



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 223/10

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, November 9, 2010

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

Board Members Present

Rich Murakami, Vice Chair
Misun Chung Gerrick
Robert Ha
Marvin Rosete

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Josh Osborne-Klein, Chair
Bill Lee
Brien Chow

110910.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 12, 2010

MM/SC/MCG/MR 3:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Ha abstained

October 26, 2010

MM/SC/MR/RH 4:0:0 Minutes approved as corrected.

110910.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110910.21

HTK Building

513 S. Main St.

Applicant: Jerry Chihara, Chihara Architects

Exterior alterations: Proposed installation of electrical equipment.

Ms. Frestedt provided a summary of proposed consolidation of electrical meters on the south façade. Exhibits included photographs and plans. She provided background information on the building: She said the HTK Building was constructed in 1924. The

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

building is located within the Asian Character Design District and listed as a contributing building within the National Register District. She said the proposed was prompted by Seattle City Light code requirements.

Applicant Comment:

Jerry Chihara explained the Seattle City Light requirement for all meters to be consolidated and pointed out on a rendering where they propose to site them on the south elevation. He explained that the power will come from the pole underground to the building and up at the most discrete part of the building. He went over the elevation plan and said that the meter bank will be placed where currently there is a wood panel door; the door is not active and they will build over it for the meter bank. He said the panel equipment is 9 ½' long by 80" tall and has a grey metal finish; the electrician recommended not painting over the proposed finish.

Ms. Frestedt pointed out that there have been different treatments to mechanical and electrical equipment elsewhere in the district – some have been painted to match the existing buildings and others were left unfinished. She said that her preference is that the panel be painted to match the building, but she noted the location on a secondary façade may allow some flexibility.

Mr. Chihara confirmed that the conduits would be painted to match the existing building color.

Mr. Murakami asked if the conduit will be surface mounted.

Mr. Chihara said that it would be and that the existing conduit will run to the same point where the current meters are.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said the location is discreet and appropriate.

Mr. Murakami commented that the panel will not be visible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Chung Gerrick commented that the application was straightforward.

Mr. Murakami asked about the downspout.

Mr. Chihara said that it will remain in place and noted that it is the only one on the building.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations, as proposed.

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:**

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

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/MCG/MR 4:0:0 Motion carried.

110910.22

East West Bank

668 S. Lane St.

Applicant: Gail Wong, Gail Wong Architecture

Ms. Frestedt went over the application for the proposed installation of an automatic teller machine (ATM) on the building’s exterior. Exhibits included drawings and photographs.

Applicant Comment:

Gail Wong went over the drawings and pointed out the proposed location. She said they had made minor changes since the application was first submitted and said the bank has proposed to add signage in a band above the machine. She said they will carry the mullion that matches the mullion line on the top of the night drop. She said the aluminum storefront panel fills in that space; she said that they will match all materials to existing. She said they will replace glazing in just one area.

Ms. Frestedt noted that signage was not included in the initial application but Ms. Wong asked if it could be considered as part of this meeting. It was determined that because the signage is part of the ATM system and not located separately from the machine that it would be appropriate to include in the Board’s deliberations.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wong explained that the back portion of the plastic sign would be backlit and that light would glow through the colors.

There were questions about the type and quality of lighting proposed and it was suggested that the motion could be conditioned on staff review and approval of the lighting.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked if the height and mounting were ADA-based.

Ms. Wong said that it was and then noted that the aluminum panel would be painted to match the mullion.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rosete expressed concern about the lighting in the sign. This led to a discussion about the quality and the color of the illuminated sign face.

Mr. Rosete made a motion and withdrew it.

Ms. Chung Gerrick reiterated the suggestion that staff approve the lighting to confirm that it is not excessively bright.

Ms. Frestedt advised that the motion could state that the lighting be subdued.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations, as proposed with the condition Staff review the lighting for the sign.

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:**

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

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/MR/MCG 4:0:0 Motion carried.

