



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 52/09

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, January 13, 2009

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

Board Members Present

Robert Ha
Misun Chung Gerrick
Weng Chan
Joshua Osborne-Klein
Jerry Chihara
Bill Lee
John Bisbee

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Chair Robert Ha called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

011309.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 25, 2008

MM/SC/JOK/JC 6:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Lee abstained.

011309.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

011309.21 Various locations throughout the District

Applicant: Julia Nelson, Chinatown International District BIA

Bill Lee recused himself because he is a BIA employee.

Signage and Street Use: Proposal to temporarily hang red lanterns from street lights for the Chinese Lunar New Year.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to temporarily suspend two Chinese paper lanterns from street lights at various locations throughout the District. The lanterns will be displayed from Jan. 17-Feb. 8, 2009 to coordinate with the Lunar New Year festivities. She distributed drawings, photographs and a map of proposed locations. Ms. Frestedt introduced Julia Nelson from the Chinatown International District Business Improvement Association (BIA).

Applicant Comment:

Ms. Nelson presented one of the plastic, waterproof lanterns for Board review and said KV Lu, from Adopt Engineering, has submitted a wind load analysis to SDOT and City Light for review and approval. She explained the lamp would be attached to the street lights with a bracket that would cause no damage to the poles. She said the lanterns are not illuminated. They wanted lanterns more in the core of the District; a lot of the businesses are participating so they wanted the lanterns located close to the participating businesses. It is to mark the Lunar New Year.

Ms. Frestedt stated that SDOT and City Light are reviewing to make sure there won't be any damage to the poles and that the method of installation is secure enough that they won't fly off or cause injury. The lanterns and extensions will be removed when the lanterns come down in February.

Mr. Chihara supported the application. He said they would add color and provide a low key opportunity to market the celebration. He wondered if there shouldn't be more on the Jackson Street corridor.

Ms. Nelson explained that originally they wanted to string more but were told by the City it wasn't possible.

Public Comment:

Jennifer Olegario, resident, said she likes the lanterns.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for temporary alterations to designated street lights, as proposed. This action is based on the following:

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

Applicable Code citations:

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

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

MM/SC/JC/JOK

6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Lee recused himself.

Mr. Lee returned to the room.

011309.22

Lucky An Dong

1041 S. King St.

Applicant: Peter Lai, Action Design Signs

Signage: Proposed installation of business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed signage that includes 1) application of gator foam letters to the brick band above the awning on the north and west facades; 2) and addition of colored vinyl adhesive letters to the face of the existing awning. The foam letters will be attached with a silicon adhesive. Exhibits included drawings, photographs and attachment details. The amount of signage proposed on S. King St. is approximately 56 sq. ft. The allowance is 97 sq. ft. The proposed signage on the west façade equals 28 sq. ft., well within the maximum allowance. Ms. Frestedt said the building owner received a Certificate of Approval for the existing awning in June 2007. The business is located *outside* the Asian Design Character District. Ms. Frestedt introduced Peter Lai, of Action Design Signs.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Lai explained the silicon he will use to attach lettering is removable without causing damage to the wall.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted that King Street is lacking in active storefronts and that it is good to reactivate and get more foot traffic there.

Ms. Chung Gerrick appreciated the inclusion of Asian characters.

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.

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

ISRD Design Guidelines for Awnings and Canopies, Façade Alterations and Signs

I. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Design Guidelines for Signs

II. A. Buildings with Multiple Tenants

The following design guidelines apply to buildings with multiple tenants:

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

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

MM/SC/JOK/BL

7:0:0 Motion carried.

011309.23

Crawfish King

725 S. King St.

Applicant: Peter Lai, Action Design Signs

Signage: Proposed installation of business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt stated that Mr. Lai was the applicant for the next proposal, as well. She read from the staff report and explained the proposed installation of two raceway channel letter signs on the existing canopy and one double-sided flag-mounted sign on the northwest corner of the building. See attached drawings, photographs and attachment details. The amount of signage allowed on 8th Ave. S. and S. Lane St. is 67 sq. ft., per façade. The applicant's proposal totals 60 sq. ft. for each façade. She explained that signage allowances have been adjusted, pursuant to SMC 23.66.338, due to lack of Asian or foreign language characters. She noted that the business is located *outside* the Asian Design Character District.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Lai explained the raceway letters will be lit using LED lights. The raceway behind the letters will be painted to match the existing I-beam in the canopy. The cabinet will be sheet metal; the background will be blacked out so only the logo will be visible.

