



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 241/10

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, December 14, 2010

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

Board Members Present

Josh Osborne-Klein, Chair
Rich Murakami, Vice Chair
Bill Lee
Julia Park
Marvin Rosete

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Brien Chow
Misun Chung Gerrick

Mr. Osborne-Klein called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

121410.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 9, 2010

MM/SC/RM/MR 2:0:3 Minutes approved. Messrs. Osborne-Klein, Lee and Ms. Park abstained.

121410.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121410.21 Hing Hay Park and multiple locations throughout the District

423 Maynard Ave. S.

Applicant: Julia Nelson, CIDBIA

Mr. Lee recused himself.

Ms. Frestedt went over the application for proposed temporary installation of white seasonal lighting (standard C7 lights) on the rim of the pagoda and in the tree to the north of the pagoda in Hing Hay Park. The lights are proposed to be hung annually from

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Nov. 15th through Feb. 15th. Exhibits included photographs. The lighting on the pagoda is attached via wire and staples, as necessary. She noted that the review is retroactive because the last meeting – where this application was scheduled for review - was canceled due to the snow storm.

Applicant Comment:

Julia Nelson, from the CIDBIA, explained that Parks has funding for this installation and the intent is to put the lights up before Thanksgiving and to remove them after Chinese Lunar New Year in February.

There was discussion about the end date due to the date for Chinese Lunar New Year fluctuating from year to year. Ms. Nelson requested that the date for removal be changed to February 20.

Mr. Murakami expressed concern that repeatedly stapling the lights to the pagoda would damage the wood over time and requested that a more permanent attachment method, such as installing hooks on the pagoda, be explored.

Ms. Nelson, responding to Board questions and comments, confirmed that the electrical outlet for the lights is located in the pagoda. She said that this is why the string of lights extends from the pagoda to the tree. She said that there would be no additional decorations, such as lanterns, requested at this time due to limited funding.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rosete was supportive of the installation but commented he didn't like the way the strand of lights goes from the pagoda to the tree; he said he preferred that it not be strung across in that manner.

Mr. Osborne-Klein expressed hesitancy to grant annual approval based on the current method of attachment. He expressed concern that the staples will damage the pagoda over time. He said it should be easy to come up with a permanent hook system.

Mr. Murakami agreed with Mr. Osborne-Klein noting it would be in the best interest of the pagoda to have a more permanent attachment method.

Mr. Murakami started a motion and withdrew it in order to reword the motion to allow Parks to return to the Board with an alternate proposal for attaching the lights on an annual basis.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for Design installation of lighting on the pagoda and tree this year until February 20, 2011 and defer the application for subsequent years

pending submission of an alternate method of attachment. The Board recommends that Parks looks at a sturdier means to mount the lights. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following section of the **International Special Review District Ordinance**:

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

A. A. Certificate of Approval Required. No person shall alter, demolish, construct, reconstruct, restore, remodel, make any visible change to the exterior appearance of any structure, or to the public rights-of-way or other public spaces in a special review district, and no one shall remove or substantially alter any existing sign or erect or place any new sign or change the principal use of any building, or any portion of a building, structure or lot in a special review district, and no permit for such activity shall be issued unless a certificate of approval has been issued by the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

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

121410.22

Storefronts Seattle

505 5th Ave. S. – 505 Union Station

Applicant: Ellen Whitlock Baker, Shunpike

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for request for temporary change of use for up to six months to allow art installations or retail for creative enterprise businesses as part of a pilot project to activate vacant storefronts. When the project is finished the use will revert back to the previous use. She explained the proposed application of vinyl decal signage in the storefront window to identify the Storefront Seattle project and participating artists or business. Exhibits included photographs. The International Special Review Board approved a Certificate of Approval for similar work in various locations throughout the District in August 2010. She confirmed that the amount of signage proposed does not exceed the maximum allowance, per SMC 23.66.338D. The proposed use is a permitted use, per SMC 23.66.320. The applicant and participants are aware that any changes to the buildings or storefronts above and beyond this proposal are subject to a Certificate of Approval.

