



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 60/10

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, March 9, 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
Brien Chow
Misun Chung Gerrick
Robert Ha
Bill Lee
Marvin Rosete

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Mr. Osborne-Klein called the meeting to order at 4:37 p.m.

030910.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 26, 2010
MM/SC/MCG/RM 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

February 9, 2010
Minutes deferred.

February 23, 2010
MM/SC/RM/BL 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

030910.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

030910.21 Ticino Apartments
100 6th Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to paint the building trim, cornice and S. Yesler Ave. entrance surround. Exhibits included photographs and color sample. She provided background information noting that the Ticino was built in 1903 and is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. She said that the ISRD Board issued a Certificate of Approval in January 2009 for alterations to the entrance on the west façade and repainting the window trim.

Applicant Comment:

Property owner John Goetzing went over the photos pointing out the Yesler Ave. entrance with the small overhang and explained the building hadn't been painted since 1988.

Mr. Rosete arrived at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Goetzing explained the paint was dingy and he proposed to use white paint for the trim.

Ms. Chung Gerrick indicated the white color choice was appropriate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ha said it was straightforward.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for paint colors, 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 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

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

Design Guidelines for Awnings and Canopies, Façade Alterations, Security and Signs
II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

MM/SC/RH/RM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

030910.22

Yuan Sheng Hang Herbs

679 S. King St.

Applicant: Mei Xie, business owner

Signage: Proposed business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt noted that Mr. Ha would translate (Cantonese) for the applicant and then explained the proposal for retroactive approval of business identification signs. The signs consist of two Dibond panels (2.5' h x 12' l), installed on 7th Ave. S. and S. King St., respectively. She indicated that this was a request for retroactive approval since the signs had already been installed. Exhibits included photographs and material sample. She provided background information noting that the Louisa Apartment building is a contributing building within the Asian Design Character District. The amount of signage allowed is 87 sq. ft. The amount proposed is 24.5 sq. ft. Ms. Frestedt introduced Mei Xie.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Ha (translating for Ms. Xie) said that the applicant said she had nothing to add. He went on to provide translation of the Chinese characters in the sign: "Herb, Wholesale, Retail" along with the name of the store and the phone number. He said there was Vietnamese writing on the sign which he did not translate. He said that while there was just one entrance there were two stores inside with an open floor plan.

There was discussion about having a telephone number on the sign. Board members stated that the guidelines indicate that sign text should be limited to the name of the business. Ms. Frestedt said that because the sign was already up and there were no other issues with it that there was room for discretion.

Board members also discussed transparency because of the number of flyers posted on the windows – that 50% of the window must remain open and clear. This store was not in violation of that but it was noted that the preference is for as much as possible the glass remain clear.

Board members briefly discussed how information about the guidelines is transmitted to community members. Ms. Frestedt said it is the responsibility of the lessee and that the property owner/manager should inform tenants that they are in a historic district. Ultimately, she said, it is the responsibility of a business to research and due diligence when opening a business.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

B. General Requirements

D. Exterior Building Finishes Outside the Asian Design Character District

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signage

ISR Design Guidelines for Signs

MMSC/RM/RH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

030910.23

Bush Asia Center/IDEA Space

409 Maynard Ave. S.

Applicant: Joyce Pisanont, SCIDpda

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal for building and office signage and proposed application of window film. She said that the applicant proposed window signs for the Bush Asia Center, consisting of vinyl adhesive lettering and logo applied to the entrances on the south and east facades; proposed vinyl adhesive door signs to identify the IDEA Space office, located on the ground floor on the south façade and proposed application of decorative, yellow window film for the IDEA Space. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. She reported that the Bush Hotel was constructed in 1915 and is located in the Asian Design Character District. She advised the board that she had no objections to the proposed signage, but was concerned that the amount of window film will limit transparency into the IDEA Space offices. She had recommended that the applicant consider alternatives that reduce the amount of window film proposed or explore alternate materials that would provide greater transparency into the space. She introduced the application, Joyce Pisanont, from the PDA.

Applicant Comment:

Ms. Pisanont went over the packet information for window film noting the original proposal for the IDEA space was for a broad stripe across the window. She said they came up with two alternatives: 1) small yellow strip on the door and, 2) a small yellow strip on the lower right hand corner of the window. She explained the design concept to tie the window film in with the interior space; the yellow stripe will call out that the business is there and provides visibility from the park. She said the space is community oriented and a resource center. The vinyl lettering to go on the doors on the south and east facades will be in three languages – Chinese, Vietnamese and English – and will provide hours of operation.

