pointed to photographs of the current conditions. He stated that the work was a necessity. He noted the time, effort and material that had been expended to make the place better. He said no one has greater financial investment and vested interest in the building more than the owners. He said the intent was to increase the value and to improve the district. He said the proposal under consideration is presented with that purpose in mind. He noted that the face brick had been painted and they talked to experts who said that because of the type of brick they would have to

do “destructive cleaning” – pressure washing, sandblasting – to remove the paint, which would destroy the brick.

Ms. Frestedt suggested that Mr. Wu walk the Board through the exhibits and materials and reference individual sections as he discusses the work.

Mr. Wu said there are two photo reports and he proceeded to go through the photos in the photo report dated December 18, 2009. He said he wanted to show details and photos of what the storefronts looked like at that time.

- Page 4: 417 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue S. Showed lateral member crossed door way so they had to move the door to the middle to allow clearance of entry. He noted that the awnings are in disrepair. He said that the video store closed due to construction disruption.
- Page 6: Show existing conditions of adjacent storefront. He noted wires strung outside, and pointed to “jealousy windows” that are out of character with the rest of the building. He said that the Hong Ning storefront had previously been altered.
- Page 8: Mr. Wu pointed out seismic brace frame located on the storefront interior. He said that the woodframe of the storefront is deteriorating. The plan is to clean it and fix it up. Above the opening the brick is painted red. At the corner the brick column has been painted a brick color.

Mr. Murakami asked if the store front was original; Mr. Wu said he was not sure of the age. He said he didn’t have information about that. He said that moldings and detail are similar to what was used and approved at the Mar Building.

Mr. Wu explained that this first report shows the existing conditions and the second report would focus on individual store front and to go through the Dec. 18<sup>th</sup> photo packet.

- Page 10: He noted that scaffolding is in place. There are several shots of the storefronts that have been upgraded and said this is what is proposed.
- Page 11: He said one of the difficulties they encountered was wanting to maintain recessed store front and have to deal with diagonal brace that comes out through the glass. Color shown here is what they propose to use. The details - the trim and moldings are identical or similar to what approved and used at the Hong Kong (Mar) Building.
- Page 12: Contains images of proposed doorway into the storefront. The way that it is set up, the door is in the middle of opening and on either side of the door is 18” – meets ADA requirement for wheelchair access. On the bottom picture is proposed way of dealing with water intrusion – drainage grate. They tried to use the hexagonal tile the mimics old buildings as the entrance area to the storefronts.

- Page 13: Shows similar proposed store front arrangement, except the cross brace was painted light gray color to try to make it disappear and it didn't do the job, so the proposal is to paint them green.
- Page 14: Shows Deng's Art Studio which had previously been substantially altered.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if there were photos substantiating claim that the storefront has been substantially altered. Mr. Wu said that he didn't have historic photos. Mr. Chris Koh stated that they do have photos. Mr. Wu continued through the packet:

- Page 15: Images show a comparison of the different sill treatments.
- Page 16: He identified the existing entrance to residential apartments; they proposed to leave it and maintain it and clean it up. He said it shows some tile work done at the apron that shows the Milwaukee and those will be preserved.

Ms. Frestedt noted to the Board that restoration of the Milwaukee sign was approved as part of the Certificate of Approval issued in January 2009 and the original neon will be reinstalled.

Mr. Wu continued:

- Page 17: Noted that the storefront pictured in the photo that had been substantially altered in the 1980s. No additional work was proposed.
- Page 18: Mr. Wu pointed to the Fortune Sports Bar and indicated where the lateral bracing crosses the existing store front; store front was substantially altered from the original and said they had to essentially destroy it to put in the lateral brace. He said it is difficult to finish the long heavy beams and steel members into a space especially when they are still operating.
- Page 19: Mr. Wu summarized the work on the alley façade. He noted the boarded plywood area and said they propose to open up. They found there was a glass frame behind it so they tried to upgrade it and put more transparency into the corner at the alley. He commend on existing conditions of how the doorways are right now and how nothing has been done to them.
- Page 20: Boarded up store front that they want to improve and bring up to the same standard as the store fronts at the main streets. The new garage entrance gate be installed where plywood opening is.
- Page 21: Mr. Wu noted that the exit stairway that is one of the required exits from the apartment units. It is a recessed doorway that they will try to maintain and they will probably try to change out and upgrade door.

Mr. Wu went over the January 2, 2010 photo report, submitted as one of the exhibits. He noted that scaffolding has been removed and the face brick will be washed per Department of Interior Standards – no power washing, no chemicals. He said rosettes required to tie face brick to floor diaphragm so whole wall and floor system act in unison to tie them together.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the rosettes are similar to others installed in the District and stated that this is a commonly used technique.

Mr. Koh interjected that they have not touched the brick yet.

Mr. Chow asked about the brick color on 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

Mr. Wu said they intend to paint the existing painted face brick, as noted on drawings, because it is difficult to “unpaint” brick and repainting would be the lesser of two evils to paint the brick to a color matching the original.

Mr. Wu continued going through the Jan. 2<sup>nd</sup> photo packet. Ms. Frestedt asked about the plywood panel on the 672 S. King St. transom area. Mr. Wu responded that the panel in the upper left hand corner will be removed and replaced with glass. He said there was a cable running through that which will be re-routed.

Mr. Wu noted on page 4 that they proposed to remove awning over Fortune Bar. He said the bottom of page 4 shows boarded up store front that they want to bring up to Main Street same design except similar lateral frame behind this; revised proposal door will be moved to the middle because that is where they can have a door.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if the lateral brace had already been installed.

