



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 44/07

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, February 27, 2007

Time: 4:30 p.m.
Place: Bush Asia Center
409 Maynard Avenue S.
Basement conference room

Board Members Present

Jerry Chihara
Robert Ha
Jan Johnson
Freeman Fong
Amalia Gonzalez-Kahn
Austen Chan

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Joanne Walby

Absent:

Hoa Tang

Ms. Johnson called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

022707.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 13, 2007
Mr. Chihara made a correction to the discussion of the Danny Woo Garden on page 4.
Moved to adopt the minutes, as amended.
MM/SC/FF/JC 6:0:0 Minutes adopted

022707.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

022707.21 New Central Hotel
651 S Weller St

Application: Proposed continuation of building rehabilitation, including window replacement, new exterior lighting, new signage and the addition of street trees on Maynard Ave.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt said the building is located in the Asian Design Character District and is a contributing building in the National Register Historic District. She said this application is part of a larger effort to rehabilitate the New Central Hotel. The applicant received a Certificate of Approval in November 2005 for Exterior Design.

Windows: The existing aluminum awning windows were approved and installed in 1982. The applicant proposes replacing the existing non-historic aluminum window with double-hung wooden units. The applicant's request for a C of A for fiberglass windows was denied in 2005. The proposed double-hung wooden units are consistent with the original windows.

Signage: The applicant is proposing to add a new sign panel that will consolidate signage for the building on the west-facing side of the building, along Maynard Avenue. The proposed signage plan includes a blade sign (3'4" x 2'9") over the Maynard Avenue entrance. Using the calculations outlined in the guidelines, the applicant *exceeds* the maximum allowance of signage as stated in the ordinance. However, that the ordinance did not anticipate this type of consolidated signage, particularly for offices that lack street frontage.

Applicant Comment: Bob Hale of Kovalenko Hale Architects presented a sample version of the single paned windows. Mr. Hale said he does not know how the original brick molding was constructed, but he believes the replacement is close to the original. He added that the design is similar to the windows that were approved for the Wing Luke Museum.

He said the signage will be placed to the left of the arched entry on Maynard Avenue. This entry leads to two levels of offices and retail for 12 tenants. The color of the signage panel will be "shutter-green".

Board Questions:

Ms. Johnson asked if the windows would be flush with the exterior. Mr. Hale said the new windows will be set to the location of the original windows.

Mr. Fong asked if this type of signage is typical of signage for multi-tenant offices in other Historic Districts. Mr. Hale wasn't sure about standards in other districts. Ms. Frestedt encouraged the Board to focus on the ISRD Guidelines. Mr. Chan didn't think that the proposed signage was representative of the District, given its size.

Mr. Hale said that the directory is intended to replace the existing signage. New signage requests by tenants would be incorporated into the proposed sign panel. He said this location is unique due to the big, blank façade with no storefronts along Maynard Ave. Mr. Hale reinforced the value of exterior

signage for shops without street frontage. Mr. Chihara was supportive of consolidating and organizing signage within a sign panel. He said the issue before the board relates to the size of the panel, given the allowance stated in the ordinance. He did not believe that the proposed signage would negatively impact the building's architectural details.

Mr. Hale reviewed the exterior lighting proposal, to add lighting to the recessed retail vestibule and office entrance. The lighting fixtures would include a shield to reduce glare and distribute light onto the sidewalk. In addition, he said the proposal includes three lights on the north side vestibule and the addition of three shielded lights in the alley.

Ms. Frestedt asked if these new lights would utilize new or existing fixtures. Mr. Hale said they would install new fixtures.

Mr. Hale presented the section of his application that includes landscaping and the addition of two Zelkova trees on Maynard Avenue. The trees have been approved by the SDOT arborist. The landscaping will consist of a 4' x 6' planting area featuring a variety of perennials.

Discussion:

Mr. Chan wanted to be sure that New Central tenants are aware that they will have to apply for a Certificate of Approval for any new signage placed within the panel.