Ms. Pisnanont, responding to board questions/comments, said the preferred alternative is the smaller version of the window stripe noting it will call attention to the space without being overwhelming. She noted that for security reasons, the desire to be able to see out to the park. She clarified that the dark background on graphic represented the clear glass and that all that will be seen is the lettering. She clarified that the PDA vinyl will go on the door on the Maynard Ave. entrance and also on the door at the Hing Hay Park entrance and that the yellow stripe would go on the IDEA Space door. She noted the warm gray color in the packet was not part of this application.

Mr. Ha suggested adding the yellow IDEA Space triangle to the Maynard Avenue door as well to help guide people in through that entrance.

Ms. Pisnanont said that they are working with the designer and if they can't devise an acceptable exterior sign on the Hing Hay Park entrance they would add the yellow indicator to the Maynard Ave. door.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted the design and sign were well done and liked that they were multi-lingual.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the preferred alternative per

Relevant 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

- C. General Requirements
- D. Asian Design Character District
 - 2. Colors
- 4. Transparency Requirement

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signage

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs

MM/SC/MR/MCG 7:0:0 Motion carried as amended.

030910.24 Red Lantern
520 S. Jackson St.
Applicant: Peter Lai, Action Design

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a round interior-lit cabinet sign (dimensions 1'x4'x4') mounted to the top of the awning above the entrance. Illumination will consist of rows of LED lights on the cabinet interior. Exhibits included drawings, photographs and samples. The Governor Apartment building was built in 1926 and it is a contributing building within the Asian Design Character District. On February 9, 2010 the International Special Review District Board approved the addition of a new window to the left of the entrance and new awning paint colors.

Applicant Comment:

Peter Lai explained that the sign would be attached to the awning where he thought it would be most visible. It will attach to the awning with 2 x 2 brackets painted to match the roof color and would be lit with LED lights.

Ms. Frestedt, responding to board comments, explained the sign would require a sign permit and the sign inspector would confirm integrity of the installation.

Mr. Rosete said it was an attractive alternative.

Mr. Lai explained how the LED lighting worked and said the color of the light would not impact the color. He said that while neon light will blur LED won't because it runs the whole length of the power supply.

Ms. Frestedt noted some concern about the visibility of the sign if one is standing below the awning and said that at this time nothing is planned for the doors and windows.

There was some discussion that the sign may be more auto – oriented rather than the pedestrian-orientation called out in the guidelines. Ms. Frestedt advised that the board could suggest adding vinyl window lettering later.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee noted the canopy is one of the few rigid ones in the district.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage, as amended to add window signage and Asian characters per

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 signage

ISRDR Design Guidelines for Signs

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and #10

MM/SC/MR/MCG 7:0:0 Motion carried as amended.

030910.3 BOARD BUSINESS

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted an observed increase in the number of retroactive applications coming before the Board. This led to a discussion about how business and property owners become familiar with the District requirements. Ms. Frestedt went over the ways in which information about the district and rules is transmitted and stated that property owners/managers will tell tenants. She said that if she notices a new business in the neighborhood she will stop in and talk to them and explain the requirements.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the one of the goals of the Guidelines Revision is to make the process more transparent to the public.

Ms. Chung Gerrick added that board members can share information as well.

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

Mr. Chow asked if the information was available in other languages.

Ms. Frestedt said brochures are in English but she brings brochures in Chinese and Vietnamese. She said the new guidelines will be in English but that one or two page synopsis would be done in key languages covering the most common use issues such as signs or change of use.

Mr. Chow noted the 50% transparency issue and said that most people don't know about it.

Ms. Frestedt said that in the past board staff had sent letters to business and property owners reminding them that they are part of a historic district and what the process was. She said it had been translated into Chinese but it was about eight years ago. She said it is part of her work plan to do it again this year.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted the increase in retroactive approvals.

Mr. Lee said that at least half of the buildings are owned by absent landlords who are not responsive to district requirements.

Ms. Frestedt noted the challenge of reaching family associations and multiple owners of properties.

Mr. Chow asked for clarification of responsibility for knowing the rules.