Mr. Wu said it had and no one would know because it would be behind a wall

Ms. Frestedt noted the packet of drawings the Board members have – they will see where the lateral bracing exists on the elevation drawings.

Mr. Wu said the next page is an historic picture – if you call 10 – 15 years historic. 17 years ago – and said the dance studio is not what it is today. He said it was a Korean Ginseng place. So is the Fortune Sports Bar – it used to be a Seafood Palace. He noted changes that have taken place since that photo in 1993. He went over many 1993 photos noting one that shows the end of the Fortune and the brick painted red and the infill that they will open up with glass was painted green. He said a 1980 picture showing the arrangement and the door frames which he said predated the district.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the district was established in 1973.

Mr. Wu showed photos from 1915 pointing out the working storefronts with fabric awnings, signs of different types. He oriented the board to the corner and pointed out the two storefronts that they have finished – corner of King and 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if the doorway to the hotel – that says “Milwaukee”, as shown in the photo is completely gone.

Mr. Wu said it was and had become part of the storefront. He showed a photo of the building under construction in 1911 pointing out remnants – looking down King Street – openings that has not been touched and is still under construction.

Mr. Wu walked the Board through the submitted drawings. He said he can show each storefront compared to what he could gather at existing before his work, but not the original. He said he can't find record of original drawings. Showed what currently exists and what is proposed. He said at 417 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue they hadn't done any of the refinishing yet but their proposal is to put new fabric awning across entire width of store front and clean up. Typical details are shown that they used to build the store fronts that exist now. He said the storefronts for 672 and 674 S. King are already done. He noted that at 672 S. King St. there used to be a pair of smaller doors there and now it is not a single door.

Mr. Wu said the Fortune Sports Bar was substantially different from what it was before. Before it had a side door but it's proposed to be relocated to the middle because of the lateral frame. He said in the alley garage entrance they propose to use instead of iron gate a motorized sectional overhead door. It is designed with a lot of transparency and they want to use a see-through garage door for visibility. It will be a prefabricated overhead system with Lexan which is a destruction proof material used for banks and security installation.

Ms. Frestedt said referred to manufacturer details and added that the proposed design is more accurately shown in the plans, with the Lexan material in the windows.

Mr. Wu summarized the proposed painting. He said the painting that they need to do to will cover existing painted masonry only. What is not painted will be left alone. The proposed color is "English Cottage" –a mustard beige color and matches as close as possible to the brick that is there. They will paint it onto a brick sample and will present that to the Board for approval before they do the actual painting.

Ms. Frestedt circulated the color sample to Board members.

Mr. Wu said they are not asking for approval of the exact color at this time and they will come back to the Board for that portion of the proposal. He described the testing that they will to do make sure the proposed color is a good match. He said when color is applied to a textured material it is hard to predict outcome. He reiterated their intent to provide a test brick for approval.

Mr. Murakami asked if they had considered removing the paint noting that there are product options that do work with historic structures. He said he has used certain products before with good results.

Mr. Wu said they talked to Evergreen Masonry Restoration – because of the vintage of the brick and the grout/mortar joints to do any harsh chemical cleaning or abrasive cleaning, high pressure washing would do more damage to the brick and mortar joint.

Mr. Murakami suggested Dev Strip 501 that he has used on a real soft brick.

Mr. Wu said they would entertain the idea of cleaning the brick. He said they will test it and if successful they will come back and propose that.

Mr. Chris Koh said regarding the store fronts when they dealt with the parking garage which is directly below, the timbers displaced and rotting away below store fronts. They are just sitting on these brick walls, Mr. Wu and their structural engineer attest to that. Without drainage and with the slopes – which along King Street it is a sloping sidewalk heading west – the water built up will build in there which is why in a lot of the photos even prior to 1993 work there is a lot of dry rot of plywood siding. He said there was water damage on the surface and on the entry ways inside the spaces.

Mr. Wu said their budget had been exceeded and there had been a lot of repairs.

Mr. C. Koh said the Fortune Sports Bar was upset with the lengthy process with the red-tagging and they moved out.

Ms. Frestedt provided material samples for store front rebuilds for Board perusal. She noted that the staff report refers to sections of the Land Use Code, Guidelines and even more significantly the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation that are relevant both to the broader issue of store front redesign as well as seismic work on historic buildings.

Ms. Frestedt said the staff opinion is that the work on the alley is appropriate –for the historic district and the Guidelines and Secretary of Interior Standards. Because it is a secondary façade it is improving conditions where prior openings had been closed off. She expressed concern about the seismic bracing and noted that the bracing is the foundation for a lot of the other discussion about that happens with the store front remodels because the remodels were done as a result of the bracing. She stated had this application come to the Board prior to any of the work being initiated it would have generated discussion about what possible strategies are there for seismic retrofitting of historic buildings and what other options could have been explored or feasible and how could the goals of seismic repairs meet needs of life safety and maintain the integrity of the historic building and the store fronts.

Ms. Frestedt said in her opinion the method of bracing – K braces- has damaged the integrity of the store fronts. The penetration of large metal beams through the glass is unseen anywhere else in the District or in other historic districts in Seattle. She said there may have been alternatives that could have prevented that design. She said the Board has to consider the proposal in light of the existing Guidelines, Ordinance, and Secretary of Interior Standards which have been adopted by the Board. She said that she included as part of the Staff Report Preservation Briefs on store fronts and seismic work. She said seismic work aside, bringing the storefronts back into repair is a worthy proposal and something that is encouraged for many property owners throughout the

district; however, she noted that there are various ways that this can be done and there may have been materials and designs of some of the store fronts that have been previously remodeled that had gained significance over time. She cited Secretary of Interior Standards # 4, which states: “...changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.”

