



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 29/10

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, February 9, 2010

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

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

020910.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 26, 2010
Review of the minutes was deferred.

020910.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

020910.21 FedEx Office

418 S. Jackson St.
Applicant: Bill Boad, Capitol Sign and Awning

Signage: Proposed revisions to existing business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the request to update the existing business identification signage to reflect the revised business name. She summarized the application as noted in the staff report and distributed the exhibits, which included drawings and photographs. She introduced the applicant, Bill Boad of Capitol Awning and Sign.

Mr. Boad explained the signage changes were prompted by a name change from “Fed Ex/Kinko’s” to “Fed Ex Office”. He went over the changes and said they would take out the existing cabinet sign over the door and will replace with a channel letter sign which will be lit by low voltage LED. They will replace existing faces of two hanging signs and will clean signs and change lamps. They will scrape off existing vinyl from windows and replace with new to reflect new name. He confirmed that this is due to a branding change.

Board Questions:

Responding to Board questions Mr. Boad confirmed that the channel sign letters will be white; existing purple letters will not be changed out; and there is a small amount of orange and green in the door sign.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the orange and green involved just a small portion of the signage and was consistent with the previous colors.

Regarding a recommendation to consider the inclusion of Asian characters, Mr. Boad was agreeable to requesting the owner to include Asian Characters but needed to know what language the signs should be translated into. Board members discussed the difficulty of determining which language to use because of the diversity of languages spoken in the District. It was agreed that the motion would include a recommendation for Asian characters with the precise language to be determined by the application, should they choose to incorporate multiple languages.

Ms. Chung Gerrick stated that the channel letters above the door were an improvement. She said the changes were comparable to the existing signage and she would support the application.

Mr. Chow inquired about the finish for the awning.

Mr. Osborne-Klein clarified that the application was signage and that the awning was not part of this application.

Ms. Frestedt said that the staff option is that there is nothing in this application that conflicts with the Guidelines.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rosete noted the change in appearance of the area west of 5th Avenue compared to the historic core.

Mr. Osborne-Klein pointed out this building is within the Asian Character Design District although it is a new building. [*Staff correction: The building is located just*

outside of the Asian Design Character District. The staff report has been updated accordingly for the record. –RF 3.8.10]

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage, as proposed.

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 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

A. Message

B. Permitted signs

D. Permitted sign area

E. Illumination

ISR Design Guidelines for Signs

II. A. Buildings with multiple tenants

C. Internally lighted signs in all locations

Mr. Murakami amended the motion to add recommendation for Asian characters appropriate for District.

MM/SC/MR/MCG 6:0:0 Motion on amendment carried.

MM/SC/RM/BL 6:0:0 Motion carried.

020910.22

Red Lantern Restaurant

520 S. Jackson St.

Applicant: Bradley Khouri, b9 Architects

Exterior alterations: Proposed storefront alterations.

Mr. Ha arrived at 5:05 p.m.

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for proposed façade alterations, including construction of two new 5’h x 7’w wood frame windows in the bay to the east of the entrance and modifications to the wooden screening. The proposal includes revised canopy paint colors. Window frames will be painted to match existing. Exhibits included drawings, photographs and material samples.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the ISR Board recommended approval for a Certificate of Approval for the addition of windows in the bay west of the entrance in 2005. She said additional storefront alterations occurred in this location prior to the designation of the historic district. She confirmed that the Governor Apartment building was built in 1926, designed by architect J. L. McCauley, and is a contributing building within the Asian

Design Character District. The window in the adjacent New Star Restaurant was installed in 2007. She noted that new business identification signage will be submitted under a separate application. She introduced the applicant, Bradley Khouri of b9 Architects.

Mr. Khouri explained that the portion of the building where the work is proposed used to be a single restaurant that occupied all five storefronts. He said that now there are two restaurants occupying the space beneath the five canopies. He explained that the intent was to differentiate the two restaurants through this proposal and provide greater transparency with the façade. He explained the configuration of the space and described limitations caused by a lowered ceiling. He said the different interior floor and ceiling heights made it impossible to match the windows so they would do so as closely as possible. He explained they would remove existing signage which would expose the remainder of the screen. He said the street-facing wall is set back within the terra cotta frame; they will keep that wall where it is. He said the window will match what is there but will be 6” shorter because of the lower ceiling and higher floors. He said there would be glass from 30” off the floor which will allow the table height to not be visible through the glass. What is there now is an opaque wall – the changes will allow greater transparency.