Ms. Frestedt reiterated that it is ultimately the responsibility of the business owner or the property owner who purchases a building to research and conduct due diligence to find out regulations. In the case of an earlier application, the new building owner was not aware of the district. She said that the City does not install signs indicating an area is a historic district but that the community could work together to raise funds for signage as was done in Columbia City.

Full board meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

030910.4 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

030910.41 Ascona Apartments
200 5th Ave. S.
Presenter: Chris Wright, Group3 Architects

Board briefing on proposed cornice replacement and proposed storefront window replacement.

Ms. Frestedt went over the removal of the cornice and the emergency approval given to remove it that came with the condition that the owner submit an application for retroactive removal and treatment of the area where the cornice was previously located. She went over earlier briefings with the board. One concern expressed was the mix of materials – sheet metal and wood dentils- and that over time in a seismic event the materials may not work well together. An alternate suggestion was to remove the dentil altogether. She said two options were bring proposed and she advised staff that that the one that most closely resembles the original with the removal of the dentils is most appropriate for the building in light of the design and the era. She said the other design is a much more modern expression and not as compatible with the district.

Project architect Chris Wright, went over the drawings noting two options were provided. Option 2 was similar to what was shown before but without dentils; he said they have slimmed down some of the dimensions as much as they could – to make a bit shallower to make the dentil more L-shaped – and they weren't able to do that. It was a less bulky. He said it was the sheet metal held up by light steel framing. He noted the problems of trying to replicate what was there before and noted concern about the details, connections to the wall, water proofing etc.

Mr. Wright said that Option 1 is the preferred option and said the cornice would be made out of 1/4" thick steel that is bent and attached to the wall. He said in the long term it will be a more durable approach without the issues of oil canning with lighter metals. He cited the Secretary of Interior Standards – to replace inkind is first option then if not feasible second option is to create a new design but it should be clearly differentiated from the old and should not create false historicism. He said their

approach is to create a clearly new piece that has integrity in itself. They are simple pieces bolted onto the building so there are not a lot of opportunities for water penetration.

Ms. Frestedt noted her perspective was that because the dentils were eliminated and the shape is going to change in Option 2 it would not be read as original. It still reads as new cornice and would be consistent with the Standards.

Ms. Chung Gerrick agreed with the removal of the dentils and having clean line or cornice; she said it would be acceptable. She said Option 1 is simple and straightforward but the nature of the building and the historical value – she wondered if it would break too much from the character of the building. She said Option 1 would be preferred on a modern building but that she was leaning toward Option 2 for this building.

Mr. Murakami said he liked the design of Option 1 as well but in the context of this building Option 2 was more appropriate in keeping with character with the building.

Mr. Chow said he looked at the original building – what was there before – and the cornice is the only thing that identifies this building. He noted one of the options and said it looks like a straight contemporary look. He said he preferred the dentils and without the dentils it is a clean top and doesn't bring back the original era.

Mr. Wright said that is why they were shifting over to Option 1 because they couldn't replicate what was there with the dentils and the form so to do a lesser copy of it was to do something new that in and of itself had integrity and beauty.

The Committee discussed the proposal to eliminate the dentils and Ms. Frestedt summarized recommendations from the past ARC meeting. Ms. Frestedt said that part of the issue about trying to replicate the dentils was that it became a challenge to recreate the design of the original with the materials that are available now. She shared her perspective that Option 2 more closely reflects the intent of the original while still having a more modern look.

Mr. Chow reiterated that the designs do not look like a building from the era of the original building and that it was too straight and clean.

Ms. Frestedt asked the ARC to evaluate the two alternatives.

Mr. Wright said there are legitimate concerns because of the different materials and noted the difficulty of making that shape out of the same material that isn't possible. He said that all the parts and pieces are difficult and there isn't a budget do it that way.

Mr. Chow said other properties were tight on a budget but had to adhere to what was requested.

Mr. Chow asked if they didn't have to do this.

Ms. Frestedt said their initial request initially was to leave the cornice off entirely and the board said they need to come back with a proposal to replace it. She said she wanted to recognize the owners for being willing to work with the board and finding middle ground. She said the owners are working with the board.

Mr. Murakami said that part of the concern is to recreate this is expensive and so not trying to come back with false historicism. He noted the fine line.

Mr. Chow said it is a straight line that changes the look of the building.

Ms. Chung Gerrick looked to see if there was a way to make Option 1 work and said she liked the profile. She pointed out a couple areas where a continuous metal could be added to read more like a more solid volume.