Ms. Frestedt stated that the Board did not have the opportunity to go through and look on a case-by-case basis at each store front to determine when previous alterations had taken place and if the work was done prior to the district being established. She said if it was determined that storefronts had gained significance over time there may have been a justification to try to work with the existing store front design. She said these are the types of considerations that should be made when looking at historic remodel and the seismic work. She said the board should evaluate this proposal not as having already been executed but is it appropriate for this building, is it appropriate and responsive to the Guidelines and Regulations which govern the district.

Board Questions:

Mr. Osborne-Klein requested Board questions/comments for each portion of the application, beginning with the alley façade.

### **Alley façade**

Mr. Rosete asked about the use of the alley and noted that not many people go into the alleys.

Mr. Wu said they hope to bring people into the alley and there is movement by the City to clean them up; this is their way to contribute to that to bring store front and business to alley.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the board has recognized support to revitalize alleys making them more pedestrian friendly and active.

Mr. Murakami appreciated the effort to open the storefront at the corner of King St. and the alley; he asked if the window was original.

Mr. Wu didn't know but Mr. Chis Koh said the opening was there but he didn't know how original the glass was.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said regarding the garage door the transparent glass is a good improvement and provides eyes on the garage.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted that most buildings use security grills and asked about the reasoning for putting in the motorized garage door instead.

Mr. Wu said energy conservation. It is a solid barrier. They are heating the basement – as part of the improvements they have to sprinkle the entire building including the basement. To do a wet pipe system which means there is water in the pipe the temperature has to be maintained at 45 degrees minimum.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if another type of system could be used.

Mr. Wu said there is another type – dry system – where the pipes are charged with gas or compressed air. By closing the opening it helps a lot and it keeps the floor of the retail spaces warmer and also keeps the sprinkler system more straightforward and simple.

Mr. Osborne-Klein recalled in previous applications submitted by applicant a request for some configuration of that garage door and asked if it was the same type of sliding door that is proposed now.

Mr. Wu said it was not, it was an open system.

Mr. Chris Koh said they didn't have room for a gate to go all the way across so it had to be a roll up system.

Mr. Wu added that it would be a clear aluminum, a manufactured product.

Ms. Frestedt said the Board should consider the guideline for use of anodized aluminum or metals in the district which indicates in the guidelines under storefront building design guidelines E. *anodized aluminum and other metals shall be reviewed and permitted*, and one of the bullets is, "*when the aluminum or metal is painted a compatible color*". She said that painting would be more responsive to the Guidelines.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted that the guidelines also reference when the aluminum is not located on a primary façade.

Mr. Wu said they plan on having it sit on a wood frame which will match the color of the storefront system. The transom is part of the wood frame system.

### **Seismic Bracing**

Ms. Chung Gerrick commended the applicants for all their work on rehabilitating buildings in the District and said given the number of different reviews to date she felt like they were working on issues together. She said when she heard about the brace frame it was a shock because it is such a big factor to the way it is altering the façade and was surprised to see this as a retroactive application. She said she was curious about how it got missed. She asked when the brace frame came about in the project and why it wasn't addressed earlier.

Mr. Chris Koh said the brace frame was done pretty early on. He said they had it installed and had to make some modifications to it. He said when they came in to discuss the air intakes and rosettes the frames were already up. He said they did a walking tour and the braces were there and as a result, he didn't think there were any issues there. He thought there was a miscommunication between Ms. Frestedt and himself on that issue. He said the drawings went to DPD but didn't go to the Board and he said he knew that Ms. Frestedt was not the Board coordinator at the time when the project first came in.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said a lot of the current Board was not there as well.

Ms. Frestedt pointed out that she went to the Building Department and talked with the building code reviewer and looked at the plans that were submitted and at no point in the plans that she saw or were approved by the Building Department did it show the seismic braces in elevation in the store fronts. The way that they were drawn and shown in the plans that were submitted should have represented the full scope of the work. She responded to Mr. Koh's comment about the walk-through with the rosettes. She said this took place during the review of the proposed fresh air vents in the alley. She said when looking at air vents, the seismic bracing – the K braces – did not come up in discussion. She said given the nature of some of the store fronts, and the placement of scaffolding it was not clear to her that the bracing was permanent. She said it looked like it could have been temporary support that would be corrected as the project was finished so it was never discussed. She confirmed that at that time bracing was not the focus of the walk-through.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that regardless he didn't think that Ms. Frestedt or the Board has the burden of going out and investigating alterations.

Mr. Wu said that we all missed it. Instead of dwelling on it he said let's see how we can make it work and that is the purpose of being here.

Mr. Rosete said in a perfect world and with an infinite amount of resources could the braces be removed and another system put in?

Mr. Wu said if money was not an issue anything could be replaced.

Mr. Rosete asked if there were alternatives.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked that had this not already been done were there alternative designs that could have accomplished the seismic retrofit goals without being visible or altering the facades in such a dramatic way.