Applicant Comment:

Ellen Whitlock Baker, from Shunpike, explained the intent to add another storefront to the existing six participating in this project. She said that they have selected a great artist for the shallow, long space. She brought a sample of the decals to be affixed to the window which will be in English and Chinese. Included with the “Storefront Seattle” decals will be the artist name and artist statement each also in English and Chinese.

Responding to board member question about why the copy would be only in English and Chinese Joyce Pisanont, IDea Space, explained that in this neighborhood the predominant language is Chinese. If an installation were proposed for Little Saigon, the copy would be translated into Vietnamese.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked about the proposed art work.

Ms. Whitlock Baker explained that all artists were selected by a panel back in July; the art proposed for this space is appropriate for this dark space. She explained that the proposed artwork will incorporate white paper and lighting.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the board does not have jurisdiction over artistic content or detail. The Board has jurisdiction over interior alterations if the alterations impact the exterior appearance of the building such as changes to store front space; Ms. Frestedt noted the transparency requirement as an example.

Ms. Whitlock Baker said that all artists have a clause in their contract about transparency requirements. She said that the proposed installation is a window display area in a walkway between two Union Station buildings and not a full storefront.

Ms. Pisanont said the window display site was chosen at the request of Vulcan who wished to see the space activated.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murakami said it is a great project.

Mr. Osborne-Klein was supportive of the project but concerned over not having the ability to see the art; he said that schematics were to have been provided and in the future asked that schematics be provided.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for signage and temporary use, as proposed with the recommendation that in the future the Board be provided schematics for review.

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 23.66.320 – Permitted uses

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

B. Asian Design Character District

4. Transparency requirement

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

MM/SC/MR/RM

5:0:0 Motion carried.

121410.23

King Louie Building

801-809 S. King St.

Applicant: Stefanie Dozal, property manager

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed masonry and concrete wall repairs on the east façade, including tuck pointing areas not previously tuck pointed. Proposed product is Safe Restore by EcoChem, with water pressure not to exceed 300 PSI. Proposal to repaint the east façade (Sherman-Williams Product: A-100 Latex Flat Color: 'Proper Grey' SW6003) following the repairs. Exhibits included scope of work details, specification sheets, and photographs.

Ms. Frestedt reported that the ISRD Board approved exterior paint colors in 2006. The ISRD Board approved the painting of the mural on the east façade in September 1999. The Architectural Review Committee (ARC) reviewed the current proposal on October 12th. Revisions have been made to the proposal in response to Committee recommendations. An ARC member recommended approaching the project in phases to minimize the impact on the mural. A copy of the National Parks Service Preservation Brief #1 – *Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings* which provides recommendations and guidance for cleaning and treating historic masonry was provided.

Applicant Comment:

Stefanie Dozal, Metro Property Services, explained their intent to gently clean the wall before painting, noting the water pressure would not exceed 300 psi. She said the existing mural is in poor condition and is not salvageable. Once repairs are made to the masonry large segments of the mural will be gone. The entire wall will be painted light gray to match the rest of the building.

Mr. Rosete noted that while the building is historic, the mural is not. Board discussion ensued about the appropriate cleaning method and materials.

Ms. Park cited National Parks Service Preservation Brief #1 – *Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings* and pointed out the text that acids should not be used.

Mr. Murakami echoed Ms. Park's comments and expressed concern about the impact of some cleansers on the historic masonry and stressed that the Brief #1 suggests alternatives.

Ms. Dozal explained that the proposed produce is the mildest option. She explained that there is a heavy layer of tar behind the paint and majority of the work will be on concrete; the brick will be tuck pointed and then sealed.

Mr. Rosete asked if the property owner is considering another mural.

Ron King, property owner representative, said that replacement of the mural is a discussion that must occur with the property ownership group. The cost for replacing the mural is significant.

Ms. Dozal said that priming the wall following the repairs will provide a better foundation for a mural if added in the future.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rosete said that the questions ARC had were answered and that he had no objections to the repainting proposal. He said that the gentlest cleanser possible should be used.

Mr. Lee said that he was sorry to see the mural go but noted its deterioration.

Mr. Osborne-Klein was supportive of the application, calling the mural “dilapidated” and noting the importance of making sure an installation is properly installed. He said that the Secretary of Interior Standards are clear about appropriate cleaning materials and said the applicant should provide an alternative.