Ms. Frestedt noted that this was a new building, not historic.

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Lai explained there was existing signage on the wall and the signage on the corner would consist of the crawfish logo. He said the building owner will replace where the Maid in Kitchen sign was removed. The attachment will be in the mortar joints and the sign will line up with the vertical lines of the mortar.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked if the sign could be above the canopy. There was further Board discussion about the location of the canopy signage.

Mr. Lai explained that the owners wanted it more at eye level.

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.

MM/SC/JC/WC

7:0:0 Motion carried.

Discussion ensued about the possibility of moving the sign to the same level as the I-beam; Ms. Frestedt clarified that the Board can vote for or against keeping it at its current location with a recommendation to consider moving it or denying it as it is until Mr. Lai has a chance to talk to the property owner. The applicant had no problem and wanted to follow the rules. Board members each provided their opinion on the location of the proposed canopy signage. Ms. Frestedt noted that this is not an historic building and no historic fabric will be covered said the Board can recommend, but not require the sign be moved.

Mr. Chihara withdrew his earlier motion.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage, as proposed with the recommendation to move the blue band sign to above the I-beam.

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

- ISRD Design Guidelines for Awnings and Canopies, Façade Alterations and Signs**
- II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines**
- III. Design Guidelines for Signs**
 - a. Buildings with multiple tenants**
 - c. Internally lighted signs in all locations**

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

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

011309.24

Hing Hay Park
411 Maynard Ave. S.
Applicant: Kelly Davidson, City of Seattle Parks Department

Exterior alterations: Proposed repairs and rehabilitation of the pagoda and information kiosk. Repairs include installing a new roofing system on both structures.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to rehabilitate the Pagoda and informational kiosk. She said the Board previously deferred action on the proposal to replace the decorative figurines on the pagoda until additional information could be provided by the Parks department regarding the significance and cultural meaning of the figurines. Ms. Frestedt introduced Kelly Davidson, City of Seattle Parks Department.

Applicant Comment:

Ms. Davidson explained her findings on the cultural meanings of the figurines on the Pagoda. She consulted with Paul Wu, Director of China Gate Foundation; Jeff Hu, UW Asian Studies Program; and Bob Fisher, Wing Luke Asian Museum; and Lu Bond, project contractor. She said that individuals provided generalized information about the meanings but most point to the warding off evil spirits and bad luck. She also stated that in regards to previous Board requests and questions regarding public safety during construction that the Park Rangers would do additional swings-by during construction.

In response to Board members' request that the figurines stay in the neighborhood Ms. Frestedt advised that the Board couldn't mandate what would happen after another entity acquired them. As the figurines are owned by the City she will find out if it is possible for the City to ensure that the figurines stay in the neighborhood but wasn't sure about the mechanism for enforcement.

Board members were appreciative of the research done by Ms. Davidson who further shared that Wing Luke is interested in using the figurines in their collection but they have no interest in the damaged ones. Community member Betty Lau initially brought up the history of the figurines but Ms. Davidson was unable to talk with her.

Ms. Frestedt suggested making sure there is some archive of how the figurines were acquired.

There was discussion about what had been approved at the November 25, 2008 meeting and it was confirmed that this application had been approved conditional on confirmation that the figurines be accurate. Today, the motion would be whether or not this meets the satisfaction of the Board in terms the condition.

The Board was supportive of the application conditional on retaining the figurines.

Public Comment:

Paul Wu noted that a side benefit of the figurines is that they keep the birds away.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval in light of the additional information that the conditions have been satisfactorily met by the applicant.

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

Ms. Frestedt stated that she would write a letter on behalf of the Board recommending that the figurines are retained in the District.