Mr. Allen Tucker said there are, and said the line of bracing could be moved in one bay – one building module, 20 feet to the next column line. In that case you would incur a lot more work to the building because you don't have the foundations where in the current design that now takes advantage of the wall on King Street and on 7<sup>th</sup> Street – it

takes advantage of primary walls. In the other case you would end up with a lot more foundation work in the building and you would disrupt the tenant spaces, but stated that it is achievable and can be done. He said when he inherited the project the proposal was not for K braces or inverted Vs, but X-braces. The reason he modified the bracing was to make the tenant spaces usable with the doors. He said they might not have lined up exactly with the existing doors and that is why they ended up doing modifications to the store fronts because the design wouldn't permit the size of door that was existing.

Mr. Rosete asked if the K braces were required.

Mr. C. Koh said yes, because this is considered a substantial alteration because all the upper floors had been vacant for so long. In the case of the Alps it was not required because it was an existing building with tenants that they rehabbed. He explained that a lot of sheer walls were designed – a bunch of concrete that goes all the way up through the hallways that are battened on to the interior. He said they are dealing with the existing store front spaces that have existing tenants in them along with an open parking garage.

Mr. Rosete said our goal is not to miss this opportunity again and confirmed that the building department required bracings.

Mr. Wu asked Mr. Tucker what percentage of the latter version that you see done to retrofits in other projects.

Ms. Frestedt said it was not relevant to this application.

Mr. Wu said he was just trying to get the information.

Mr. Osborne-Klein explained that this is the period where the Board questions.

Mr. Wu said if 90% of the work that was done on this type project is typically done this way then the Board needs to know that.

Mr. Murakami said there are other recessed storefronts that have bracing and said he thought it was unfortunate.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said throwing around a 90% statistic is not valid. He said there has been a lot of seismic retrofitting done in Pioneer Square and some in this neighborhood. He said he hasn't seen any that have disrupted the façade so what is different about those to what has been done here.

Mr. Tucker said what is different in this building is the recessed façade. He noted the store fronts are recessed. He said buildings in Pioneer Square that are retrofitted with steel braces are flush to the inside face sidewalk wall. He said it is more of an issue with this building because of the way the store fronts are recessed.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted they are an historic feature.

Ms. Frestedt agreed.

Mr. Wu said he would take exception to that and reiterated that they are working storefronts that have been altered many times.

Mr. Osborne-Klein reiterated that storefronts are an historic feature in the neighborhood.

Mr. Rosete said from a cultural aspect it is culturally traumatic to see the K bracing going right through what would be considered storefront. He said the challenge is how to correct the situation without adding undo time to remove what has already been vested is difficult.

Mr. Wu said to do what Mr. Tucker was proposing you have the K braces inside which would tremendously disrupt the interior of the building, plus having to go in and dig up huge footings down below because all the loads have to transfer all the way to the ground.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if he was saying that the alternative he suggested would not be as effective at mitigating.

Mr. Wu said it would not.

Mr. Tucker said that basically what you would have had to do to get the lateral load out of those exterior walls since you have flexible wood diaphragms you have to take the vertical element all the way to the roof otherwise you would have to take it down to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and transfer it horizontally across and then come down. He said you are making basically an indirect load path that is really inefficient and requires a lot more hope that the existing materials will support this phenomenon.

Mr. Osborne-Klein clarified that what he was saying was “there would have been a way to retrofit this without impacting the facades but it would have been much more expensive and invasive to the building”.

Mr. Wu said definitely.

Mr. Chow asked what the strongest method is.

Mr. Tucker said the way it is now.

Mr. Chow said right now the way it is designed and put in it is the strongest way to keep the building up.

Mr. Tucker said with steel elements, yes. With the other option that wasn't talked about was "moment frames", which are flexible. He added that the existing brick is really brittle and stiff and is going to attract all the load, it will fail before the load is transferred to the steel elements unless you make them massive and add many of them. That is why that option typically isn't used on the exterior wall to give you the wide open spaces. They typically move it to the interior if it is used at all.

Mr. Rosete said presuming that there is also the future of this building will see actual living tenants inside so that of course would add to the load so this will also increase their safety margins with the current bracing with the other ones even though. He said getting this building up and running where people are able to use it immediately, efficiently and of course trying to keep within as best within our guidelines. He asked if this was also an efficient method.

Mr. C. Koh with the upper floors they tried to maintain all the corridor hallways that are there. The idea was that although they were doing this substantial alteration to the building as far as what the codes require, he said they were still trying to work within the existing framing that was there. He said if you think of the building as three parts: a basement/garage that is completely open for cars to go through; ground floor which is retail spaces which are long and narrow and go to the back; and then the third floor which was SROs – these small 150 square foot units that they are sometimes making one 300 square apartment unit. There are three separate levels that don't always match up so you are relying on hallway corridor walls that go through from floor 5 through floor 2 and then the shift from floor 2 to the retail.

Mr. Rosete confirmed his understanding of the project goals that to keep the facades would have substantially changed how the interior would have been reconfigured.

Ms. Frestedt said ultimately the Board's decision and the jurisdiction of the Board is the building exterior. She said that as deliberation occurs Board members may want to refer to the back page of the Staff Report where she extracted some of the most relevant portions of the Preservation Brief 41 on Retrofits and urged Board members take these sections into account when making their decision, in addition to what they have heard from the applicant's presentation.

### **Store Front Alterations**

Mr. Rosete asked if all the bracings would be the Village Green color.

Mr. Wu said yes; all bracings would be green.

Mr. C. Koh said there are literally only 4 spaces where there is the brace.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said she thought the drawings that show existing and proposed storefront alterations are helpful because they compare what was modified and show the location of brace frame. She said where the brace frame penetrates the glass the detail

could be improved so it minimized where it was penetrating the glass. She added that it is very unusual to see steel structure starting from outside and then going back in again; it seems like there could have been more thought put into how the two materials meet. She said she would be curious to see what other ways of expressing that without disrupting the clean store front on the other side.