Mr. Murakami agreed and said that he was supportive overall. He reiterated his concern about the proposed acidic based cleaner and said there are other products that are not as damaging. He said that soft brick will absorb the material and will cause long term damage. He said it would be good to remove the old asphalt paint first. He asked the applicant about the use on the interior of the building behind the wall.

Ms. Dozal said it is used for industrial storage. She said that some of the cracks go all the way through the wall.

Ms. Park said she shares concerns about the product. She would miss the mural noting that it added life to the wall. She suggested taking photos to preserve a record of what had been there. She said she likes the idea of restoring vitality to this wall.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for Exterior Alterations and Paint Colors, as proposed with the exception of masonry cleanser. This approval is conditional upon submitting to staff for final approval a proposed cleaning product that is consistent with National Parks Service Brief #1. This action is based on the following:

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

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.

NPS Historic Preservation Brief #1 - Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings.

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

121410.24

Cobalt

505 Union Station

Applicant: Bart Haynes, sitting in for Michael Springer, Trade-Marx Signs

Signage: Proposed business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of one (1) business identification sign, consisting of custom fabricated stainless steel, brush finish reverse pan channel letters and logo to be halo illuminated with white LED lighting. The letters will be mounted to a clear Lexan backing and bolded to the mortar. Dimensions: 27' 3-5/16" w x 4' h x 3" d. Exhibits included drawings, photographs and material sample.

Ms. Frestedt said the business is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. The proposed signage does not exceed maximum size allowance per SMC 23.66.338 Table D. Cobalt is the primary tenant in 605 Union Station, occupying four floors of the building. The signs for the prior tenants (Amazon and Accenture) have been removed. She explained that Staff does not object to the proposed sign lighting in this location due to the fact that it is replacing similar previously approved signage and there are no adjacent buildings that would be adversely impacted.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Haynes went over the proposed signage on the west elevation of the building noting its exposure toward the stadium. He said there would be little visibility from the street below. He provided photos of the original signs and said proposed signs would have a scale relative to what had been there before.

Mr. Lee left at 5:45 p.m.

Mr. Haynes said the sign would have visibility from a distance. He said the tenant is taking over the 6th-9th floors – 50% of the building. He said the sign will be custom made, stainless steel, and said that it will have a Lexan back to prevent water and bird infiltration. He said what it proposed is elegant and noted the letters will be halo lit. He added that the material was selected to pick up existing details in the building.

Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Frestedt cited SMC 23.66.338 D4 and said that the location of the sign is permitted given the level of occupancy the applicant will have in the building.

Mr. Haynes said that a lot of signage in the International District is pedestrian-oriented whereas this sign is meant to be viewed from a distance. He said that the previous signs were almost not visible. He explained there would be no connection to the window mullions – all attachments would be into the mortar joints. He explained that the halo lighting would not create glare; it is softer and more refined lighting. He said that the location of the sign was chosen because it is within the area leased by the applicant and also because power and penetrations are already there. He also noted the vantage point of the location.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rosete said it was essentially replacement of a previously approved sign.

Mr. Osborne-Klein commented that it is a good location, makes sense and it is an improvement over the previous signs. He noted the rule about hardship. He said he does not believe there is a hardship case to be made in this instance.

Chris Reed, Cobalt, referred to leasing requirements that dictate parameters for business signage, including location.

Mr. Rosete said the sign would not be visible if smaller.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said this sign is different from others in the district that are pedestrian-oriented and that this sign is meant to be seen from outside the district, as it is facing west.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval signage; this decision takes into account circumstance based on sign's location and topography:

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

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

- A. Message.**
- B. Permitted signs.**
- E. Illumination.**

2. Illuminated signs shall be designed and sited in a manner to minimize glare on floors above grade in nearby residences.

ISRD Design Guidelines – Design Guidelines for Signs

A. BUILDINGS WITH MULTIPLE TENANTS: The following design guidelines apply to buildings with multiple tenants:

All signs on a single building shall be coordinated as to size, shape, color and location. They shall be of shapes, colors, and textures compatible with each other and with the architecture and exterior finish materials of the building.

B. BUILDING GREATER THAN ONE STORY: Projecting signs or surface-mounted internally-lighted "box" signs shall be prohibited above the sill line of the second floor. Signs identifying the building or a single primary tenant are excepted from this provision.

