



The City of Seattle

## International Special Review District

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

ISRD 163/18

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY August 28, 2018

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

#### **Board Members Present**

Eliza Chan  
Stephanie Hsie, Vice Chair  
Sergio Legon-Talamoni  
Tiernan Martin, Chair

#### **Staff**

Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom

#### **Absent**

Russ Williams

Chair Tiernan Martin called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

#### **082818.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

082818.11 660 S. King St. – Atlas Hotel  
*Applicant:* Kevin Park, Signs of Seattle

Ms. Sodt explained the application for proposed replacement of the awning fabric on the existing frame and installation of an illuminated channel letter raceway sign to be attached to the awning; dimensions: 16” high x 10’ long. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Atlas Hotel was constructed in 1920. It is a contributing building located within the Asian Design Character District. Illuminated signage on the face of the awning is permitted by SDCI, although it’s not a common element on awnings within the ISRD. The 10” letter size of the English business name is consistent with signage on other awnings in the District. The inclusion of multi-lingual signage is encouraged.

Applicant Comment:

Kevin Park provided material samples.

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

“Printed on Recycled Paper”

Mr. Park said the sign is aluminum panel with LED channel letters.

Ms. Hsie asked if the characters are backlit.

Mr. Park said yes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martin supported the application.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for awning and signage alterations, as proposed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the August 28, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This action is based on the **following applicable sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and District Design 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**
  - a. Awnings**

**SMC 23.66.338 – Signs**

**ISRD Design Guidelines**

- I. Awnings and Canopies**
- II. Design Guidelines for Signs**

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: #10.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in 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/EC/SLT      4:0:0      Motion carried.

082818.12

Right-of-Way along Maynard Ave. S. at S. Weller and S. Lane Streets  
*Applicant:* Jinny Green, SDOT

Ms. Sodt explained the application for proposed revision to the brick pavers and curb configuration at two intersections, as listed above, to accommodate updated ADA ramps. Exhibits included plans and photographs. The Board received an informational briefing in May 2018. The Board discussed exploration of alternate paving patterns or treatments

rather than eliminating all but a sliver of the brick pavers. The applicant is proposing two different paving restoration options for Board consideration.

Applicant Comment:

Jinny Green presented via PowerPoint (in DON file). She said pavement resurfacing work will be done; they are re-doing the ramps first. She proposed to do a bulb-out and ADA ramp with brick overlay, presenting two options: either replacing with all brick, consistent with the current condition, or installing brick just around ramp. She said that on the southeast corner on Weller the sidewalk will be lowered, and they may not need a curb. She provided renderings of the proposed options. She said the proposed brick color will wear to closely resemble existing brick. She said at the briefing the Board was concerned with uniformity; there are benefits to both options – with or without brick. She said she received a letter from Betty Lau who was not supportive of use of brick or curb bulbs.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked if there are slip-issues with the brick.

Ms. Green said there have been no significant claims but there are concerns for elderly.

Ms. Hsie asked if brick is part of the green street plan.

Ms. Green said it is not.

Ms. Chan asked if they will repaint crosswalk to match so it all lines up.

Ms. Green said they will.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hsie said the crosswalks and location of ramps is an improvement. She said the brick patterning should be consistent with what is on the north end but noted patterning inconsistencies from corner to corner.

Mr. Martin also noted the lack of consistency and the challenge of replacing brick. He said there is no guiding document for what corners should look like. He appreciated the alternative provided. He recommended the brick alternative because it is what is seen in the District, even if it is imperfect. He cited 23.66.302 E.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked if there is treatment to minimize slip risk.

Ms. Green said options are limited and costly. There isn't a treatment proposed.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni expressed concern about public safety. He agreed that brick option maintains the visual order and without a guiding principle, he would lean to the brick option for continuity.

Ms. Chan was concerned about potential for injuries.

Mr. Martin said there is brick there now, it is all over the district. He said using brick again is not dramatically changing anything. If there is interest in improving the tactile quality, then a cohesive plan is needed for the neighborhood.

Grace Kim, Schemata Workshop, said that scoring on bricks is helpful, that has been done next to Federal Building.

Ms. Green said she would look into that.

Ms. Hsie asked what is on the corners at Hing Hay Park.

Ms. Green said all corners have brick.

Board members generally agreed that retaining brick is preferred because it is prevalent in the District and its use here will be limited in area. If it is found that scored brick is an option, Ms. Frestedt can review that administratively.

Ms. Chan noted community concerns about safety and asked if there was a third option.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for site alterations, including original paving option as proposed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the August 28, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This action is based on the **following applicable sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and District Design Guidelines:**

**SMC 23.66.302 E**

**SMC 23.66.334 – Streets and sidewalks**

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards: #10.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in 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/SLT/SH 3:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Chan abstained.

### **082818.3**

### **DESIGN GUIDELINES WORKSESSION**

Schemata Workshop presented the working draft of the design guidelines to the Board. Community members will still have the opportunity to comment on the draft before it is finalized and adopted by the Board and the Department of Neighborhoods.

Grace Kim and Joann Ware, Schemata, Susan Boyle, BOLA, presented. Draft changes were reviewed including Reader's Guide, ISRD boundary map, building design – previous design

concept, and document resources. Flow and usability were addressed as were goals and guiding principles.

Mr. Martin said it is great to have the process laid out, he supported the FAQ section. He recommended adding language about Board and applicant interaction.

Ms. Sodt said that could be added under “What is the ISRD board?”.

Ms. Hsie suggested clarifying what applicants should bring to a meeting, at a minimum.

This led to a discussion about the application and related checklist that accompanies the application form and the role of the Coordinator in following up with the applicant indicating what information is missing from the application.

### Reader’s Guide

Ms. Ware provided a summary of the Reader’s Guide highlighting how to use different sections.

Mr. Martin recommended including resources, such as pictures/infographics; should include website.

Ms. Ware: board coordinator phone number and website will be listed.

### Document Resources

There was discussion about how to cite Guidelines east and west of I-5.

Ms. Ware noted that each guideline will have its own number.

Ms. Hsie stated that location specific structure is confusing, i.e. east of I-5; work on numbering.

There was discussion about methods for numbering and referencing individual guidelines.

Ms. Ware: only five sections; goals and guidelines will be referenced.

Ms. Kim: tabs with overarching description and then bold highlights.

Mary Kate Ryan: cite on every page so people don’t have to go back.

Ms. Ware: took out Roman numerals; used letters and numbers, since some users may not be familiar with Roman numerals.

### Flow and Usability

Mr. Martin recommended beginning with Guiding Principles for whole neighborhood; look at subsections that apply; then move to applicable section.

Board members stated that the diagrams can be confusing, but the descriptions are clear. There was a suggestion to add an index for diagrams and figures.

Ms. Hsie said she appreciates the way 'New/Tall Buildings' has been reformatted. Noted 3-C, with carved, angled, or shift forms, most important is why someone would do it – why they think it relates to the neighborhood.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni: add more description in heading – how to think about strategies.

Mr. Martin: page 29, likes diagram relating to contributing versus non-contributing; wants to see how massing of tall building could relate to an existing building; wants to see diagram that gets at the idea.

Ms. Hsie: wants to see tall building diagram in relationship to existing contributing building; want to see strong relationship. Call out street façade level, transom level, trim band, would be helpful to add modern/contemporary version of diagram on page 27. Façade variation – buildings in district are ordered; difficult when trying to make arbitrary design that is not based on anything.

Ms. Hsie: C-3 – break up large expanses of blank façade; prefer those programs be on back.

Ms. Kim: avoid blank walls on street facing façades; even apply to I-5.

Ms. Ware: define street-facing in glossary.

Mr. Martin: page 25, lighting: want to see photo that reflects bullet 2.

Ms. Sodt: noted the ACT Theater, Eagles Auditorium, as an example.

Mr. Martin: page 34, east of I-5 section; wants to see more photos of what a mid-block passage looks like.

Ms. Hsie agreed with Mr. Martin; example can come from non-Seattle location.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni suggested including a brief bit in introduction section on role/purview of board. Board members agreed.

Ms. Hsie: page 37, west of I-5; go in to history of site, celebrate history of site, cultural components of site we want to support.

Mr. Martin spoke to public space as gathering, informal setting like card-playing gathering space at this building; ghost activity.

Ms. Chan noted the importance of night time activation.

Mr. Martin referred to the importance of linking the two (public space as gathering, informal setting like card playing gathering space at this building and safety issue).

Accent colors – the Board agreed that color important but don't want to limit options. Community feedback is important.

### Goals and Guiding Principles

Ms. Kim noted that sustainability / green building / environmental issues are absent from Guidelines.

Mr. Martin asked why bicycle parking is promoted; sustainability is less of a priority.

Ms. Hsie noted that low-income housing is at the top of the list.

Ms. Ware noted different kinds of housing are included.

Mr. Martin asked if URM building structural vulnerability reflected?

Ms. Kim confirmed that rehabilitation is encouraged.

Ms. Sodt suggested that best practices on seismic retrofit could be provided – bracing not visible, preventing need for rosettes, keeping window areas free of bracing, where possible. She confirmed that retrofits need to come before board. Might have some language from UW work that is applicable.

Ms. Ware: could add UW to resources.

Mr. Martin encourages design that facilitates spill over into the right-of-way, i.e. vending, café; provide image.

Ms. Hsie suggested providing a better image of crosswalk and China Gate.

Ms. Kim: in the CID see a mix of generations using the same space at different times.

Mr. Martin: include aspirationally to both sides of I-5.

Ms. Boyle: family friendly discussion on page 33. Historic section is an overview only; who are we leaving out?

Ms. Hsie said to be clear why something is being done or why are they doing it differently (SDOT).

**082818.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

**Adjourn 6:17 pm.**

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