Mr. Murakami suggested breaking it up more if it were more like angled pieces that created an almost secondary rhythm; adding double pieces every so many...to fill in the ends. He said his preference is Option 2 because it is more in keeping with the character of the building and what is still left of the existing building on the first floor – the separation between the first and the upper floors – he said it seems to respect that a little more than the metal plate.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said she preferred Option 2 and supported not having dentils. She respected the owner's willingness to replace the cornice because it is a big feature. She said having it on top of the building adds a lot to it. She said Option 1 feels like it needs more massing.

Ms. Frestedt said it would be an option if the owners wanted to further explore Option 1 but it would need revision. She said that Option 2 as shown is a compromise and addressed concerns that had been raised.

Mr. Wright noted the owner's desire for a decision but that he could talk to the owners. He noted the possibility of adding to Option 1 the cross braces that would create the shadow line that would be similar to the dentils.

Mr. Murakami said he would not support Option 1. Ms. Frestedt recapped that she heard support for Option 2 and the committee would be open to considering all the alterations and revisions to Option 1 should the applicant choose to come back to this committee.

Ms. Frestedt distributed materials for the windows and provided background information. She said plans to replace the windows triggered some energy code requirements for the windows specifically along 5th Avenue. The application said that certain windows are proposed to be replaced; she expressed concern about the

continuity of the storefront in general and ideally all windows would be replaced to be consistent with one another.

Mr. Wright walked the ARC members through the packet and said most windows are not being replaced and pointed out the ones that would be. He said the existing windows are aluminum with clear glazing and their intent was to use the same. He said they were hoping that DPD would not require them to meet the full energy requirements because this was a historic building but that was not the case so they need to get the U-factor which means using a different window manufacturer and slightly different glazing. He provided a sample and said there was a slight difference.

Ms. Frestedt noted the slight hue and pretty negligible but said it was a small piece and out of context so didn't know what the impact would be.

Mr. Wright said that there are a couple windows where the glazing had been replaced and the windows are a little different. He said they are back in the courtyard area so not real visible.

Ms. Frestedt said it had not come before the board.

Mr. Wright said the profile of the window is slightly different.

Mr. Murakami asked the reason for changing the windows.

Mr. Wright said there are different reasons. He said in one area a door was being removed and windows put it.

The Committee and applicant discussed the requirements of the energy code and the visual impact of various options (double or triple glazed) on the profile of the window.

Ms. Frestedt suggested the board review the impact a new profile would have where there are three different windows and multiple profiles and have all possibilities been ruled out from manufacturer options. She said that ultimately the interest is minimizing the profile and depth change.

Mr. Wright said he thought the new window would add more consistency than what exists currently.

Mr. Murakami asked if the manufacturer of the existing windows still exists.

Mr. Wright said they do – it is Milgard – but they aren't trying to do the energy code with their aluminum windows anymore. Regarding Ms. Chung Gerrick's suggestion of grouping all the new windows together he said that windows being replaced are being done because they need to be.

Ms. Frestedt in the application that went before the board for exterior alterations it involved replacing some of the windows but at that time the applicant wasn't aware of the impact of the energy code.

Mr. Wright said they knew but it seemed that the preference of the board was to match existing and they were hoping that DPD would give a waiver.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the storefronts have undergone a number of changes.

Mr. Wright described the current window configuration – some single hung and some are fixed.

Mr. Murakami noted having three the same with one different in the same bay is a little odd. He pointed out another area where there are different profiles – one existing, one new, fixed and one new, operable.

Ms. Frestedt suggested ARC members determine if enough clear information exists that would be helpful to the full board or if other drawings or details should be added.

Mr. Murakami asked about sheet 9 – approved casement.

Mr. Wright said that was the profile of the windows that were originally proposed – they were double glazed. He said that manufacturer can't meet the energy code.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked about the trim and asked if by adjusting the depth they could make it look like all the windows were more uniform and the trim would read more strongly.

Mr. Wright said they could make it proud of all the windows and thought it was a good idea.

Ms. Frestedt asked if because they were replacing the trim throughout they could have that uniformity throughout the entire area where the trim was being replaced or just for those bays that are called out.

Mr. Wright said it would have to be done everywhere. He said he thought it was feasible but would have to ask the contractor and put a price on it. He said he would explore that.

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