He said they intend to paint the awning a matte finish red (color sample provided) to distinguish the restaurant from the one next door. With regard to painting the awning everything that comes off the building will be painted the red. He provided a sample of the glass confirming that they would not use mirrored glass. He added that the window would be dual glazed and the wood frame would match exactly what is there. He clarified that while the awning and its supports would be painted the red, everything within the plane of the building wall will stay brown.

Board Questions:

Responding the Board questions Mr. Khouri said the trim around the window would remain stained wood and painted portions would be the supports to the canopy.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted the great gesture to remove the Golden City opaque screening and said it helps the store front, adds transparency and creates a positive environment for pedestrians.

Mr. Rosete liked how it opened up the storefront and asked about signage.

Mr. Khouri noted a different contractor would come back with a signage application.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said it was an overall improvement and noted the configuration of the awning, storefronts and the signs have relationship together.

There was some discussion about signage, including a description by the new business owners; however, they reiterated that signage will part of a separate application. Ms. Frestedt stated that the current application should be considered on its own.

Mr. Chow asked if the glass would be tinted and what the District requirements would allow. He commented that people prefer to not be seen when at a restaurant and asked the owners if they would want tinted glass.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the guidelines prefer clear glass.

Ms. Frestedt said in accordance with the guidelines tinting is discouraged and mirrored glazing is prohibited. She said that the Land Use Code has a transparency requirement as part of the building design requirements is to encourage and increase the amount of visibility into and out of a business or storefront including restaurants.

Mr. Chow said it doesn't make sense.

Mr. Murakami asked why the screening on new window stopped below its relation to the other one.

Mr. Khouri explained the window is 30" high now and said they could bring the screen down but the lower it gets the more visible the tables are inside – right now the ledge is just above the table. He explained the difficulty of dealing with the different height ceilings and floors inside. He said the only way to make it match up would be to rip out the ceiling and raised it but there is HVAC running the length of the space. He directed Board members to A2.1 in the packet which shows the floor plan of the restaurant and pointed out which section was 6" higher.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked members of the Board if they support the proposed alignment of the two windows or if there is any concern about the screen.

Mr. Khouri said on the right side the screen is higher than the window.

With regard to the paint color alternatives presented by the applicant, Mr. Osborne-Klein said that all three colors were appropriate and for Board comment.

Ms. Chung Gerrick supported the applicant's preferred color.

Mr. Rosete said it matches well with the overall look.

Mr. Chow liked the way the windows were aligned because it individualized the store front.

There was a brief discussion about the canopy material. Ms. Frestedt stated that if the canopy needed to be repaired, materials should be in-kind. She said changing the materials would require a Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Chung Gerrick invited Board discussion regarding differentiating the businesses by painting the awning rather than having uniformly colored awnings across the storefront. She said that typically there is a different color store front but awning is more uniform within the building.

Mr. Rosete noted a recent application where the owners chose to have a uniform awning.

Mr. Osborne-Klein had no problem with this type of differentiation noting that the design of the awning was the same so there was architectural consistency and said it was a nice way to differentiate the businesses.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said she liked the colors.

Mr. Rosete said the color is not outrageous.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said there were no awnings on the east side store front so it is not as disruptive.

Mr. Murakami indicated that it is not a building-wide awning and it does help differentiate the businesses.

Mr. Lee said the proposed color was a lot closer and respected the brown without trying to take over the building.

Ms. Frestedt said the colors are consistent with the Guidelines – they are a muted and architecturally appropriate color. She said because the storefront is a different design there is already some deviation of storefront designs throughout the course of the building she didn't have any objections to the proposal. She said there are buildings elsewhere in the district with awnings that are all different designs and colors and while this is a different circumstance, each application is reviewed on a case by case basis. She noted this is easily reversible with paint color.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve for a Certificate of Approval for façade alterations, as proposed with wood awning.