Mr. Wu said he put a lot of thought to that and said that because they have the existing frame and the tempered glass it has to fit in there and you can't cut holes and try to fish through and it has to come in several pieces. Most of the instances they are able to do it in two pieces where they cut a piece at an angle and fit another piece on top and all you have is a joint that can be sealed with sort of a translucent or opaque clear sealant. He said first of all is whether the Board will approve their approach to the seismic improvements and once that is crossed then the next thing is how to deal with these so-called offensive cross braces or lateral braces.

Mr. Rosete asked if there are other properties that will require such braces.

Mr. C. Koh said no, this is the final one.

The topic of bracing was raised again.

Mr. Wu said the building has a soft story which is unusual for this type of building. It has a lot of openings on just one level, some of them on more than one level. Some has mezzanines and these will be the weakest points where we need to brace. He already explained the difficulties of dealing with this.

Mr. Tucker explained that the floor is sloped starting on 7<sup>th</sup> Street heading toward King and then down King. There is not one floor below the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor that is at the same level all the way across that building.

Mr. C. Koh noted the sloped floor in the parking garage and within the spaces.

Mr. Osborne-Klein brought the discussion back to the store fronts.

Mr. Murakami asked about the detailing for the store fronts, that the applicant had said they used what they did on the Alps.

Mr. Wu said Kovalenko Hale Architects did the Alps and they borrowed ideas from that.

Mr. Murakami asked what was the basis for that detailing.

Mr. Wu said he called those the typical moldings they used – the brick molds, the trims – they are very typical trim work for that vintage.

Mr. Murakami cited the Secretary of Interior's guidelines when dealing with historic buildings and said it is preferable not to try to recreate the history if it is not original.

Mr. Wu said in this building when you say "modern" it depends on what age. For example in 1993 they have aluminum trim and entrances – do you want to go back to that or do you want to go back to 1953 where there is a different set up? Where they go through different generations it is hard to go back and say "this store front will go to 1953, this one will be 1993 etc." So this is a safe bet that they will unify the building and make it better.

Mr. Murakami said he didn't disagree with that concept but that the issue here is that the project isn't trying to falsely recreate history regardless of the age. He said "don't try to make something look like it was of that vintage when it was built in 2010".

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the guidelines stated that materials should be wood, natural and compatible with the district. They want you to differentiate between the historic elements and the new elements.

Mr. Wu said they used what they considered a safe material and trim – what was approved before at the recently approved Mar Building and the Alps Building they are using those.

Mr. C. Koh said the storefronts are all wood. He said that Mr. Wu pointed out that they also in doing to make the doorways ADA compatible.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that Mr. Wu said that they had to make them half ADA compatible.

Mr. Wu said not totally and said they did the best they can to meet that but if you really go with ADA all the levels to the sloped sidewalk would not work.

Ms. Frestedt said that ADA is part of the overall Land Use Code that isn't written into the ISRD Code. There are instances where historic buildings are involved where exceptions are made for some of the code requirements in order to retain the historic characters and it is possible that might have been one of the factors when the project was reviewed by DPD.

Ms. Chung Gerrick clarified that the 419 and 421 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. storefronts will stay the way they are.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the elevations call out the addresses and those that are proposing to be changed have the circle around them.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said – you said that you widened the doorways or changed the doorway configuration for ADA reasons but actually it seems like you substantially narrowed the door way from what it was originally. Specifically 417 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. C. Koh explained there were formerly two 2' 2" wide doors that were replaced with a 36" door and explained that one door is always bolted and locked acting as a strike for the other door and making the doors non-ADA compliant.

Mr. Wu said that ADA is 34" for one door.

### **Colors**

Mr. Wu said he would come back for the brick color. He confirmed that the store fronts will be the Village Green color.

Mr. C. Koh said the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor all the brick cleaning has been down to the store front and is uniform. He said they will try the Dev Strip 501, recommended by Mr. Murakami.

Mr. Osborne-Klein advised the applicant they could withdraw that portion of the application.

Mr. Wu said they could withdraw it.

Mr. C. Koh said they had contacted several contractors and they tested patches of what they were doing – and the comment from a couple of the companies was the softness of the brick and that when they pressure wash mortar will just come right out. He said they will revisit that and will try the suggested product.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said that even if it doesn't remove all the paint just having some remnants of the paint would be nice too – like a ghost sign – a little bit of history of what it used to be but not covering with new.

Mr. C. Koh said it has been multiple colors.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that is part of the history. He agreed with Ms. Chung Gerrick that painting brick is disfavored and not a good solution to these problems so cleaning it up might be a better option but said the board would entertain seeing samples of paint and cleaned brick.

Mr. Lee said they do not have the working history of the reconstruction of the store fronts and asked if they were able to find any original color.

Mr. Wu said they were able to find white on the windows and that is it.

### **Public Comment:**

Betty Lau, Chong Wa, said she is relieved to hear about seismic structure and said safety is first. If it alters the looks and given the way the looks of the building has changed even over the last 55 years or so it is a small price to pay. She said at first she

thought it was hideous when she saw the bars but now she thinks it looks nice. She said she would feel comfortable moving in knowing that if there was an earthquake she would be safe. She said safety is paramount.

Maria Koh, owner, said she supported the bracing.

