



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 279/08

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, October 28, 2008

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

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Amalia Gonzalez-Kahn

Vice Chair Misun Chung Gerrick called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

Mr. Ha arrived at 4:41 p.m.

102808.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 23, 2008

MM/SC/JOK/JC

4:0:1 Minutes approved. Robert Ha recused himself.

102808.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

102808.21 Ton Kiang B.B.Q. Noodle House

668 S. Weller St.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to replace the existing awning with a new aluminum frame awning on the face of the storefront. The awning will be covered with red vinyl material and will include signage adhered to the face of the awning. The application includes a request to replace the sign face of the existing blade sign. The new sign face consists of a white Lexan background with red vinyl adhesive lettering. Ms. Frestedt said the proposed signage is well within the allowance, per SMC 23.66.338. No additional illumination is proposed. She added that the business is located in a contributing building within the Asian Design Character District. The applicant has been advised that the attachment should not penetrate the brick or damage historic materials. Ms. Frestedt stated that the Board had deferred consideration of the

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

proposal at the last meeting due to insufficient information, since the applicant had been unable to attend. She then introduced the applicant, Long Mai, from Art Unique Design Signs.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Mai explained that the proposed signage is similar to the signage next door. He provided photos of the neighboring signage for comparison.

The Board discussed the location of the proposed awning and signage in relation to adjacent storefronts.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted the request seemed consistent with neighboring building and is appropriate.

Mr. Osborne-Klein expressed concern that a portion of the blade sign would be covered by the awning.

Mr. Mai agreed that a portion would be covered, but that people driving by would be able to see lettering on the opposite site.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the proximity of the awning to the blade sign was not ideal but the blade sign is already there and they are just adding a new face.

Mr. Chihara agreed and said it is a readability issue but the owner finds it acceptable. He reminded to make sure it is not attached into historic material.

Ms. Chung Gerrick stated that she appreciated the inclusion of Chinese characters in the signage.

Mr. Osborne-Klein stated that the design of both elements is an improvement upon the current signage and canopy.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the installation of an awning and 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. Awnings and Canopies**
- II. 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 23.66.336 – Exterior Building Finishes

B. Asian Character Design District

5. Awnings

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

MM/SC/MCG/JC

5:0:0 Motion carried.

102808.22

Key Bank

666 S. Dearborn St.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal for new signage on the Key Bank building which involves: Replacement of three (3) illuminated cabinet signs with three (3) LED-illuminated signs to be installed on the North, South and West facades. Each sign will have a plastic face and will be mounted on aluminum raceways painted to match the color of the brick; replacement of two (2) illuminated Lexan sign faces on the double-sided pylons located on the southeast corner of the property; installation of a new illuminated “ATM” canopy sign on the south side of the building; installation of a painted aluminum “Clearance” sign on the south side of the building; and replacement of five (5) new directional signs with concrete footers on the south side of the parking lot. She distributed application materials and photographs to the Board. She confirmed that the proposed signage is well within the allowance, per SMC 23.66.338, and noted that the business is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. She introduced applicant Ray George, from The Sign Post.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. George reiterated the proposal and stated that they proposed to replace the old Key Bank logo signs with the new logo and pointed out where the signage would go on photos.

Mr. Osborne-Klein expressed concern about the amount of illumination and asked how much light will be visible especially to the residential building across the street.

Mr. George explained the LED lights would be 25 – 30% less bright than the existing lights. He said that LEDs are less dominant than neon or fluorescent; they are more energy efficient with a longer life and no mercury tubes. The reason for moving the signage is to keep consistency between branches and all signage is being moved to the top of the buildings; it is a standard for Key Bank. He said the lights would be on until about 10:00 p.m. or so and the lumens off the street light are stronger than what the bank sign will do.

Ms. Chung Gerrick recommended in addition to the signage at the top of the building keeping the same signage on the north elevation as currently exists.

Mr. George stated he would start with this and would send recommendation to let the bank make the decision.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Chihara said that his main concern was the glare element and he was satisfied with what Mr. George described.