Mr. Hale said that the owner will submit applications to the Board for new signage in the future. Mr. Frestedt reiterated that the proposal before the Board is only for the signage panel, new lighting, and landscaping. She agreed that any new signs will have to be presented to the Board for approval.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations including the window replacement, lighting, signage and new street trees on Maynard Avenue, as presented.

MM/SC/JC/RH 5:0:1 Amalia Gonzalez-Kahn recused.

The action is based on the following:
SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

IRSD Design Guidelines
II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Design Guidelines for Signs
II. A. Buildings with Multiple Tenants

022707.22 NP Hotel Residential Apartments
308 6th Avenue S.

Application: Proposed alteration to NP Hotel – flagpole removal.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt said the applicant is seeking approval for the permanent removal of a flag pole (approx. 30' tall) located on the roof of the NP Hotel, adjacent to the west parapet. The applicant's decision to remove the pole is based on the deteriorating structural conditions of the pole. The flag pole is an original feature of the building.

Applicant Comment: Tom Im and Elaine Ko of Inter*Im presented the application. Mr. Im explained that they were doing repairs to the cornice and window when a tenant complained of a water leak and they discovered that the flag pole needs repairs, too. A structural engineer and building technician examined the pole and determined that the flag pole needs to be removed and the area of the roof around the pole must be repaired. Ms. Ko said that Inter*Im looked into repairing the pole with an epoxy. This option would have been much cheaper than demolition; however, the engineer determined that this type of repair would be inadequate since the roof is also damaged.

Board Questions:

Mr. Fong asked what the replacement of the flagpole would cost. Ms. Ko said they received estimates, ranging from \$25,000 to \$45,000. Mr. Hale, who has worked with Inter*Im as an architect on the NP Hotel, noted that the cost of anchoring a flag pole this large is significant and costly.

Mr. Chihara asked if the applicant had done an assessment of the historic materials on the building. Mr. Hale said the flag pole was cited as an historic element in the nomination report submitted to the National Park Service.

Mr. Fong said he did not think the Board should consider cost when reviewing applications.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the Board may not have enough information about cost to consider that in their decision, since the applicant had not submitted a complete estimate. She said the Board should consider whether or not the flag pole is a character-defining feature and if it should be replaced. She added that the Board could request additional information about the costs of replacement.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Fong said he felt the proposed demolition of the flag pole is troubling. He suggested that the applicant find a way to replace it. Ms. Johnson agreed with Mr. Fong and said it would be sad to lose part of "the jewelry" of the District.

She suggested the applicant find a more cost-effective way to replace the flag pole.

Ms. Ko stated that Inter*Im has a list of capital repairs for the building and replacing the flag pole is not a priority. She added that the reason for the application is the result of safety concerns and reinforced the need to remove the pole.

Dr. Chan said the owner should explore replacement options. Ms. Gonzalez-Kahn agreed that since removal is a safety issue the Board should approve temporary removal of the flag pole. Mr. Ha agreed.

The Board discussed the possibility of bracing the flag pole in the short term until a replacement plan can be agreed upon. Mr. Im said the structural engineer explored a bracing plan, but even if the flag pole was braced, public safety would remain a concern.

A Board member suggested that the Board should vote on the demolition and discuss a replacement plan at an upcoming meeting. Another Board member asked if the flag pole is considered a “character-defining” feature. Mr. Hale confirmed the pole was included in the narrative for the historic designation nomination.

Ms. Frestedt said the flag pole is considered a character-defining feature due to its visibility and original materials. However, she said that the Historic Preservation Program lacks documentation that confirms specific historic significance of the pole.

Mr. Fong said the Board should be consistent in its decision-making since the Board has protected original features in other buildings in the District.

Public Comment: Michael Chan stated that the Board may be over-analyzing the issue. He said that removal is a safety issue. He was in favor of the Board approving the removal of the flag pole if the applicant returned with a replacement proposal.

Action:

I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the temporary removal of the flag pole, on the condition that the applicant returns to the Board with a replacement plan.