Bernie Kay, community member, was not going to make any comment for or against but commented on the little entrance on 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. that is not used any more, but has historic value. He noted that it was the family's private entrance to their personal suite which was on the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> floor. It was a personal entrance to the office and to the gambling club down below. He said he has historic reference.

### **Board Discussion:**

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested review by section: alley, seismic, store front, paint and then polling the Board on each of the items.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the staff report proposes two separate motions and encouraged the board to consider if there are portions of the work they do support having separate motions for that which is supported and that work which may not be so that it is very clear for the record. She noted the withdrawal of the proposal to paint the previously painted masonry and that will be part of a later review.

Mr. Ha said he supported the seismic bracing for safety reasons.

Ms. Frestedt clarified that the question is not whether or not seismic bracing should be allowed as it is a requirement that they do have some kind of bracing; the question is "is this the appropriate bracing for the façade".

Mr. Ha said he thought it was OK for safety reasons. He was OK with the whole application.

Mr. Murakami supported the alley façade with the condition that the aluminum garage door be painted to match the Village Green color. Regarding the seismic bracing he said it was unfortunate that comes before the Board as a retroactive item. If the Board had the ability to voice their concerns prior to design perhaps there could have been alternatives found that don't penetrate the store fronts. But given the fact that they are in place now is prolonging the life of the building it is a good thing. The store front alterations – the penetration of the brace through the glass is a difficult detail and he said he prefers minimizing that interaction as much as possible. The plywood versus the butt glass and the butt glass makes it disappear more than the other one.

Mr. Lee said he goes through the alley a lot and appreciates the plan there. Regarding the garage door he said to paint the aluminum; at least it will match. He said regarding the seismic brace it is unfortunate we have to face this on both sides. He said it would be nice if it could be minimized as much as possible or come up with some way of not

making it as obtrusive – as he walks down the street he sees two I-beams staring at him. Regarding the storefronts, he noted that storefronts that have been altered 4 or 5 times already. He said just minimizing what they can to at least not make it look as bad would help. He said he could appreciate the applicants' willingness to try to work with using a chemical to get the paint off but he appreciate they were also looking to find a paint that would at least match the brick as much as possible. The Village Green color and making the store fronts uniform is reasonably appropriate.

Mr. Osborne-Klein appreciated the willingness to work with the alley and attempt to revitalize is and agreed the aluminum door should be painted because it is consistent with the guidelines and Secretary of Interior when we do allow aluminum. He noted it is typically disfavored but because it is not a primary façade so if it were to be painted in a compatible color it would be OK. He said he had grave concerns about the seismic bracing and reiterated that it is unfortunate that this a retroactive application because had the applicant come to the Board with this design initially the Board would have asked for alternatives and would have done a much more searching inquiry into what kind of options there were. He said he thought the choice the applicant ultimately decided on doesn't comply with the Secretary of Interior Guidelines. He said this Board really doesn't have the discretion to approve something that clearly doesn't comply with the Guidelines. He said he had grave concerns about what kind of precedent would be set or message that would be sent to the community if the Board decided to look the other way at construction that had already occurred that violated our rules; he said that would really undermine the rule and authority of the Board in the big picture. He would not vote to approve the structural bracing. He said there are similar issues with the store front alterations and that it is pretty clear that the store fronts were altered to work with the seismic bracing the way that they are configured. He said he hadn't seen any evidence there was any thought in to the Guideline recommendations to make them consistent with the spatial relationships that characterize the property or any of the guideline requirements that talk about facades and store fronts. It seems like these were primarily designed to work with the structural bracing which he didn't think complied with the guidelines. He said he had no problem with the paint.

Mr. Rosete said the goal was to make the alley functional and something that is a larger goal of the International District.

Mr. Chow interjected that the district is called the "Chinatown International District" and he would appreciate if it were referred that way.

Mr. Rosete said as a secondary façade and the way it is designed he had no problems but agreed the aluminum should be painted. He appreciated the uniformity of the storefronts that make the building stand out, but expressed concern with the storefront alterations and said a lot of them were due to the seismic bracing but also the consideration as to the uniqueness of the building design. He said the applicant is doing their best to create that uniformity and distinctiveness to their building and still try to comply with everything. He appreciated the overall scheme. With the seismic bracing, he said he agreed that it was mangled beyond everyone's control and according to the

Secretary of Interiors guidelines which the Board must follow they do make the proposal out of character for the District. Had the board had the opportunity to look at it in advance something could have been done. He said there are some things that clearly fell through the cracks but given the alternatives as a whole he said he thinks the Board probably would have ended up selecting the current proposal. He said it would have been nice to have the option to review alternatives. He said that it is outside of guidelines and you cannot deny that. He said there are more opportunities in this project that at least now we can mitigate it through alterations.

Ms. Chung Gerrick supported the alley façade as proposed, with the exception of painting the aluminum frame either green or black. Having it painted to match the other colors will make it more uniform. Regarding the seismic bracing she agreed with Mr. Osborne-Klein and said it is setting a precedent to the community and that needs to be addressed as a Board. She said even though it is retroactive project the Board has to review it as if it were not complete. She added that if it was not built it is not something that the Board would have approved. Regarding the storefront alterations, she said she understood why they applicant made some of the alterations and she said it goes back and forth between seismic bracing and because of the seismic bracing they had to make some of the storefront alterations. She agreed with Mr. Murakami with minimizing the penetration where the brace frame goes through the store front and minimizing with silicone or with smaller trim will help read the store front without having distracting with other frame around the window. She noted the applicant will come back with the paint color for the brick. She said she supported the Village Green and trying to remove the existing paint instead of painting over it.