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

A. General requirements.

B. Asian Design Character District.

1. Materials.

2. Colors.

3. Surfaces.

4. Transparency.

ISRD Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #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/RM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

020910.3

GUIDELINE REVISION SESSION

Board discussion regarding proposed design guideline revisions.

Ms. Frestedt passed out the latest draft version of the guideline revisions and noted she met with the consultants who provided feedback on formatting and clarity. She said that the latest draft identifies places within the document for graphics and text boxes. She proceeded to go over updates; what follows is board feedback to those updates.

Regarding Comment A3 on Page 4: Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested looking at the Livable South Downtown planning documents for neighborhood maps.

Regarding quote on page 4: Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested citation be included at bottom of quote rather than at the beginning.

Page 5:

Page 5, under “Why do I need a C of A”: Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested instead of “*may* require” use “*generally* requires”. He recommended keeping it simple.

Mr. Chow asked if “Architectural Drawings” means they have to be drawn by an architect.

Ms. Frestedt noted the drawings don’t have to be done by an architect said that she appreciating the question since she doesn’t want applicants to think that they’re required to hire one. Board members suggested other ways to refer to drawings, including technical drawing and design drawing. Ms. Frestedt explained that she is sensitive to the budgets that a lot of applicants are working suggesting a hand drawing or tracing a

photograph – something may be able to prepare themselves. She explained that she often works with applicants before they come for Board review to make sure the application contains the necessary level of detail.

Mr. Rosete said it is subjective which is hard to be specific and said to communicate idea rather than specifics.

Page 6

Ms. Frestedt commented on revisions to the section on Board review and the role of the Architectural Review Committee (ARC). She said more detail could be added here and spoke to the need to strike a balance and how to define ARC noting that not every application is reviewed by the Committee.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said it is good and that Ms. Frestedt found a middle ground.

Mr. Chow asked what kind of change requires a Certificate of Approval and said there are smaller businesses and larger businesses, citing Milwaukee Building as large and Fed Ex as small, and asked how to answer the question in terms of income level of the change.

Ms. Frestedt said that income level isn't part of the Board's review or consideration so it isn't appropriate to include in the Guidelines. She said to some degree she takes into account a small business owner who is operating a business and is designing a sign and may not have the ability to hire an architect but work with a small sign company who can't supply all the architectural details that an architect would. She said it is trying to work with what info does the board need to make an informed decision and often those questions are answered before it comes before the Board.

Mr. Rosete asked about the process for review and timeline.

Ms. Frestedt explained the period of time for review may take 3 – 5 weeks and said it is difficult to estimate or set expectations of time because it varies so much from project to project. She said the Code allows 28 days from receipt of a Certificate of Approval application to determine whether or not the application is complete. She noted that timing varies from application to application.

Mr. Lee said people assume that once the application is mailed they are ready to go. He suggested breaking things up and explaining how the process is done.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said it could be broken up into steps or bullets because the paragraph is a bit dense.

A discussion of the bullets on page 8 led to a discussion of sustainability and sustainable materials.

Mr. Osborne-Klein posed the question if a building were constructed of a non-sustainable material, such as mahogany, and our guidelines prefer in-kind replacement, does historic nature trump sustainability?

Ms. Frestedt said preference is given to repair of historic features – so if there is a building with mahogany there is a stated preference to look at what options do you have to retain and restore what is there versus replacing it. If you have to replace, then perhaps there is another compatible material other than mahogany.

Mr. Murakami stated that the energy code has exceptions for historic buildings.

Mr. Lee noted that the Milwaukee storefronts had been changed many times and asked which historic time is considered relevant.

Ms. Frestedt reminded the Board that the Secretary of Interior Standards were included at the end of the document. She said in following the Standards when looking at storefront renovation or remodel, part of the consideration that is given when determining the appropriate strategy for rehabilitation is to research the changes that have been made over time. The Code requirements for applications state that when original materials are removed the applicant must submit a survey or summary of what the changes have been over time. She said that is typically part of the discussion that happens as someone is preparing their application and the information should be part of the Board's consideration. She said she wasn't certain how much detail to include in the guidelines because there is already direction about strategies for rehabilitation provided by the Secretary of Interior Standards. She said the Guidelines are really supplementing the existing Standards and Land Use Code.