110910.23

Milwaukee Hotel
662-674 S. King St.
Applicant: Paul Wu, Wu Architecture

Ms. Frestedt went over the proposed installation of building signage on entry doors and the proposed storefront alterations at 662 S. King St., 666 S. King St. and 674 S. King St., including restoration of transom windows, window trim and paint colors. She provided a summary of proposed changes:

Exterior alterations:

- Expose transom windows and repair or replace transom frames in the following locations: 662S. King St. and 666 S. King St.
- Remove awning at 666 S. King St. No replacement is proposed.
- Rebuild storefront system on the east facing portion of the storefront at 668 S. King St., including installation of frosted glass in the transoms and paint colors to match King St. façade (ICI 1206 – Village Green).
- Refinish and paint existing doors and frame (black).

Signage: Application of vinyl decal building identification door signs and address identification. Dimensions: 18” w x ~ 9” h.

Ms. Frestedt read the staff comments included in the staff report. She noted that the work included in the proposal was completed without prior review or approval by the ISRD Board. She said that the applicant requests retroactive approval for the work listed in the report. She said that based on a comparison of before and after photographs, she is concerned that historic storefront materials were removed as part of the storefront and transom rehabilitation. She noted that although the design of the storefronts may not date back to the time the building was constructed, it appears that alterations on one or more of the storefronts may have gained significance over time.

Ms. Frestedt expressed concern that the design of the architectural detailing added to the base of the storefront window on the east façade of 668 S. King St. is not consistent with the approved design of other storefronts and is not compatible with the original detailing of the building.

Ms. Frestedt provided details about the building. She said the Milwaukee Hotel was built in 1911. The building is located in the Asian Design Character District and is a contributing building in the National Register Historic District. She summarized prior approvals by the ISRD Board and the Dept. of Neighborhoods.

The applicant, Paul Wu, went over the history of the project and said they are almost done and that the space now is completely utilized. He said they updated the storefronts and, in their opinion, made them better. He said the decals and signs are done and they have received no adverse comments on the refurbished Milwaukee sign. He said that on the east façade storefront they cleaned up the grill work on the transoms. He said that the detail on the east façade storefront had been added to hide the joists; he said that he didn't think it changed things that much because it is down low. He said that he hoped the board would consider it and approve it, as constructed.

Mr. Wu said that they just made repairs to the panes and to the damaged mullions on the transoms. He said that because the DON Director overruled the Board's decision to approve the bracing the owners had to spend almost \$1,000,000 to re-do the seismic bracing. He said he hoped he has heard the last of that.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the decision about the bracing had already been made and was not part of the current application and Board's review.

Mr. Murakami said that he was surprised that Mr. Wu would go ahead and have things done and then seek retroactive approval knowing what has already happened.

Mr. Wu said that he wasn't there day-to-day and that a lot happens without his knowledge. He went over on the drawings showing what elements were being reviewed.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the addition of frosted glass at the transoms had been approved as part of the last review and that the inclusion of the frosted glass in the current proposal is consistent with what had been previously approved. She said the owners are applying for Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits and the frosted had been recommended by Steve Matheson, from the State's Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation, as a mitigation to screen the cross braces.

Mr. Wu said it is the same frame but with a vertical detail to hide the gap and noted it is the same detail as on the other storefronts.

Ms. Frestedt explained that originally the other storefronts had a similar layer of detail, but that the approved plans included simplified profiles. She said that the clear glass remains on the store front on the far west side because there is no cross bracing there. She provided "before" and "after" photos of the east side store front and pointed out the conjectural details and minor modifications that had been done. She said that during the discussion about the bracing she had stated that the more simplified store front was preferred because it was not adding conjectural detailing that wasn't historically there.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted the variation of the other bays and said that because it is away from the rest of the store fronts and is as low as it is, being inconsistent with King Street seems appropriate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murakami said that the detailing suggests a false historicism and it should be more of this day.