Mr. Osborne-Klein was concerned about the placement of the sign on the north façade.

Ms. Frestedt referred to the code and cited the intent to minimize signage above street levels.

The Board discussed the location of the proposed signage and lighting and its potential impact on the building across the street. Board members stated that signage at the pedestrian level is important. A Board member asked if it would be possible to eliminate the lighting from the proposed sign on the north façade.

Mr. George said that in order to do the sign without the LED lighting the applicant said he would have to go back for corporate approval and reiterated that more lumens are emitted from the street light than from this proposed signage.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the Board could consider moving to approval the remaining signage, but ask for additional options for placement of signage on the north façade.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the installation of signage, as proposed except the north corner sign which will be deferred until additional options are provided by the applicant.

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

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

MM/SC/JOK/JC 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Frestedt advised the applicant she would issue the Certificate of Approval for the application as proposed except for the north corner sign for which the applicant will submit alternatives.

102808.3 BOARD BRIEFING

102808.31 Briefing by Jonathon Dong, SDOT Seattle Department of Transportation, on proposed curb expansion in existing bus zones.

Mr. Dong explained proposed improvements to streets and transit. They propose installing bus bulbs to make it easier for transit to get in and out of stops; the bulbs will extend stop over to travel lane so bus doesn't have to get out of traffic for stop. They propose to install three bus bulbs in the ID jurisdiction: corner of Maynard Ave. and Jackson on the north and south sides of the street and on 8th Ave. underneath the freeway overpass. He said no parking will be lost because these are existing bus stops.

Ms. Frestedt said it creates more room for passengers but also opens up sidewalks.

Mr. Chihara asked about potential safety issues.

Mr. Dong noted that traffic study will be done as part of the improvement.

SDOT employee Brian Henry said similar bulbs have been installed in San Francisco and have not raised significant safety issues.

Mr. Chihara asked if there are future plans for designated bike lanes.

Mr. Dong said bike lanes are proposed. He added that bus bulbs narrow the street down so drivers tend to slow down. He also noted that “far side” or mid-block stops where the bus doesn’t stop in front of a crosswalk but crosses the intersection and then stops tend to minimize pedestrian conflicts.

Mr. Chihara said he could see benefit for pedestrians and was curious about what it does to vehicles.

Mr. Dong stated they are working closely with Metro and would work closely with the ISRD to design the stops. He is not sure if there will be a shelter on the north side and said so many routes stop there that people don’t wait that long for a bus.

Mr. Ha stated unwanted activity takes place in shelters. He stated that he would not want to see a shelter structure added in front of his shop.

Ms. Frestedt suggested to the Board they advise of any additional information they would like to see if this were to come back as an application.

Ms. Chung Gerrick would like to see a site plan that showed exact locations, bus bulb, street furniture etc.

Mr. Chihara asked if traffic studies are available.

Mr. Dong concurred and said they will provide the results of the traffic study. He said these improvements would not preclude a street car and they would discuss which streets it will run on. He said they will come back for comments on street furniture.

Public Comment:

John Bisbee, owner of Higo, explained that coming out of the parking lot near the bus stop under I-5 was difficult and recommended checking the sight lines coming out of that driveway.

102808.4

GUIDELINE REVISION WORK SESSION

Ms. Frestedt distributed copies of the latest revision draft. She explained that the introduction, policy, purpose and intent sections were formatted based on Columbia City, Ballard and Pioneer Square Guidelines.

The Board reviewed the introductory parts of the draft. Mr. Osborne-Klein thought the description of ISRD should be first with “History” as a subsection underneath.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested including a map that shows the district boundaries and outlines the Asian Character District.

Ms. Frestedt explained the Purpose and Intent section would include the role of preservation in helping to support the district's history and character, and will make reference to the neighborhood plans. She referenced the goals and objectives sub-section and said that she was looking at feedback from the Board on which items to modify or exclude. She said that Mr. Chihara had sent her comments via email and suggested narrowing the current list.

