



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 74/10

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, March 23, 2010

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

#### **Board Members Present**

Josh Osborne-Klein, Chair  
Misun Chung Gerrick  
Robert Ha  
Bill Lee  
Marvin Rosete

#### **Staff**

Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### **Absent**

Brien Chow  
Rich Murakami

#### **032310.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

February 9, 2010  
MM/SC/MR/RH 5:0:0 Minutes approved.

#### **032310.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### 032310.21 Fujisada Condominiums

510 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.  
*Applicant:* Ron Meckler, contractor

**Use:** Establishing the use of a minor communication utility (wireless) on the rooftop.

**Exterior alteration:** Proposed installation of rooftop communication equipment and screening.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to establish use of a minor communication utility (Clearwire wireless) on the rooftop. She went over proposed installation of rooftop communication equipment (antennas and microwave dish) and construction of an 8'8" h x 8' w x 5'6" d screening house mounted, on a steel platform on the roof. The screening

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

house will be clad in a Pultex Fiber Reinforced Polymer composite material painted to match the building exterior. Exhibits included plans, drawings, photographs and material samples. She provided background information on the building noting that the Fujisada was constructed in 1999. It is a non-contributing building within the Asian Design Character District. She said that staff had no objections to the proposal and that it was appropriate and consistent with the guidelines.

#### Applicant Comment:

Ron Meckler, Powder River Development Services, explained the proposal to put antenna on the roof and referred to presentation boards to orient the Board to the details of the project. He explained the proposal to build a platform on the roof to support the proposed antennas. He said there would be a small 2' x 2' x 5 1/4'h cabinet on a steel grid platform with a screening wall to house the equipment. He said it would resemble a penthouse and provided photo mock ups to show what it would look like. The screening material, FRP (fire rated panel) is formulated from a Plexiglas-type material that is transparent to radio waves allowing the equipment to be screened visually but still allow the antennas to send and receive signals.

He said they propose to locate it on the south edge of the building which is along the alley; it would have minimal visibility from the alley and would have no visibility from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He said they generally try to put the antennas on the center of the building (and Seattle Code requires they be put in the center of the building if technically feasible) but because the building owner did not want penetrations into the roof they sited it in the proposed location. He explained that they will span between two parapet walls to provide support for the entire structure on the load bearing walls without touching the roof. He said that the south side of the building is preferred also because Clearwire's primary service area for this facility is to the southwest and southeast; he provided propagation maps showing the areas to be served by this facility.

#### Board Questions:

Responding to board questions Mr. Meckler said that antenna and cable would be enclosed behind the screening wall and will not be visible. He directed board members to A4 of the site plan which showed detail of the equipment platform. He explained that the height of the screening would be slightly lower than the existing elevator penthouse and clarified that the screening would be "color infused" during the manufacturing process and that it would match the color of the siding of the building and would require no future repainting.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted that the proposed synthetic screening material typically would be discouraged in the district but added that because building is a non-contributing building and the roof top use would not be visible from street level the exception would be okay.

Ms. Frestedt noted there were safety reasons for proposing the material and noted that SMC 23.66.336 Section B allows for the board to allow other materials to be used if there are extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Meckler said the only other option would be to construct the screening from wood but then the antennas would have to be on the outside but that they thought this was a better design and was better to conceal the antennas.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for use and exterior alterations, as proposed. This action is based on the following:

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

**SMC 23.66.030 - Certificates of Approval – Application, review and appeals**

**SMC 23.66.320 – Permitted Uses**

**SMC 23.66.332 – Height**

**C. Rooftop Features**

**SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes**

**A. General Requirements**

**B. Asian Design Character District**

**Relevant Secretary of Interior Standard's for Rehabilitation:**

#9 - New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic 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/MR/BL 5:0:0 Motion carried.

032310.22

Ascona Apartments

200 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

*Applicant:* Chris Wright, Group3 Architects

**Façade alteration:** Proposed cornice replacement.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed replacement of the building's cornice, consisting of galvanized sheet metal, painted white to match the building trim. Exhibits included plans, drawings and photographs. She provided background information on the building noting that the Ascona (formerly the Alki Hotel) was constructed in 1910 and is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. She said that staff issued an Emergency Certificate of Approval for the removal of the original cornice in October 2009 following an unexpected structural failure. The Architectural Review Committee reviewed alternative design options on Jan. 12<sup>th</sup> and March 9<sup>th</sup>. The ARC recommended approval for Option 2, as proposed on March 9<sup>th</sup>.

