



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 130/10

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, June 8, 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

Absent

060810.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 11, 2010

MM/SC/RM/MR 3:0:3 Minutes approved. Ms. Chung Gerrick and Messrs. Osborne-Klein and Lee abstained.

060810.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Order of review changed from agenda.

060810.22 Ascona Apartments

200 5th Ave. S.

Applicant: Chris Wright, Group3 Architects

Design: Proposed exterior alteration to conceal the structural brace on the north façade.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to extend an existing stucco-finished building projection on the north façade to conceal the structural steel frame installed to reinforce an expanded window opening. Exhibits included plans, drawings and photographs.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

She went over the background on the building noting that the Ascona was constructed in 1910 and is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. The Architectural Review Committee (ARC) reviewed the proposal on April 13th and recommended alternative designs to minimize the structural framing element. She said the structural frame was installed without a Certificate of Approval after the ARC meeting. On May 27th, 2010, the ISRD Board and DON Director denied a request for retroactive approval for the design of the structural brace, as installed.

Ms. Frestedt said the proposed alterations appear to be an appropriate strategy for screening the structural brace considering the design of the existing articulation of the wall projection on the north façade and the information provided in the structural engineer's report (located in the project file). Staff does not believe that the proposed alteration will have a negative visual impact on the building or the District.

The applicant, Chris Wright explained the proposed changes and referred to the exhibits. He said that the proposed design will extend the projected wall to conceal the brace. The wall will be concrete and covered in stucco to match the existing wall. He said other options had been explored but weren't possible because of the way the two different wall materials meet. A letter from structural engineer Mike Leonard, MLA Structural Engineers which discusses the details about alternatives that had been suggested at ARC was circulated for board review. Mr. Wright said the bracing will be hidden within the structural panel they are adding and that some projections already exist so this one won't look out of place.

Board Questions:

Mr. Osborne-Klein pointed out that in Mr. Leonard's letter only one option was discussed and asked where the others are.

Mr. Wright said locating the frame within the wall was proposed as an option but it is not workable because the frame has to be on both sides of the wall. The way it is installed it also serves as a lintel. He said there is sufficient waterproofing.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Rosete said from a passerby's standpoint it's not obtrusive since it is recessed. He added that it looks fine and will match what is there.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said in another context she favored exposed steel because it is more honest and portrays a new opening but here she supports what is presented.

Mr. Osborne-Klein thanked Mr. Wright for being responsive to ARC. He said the change was not significant and that he supported it.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for 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 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

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

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.

#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/MR/RM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Ha arrived at 4:55 p.m.

060810.21 St. Paul Medical Clinic
510 6th Ave. S. – Fujisada Building
Applicant: Tuan Ngo, business owner representative

Use: Proposed change of use from retail to medical clinic (3,176 sq. ft.).

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed change of use from retail to medical services. Exhibits included plans. She said the applicant initially proposed to locate offices behind the storefront windows, but had agreed to locate the waiting area near the window to activate the area in order to be more pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Tuan Ngo explained that a husband and wife team from Kansas has obtained the space with intent to buy it and that they plan to upgrade the space. He said they would like to get rid of the ramp to make a street level lobby area and that there will be four rooms and four doctors. He said they want to attract a pharmacist to the site in the future. He said they would like to remove the security gate because it seems unfriendly and paint the recessed area and add decorative elements.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the previous occupant installed the security gate because of undesirable activity there. He suggested using planters and illumination to discourage unwanted use of the area.

Ms. Frestedt said changes to the entrance would have to come back to the board as the current application was only for a change of use.

Board Questions:

Mr. Murakami asked how the mezzanine area would be used.

Mr. Ngo explained it would be a staff work area for back office use only. He noted that both private and public funded care would be provided.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Chung Gerrick commented that locating the waiting room near the street is a good idea.

Mr. Murakami agreed that activity up front was good.

Mr. Ngo commented that the window would bring in sunlight.

Mr. Osborne-Klein agreed and said that while he had technical concerns with the use at street level there will be foot traffic and the business is similar to others around the neighborhood. He supported the application.

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

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

SMC 23.66.320 – Permitted uses

SMC 23.66.326 – Street-level uses

MM/SC/MCG/BL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

There was discussion about whether or not the security gate should be removed and what options might there be to prevent unwanted activity in the entrance. Planters, security cameras, lighting, security alarms were suggested as alternatives to the gate. The existing security gate was not installed according to the board-approved plan and it was suggested that if it were to remain that it be installed per the approved plan by moving it up so the metal band is no longer visible.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the security gate was approved so the board can't revoke its approval nor mandate its removal but the board could recommend the applicant explore options. She said at the minimum the incorrect installation should be corrected.

This led to a board discussion about strategies to enhance public safety.

Mr. Chow said that he suggested lighting up alley spaces with lanterns – Japanese lanterns in Japantown, Chinese lanterns in Chinatown and Vietnamese lanterns in Little Saigon. He said that in other places in the world alleys are well lit.

Mr. Murakami said that how alleys are used would help as would activation.

Ms. Frestedt said the board's focus is to support historic preservation and buildings but can also support the desires of the community.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that supporting activation of alleys is consistent with historic preservation and how the alleys were used.

Ms. Frestedt said that gooseneck style lights and Asian style lanterns could be listed as examples in the guidelines. She said the Asian style lanterns – noting the ones the BIA used as Christmas Lanterns – would contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

There was discussion about the financial difficulty of sustaining the additional lighting.

Ms. Frestedt described a program in Columbia City where the Columbia City Business Association purchased light fixtures for the alleys that were approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board. The fixtures were available for business and property owners who wished to install them. She explained that this might be a possibility within the ISRD if funding became available for the purchase of fixtures by the BIA, PDA or other organizations.

060810.3 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Frestedt explained that City Council had reviewed parts of the South Downtown Rezone. She reminded the Board about the public hearing that would be held the next day and that it could also be viewed on the Seattle Channel. She passed out a brochure similar to what had been presented to the board by DPD staff. She said that there would be a series of meetings focusing on various segments of the neighborhoods each time. She said the South Downtown Rezone would be presented to full Council in September. She said she would invite DPD staff back to go over development standards, setbacks, relationship to the street and open space.

She summarized the role of the board in reviewing new construction; the board reviews bulk, massing and scale given the height allowed in the area to consider if the development is appropriate for the district. Beyond that the board looks at such things

as the fenestration – rhythm of the windows – and how the building is modulated, rooflines, cornices, materials and finer design details.

Mr. Osborne-Klein left at 5:45 p.m.

Ms. Frestedt went over how square footage of different heights could be distributed across the site. She said that the height increases proposed in the rezone were north of Main and south of Weller, west of 4th and east of I-5 but that the rest would remain unchanged because of the negative impact additional heights could have on the character of the district. She offered to go over board review of new development and proposed code changes with board members.

5:55 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

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