011309.25

Key Bank

666 Dearborn St. S.

Applicant: Ray George, The Sign Post

Signage: Proposed revisions to the building sign plan, including a proposal for additional Key Bank logo signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the follow-up proposal for additional signage on the Key Bank building, including the installation of one (1) 2'x17' LED sign and one (1) 1'6" x 12'8.5" LED sign on the North façade; addition of one (1) 1'6" x 12'8.5" LED sign on the first level of the South façade [the Board already approved the installation of one (1) 2'x17' LED sign on the second level on 10/28/08]; the relocation of one (1) 2'x17' LED sign, which was approved on 10/28/08, from the first level to the top of the tower on the West façade; installation of one (1) 1'6" x 12'8.5" LED sign on the first level of the East façade. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. She explained the Board issued a Certificate of Approval on October 28, 2008 for business identification, ATM and parking signage. During the Board's consideration of the previous application, the Board deferred action on an illuminated sign proposed for the building's north façade. She provided a summary of Board comments from the 10/28 meeting. Board members emphasized the pedestrian-oriented character of the District. The Board stated a preference for retaining signage at the pedestrian-level, which is more characteristic of the District, particularly when in close proximity to residential buildings; board members expressed concern about the glare that may be cast from the sign on a second level into adjacent second and third story residential windows across S. Lane Street; Board members stated that placement of the sign above the first story would limit visibility from the sidewalk.

Based on these comments, the Board determined that the proposed sign would not conform to SMC 23.66.338E and Design Guidelines for Signs – Section II: Buildings greater than one story. The Board asked the applicant to return with an alternative proposal. Recommendations included: relocating the sign; installing a non-illuminated sign in the proposed location; or replacing the sign in the existing location. The Board also suggested retaining signage at the pedestrian level.

Ms. Frestedt stated that this business is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. Noting the third bullet in the description of the proposed work and considering the language in Section IIb of the Design Guidelines for Signs, she is supporting approval of the proposal on the basis that: A) the property is not a contributing building within the District, and B) Key Bank is the *primary* tenant of the building.

Mr. Osborne-Klein interpreted that rule to mean this is not prohibited but not favored.

Applicant Comment:

Ray George noted that the originally proposed sign location was not good and that the proper location would be the lower section on the northeast corner where it would have more visibility. He observed that more pedestrian level signs were needed. He said the Westside tower is the best location as the tower is a good identification sign.

Mr. Osborne-Klein agreed that tower was the obvious place to put a large sign but expressed concern about the aesthetics of it although it would not be pointing directly at apartments.

Mr. George responded to Board member questions that there are still the same amount of signs as in the earlier presentation but they are keeping the one over the doorway that the Board recommended and then one on the south side over the doorway. He followed the Board recommendations of keeping the pedestrian signs over the doors, moving the north sign down low so as not to disturb neighbors, and moving the west sign up so that it can be seen from many different angles.

Mr. Chihara thought the application in general was an improvement over what was there previously. The LED system allows the signage to be much lighter in its whole combined appearance in the surface of the building. He had no problem with the signage on the western face even though it is above the 2nd floor; it doesn't conceal any kind of architectural detail and it is more appealing as a signage package. He felt the applicant satisfactorily addressed the Board's concerns about placement.

Mr. Bisbee concurred.

Mr. Chan appreciated the applicant's willingness to make the changes and the west tower sign is better and more visible than before.

Mr. Ha concurred with Mr. Chan.

Public Comment:

Liana Woo asked for clarification as to where the sign will go.

Mr. George explained it would be a couple feet below the tower; will stay below the line of the top of the building.

Sid Wang agreed with the Board that lighting the dark parking lot is a positive benefit.

Mr. Lee asked if the sign on the west will be lit. Mr. George confirmed it would.

Board Discussion:

The Board concurred it had enough information to make a decision.

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

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

ISRD Design Guidelines for Awnings and Canopies, Façade Alterations and Signs

IV. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

V. Design Guidelines for Signs

a. Buildings with multiple tenants

b. Buildings greater than one story – Projecting signs or surface mounted internally-lighted “box” signs shall be prohibited above the sill line of the second floor. Signs identifying the building or a single primary tenant are excepted from this provision.

c. Internally lighted signs in all locations

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

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

011309.26

Seattle Oriental Art

661 S. Jackson St.

Applicant: Thu Tang, business owner

Exterior alterations: Request for retroactive approval for security gates.

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for retroactive approval of installation of fixed security gate on the storefront east façade; installation of accordion-style security gates on the storefront’s north façade. Exhibits included photographs and documentation. The Board initially heard this application on October 28th, 2008. At that meeting, the Board moved to *defer* action on the proposal for retroactive approval for security gates pending submission a proposal for alternative security systems or documentation confirming that alternative security measures, including non gate-based security systems, were not feasible.