Applicant Comment:

Chris Wright, Group3 Architects, went over the options to rebuild the cornice that had been explored and the described the evolution of the preferred design. He referenced the Secretary of Interior Standards and noted that the preferred option was to replace in kind but an acceptable option was to have a new design as long as it was differentiated from the original and was not trying to create a false historicism. He explained that the original proposed design, which included dentils fabricated out of wood, wasn't feasible due to structural issues that could arise. He said that it would be cost prohibitive to replicate the dentils in sheet metal. The current profile incorporates a triangular shaped brace which modifies the profile. He said the proposed material would be sheet metal – same as the original – but that the new would be galvanized. He said the color would be the same as the previous cornice and would match paint trim.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the applicant originally attempted to replace the cornice in-kind using different materials but determined that the how the two different materials would relate to one another over time – through weathering or seismic event - would not be structurally sound.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said the ARC looked at the proportions and after review of two options most members preferred Option 2. She said the depth and profile were similar to the original and said it was buildable. She said that Option 1 was too modern for the building and that Option 2's proportions were good and also the construction and detailing will last another 100 years.

Mr. Wright said that Option 1 proposed use of a thicker material that limited its shape.

Ms. Chung Gerrick explained that Option 2 is different from the original in that there were dentil every 24- 36" and now there are none.

Ms. Frestedt noted another difference was that the original cornice was a more ornate designed and the proposed cornice is more angular and streamlined. She noted that absent member Chow, who had attended the ARC meeting, had stated a preference for the inclusion of dentils.

Mr. Rosete said it would be nice to have it look like it did before but noted the appropriateness of the proposed design and materials.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the materials are the same as original and she credited the applicant for staying with the sheet metal since that was the traditional material used.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if there were attachment concerns.

Ms. Frestedt said that DPD would review and she would defer to their structural review team but she thought the attachment was appropriate.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked if having no cornice was an option and Ms. Frestedt explained that the cornice was a character-defining element of the building and had it not come down unexpectedly removal would not have been supported. She said the Secretary of Interior Standards support replacement and reported that in similar cases – such as after the Nisqually earthquake – decisions were made to repair or replace the cornices.

Ms. Chung Gerrick commented that it would be a mistake not to have the cornice noting that even though the profile would not be exactly the same the depth of the cornice matches the original and that she supported Option 2.

Mr. Lee noted that the cornice would be re-attached to the same location.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the cornice replacement, as proposed. This action is based on the following:

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

**SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval – Application, review and appeals**  
**SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes**

- A. General Requirements
- C. Exterior Building Design Outside the Asian Design Character District

**ISRD District Design Guidelines**

II. Storefront and building design guidelines

**Relevant Secretary of Interior Standard's for Rehabilitation:**

#2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

#6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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

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

032310.23

Ascona Apartments

200 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

*Applicant:* Chris Wright, Group3 Architects

**Façade alteration:** Proposed storefront window replacement.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed revision to storefront window replacement. Exhibits included plans, photographs and manufacturer specification sheets. She provided background information noting that the Ascona (formerly the Alki Hotel) was constructed in 1910 and is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. In Sept. 2009, the ISRD Board approved a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations, including replacement of select storefront windows required by DPD and energy code requirements. The proposal was reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee on March 9, 2010.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Wright explained the proposed revision to the storefront window area. He explained that the windows that had previously been approved by the Board would not meet Energy Code requirements and so revisions were necessary. He said they were able to negotiate with DPD on how they would meet the Energy Code and that they were now able to use the same Milgard window with the same profiles, all with double glazing and a Low E window coating. He said the glazing had a slight tint to it unlike the other windows which have clear glazing. He provided glazing samples for board review. He said with these windows are closer to the original profile. He pointed out two windows that will be broken up into six panels. He said on the northwest side they proposed some operable windows which will match the casement windows next door. He showed a photo showing the use of both casement and fixed windows on one building noting the slightly different profile. He said the tint would be very subtle.