There was discussion about the bullet related to design of new construction and compatibility. Ms. Osborne-Klein wanted to avoid encouraging compatibility with undesirable traits in the District.

Ms. Frestedt said there are different ways to review look at the broader implications of that bullet. She said as overarching goals this is just a general statement. She said that the details should be included within specific guidelines for new construction.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said he thought the last bullet was redundant.

Ms. Frestedt said there may be redundancy and will revisit this section. She said there may be way to collapse bullets to eliminate redundancy.

Mr. Murakami said one is more general and one is more specific.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said he liked calling out the individual expression.

Mr. Murakami asked if that was addressing the chaotic nature of the district.

Ms. Frestedt agreed and said it is part of the character of this neighborhood and Chinatowns throughout North America, many of which have haphazard form of development and individual expression. She said it is part of what makes the neighborhood unique and provides character and asked how to encourage that in a meaningful way.

The discussion turned to the sections on General Goals for Rehabilitation and Guidelines – Specific. Ms. Frestedt started with the section on Site Design. She said she re-organized the section to provide a context statement, general characteristics in District that support site design and will then start to list individual guidelines for design. She suggested that the same structure be used for Building Design, Signs, Lighting, etc. She said she would collapse individual categories on open space and parking into the site design section. She said when looking at the footprint of any site, such as Hing Hay Park or a building, one can look at the characteristics of that site; it may include open space, parking, or features like landscaping. It is not necessary to call the each element out separately. She said that she will write a brief introductory heading in italics under each section and noted she had started to draft headings on Page 10 under storefront guidelines and Page 11 under signs and will continue to do it under the others.

Mr. Rosete noted the preference for street pedestrian activity.

Ms. Frestedt stated that due to the importance of the pedestrian environment she included it under General Goals.

Going back to structure, Ms. Frestedt asked for Board feedback on the underlying characteristics or baselines of each sub-heading and she asked what kind of direction within that baseline the board wants to provide within the individual guidelines.

The discussion turned to parking. Ms. Frestedt said that DOT manages where parking is allowed to a large degree. She stated that the Board approves changes to existing street parking configuration.

Mr. Lee asked about space requirement for pedestrians on sidewalks noting street vending and street furniture.

Ms. Frestedt said 6' is required for ADA within the right of way.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested adding the phrase “and authorized” after the text “where appropriate” under Site Design guideline C.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the Board has jurisdiction over review and approval of merchandise displays. She said the City believes that street merchandise displays add positive benefits and is actively working to streamline and clarify the permitting process for merchandise and produce displays. She said that many of the existing businesses do not have current permits and that their configuration may not meet current Code

requirements. She said that a team of City Departments (Planning and Development, Transportation, etc.) is exploring ways to revise the Code requirements to allow greater flexibility in display configurations.

Discussion ensued about the alleys being accessible and safe and that there is movement to rid alleys of dumpsters. There was discussion about the cobblestones in the alley and it was noted they are an historic element and that they should be maintained accordingly.

Ms. Frestedt suggested rephrasing the 2nd sentence under guideline E – “with a preference towards hospitable, safe, clean”.

Mr. Lee said alleys are also referred to as “through-ways” and noted the vacated alley behind the Four Seas.

Ms. Frestedt noted the use as a pedestrian passage rather than a vehicular alley.

Ms. Frestedt clarified the difference between site design guidelines versus building design guidelines. She said one addresses the site, such as the ground and the context of the site surrounding the development, and the other addresses the physical building or structure on the site.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested including public safety in site design section.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested adding section about exterior lighting there.

Ms. Frestedt said lighting is included under building design but perhaps it should be also under light and site design, because if it is a park or an alley there may not be a building but you may want to add lighting.

Mr. Lee suggested adding to parks and alleys to open spaces.

The discussion then turned to use of terms and their definitions. Mr. Osborne said he was not sure about use of the term “fenestration”. Ms. Frestedt noted there is a glossary at the end of the guidelines and went over the definition of the word in the glossary. Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested use of foot notes instead of a glossary. Ms. Frestedt said it is not common to footnote in guidelines and noted that including a definition section is more typical, but said will revisit the issue of technical terms.