MM/SC/MR/JP 3:0:1 Motion carries. Mr. Osborne-Klein opposed.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that he voted to oppose based on SMC 23.66.338 D4 and the fact that the applicant has not demonstrated hardship to request a sign.

121410.25

East West Bank

668 S. Lane St.

Applicant: Jason Taylor, for Sign Tech

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of signage on the west façade consisting of one (1) flat-mounted, non-illuminated aluminum sign with vinyl graphics; dimensions: 36" w x 14" h; and one (1) illuminated aluminum cabinet sign featuring push through acrylic letters and vinyl decal graphics; dimensions: 8' w x 2' h. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. She reported that the business is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. The International Special Review District Board recommended approval of a Certificate of Approval for signage in Sept. 2010. The Board recommended approval for the installation of an ATM machine on the east façade in Nov. 2010. She said the amount of signage allowed per SMC 23.66.338 Building identification signage - Table D – is 110 sq. ft. The total amount of signage proposed is 92.25 sq. ft. This includes the signage that was approved by the Board in Sept. 2010.

Ms. Frestedt expressed concerns about this proposal noting that the placement of illuminated business signage on a residential story (2nd floor of the west façade) is uncharacteristic of the District and could contribute to unintended light leakage for nearby residential units; and the intensely blue color is not compatible with the color and character of the west façade of the building. Additionally, she said the placement of two nearly identical signs on the west façade creates a visual redundancy. An alternative that combines the two signs into one sign placed lower on the building would be preferred.

Applicant Comment:

Jason Taylor went through the packet of materials with board members and pointed out earlier-approved signage that has already been installed. He said that they want to increase visibility from Lane Street. He proceeded to go over sign and attachment details of the two signs one of which will be an East West sign with their logo and text in English and Chinese and the other will be a sign to direct traffic to an underground parking lot. He said the parking lot is seldom used and the bank wants it to be more visible. He said the East West sign is proposed to be illuminated as an identifier to traffic on Lane Street; he said that only the copy is illuminated.

Ms. Park commented that the bank is not open at night and noted that adjacent residents could be negatively impacted by the new sign's lighting. She said that there are numerous signs on the front of the building and that signage on the back should guide people to parking. She questioned the need for illuminated signage at the height they were proposing and reiterated her concern about its impact to the residents. She asked about ownership of the building.

Mr. Taylor said that the intent was to attract traffic traveling west on Lane St. He stated that the East West Bank owns the ground floor retail spaces. He added that there is an entrance into the bank from the parking garage.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the building is condominiums and that the bank owns a percentage of the common space, including the wall under discussion. He said the signage seems cluttered and suggested it may be more efficient to combine the two.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if the applicant had evaluated the glare of the second story sign on adjacent windows.

Mr. Taylor said that had not, but that the lighting was minimal and explained the construction of the sign. He said combining the signs is not possible and would look tacky. He said they don't want to mess up their branding. He said they were not interested in changing the color of the sign or reducing the graphics.

Discussion ensued about the location of the signs, glare as well as redundancy. A Board member noted that if the sign was moved to below the 2nd floor sill line the illuminated sign would still be visible.

Public Comment:

Mr. Rosete said he sees the logic of the signs, but believes that the bank could get the message across without illuminating the second story sign.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted that Key Bank modified their signage to minimize impact to the building. He commented that while he understands the need for the signs the current proposal doesn't comply; he said the location of the sign is inconsistent with the guidelines. He noted the clutter and redundancy of two signs.

Mr. Murakami agreed with Mr. Osborne-Klein and said that with the placement of the two signs so close would create clutter. He expressed concern that the placement and the height of the signs were inconsistent with the guidelines.

Ms. Park concurred and said the glare would impact the residents. She questioned the necessity for a larger sign and suggested combining the two signs.

Mr. Rosete said that the parking sign is reasonable, as proposed.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for the parking signage to be located on the first story, and recommend denial of the Certificate of Approval for the illuminated signage proposed for the second story.

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

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

C. Message.

D. Permitted signs.

3. The total number of signs permitted per use is not limited; provided, that the total area of all signs for an individual use shall not exceed the area authorized in subsections D1 and D2.