The Board approved a Certificate of Approval for retroactive approval of decorative window film on October 28th. The T&C Building is a contributing building within the Asian Design Character District. The storefront’s east façade abuts an alley and is visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant did not obtain a Certificate of Approval prior to the installation of the security gates. Ms. Frestedt stated that the fixed gates on the east façade do not meet the Design Guidelines for Security Systems, Section A, which states: *Permanent window and door security bars shall be discouraged on primary facades within the Asian Design Character District. Primary facades are those which front on a public right-of-way or can be viewed from a public right-of-way.* The east-facing window is visible from the right-of-way on the south side of Jackson Street.

Applicant Comment:

Mike Miranda, friend of the applicant, stated Mr. Tang was not aware of the rules until after the gates were installed. Mr. Miranda noted that according to the Design Guidelines, the gates were discouraged, not prohibited. He said Mr. Tang was concerned about security and asked for Board flexibility in making their decision. He asked if the Board would be willing to keep the east side gate if it were painted.

Ms. Frestedt clarified the prior ruling and stated that the Board had approved security film for the windows. She said that in her opinion painting the gates in their current location does not meet the Guidelines.

Board Questions:

Mr. Osborne-Klein stated the gates violate the Guidelines and that alternatives for protection were not explored.

Mr. Tang asked if putting the bars on the inside would be acceptable.

Discussion ensued that putting the gates on the inside would be better although it would still impact the aesthetic of the façade. A Board member said the role of the Board is to apply the Guidelines as fairly as possible and if the Board starts making concessions the Guidelines become useless.

Mr. Chihara recognized that the gates are installed, costs have been made and that while he was sensitive to the issues of safety and costs he preferred that a counter proposal and concessions be made.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said that perhaps Mr. Tang could recover the cost of the gates through his landlord.

Mr. Bisbee was sympathetic and was aware of the security issues but he doesn't like the gates because they send the wrong message about a welcoming community.

Mr. Chan agreed that the bars on the alley side should be inside and stated the gates on Jackson were against the Guidelines.

Mr. Lee agreed that the bars on the alley side should be inside the window

Ms. Chung Gerrick commented on the lack of transparency on the storefront. She said during business hours the gate and curtains should be open.

Public Comment:

The owner's wife, Christine Tang explained the artwork sold at Seattle Oriental Art is good work from an artist in China. Some of the stone carvings take five years to make. The store is in a bad location; the gate is a solution to keep people out and bars inside the window would still allow glass to come int. She said the curtain is open during the day.

Mr. Osborne-Klein stated it is still blocking most of the window.

Ms. Tang added that the curtain was a piece of art also.

Mr. Ha stated that if the art is valuable they should have an alarm system.

Mr. Miranda stated Mr. Tang couldn't afford an alarm system.

Resident Ms. Olegario sympathized with the applicant but was not supportive of the gates as they don't characterize the neighborhood.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Chung Gerrick was okay with the gate on Jackson with the curtains open and with the bars on the alley moved inside.

Mr. Osborne-Klein agreed although both were questionable; they are already up and the scissor gate can be justified. The alley bars are in conflict with the Guidelines. He said he would support the gate on S. Jackson subject to the condition that they are removed when tenant moves.

Mr. Ha agreed to the gate on Jackson but disapproved of the alley side.

Mr. Chihara supported neither because they don't comply with the Guidelines.

Mr. Bisbee didn't like the gates but he understood Mr. Tang's concern. He thought other examples were better. The bars are not permanent but he recommended moving them inside and painting them to match the window trim.

Mr. Chan stated he would support denying the one on the alley and keeping the one on Jackson.

Mr. Lee doesn't like the gates; if the bars were moved inside he could live with it but an alternative would be preferable.

Ms. Frestedt explained that if the Board denied the gates they could ask the applicant to come back with an alternative.

Mr. Osborne-Klein expressed frustration that the applicant was asked for alternatives but has brought nothing in.

Motion #1 - East/alley Façade

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board deny a Certificate of Approval for a security gate on the east facade, as proposed. **This action is based on the following:**

The proposed alteration does not 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

The gate was installed without a Certificate of Approval.