Ms. Frestedt asked what additional information is needed. She asked the Board to consider applications that have been reviewed and how expanded set of guidelines could help provide more direction to applicants and to Board members.

The Board started to discuss sign guidelines and general characteristics associated with signs. Terms that came up were: compatibility, multi-lingual, placement, pedestrian oriented, auto oriented.

Ms. Frestedt said the Land Use Code for the District is fairly proscriptive regarding signage and encouraged the board to read section 23.66.338 of the Seattle Municipal Code, in their Board Handbooks. She asked: what is not there that Board members want to see included in the guidelines?

Mr. Osborne-Klein said repeating certain information from the Code in the guidelines could be helpful.

Ms. Frestedt agreed and asked the Board to thinking about sections of the sign chapter of the Code that could be reinforced in the guidelines. That concluded the guidelines portion of the discussion.

Board Business:

In response to a request for information from a Board member, Ms. Frestedt provided a brief summary of the Board's review of the atrium and mural on the Bush Asia Building noting that the new atrium was constructed following Board review and approval of the project. She said she spoke with the architect on the project, Bob Hale from Kovolenko Hale, who recalled that the issue of the mural and changed sight lines came up when the application was reviewed by the Board. He said sight line drawings were submitted to and reviewed by the Board who then approved the application.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that the new atrium is physically covering part of the mural.

Ms. Frestedt stated that based on her review of the plans and after visiting the site it appears that the atrium was built in accordance with what was approved by the Board.

Mr. Chow said he was at the Board meeting at the time it was reviewed. He said that would have been a huge red light if it had come before the current Board.

Mr. Osborne-Klein stated that different boards have different priorities and that it didn't clearly violate the code – it has aesthetic issues that this Board would question.

Ms. Frestedt said the form of a 45° atrium it creates very different sight lines than something that is rounded that you can see over the edge so that was the discussion at the time that it went through and was approved.

Mr. Chow said it looks like it was built on top of the mural.

Ms. Frestedt said looking at the lines for the existing atrium they fall within the footprint of what had been there previously.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said because it is concrete it seems like the walls are much thicker and expand into the mural more than the original design did.

Ms. Frestedt said there is a portion of the work that the mural painter has not yet come to complete the “bringing it back to the in-kind” condition that it was before construction. She stated that the attachment point from the previous green house is visible and the mural painter will come back to correct that. She said her understanding is that the painting hasn’t been scheduled yet but that is the intent of the property owners.

Mr. Chow said the design of the atrium covers everything the Board is trying to achieve. He said, as an example, the seismic bracing that was put in...we aren’t going to change that and as a board there was some disapproval because it went through without being approved. It is the same thing with the mural.

Mr. Osborne-Klein pointed out that the mural was approved.

Ms. Frestedt explained that everything was executed for the atrium was done per Board approval. The nature of Boards’ interpretations of Guidelines and the codes can vary depending on who the members at the time.

Mr. Chow asked to see who was on the Board then.

Ms. Frestedt said she can provide that information and that is also available in the file. She encouraged Mr. Chow to come to DON office and review the file since the file contains the drawings and information about what was approved.

Mr. Chow left at 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Frestedt advised Board members to keep in mind that an elevation drawing that shows the building from the ground to the top is flat and provides a different sense of the perspective than in person. When trying to understand what the physical implications would be of any proposal, one might look at whether a flat drawing will be enough and might 3-dimensional or sight line drawings be needed. She said that board members can request that information and site visits are also helpful.

Ms. Frestedt requested that Board members look through the Code – specifically at Building Design (SMC 23.66.336) and Sign (SMC 23.66.338) sections – as those will be the focus of the next review session. She said that one of the consultants from LNM Architecture recommended changing the phrasing from “New Construction Guidelines” to “Additional Criteria for New Construction” because they are not separate – the same rules apply – they are just additional things that are relevant.

Mr. Murakami asked if “Alterations to Public Right of Way” should move to “Site”.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said he viewed Public Right of Way issues as a separate category unto itself – Building Design, Site Design and then Public Right of Way which could deal with alleys, parks, streets and sidewalks.

Ms. Frestedt suggested adding a discussion of public art.

020910.4 BOARD BUSINESS

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