



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 145/09

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, May 12, 2009

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

Board Members Present

Robert Ha
John Bisbee
Bill Lee
Misun Chung Gerrick
Weng Chan
Rich Murakami

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Joshua Osborne-Klein

Chair Robert Ha called the meeting to order at 4:38 p.m.

051209.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 14, 2009

MM/SC/BL/JB

3:0:3 Minutes approved. Ms. Chung Gerrick, Mr. Murakami, and Mr. Chen abstained.

051209.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

051209.21 Chinatown International District Summer Festival banners

Various locations throughout the District

Applicant: Julia Nelson, CIDBIA

Summary of the proposal: Proposed installation of temporary banners.

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for temporary Summer Festival banners. The proposed 30”w x 60”h vinyl banners will temporarily replace the existing permanent District banners from approximately June 1 to July 31, 2009. Ms. Frestedt noted that according to a SDOT Director’s Rule no sponsorship on any banner shall cover more than 20% of the total square

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

“Printed on Recycled Paper”

footage of the banner. Sponsorship name or icon font shall not be larger than the font of the message on the banner. This is relevant since the sponsor's name and logo is included on the banner. It meets the criteria in the Director's Rule.

Mr. Lee stated that he works for the BIA and asked staff if he should recuse himself. Ms. Frestedt stated that even though he works for the BIA his role is entirely separate from the decision making about the design or creation of the banners and she did not think there was a conflict of interest. No objections were raised by the Board or the applicants or the members of the public about his participation in the deliberation about the application.

Applicant Comment:

Julia Nelson, Chinatown International District Business Improvement Association ("BIA"), showed a sample of the banner for size and said 62 banners would be installed throughout the District.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked how last year's banner was received. Ms. Nelson said there were not a lot of comments but it seemed like the opinions were divided.

Ms. Frestedt explained that Board members had expressed concern during last year's review of the BIA's proposal that the banner design didn't speak to the character of the neighborhood. The design had been a departure by the BIA from previous years in an effort to reach a broader audience. The Board at the time supported the proposal because it was temporary and asked that in future years they look at ways to bring Asian character back into the design.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked about the proposed locations of the banners and if any were to be placed inside the Asian Character district because they appear to be on the major road. She said it would be nice to have them more scattered.

Ms. Nelson said that McDonalds is a main sponsor and that the locations were selected by the sponsor to get more exposure, particularly on Jackson & 5th Ave.

Ms. Frestedt noted that most attendees of the Summer Festival are not from within the community as determined by surveys conducted by the BIA.

Mr. Ha noted that he liked the proposed design and the inclusion of Asian characters.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted that the graphic ties in with neighborhood.

Public Comment:

Joyce Pisanant, Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation Development Authority, appreciated the banner and said there is more cultural relevance in this banner design compared to last year.

Board Discussion:

The Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

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

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

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs.

SMC 23.55.012 – Temporary signs permitted in all zones

MM/SC/RM/WC

6:0:0 Motion carried.

051209.22

Kong Yick West Building

701-707 S. King St./1-5½ Canton Alley

Applicant: Joyce Pisanont, SCIDPDA

Mr. Lee and Ms. Chung Gerrick recused themselves due to their indirect involvement with the property owner and design creation, respectively..

Summary of proposed changes: Exterior design – Paint colors

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal for paint colors on three storefronts in the Canton Alley. Exhibits included photographs and color samples. She said the Kong Yick West building is a contributing building to the National Register District. The building is located in the Asian Design Character District. The ISRD Board approved a Certificate of Approval for Exterior alterations, including masonry restoration and primary façade paint colors in March 2008.

Applicant Comment:

Ms. Pisanont explained the proposed work was part of the annual community Spring Clean. She explained the alley way revitalization done by Wing Luke Asian Museum and said this was an opportunity to move in the same direction. Architectural volunteers from Olson Sundberg Kundig Allen chose colors to complement Wing Luke.

Mr. Murakami preferred the green shade over the gold. Mr. Ha and Mr. Chen also liked the green.

Ms. Pisanont explained they are complementary colors to the Wing Luke museum.

Mr. Bisbee asked if there would be lighting in the alley.

Bernie Kay, property owner representative, said not at this time. He noted that the antique lights had all been stolen.

Ms. Pisanont said Donnie Chin, a tenant along the alley, wanted red for his shop.