Mr. Wu said that just vertical pieces were added. He stepped outside to photograph the existing conditions of the other storefronts with a digital camera. In Mr. Wu's absence the Board ceased discussion of the application and went over Board Business in his absence.

Board business: Ms. Frestedt made an announcement about the Nov. 17th ISRD Board election.

Mr. Wu returned with the camera and shared the photos he'd just taken with members of the board. The photos revealed the same molding on the King St. store fronts. He said that all the stores have the same detail now.

Ms. Frestedt said that this detailing was not consistent with the approved plans. She provided the approved and stamped plans showing the simplified version of the storefront. She said there is additional information on plans at the DON office.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said that the signage is attractive but she wished there were more Asian characters.

Mr. Wu said that it is an historic sign and there weren't originally Asian characters on it; the sign is a re-rendered version of the original sign.

Ms. Frestedt summarized the process that followed the Board's recommendation on the application for the cross-bracing and storefront alterations. Mr. Wu had presented detail with cross bracing and the Board made a recommendation to the DON Director. The Director reviewed the recommendation and met with Mr. Wu and Mr. Chris Koh based on her concerns. Corrected drawings were submitted as part of the reversal of the cross bracing. She reiterated that work must occur in accordance with approved plans.

Ms. Frestedt pointed out on the drawing that the detailing had not been approved and pointed out that it had been crossed out. She stated that the detailing as rendered was not approved. She said that that in the other details there are three divided transoms and part of the correction was to restore the original transom configuration with frosted glazing.

Mr. Wu said he was not involved with that and said that this building has gone through a lot of changes. He said that at one time the store fronts were aluminum and he said they are working storefronts that evolve and change over time. He said they attempted to restore - not to repeat history – but try to emulate. He said that their intention is good but somehow this info doesn't get across. A lot of material and expense was spent to rehab the building and if the Board thinks that it needs to be re-done then so be it and the owner will have to spend more money to redo it. He said he hoped it wouldn't come later on from complaints that people might have. He said they are looking at bad economic times and if we are going to make people spend money to redo these details – which at best is conjecture.

Ms. Frestedt said the purpose of today's meeting is not to go back and revisit everything that has happened leading up to this point; it is to look at the approved plans for the building and what is appropriate for the building in light of what has been approved.

Mr. Wu said the Board could approve everything and be over-ruled by the Director.

Mr. Rosete commented that the sign is a good restoration and enlivens the building. He noted the original colors used and said it meshes well.

Ms. Chung Gerrick and Mr. Murakami agreed.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said that she didn't agree with putting in the frosted glass in the transoms but that if federal funding was dependant on it, she would support it.

Mr. Murakami agreed with Ms. Chung Gerrick. He said that clear glass and proper paint on the braces would help them to disappear.

Ms. Frestedt said that pictures were taken before the work was approved and the Board should base their decision on approved plans.

Mr. Ha said that based on what's been approved, he'd support the proposal.

Mr. Murakami said that although he feels for the building owner there is a process in place that could have prevent the costs that have been spent. He said the process wasn't followed and he said the work should be done per the approved drawings.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said that the 7th Ave. S. store front is on a less prominent part of the building and the base detail is close enough. She said there is not clear drawing that shows the radius or detail. She said it is not exact, but it is very close to what is drawn and she would support keeping it as is.

Mr. Rosete noted the attempt to be uniform and said that it is not as visible. He said that the process was not followed and that it looks different.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval for a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and signage, as proposed.

This action is based on the following applicable sections of **the International Special Review District Ordinance, District Design Guidelines and Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:**

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval – Application, review and appeals

SMC 23.66.336 Exterior building finishes

A. General Requirements. Exterior remodeling should respect the architectural and structural integrity of the building through sympathetic use of colors, materials and style.

B. Asian Design Character District

1. Materials. Materials shall be limited to brick, concrete, stucco and wood. Other materials such as anodized aluminum may be used if approved by the Board.