MM/SC/FF/AC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

This action is based on the following
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, #5, #6

022707.23 Seattle Vision Clinic
677 S. Jackson St – T&C Building

Application: Proposed signage.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt presented samples of the lettering proposed for the new sign. She said the proposed signage will be comprised of 10” bronze colored, satin finish brass letters. The letters will be stud mounted with 2” studs onto an existing wooden panel above the window. The letters will be reinforced with a silicone adhesive. Ms. Frestedt said the silicone adhesive proposed is 100% clear silicone, brand not specified. She spoke with a representative from McNamara Signs who confirmed that the silicone could be removed in the future, although additional treatment to the wood (e.g. sanding) may be necessary.

Applicant Comment: Dr. Lund Chin presented the application. He said the application is intended to help “upgrade” the signage, which has been on the building for nearly 40 years.

Board Questions:

Mr. Chihara asked if the wood panel on which the letters would be attached is historic material. The applicant said no. He added that the letters and adhesive can be removed easily in the future if necessary.

Public Comment: There was no public comment:

Discussion: The Board agreed that this proposal is appropriate.

Action:

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

This action is based on the following:

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs

MM/SC/AC/RH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

BOARD BRIEFING: Preliminary Design Approval

022707.24 Chinese Wellness Plaza
605 8th Avenue S

Dr. Austen Chan recused himself.

Application: Proposed design of a six-story mixed use building with ground floor retail, medical services, administrative offices, and one penthouse

residential dwelling. Two floors of housing have also been incorporated into the project. Parking for nine vehicles will be provided at grade. The project includes the proposed demolition of an existing storage building.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt said the applicant submitted for a Master Use Permit on May 12, 2006. This project requires SEPA review, therefore the ISRD Board cannot take action until after the SEPA determination has been issued by the Department of Planning and Development. The Board received two briefings in 2006, on June 27 and November 13.

Ms. Frestedt said that at the November meeting the Board asked the applicant for the following changes: To simplify the fenestration by using the same size and type of window (double-hung) and pair or group the windows in different ways; Make all bay windows the same size; Relate the penthouse to the base of the building in terms of a consistent form and design; Make the base of the building more substantive to connect with the pedestrian environment. The Board also suggested the use of one material to clad the entire base. A preference for brick cladding was expressed.

Applicant Comment: Dennis Su conducted the briefing. Mr. Su said he is seeking the Board's approval on the overall design.

He pointed out many of the changes that had been made to the latest design in response to Board feedback at the last briefing. He mentioned that the pitched roof design, which had been an objection by the Board, is seen on other surrounding buildings and presented photos as an example of this. He said the proposed roof design will help the penthouse relate to the District.

Board Questions:

Ms. Frestedt asked if the external water feature on the penthouse level would be visible from the street. Mr. Su said no.

Mr. Fong asked about the head height of the windows from the floor finish. He also inquired about the ceiling height. Mr. Su said the window heads would be 6-7' from the floor and the ceilings will be 8' 6". Mr. Fong suggested increasing the window height but Mr. Su explained that he would like to keep them at the same level as the door jamb.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Fong said that the current design was an improvement from the last draft and it headed in the right direction. Mr. Chihara said the design is more compatible with the District, but added that he would like to see the street level façade contribute more to the pedestrian environment through increased transparency. Ms. Johnson agreed and suggested that Mr. Su incorporate display windows at street level.

Mr. Fong suggested the installation of a decorative grill at the garage level. He also wanted the penthouse window profile consistent with the louvers. Mr. Chihara added that as the building develops she would like to see further compatibility of elements and materials that are sympathetic to the District.

Ms. Gonzalez-Kahn and Mr. Ha agreed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

Board expressed support over the revised drawings and told Mr. Su that he should move forward with the SEPA/MUP application.

022707.3 **BOARD BUSINESS** There was no board business.

Moved to adjourn at 6:30pm

MM/SC/JJ/RH

6:0:0 Motion carried.

Issued: March 12, 2007

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