Mr. Bisbee said he went on a tour of Wing Luke while it was under construction and there was talk of an “immersion experience”. He said that some of the storefronts used to be apartments and asked if that would be recreated in the Kong Yick East building as an interpretive exhibit.

Ms. Pisanont said that one of the storefronts on the Kong Yick West is an apartment and another is currently in use as a retail store.

Mr. Kay said the original intent with Wing Luke was to recreate with apartments but there are some budget issues.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

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

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**
- B. Asian Design Character District**
 - 2. Colors**

MM/SC/WC/RM

4:0:2 Motion carried. Ms. Chung Gerrick and Mr. Lee recused themselves.

051209.3

GUIDELINES REVISION WORK SESSION

Board discussion regarding guideline revisions.

Ms. Frestedt provided a copy of the latest revision of the Guidelines to the Board (in file) and explained she wanted to focus on the General Guidelines and began with changes made to the section on the Certificate of Approval process. She said she thought it was important to add a reference to the Municipal Code section which is the authorizing language that allows this Board to review changes etc. as listed in 23.66.030. She added the heading “Why Am I Required to Apply?” She noted she added the website address and that language assistance was called out. In response to a Board member’s recommendation she also added language about the Architectural Review Committee under “Board Review”.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested separating façade improvements and signage under “what kind of changes require approval?” Should be worded “Change of Use” approval. She suggested that “New Construction” should be another item because façade improvements seem to be more renovation.

Ms. Frestedt said under “Design Approval” it includes new construction with preliminary design approval included under that; perhaps it should be clearer and be separated out.

Ms. Chung Gerrick –design approval could be existing buildings and then a separate one for new construction.

Ms. Frestedt explained that she established a distribution list to notify the community about the process. She said 15 people have asked to be added to the list.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted a majority of applications come in for signage.

There was further discussion about the formatting and organization of this section.

Ms. Chung Gerrick liked it and said it provides more back ground and explains how the ISRD is an extension of the Land Use Code.

Ms. Frestedt concurred and said that was the intent. She said she hoped to strike a balance in the guideline language between the technical and the approachable. She said as part of the adoption process once there is a near final draft she said there would be a town hall type community meeting so the community can have input.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said the parts starting with a question feel more personal and suggested doing that throughout.

Mr. Murakami thought it seemed out of place but felt more accessible.

Mr. Lee said it sets the direction and provides law and rationale for the application process.

Mr. Murakami said the introduction and context sections set the tone for the rest of the document.

Mr. Bisbee noted people are in a hurry to get their business going and thought it important to let people know the process has a timeline. He suggested referring to the timing of application.

Ms. Frestedt noted the difficulty in estimating timelines since each project can vary from the next. She said that perhaps just stating something along the lines of "...allow yourself enough time so that if changes are required, you have time to make corrections before your application is scheduled for review."

Ms. Chung Gerrick said if the process is clearly laid out applicants could anticipate the timeline and suggested adding an FAQ section at the end.

Ms. Frestedt stated that information is available on the website and that she could borrow some of the language on the website.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested listing something about other City permit requirements, such as the need to obtain a Sign Permit from the Department of Planning and Development.

Ms. Frestedt said it could be done in a simplified way and agreed with the need for clarity and a reference to the timeline.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked if Ms. Frestedt regularly met with applicants before they submit application.

Ms. Frestedt explained that sometimes she meets with applicants in an advisory capacity or conducts a site visit to help applicant, particularly with business or property owners who are new to the District.

There was discussion about the definitions section. Ms. Frestedt noted a set of guidelines from the Denver area that provides an effective example of how this can be done well.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted the usefulness of a visual dictionary of the neighborhood buildings and features.

Ms. Frestedt noted the value in graphics but also the challenge of budget issues and thought photos may be more feasible at this point. She referenced the Guidelines samples from Victoria and Vancouver, BC as good examples.

She continued on to the General Guidelines she asked if there were other priorities to include and noted the importance of keeping this section brief with specific sections providing more detail. She said General Guidelines should provide a set of “universal standards” that apply throughout the District. She said the section needs some work and asked for feedback on individual bullets. There was discussion about the scale of future development. She noted that she received two comments from the community to add the scale should be compatible with existing development as well as development that occurs as part of the South Downtown rezone. She said that even though the zoning is likely to change under the South Downtown rezone it is hard to refer explicitly to something that hasn’t happened yet.

She read through the General Guidelines in the draft and asked for Board feedback. She referred to examples of general guidelines in the Ballard and Columbia City Design Guidelines.