ISRD Design Guidelines

III. Security Systems

The following guidelines will be used by the board in the evaluation of requests for security systems that impact the exterior appearance of a facade.

A. Permanent window and door security bars shall be discouraged on primary facades within the Asian Design Character District. Primary facades are those which front on a public right-of-way or can be viewed from a public right-of-way.

The installation of permanently fixed security bars, which are visible from the public right-of-way, is discouraged within the Asian Design Character District.

B. Sliding scissor gates or roll-down panel systems are preferred to minimize the visual impact during business operating hours.

C. Security systems shall not cover distinctive architectural features on the facade nor should installation damage the structure.

D. Other security systems considered that do not have a negative visual impact to the exterior facade shall be utilized if feasible. Such systems may include internal alarms or transparent film coverings for windows.

The applicant has not provided sufficient documentation to verify that alternative security measures are infeasible.

MM/SC/JOK/WC 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Motion # 2 – North/S. Jackson St. Façade

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for a security gate on the north facade, as proposed. As a **condition** of this application, the gate *must be removed* if the business vacates the premises.

This action is based on the following:

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

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

ISRD Design Guidelines

III. Security Systems

The following guidelines will be used by the board in the evaluation of requests for security systems that impact the exterior appearance of a facade.

A. Permanent window and door security bars shall be discouraged on primary facades within the Asian Design Character District. Primary facades are those which front on a public right-of-way or can be viewed from a public right-of-way.

B. Sliding scissor gates or roll-down panel systems are preferred to minimize the visual impact during business operating hours.

C. Security systems shall not cover distinctive architectural features on the facade nor should installation damage the structure.

D. Other security systems considered that do not have a negative visual impact to the exterior facade shall be utilized if feasible. Such systems may include internal alarms or transparent film coverings for windows.

MM/SC/JOK/BL

5:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Chung Gerrick and Mr. Chihara opposed.

011309.27

Ticino Apartments

100 6th Ave. S.

Applicant: John Goetzinger, property owner

Exterior alterations: Proposed alterations to the Yesler Way entrance; request for retroactive approval of alterations to the 6th Ave. S. entrance; and exterior paint colors.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed work. At the entrance at 6th Ave. S. the applicant requested retroactive approval for removal of wooden overhang and decorative pilasters and installation of new granite surround and sloped roof pediment; request for retroactive approval for replacement entrance door assembly featuring tempered glass with sidelights. Based on photographs in the project file, the entrance door that was removed did not appear to be original. The application included the entrance at S. Yesler Way which requested to build door surround and pediment out of cedar wood to match the 6th Ave. S. entrance and retain existing pilasters. Repaint entrance surround off-white to match granite entrance on 6th Ave. S. Approval for exterior paint colors was requested to repaint window trim and concrete molding muted-white and retroactive request for black paint colors at the base of the building. Exhibits included drawings and photographs.

Ms. Frestedt explained The Ticino was built in 1903 and used to operate as the Terrace View Hotel; it was renovated in 1988. The building is located outside of the National Register District and the Asian Design Character District; however, based on its age and a visual assessment of architectural integrity (in comparison to historic photographs), it is the staff opinion that the building is a contributing building to the local, International Special Review District. Ms. Frestedt said that the removal of original features or features that have gained significance over time is not recommended by the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation. The staff opinion is that the appropriate treatment of the entrance surrounds would be to repair the existing features, or where deterioration would prevent repair, to rebuild or replace the features in-kind using identical (or approved alternative) materials. The design of the door surrounds and pediment are not consistent with the architecture of the building or other historic residential buildings within the District.

Applicant Comment:

John Goetzinger explained the entrance was originally a side door with the main door on Yesler. He explained he thought the granite is compatible with the building. He chose the stone because he thought it played well with the brick above. He said when he first purchased the building 3 ½ years ago it was painted black. He said he did not know about the District requirements and there was nothing in the title that mentioned the ISRD.

Ms. Frestedt reported that June 29, 1988 the former owner received approval to rebuild the cornice at Yesler and 6th and for restoration of existing windows. The proposal for the paint and windows was appropriate as was the design and material of the surround.

Mr. Goetzinger stated the work he did was completed in July and August 2008.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said there is no precedent anywhere in this District for the pediment shape and the stone seemed foreign to the façade. The material should be more compatible to the building. She recommended Mr. Goetzinger come back to ARC with alternatives as she would not approve as it is.