Ms. Frestedt said the Board should consider the glazing tint considering the guidelines that windows must be clear. She said that ideally there would be no tint and that windows would have the same consistent profile throughout but noted there were tradeoffs working with DPD and the Energy Code. She said ideally all windows on the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue façade would be replaced in order to maintain a uniform appearance, but she explained that the Board cannot require that the applicant replace all windows. She said that some gains were made in not having to use triple-pane windows that were initially proposed. She said that she thinks the proposal is acceptable.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted the challenges of integrating a triple pane window into the existing configuration and said the new proposed window even with the slight tint would be a big improvement. She said she was supportive of the proposal.

Mr. Rosete said that it was not as noticeable from the street level.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the existing windows were not original and that all storefronts had previously been altered.

Public Comment:

Betty Lau, Chong Wa Benevolent Association, asked why the windows would be tinted.

Mr. Wright explained that it was to meet the Energy Code.

Ms. Lau asked what “dentil” meant.

Mr. Wright explained what dentils were and provided a photo.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the challenge with the façade was the amount of glazing and that the energy code reviewer had expressed concern about that. She said that other storefronts have kick plates or bulkheads and this one doesn't so the potential for energy loss would be much greater.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee noted the cleaner look of the storefronts since the planters were removed.

Mr. Osborne-Klein expressed concern about the profile and the continuity of the storefronts.

Mr. Rosete noted that the windows had been changed and were fairly modern. He said was more concerned about the tint.

Ms. Frestedt said the tinting appears to be minimal.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said he is less concerned with the tint than the overall window design. He said the modifications seem minor and the layout is a little different but not so much that it is noticeable.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the façade alterations as proposed. This action is based on the following:

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

**SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval – Application, review and appeals**  
**SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes**

- B. General Requirements
- D. Exterior Building Design Outside the Asian Design Character District

**ISRD District Design Guidelines**

II. Storefront and building design guidelines

**Relevant Secretary of Interior Standard's for Rehabilitation:**

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

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

Ms. Frestedt thanked the applicant for his efforts to meet the Guidelines and the DPD requirements.

**032310.3                      GUIDELINE REVISION WORKSESSION**

Board discussion regarding proposed design guideline revisions.

Ms. Frestedt provided the latest draft of the guideline revisions and summarized changes made since the last meeting. The draft of the guideline revision is available in DON file; what is provided here are board comments.

**Page 6:**

Ms. Frestedt said suggestions were made on other ways to break up this section – potentially with bullets. She said she had reservations about providing more detail about the timeline because it varies so much from project to project. She said the General Goals provide a foundation for specific guidelines that follow and each specific guideline that follow meet and respond to the general goals for the district. She said she revised the bullets to minimize redundancy.

**Page 8:**

2<sup>nd</sup> bullet: Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested adding “when feasible” to the end. Ms. Frestedt expressed concern about whether inclusion might open a can of worms. Mr. Osborne-Klein said he thought “feasibility” had a fixed meaning and that it would be appropriate; he said something is either feasible or it isn’t. Ms. Frestedt said it was reasonable and would introduce the word back in.

5<sup>th</sup> bullet: Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested adding “and features” after “earlier buildings”.

Ms. Frestedt said the idea is not to add features if the building didn’t have it to begin with. Mr. Osborne-Klein said not to mimic historic features.

**Page 9:**

Regarding the section on Site Design, Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested including that buildings are typically ¼ or ½ block coverage.

Ms. Frestedt said lot coverage is a good example of site design. Sections of code can be reinforced in guidelines; she said that guideline “D” could be moved to general characteristics. She noted underground parking garage and that a desirable characteristic would be to have the entry off alley.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that was too specific to put under “general characteristics”.

There was discussion about the level of detail that should be included under Site Design. Ms. Frestedt said that lighting, street furniture, public art may be more appropriate for Site Design section.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested including a reference to lighting in the right-of-way and lighting on building sites.

Ms. Frestedt said under Building Design guidelines there is still a section on lighting; she proposed to have it in both locations especially since there is a concern in the community about light and public safety and calling it out under Site Design and Right of Way is appropriate and it will help anticipate some proposed changes that may come.

Mr. Rosete asked about sidewalk width.