Mr. Chow thanked the applicants for working on all three buildings. He said he has been in Chinatown since 1951 and appreciated the work done to the three buildings. Regarding the alley façade, he agreed with most of the Board members that the color of the garage door should match the front. He said it is a nice standard to set for the rest of the buildings in Chinatown to work on the alley fronts because as far as the whole picture for Chinatown alleys are a big of the district. Regarding the seismic bracing, he said that he is in the belief with safety and if it is right that this is the strongest bracing that will keep the building up in the earthquake that will come through Chinatown he said he agrees with this seismic bracing proposal. It is a bit of an eyesore but he said he would rather have an eyesore than somebody dead. He said regarding the Secretary of the Interior's stipulations, they can come down and look at this building and understand why he is supporting this type of bracing. As far as the storefronts are concerned he said the applicants did a real good job to adjust to safety of the building and other than that he said he was looking forward to seeing the building done and having people in there.

Ms. Frestedt said given the nature of all the different items there seems to be some consensus on certain parts of the application and there is disagreement on other parts and this is an opportunity for the board to discuss amongst themselves.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said he agreed with Ms. Chung Gerrick about setting precedent about seismic retrofitting but that wasn't the only precedent that he was talking about. He was also talking about the idea that someone can put something up in this district that doesn't comply with the guidelines and then seek retroactive approval of it and this board, because it is retroactive would look the other way. He said he is concerned this will tell other developers that the way to get around the historic preservation guidelines in the district is to just do it and then come back later and ask for forgiveness – he said that seemed inappropriate.

Mr. Rosete said he had a feeling that having been given the options the board probably would have gone with the option the applicant proposed, but noted because we went around the guidelines that does set a precedent that we do not want.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that we have no way of knowing if that is true the Board would have supported this option. He said the Board may have asked for alternatives and for engineering report that showed the alternative designs and looked at their feasibility and the same with the facades...the Board would have looked at alternative ways of designing those facades. He said that none of that is presented to the Board now and there is no basis for determining whether this is indeed the best way to preserve public safety or whether there was another option that could adequately protect public safety and comply with the guidelines.

Mr. James Koh, from the audience, said they did not purposely go against the Board.

Mr. Wu asked if he could respond to the Board's comments.

Ms. Frestedt said the procedure at this point is for the Board to deliberate and not going back to re-evaluate the entire proposal again and encouraged the Board to continue.

Mr. Osborne-Klein responded to Mr. Koh Sr. that he did not mean to intimate that the applicants did this intentionally and were trying to circumnavigate the rules by just constructing. He said his concern was what the Board's approval of this kind of retroactive approval would show other people.

Mr. Wu said this would not set a precedent because all people know that they have gone through a lot. He said they lost a tenant, stopped work for two months, and this is not something people want to try. This is an oversight. He said in the district things like this happen, this not an ongoing thing. People make mistakes and have oversights. As far as historic preservation he said he has a whole dissertation on that and you don't want to hear that. He pointed out the Wing Luke Museum and said it is an historic building.

Ms. Frestedt interjected that this application is not about the Wing Luke Museum and asked the board to continue deliberations.

Mr. Lee said the Board is not blind to safety and would never say that the strongest things should not be put up. He said it might have been possible to present ideas that would have minimized impact to the store fronts. The Board believes in safety and the historic outlook and where people are coming from.

In response to a question from a Board member, Ms. Frestedt said if the Board denied a Certificate of Approval for this work one of a number of things could happen and given the scope of this work she didn't know which direction it would go. There would be a requirement to correct that which was not approved. It would be the responsibility of the applicants and the property owners to come back with a plan as to how it would be corrected and work with the Board to address that. Or, she said, it would be appealed through the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if the Board could ask for submission of alternative designs and reasons why they are not feasible. He said the only way this kind of design would comply with the guidelines is if it were the only feasible earthquake retrofitting methodology.

Ms. Frestedt said she had asked for those details on numerous occasions from Mr. Wu. She said that Mr. Tucker had provided a response to that request, but it did not sufficiently address alternatives. She said that given the discussion that has occurred today her interpretation is that there are other options and they likely could be more costly and they may not be the most efficient but there are other options that would not have penetrated the store fronts. She said she thought she heard that it is possible to reverse; however there are a lot of implications to that. Given the information that had been provided by the engineer tonight, and by the information provided previously in a written format that is included with the staff report, the board should make decision on the information provided. She said the Board could request more elaboration on what was presented tonight, but that it was unlikely to include alternatives at this point since this is the proposal requested by the applicants, but that is for the Board to decide.

### Alley

Action: I move to approve the alley façade, to include painting of the garage door and the rosettes uniform color Village Green.

There was question about whether or not the rosettes should be included in the motion.

Ms. Frestedt clarified that in the Staff Report she had suggested *excluding* the rosette paint color from this portion of the application in part because she thought might be some discussion about the green stands out on the building as opposed to blending in similar to the intent trying to correct the color of the brick on the store front level and thought the Board might discuss the color of the rosettes. If the Board is comfortable with the color green on the rosettes for the building façade it can include that.

Mr. Koh Jr. said the rosettes were green on the 7<sup>th</sup> and King Street façade and on the alley façade the brick is a different color – a reddish pink – so the rosettes there are a reddish pink.

Ms. Frestedt noted the reddish pink on the alley side had already been approved.

Mr. Rosette withdrew his motion.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed alley modifications subject to the garage door being painted Village Green and not including the rosettes.