Mr. Osborn-Klein recommended consolidating traffic and auto-oriented sections. He suggested adding a reference to multi-transit modes that exist in the District: bus tunnel, bus routes, and bike lanes.

Mr. Bisbee, commented as a community member. He suggested that the Board consider referencing way-finding issues.

Ms. Frestedt commented on the community history and activism regarding maintaining and preserving the residential base, including rehab of apartments and hotels. She cautioned against losing site of that emphasis, as the Board refines this section.

The Board discussed the order of the objectives.

Mr. Chihara cautioned against creating a hierarchical order. He suggested leaving the importance of each item to individual readers.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested noting the list as bullets rather than numbers.

Mr. Chihara agreed that general language may be better.

Mr. Osborne-Klein agreed and suggested adding accessibility. He also noted that public safety is not included.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested promoting and encouraging local ownership rather than big corporations.

Ms. Frestedt stated she believed that the intent of Columbia City guidelines was to prioritize locally owned businesses over national chains. She said it would be a benefit to add this as a policy statement.

102808.5

BOARD BUSINESS

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m. Following the conclusion of the full Board meeting, Ms. Frestedt convened the start of the Architectural Review Committee meeting.

102808.6 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

102808.61 1017 S. Jackson St.

Ms. Frestedt said this is a briefing on proposed new construction of a six-story mixed-use building consisting of ground floor retail (7,764 sq. ft.), 60 residential units, and underground parking. Proposal includes partial demolition of the existing building. Ms. Frestedt introduced the applicants: Ed Linardic, LDG Architects, and property owner, Chris Koh.

Mr. Linardic provided an overview of the revised drawings and elevations. He summarized the landscaping plan and changes to the King Street entrance. He said that they plan to add a gate, planters and a pathway leading to the south façade of the building. He also summarized the changes to the common entrance, gate and sign plate on the Jackson Street façade. He said the signs would sit on top of the gate and not penetrate the brick façade.

Mr. Linardic said the design of the King St. gate would be a modern Asian motif. The gate would serve to screen parking and add pedestrian scale to the lot. It would be made of steel and have a painted red finish.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked if the parking would be secured.

Mr. Linardic said it would not be.

There was a discussion about the materials for the proposed new construction, which will come under a separate application. Mr. Linardic said the base of the new building would be masonry to match the existing. Mr. Chihara suggested selecting a brick shade that is compatible with, but does not mimic the original.

There was a discussion about the proposed color scheme. Ms. Frestedt noted that this building does fall outside of Asian Character Design district. She said that lends itself to some flexibility to colors and materials that could be considered. She added that compatibility and consistency are both relevant.

The ARC discussed the treatment of the concrete base on the west façade.

Mr. Chihara suggested they would create some kind of rhythm. Mr. Linardic said there are reveals on the wall but he wasn't thinking of painting it because most of it won't be visible. Mr. Chihara stated the property next door was developable property and so there would be no fenestration on the wall but with the wall being homogenous it seems bigger than it actually is. He wondered if it a color break up besides the scoring and reveals would help.

Ms. Frestedt asked if absent the color the scoring would be sufficient; how that façade's mass is handled does fall into preliminary design.

Mr. Chihara said it is more substantial than what was being offered before in terms of treatment.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested adding a little bit of texture to the concrete form might help give a bit more interest.

There was discussion about what is needed to complete the application for Preliminary Design. Ms. Frestedt summarized the missing documentation. She also requested a 3-D rendering of the

storefront design. There was a brief discussion about the structural requirements for adhering the historic façade to the new building. Mr. Chihara asked if the masonry was load bearing brick.

Mr. Koh said no it was veneer. He said he could have his structural contractor restamp the original documents, since nothing is slated to change, and write a letter.

Mr. Chihara didn't see any reason to review that portion of the project separately at ARC as long as it is updated.

Mr. Koh said he could submit this electronically to Ms. Frestedt who will forward it to Board members.

ADJOURN

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