Ms. Frestedt said that SDOT mandates minimum sidewalk width requirements. She said there is nothing in the Design guidelines or Ordinance that gives SDOT guidance about what community wants to see. She said there can be a recommendation for wider sidewalk widths that might allow for merchandise displays or vending. She said that one way this could be triggered or could kick in is thinking about proposed new development. She explained as an example that if a developer wanted to build a mixed

use building where there is currently a surface parking lot the developer would also be required to make improvements to the sidewalk and the rights of way. If the design guidelines provide guidance as to what the neighborhood would like to see above and beyond whatever minimum is established – this would be an opportunity.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said board preferences might depend on where adding that wider would be supported in retail core for on street vending and other on street permitted uses that may be approved later on such as cafes.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said that wider sidewalks could impact some parking on streets.

Mr. Osborne-Klein commented that the Maynard Green Street widened sidewalks and didn't lose much parking.

There was an extended discussion about sidewalk widths and merchandise displays. Ms. Frestedt said that SDOT came and gave briefing to the board on merchandise displays and vending carts. She said stating a preference for wider sidewalks might allow more flexibility for how vending might be configured. A Board member noted that there is currently little enforcement of the existing merchandise displays. Ms. Frestedt said allowing sidewalk merchants and vendors is desired.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested noting public safety again noting that when talking about benches. He said there is likely language from other guidelines regarding site design as way to enhance public safety and promote street activation.

Ms. Frestedt noted that a list of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles is included as a place holder on page 15. She said there may be a need to revise the section, simplify principles and moving into site design.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said one option would be to reference the list then include it as an appendix at the end.

Ms. Frestedt said that maybe a general characteristic is that selection of street furniture and lighting is consistent with principles of CPTED.

There was a discussion about the “general characteristics” and whether they refer to what currently exists or a future vision.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested beneficial characteristics that exist today would be called out and the guidelines would have aspirational goals to move the district forward.

A Board member recommended adding bus and trolley stops under Site Design.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lau said she is working on suggestions for the introductions and would submit to Ms. Frestedt. She noted that on pages 7 and 14 the term “Pan Asian” was not appropriate because there was no way to define Pan Asian characteristics. She said “Asian” is enough and that “Pan Asian” is redundant. She noted that under general characteristics – page 9 – it states the area was historically mixed use and residential. She noted the Chong Wa Benevolent Association as a social club and said that area should be beefed up to reflect buildings that were dedicated for social clubs, opera, Chinese School etc.

Mr. Rosete said that social halls may have been lumped into mixed use/commercial.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said it would be nice to specifically call out the unique building uses that don't exist elsewhere.

Ms. Frestedt agreed. She suggested adding a bullet under General Goals or as an overarching goal that is pervasive throughout the entire guidelines rather specific to site design.

Mr. Rosete said that social clubs were important in the historical forming of the communities because people couldn't go anywhere else and some social halls have survived: Nippon Kan, Nissei Veterans and they should have a separate identification within general characteristics because they were critical to formation/foundation of the district.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested putting that under uses under general goals section. It is a use not a design.

Mr. Lee suggested adding the Nippon Theatre, Library, Community Center.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that the purpose is not to call out every building and use – just the social organizations are an important feature of this district and should be called out.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said on Page 2 – guiding design principles, purpose and intent – suggested adding some social aspect to first bullet. This lead to a discussion about how to incorporate that function of district into guidelines; importance of including those roles and functions. Function and role of those buildings make this district really unique.

Ms. Frestedt suggested that board members look at Code sections on building materials and signs. She said the current guidelines as they are written has section for storefront and building design guidelines and specifically references the Asian Design Character district; she asked board members to think more broadly because that is one area in which the guidelines can provide direction to applicant but also what goals, characteristics, guidelines would you like to see for signs, materials, finishes, colors outside of the Asian Design Character district

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that when the South Downtown land use changes come he expects that is where the most dramatic changes will occur.

Ms. Frestedt agreed and said that is where the majority of development will be possible is outside of the historic core and where we might see the most dramatic change. She noted the value of thinking ahead and anticipating how the guidelines can help provide framework for how development can occur.

**032310.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Frestedt reminded board members to turn in their financial interest statements, as required by the Office of Ethics and Elections.

Ms. Frestedt reminded board members to think of examples of recent applications that would provide some good discussion points for signage and noted specifically as signage relates to awnings.

6:22 p.m. Adjourned.

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