SMC 23.66.338 Business identification signage

ISRD Design Guidelines for Façade Alterations

II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

- B.** Earthen materials such as brick, wood, concrete and tile shall be use for entry doors, windows and the main façade.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

#2. The historic character of a property shall be retrained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

#10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/MCG/RH 3:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Murakami opposed.

6:05 p.m. Adjourn full ISRD Board meeting

110910.5 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

110910.51 Freedman Building
616 S. Weller St.

Applicants: Paul Wu, Wu Architecture and Mark Chow, property owner

Briefing on proposed exterior alterations, including construction of a new aluminum storefront system and modification of an existing doorway on the south façade.

Ms. Frestedt explained the 2008 approval to turn the mezzanine to retail and the alley to outdoor usable space.

Mr. Wu said that the previous proposal to fence in the area has been eliminated. He said they will clean up that area and put in new paving. He said that they will improve the loading dock area and make a grade level entrance to make it more accessible. He said there will be no barriers or bollards in the alley. He explained that the concrete will be sawcut 2 x 2 grid pattern. He said that all services will remain and they will fix the area so it will drain. He said the current owner wants to make the area livelier. He explained they proposed to put in an aluminum store front because of the back alley location; he noted that the Maynard Street side has wood store fronts painted gray.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted that the windows located above the proposed store front were also aluminum.

Mr. Wu said there is cast in place concrete around the openings. He said they propose to paint the masonry to match – to make the paint “disappear”. He said that the concrete work will be painted the same color to bring back the features of the main entrance with the canopy, CMU walls on side. The exit from the upper level will be raised up about a foot because it currently sits low; they propose to just cut the concrete above and install a secondary canopy. He said that the condensers and meters must be raised; he said they would build a platform and fence in the area so that people can’t access it.

Mr. Chow said they would put in a solid door because of security concerns.

Mr. Murakami asked about the concrete in the back.

Mr. Wu said that it slopes and that they can raise it 8” and noted they will need a header. He said it will all be painted out to match.

Discussion of the look of the canopy ensued and there was agreement that because it is on a secondary façade and the storefront has a modern look the committee recommended that the canopy design be simplified. It was noted that the backside can be attractive without all the detail.

Mr. Wu said they proposed to maintain the mechanical chase to the roof to take care of the duct work. He said the 2 x 4 chase is at the corner and said they would use metal siding material or could use cement board and stucco it. Noting the exiting requirement he said they did not want to enclose the courtyard.

Ms. Frestedt commented that channeling the equipment on the back of the building is a good idea.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said the metal material would be appropriate noting it would go better with the aluminum on the back.

Mr. Wu said the existing opening is 10’ wide – not alley side. He said there are lots of blocked windows. He said that it is currently kitchen space; if the restaurant ever leaves they can open up the space.

Ms. Frestedt noted it appears that the infilled windows were never reviewed or approved by the board and appear very unfinished.

Mr. Wu said they could paint the blocks out.

Ms. Frestedt said that painting unpainted brick is not supported by the district rules. Mr. Murakami expressed concern about the breathability of the brick – painting doesn’t allow the brick to breath. Moisture gets trapped and the face of the brick will start to break away. Sand blasting is not recommended and is chemically removing paint should be done only after researching the product.

There was no concern with the use of aluminum on the alley side. The Committee stated a preference for clear glazing.

Mr. Wu said he hoped the work would revitalize the alley. He said they propose to do a trench for pulling cable, hoses, etc for carts. Responding to Board comment he said the pervious pavers were not desired because they are hard to wash; he said they prefer impermeable type surface.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said this is a great opportunity for street vending and for increasing foot traffic.

110910.52 Far East Building
614-624 S. Jackson St.
Applicant: Resa Hunkin, Hon Joe LLC

Discussion of alternative paint colors for ground level storefronts.

Resa Hunkin brought color samples for review and said the approved color would be painted everywhere the bright blue is now.

It was determined that color 065 was acceptable and would be considered in-kind.

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