E. Illumination.

2. Illuminated signs shall be designed and sited in a manner to minimize glare on floors above grade in nearby residences.

The location of the proposed illuminated signage may create glare for nearby residential floors.

ISRD Design Guidelines – Design Guidelines for Signs

A. BUILDINGS WITH MULTIPLE TENANTS: The following design guidelines apply to buildings with multiple tenants:

All signs on a single building shall be coordinated as to size, shape, color and location. They shall be of shapes, colors, and textures compatible with each other and with the architecture and exterior finish materials of the building.

B. BUILDING GREATER THAN ONE STORY: Projecting signs or surface-mounted internally-lighted "box" signs shall be prohibited above the sill line of the second floor. Signs identifying the building or a single primary tenant are excepted from this provision.

The location of the proposed illuminated signage does not meet the requirements for Buildings Greater than One Story since it is proposed to be located above the sill line of the second story.

MM/SC/MR/RM

4:0:0 Motion carried.

121410.3 BOARD BRIEFINGS

Ms. Frestedt commented that new Chair and Vice chair would be selected at the first meeting in January and asked members to consider serving one of the roles.

121410.31 Kong Yick West

Briefing by Joyce Pisanont, IDEA Space, on proposed façade improvements, including installation of a storefront awning system on the King St. façade.

Ms. Pisanont explained the Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation Development Authority (SCIDPDA) received a \$30,000 grant from Office of Economic Development (OED) and that the money must be used for primary façade improvements, for capital costs. She said that they were hoping for additional resources and want to spend the dollars where they would have the greatest impact.

Ms. Pisanont presented renderings created with students from the University of Washington. She said they looked for a group or “cohort” of small businesses and came up with the Kong Yick. She said they propose to do an canopy over the “inner three” businesses. The design is based on the approved canopies for the Far East Building on S. Jackson St. The installation of the canopy would require removal of Harbor City’s neon blade sign, and then do the rest when more funds become available or when conduit on the east end can be removed. She said that culturally relevant signage would hang from the awning, referring to a graphic rendering of the proposal. She said the awning would have a steel frame and that they were exploring options for the top of the awning, including a translucent top but noted the challenge of cleaning pigeon droppings. She said the building owners support the proposal and would cover matching funds of \$12,000.

Ms. Park expressed concern that without a translucent canopy the awning may make the sidewalk too dark.

Ms. Pisanont said that lighting has also been explored.

Ms. Park suggested a high quality acrylic or plastic awning might allow in more light.

Ms. Frestedt noted the applicable sections of the code – SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes, which states the preference for natural materials.

Mr. Osborne-Klein stated that the Board had previously approved awnings throughout the District which are constructed of acrylic and feature signage.

Ms. Park suggested a milky translucent material.

Ms. Pisnanont explained that another design inspiration was the canopy on the north façade of the Domingo Viernes apartments. Responding to a Board member’s question she said that maintenance is a significant factor.

Mr. Murakami said that a semi-translucent would be good for natural light into the store front. He commented on the slope of the street and noted the height of a canopy on the west side of the building.

Ms. Pisnanont explained that the building owners are interested in removing the electrical conduit but it would be costly since they would have to be routed underground. At this point they are concentrating on life safety issues in the building.

Mr. Osborne-Klein expressed concern with trying to do too much with \$30,000 and that the end result might be poor quality. He preferred a scaled approach to retain the quality.

Ms. Pisnanont said that they want to do it right and won’t sacrifice quality.

Mr. Murakami appreciated the design and care taken to preserve the transom windows.

Mr. Rosete said the consistency of the canopies is a good precedent.

Ms. Park said that making light available is positive to creating a vital lively street.

Ms. Pisnanont said that they have looked into lighting and said that they would not pursue that until they have a better understanding of the conduit issue. She said there is so much conduit on the east side that it would impact the ability to put a canopy there.

121410.32 Storefront Design student project
Presentation by Joyce Pisnanont, IDEA space, on streetscape and merchandise display design concepts developed by a class of Taiwanese students working with UW Professor Jeff Hou.

Deferred.

121410.4 BOARD BUSINESS

Adjourn

7:15 p.m. Adjourned.

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