Mr. Lee suggested keeping the section short or people won’t read it.

Ms. Chung Gerrick noted that the ID is different from other districts in that it has multiple communities under one umbrella, which adds complexity.

Ms. Frestedt explained the District contains Nihonmachi, Chinatown, and Little Saigon. She also noted that the Asian Design Character District is distinct and should be called out in the Guidelines with separate direction for the peripheral areas or edges of the District.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said new construction should be compatible with existing in terms of scale, materials and set back and asked how this would be handled in Little Saigon where there aren’t many historic or contributing buildings.

Ms. Frestedt said the area east of I-5 needs to be discussed further because of its difference in character. There was discussion about the role of zoning and how land is developed.

Mr. Murakami said zoning codes sets the limit and noted that the existing condition in Little Saigon is underdeveloped.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said it is discouraging for a developer because they may think that they will be maxed out at two stories because all the adjacent buildings are that height.

Ms. Frestedt said she would work on the language for this section. She read the bullet that states that a “mixture of uses should be encouraged” and said the difference between “mixed use” and “mixture of uses” and said “mixed use” refers to mixing residential or office on top of retail. The intent of the term “mixture of uses” is not building specific but district wide. She read from the bullet says “the inventory of contributing building, spaces and historic uses should be respected and maintained” was language that was borrowed; she said a community person asked

what it meant to be “respected”. She said perhaps “respected” isn’t the right word for this district but that “maintain the inventory of contributing buildings” is important.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said one of the guidelines lists things encouraged/discouraged and asked if this would be a good place to put that.

The Board briefly discussed design guidelines for signage and there was general Board agreement that the detail about signage in the Columbia City guidelines was desirable because it discusses multiple sign types in depth.

The meeting of the full Board was adjourned.

051209.4 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

051209.41 Chinese Southern Baptist Church
515-517 10th Ave. S.
Applicants: Andrew Ng, Sik Wong, and Ivan Leung

Proposed demolition of a portable structure and final design of a newly constructed 2-story education building adjacent to the church.

Ms. Frestedt said introduced the applicants and said they are presenting their proposal for final design and seeking a recommendation from the Committee.

Mr. Wong summarized the alternative color schemes they came up with and showed which was their first choice. He said they changed to the smooth type Hardi Plank and said cost wise they are pretty much the same.

Ms. Chung Gerrick commended the applicant for bringing many alternatives and the presentation provides much better view of what it will all look like. She preferred the first color proposal and saw the color as deriving from the church. She also preferred the smooth type Hardi Plank. She asked the applicant to explain the stepping at the façade at the ends.

There was discussion about the roofline design.

The applicants explained that there will be four exterior lights and provided photos for review. There is some street lighting across the street. The new building should be a lot lighter than existing.

Ms. Frestedt advised the Board can weigh in on the brightness/wattage of bulbs.

Mr. Leung said no additional signage is planned at this point. He summarized the landscaping plan and said the space they have is at a premium and they have tried to do as much as possible. There will be a few Italian Cyprus in the front (10th) and a flower bed along the front, side and back.

Ms. Frestedt said previously the committee had supported the ability to depart from the assigned Green Factor score assigned by DPD so long as they were maximizing what they could conceivably do on the site.

Mr. Leung said they wanted to stay away from bigger plants and trees for security reasons. With regard to window treatments along 10th, right now they have mini-blinds and they will likely use mini-blinds in the new building as well.

Ms. Frestedt said when considering blinds – because of the transparency requirement – is that if that is an approach you are proposing and is supported by the ARC she suggested the committee consider as part of the motion that the blinds are open during the daytime hours so that the building doesn't become shut off.

Ms. Chung Gerrick said she would like to recommend differentiating the main entry with a nicer light fixture so it feels more welcoming.

Ms. Frestedt asked about a reference to a fence and gate to be relocated between the two buildings.

Mr. Leung said it was existing and they were moving it back a little.

Ms. Frestedt noted there seemed to be agreement with the original paint color, smooth Hardi Plank and a different light fixture at the main entrance on the north façade.

Mr. Murakami asked about the lighting on the street side of the building.

Ms. Frestedt said the can type of light has been approved in front of the Seattle Vision Clinic on Jackson and noted they are flat but well-directed. She said there are three issues: the amount of wattage, the number of fixtures, and the fixture design.

The applicant said they would find another fixture that would be more decorative and aesthetically pleasing.

The Committee was in support of the application and recommended approval to the Board.

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