Mr. Osborne-Klein noted there is new construction which includes a lot of granite at 5th and Jackson.

Mr. Chihara said he would like to review the Yesler entry as a separate element as it has some historic significance.

Ms. Frestedt stated Yesler was the original entry. Replacement is subject to review based on compatibility with style.

Mr. Chihara preferred to accept the alterations on 6th Avenue and review alternatives for the Yesler Way entrance.

Ms. Frestedt encouraged the Board to take action on the pieces they supported and can defer pending alternatives.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board concurred they had enough information to make a decision.

Motion #1 - Entry reconfiguration and paint colors:

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for paint colors and the reconfiguration of the entrance door and glazing on 6th Ave. S., as proposed.

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable 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 Design Outside of the Asian Design Character District

ISRD Design Guidelines

II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

#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.

#3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

#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 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/JOK/JC 7:0:0 Motion carried.

MOTION #2 - Exterior alterations to the entrance surrounds on 6th Ave. S. and S. Yesler St.:

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

The proposed alterations do not meet the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:**

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

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

B. General requirements

C. Exterior Building Design Outside of the Asian Design Character District

ISR Design Guidelines

II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

#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.

The proposal does not meet Standard #2 because the removal of the entrance surround and subsequent alterations on 6th Ave. S. and the proposed alterations to the entrance result in the removal of architecturally distinctive materials that characterize the property.

#3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

The proposal does not meet Standard #3 because the design and material of the granite surround and pediment are inconsistent with the architectural character of the building and the District.

#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.

The applicant did not demonstrate that repair or in-kind replacement of the existing features was not feasible.

#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/JC/JOK 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Chung Gerrick opposed.

Mr. Chan and Mr. Osborne-Klein left at 7:15 p.m.

011309.28

Milwaukee Apartment Building

672 S. King St.

Applicant: Paul Wu, Wu Architecture

Exterior alterations: The proposed alterations include: masonry restoration and repair; repairs to the existing wooden windows; construction of a new storefront system on the alley façade; installation of a custom designed steel gate into the parking garage on the alley façade; removal of the fire escape on the alley façade; exterior paint colors; and removal of a cabinet sign frame on the southwest corner of the building.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed rehabilitation of the Milwaukee hotel includes masonry cleaning and restoration, window repairs, painting. She said the Milwaukee was built in 1911 and is a contributing building within the National Register District. The building is located within the Asian Design Character District. The Board received a briefing on the proposed restoration and repairs on May 27, 2008. At that time the Board voiced support for removal of the alley fire escape and the cabinet signs on the west façade. The project previously received use approvals for a Buddhist Cultural Center and 120 apartment units for the upper 5 floors. Most recently, the Board issued a Certificate of Approval for a Change of Use in January 2008 to convert 2000 sq. ft. of office space to residential units. In 2006 the Board approved a Change of Use from storage to parking on the basement level.

Applicant Comment:

Paul Wu explained the proposed work, referencing the drawings and photographs submitted with his application. He said he appreciated the recommendation from staff regarding the National Park Service briefing paper on masonry restoration. He said that no sealant was proposed, the masonry would be cleaned with water using natural bristles. He said the existing masonry would be patched where necessary. He said he would answer any clarifying questions.

Mr. Chihara asked if the masonry patch would match the existing.

Mr. Wu said he would bring a sample back to the Board. He noted that the alley storefront would be similar to the work he had done on the Hong Kong Building and that they were getting the doors from the same manufacturer that they worked with on that building.

Mr. Chihara said the application seemed consistent with what the Board reviewed before. He thanked the applicant for his responsiveness to past Board concerns regarding the alley openings and fire escape removal.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said the rehabilitation will make a great contribution to the community.

Board members were supportive of the proposal.

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

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

- 1. Materials**
- 2. Colors**
- 3. Surfaces**

SMC 23.66.342 – Parking and access

E. Access to parking

ISRD Design Guidelines

II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

#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.

#5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

#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.

#7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

#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.

#10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a 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/JC/MCG

5:0:0 Motion carried.

011309.29 HTK Building
513 S. Main St.
Applicant: Jerry Chihara, Chihara Architect

Postponed at the request of the applicant.

ADJOURN

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