**MM/SC/MR/RH 7:0:0 Motion carried.**

### **Seismic**

Action: I move to approve the seismic bracing as presented.

**MM/SC/BC/MR 5:2:0 Motion carried. Mr. Osborne-Klein and Ms. Chung Gerrick opposed.**

### **Store Fronts**

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested requesting that applicant modify the detail where the brace frame penetrates the glass.

Ms. Frestedt suggested a motion that states something to the effect of the store front remodel as proposed, conditional on denying the portion of the store front that penetrates the brace. She said that will require them to come back with alternatives specific to that portion of the store front.

Action: I move to approve the alterations to the store front as proposed except for the element of the store front where the seismic bracing interacts with the store front.

**MM/SC/MCG/RM 7:0:0 Motion carried.**

### **Rosettes**

Ms. Frestedt said the installation of the rosettes seems appropriate because it is a common, frequently used strategy so there should be another motion addressing the installation of the rosettes and the color of the rosettes.

Action: I move to approve a Certificate of Approval for the rosettes, as proposed.

**MM/SC/MR/BL 7:0:0 Motion carried.**

Ms. Frestedt said they will need to follow up with the treatment where the bracing penetrates the glass.

Mr. C. Koh asked about the stop work order.

Ms. Frestedt said as soon as the Certificate of Approval is issued she would notify DPD.

Mr. Osborne-Klein clarified that the board denied the element at the store front and the interaction with the seismic structure.

*Mr. Chow left at 7:25 p.m.*

*Mr. Ha left at 7:30 p.m.*

### **012610.3 BOARD BRIEFING**

Briefing by Ethan Melone and Darby Watson, Seattle Department of Transportation, on the proposed First Hill Streetcar alignment options.

Mr. Malone and Ms. Watson presented via PowerPoint, full report is available in DON file. The presentation provides an overview of the proposed alignment options and provides background on the streetcar project.

Included here are Board questions and comments and Public Comment.

Public Comment:

Betty Lau stated the Chong Wa took a formal position in support of the Jackson Street couplet alignment because the tracks are going to be an impediment to people with walkers and canes. She said the loop route would pass in front of a couple of Chinese schools and so there are already problems with kids running out in the street and we don't want to be yanking them off the street and having to watch out for trolleys. In addition they have youth activities there – a Chinese drill team, boys dragon team. Because of the number of kids around there they want to minimize traffic there. She said they also have festivals where the street is taken up and with the trolley coming through and the kids are practicing in the street and parades it is just going to be a huge impediment to the youth activities. That is why Chong Wa preferred Jackson couplet.

Board comments:

Mr. Lee agreed with what Chong Wa's position. He said Weller is not that large and that could be a conflict. He also supports the Jackson alignment because of the celebrations, such as the Summer Festival. This led to a discussion about the use of the streets for the Festival and impact of having to change the festival's configuration.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said he preferred this configuration and not only for the reasons stated but also because he liked the idea of connecting Pioneer Square – International District and bridging gulf between the two neighborhoods because there is so many similarities.

Mr. Rosete asked if it will go to Harborview and said a lot of the residents in the International District that go to Harborview on a regular basis.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that it would connect the district to Seattle University.

Mr. Lee said it is a straight shot for Little Saigon if we are going to be expanding to Little Saigon or even Rainier Avenue it is just a straight run.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said that not too long ago we looked at the bus bulb where they made the sidewalks wider and asked how that impacted having this island for the trolley.

Ms. Watson said there are a couple challenges with doing this in a platform and the biggest one is with pedestrian traffic especially on a street like Jackson. Getting people off onto the platform, making it safe, making sure there is a signalized cross-walk that they can easily get to either side. The bus bulbs – they would just have to go through and determine how much width is needed. If we don't have a turn lane that we can use, then do we take parking off one side and how many stalls does that impact. She said that would impact local retail. They have to go through all the pros and cons.

Mr. Melone said one of the things they heard from the first set of public meetings was that people really wanted the stop now represented roughly at 7<sup>th</sup>. Some people wanted it at 6<sup>th</sup>, some wanted it at Maynard. We are showing it somewhere in that area. We do, once we get past 8<sup>th</sup> because of the bulbs that are already in place and we don't have a center turn lane – if we are going to provide that stop it is going to get more complicated in terms of how we minimize any parking impact, still work with bikes and there is a lot of work to do at peeling the next layer of the onion and figuring that out as well. He said they will come back when they have additional details.

Mr. Osborn-Klein said that what the Board will be looking at when they come for approval is that some details discussed tonight – pedestrians, bikes, facilitating pedestrian-oriented nature of the community is big – but also the particular station designs. The Board will consider whether it is consistent with the Asian character of the district and also consistent with the historic elements. He noted there has been a lot of community concern with bus stops – about providing places for criminal activity to occur.

Mr. Melone said on the South Lake Union line they were really conscious of that so there are no benches, no waste receptacles and it is very minimal. He said they do get criticism on the other side from people who want those things. They look forward to

working through these in more detail and want to have a discussion on all those points and approaches before they begin design work.

Ms. Frestedt said that is ideal. She said it sounds like that Jackson alignment option is preferred by the Board.

Action: I move that the board resolve to encourage the City to move forward with the Jackson couplet alignment, as being more consistent with the Board's guidelines.

MM/SC/JOK/RM 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Frestedt said she would write a letter on behalf of the board and would send that to Mr. Melone so he could share it with Council.

#### **012610.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

There was no Board business.

Rebecca Frestedt, Board Coordinator  
206-684-0226  
rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov