



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 24/16

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, January 12, 2016

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

Board Members Present

Tiernan Martin
Miye Moriguchi
Martha Rogers, Chair
Herman Setijono
Valerie Tran
Marie Wong

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Carol Leong

011216.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 10, 2015

MM/SC/MM/MR 2:0:4 Minutes approved. Mmes. Wong and Tran, Messrs. Setijono and Martin abstained.

November 24, 2015

MM/SC/MM/MW 3:0:3 Minutes approved. Ms. Tran, Messrs. Martin and Setijono abstained.

011216.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Applications reviewed out of agenda order.

011216.23 517 and 523 8th Ave. S.

Applicant: Malcom Harris, Harris, Mericle & Wakayama

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed signage to be installed in three (3) locations. Exhibits included photographs, plans and specifications. The property is located in the Asian Design Character District and is currently being used as a surface parking lot. In February 2011 the

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

ISRD Board considered a proposal to establish use at 517 and 523 8th Ave. S. as parking lots for a series of clients who were leasing space in the lot. The Board determined that the applicant failed to establish that the users of the lot were accessory to activities within the Chong Wa Benevolent Association building and voted to deny the proposal. In accordance with Seattle Municipal Code 23.66.320, surface parking areas are prohibited as principal uses, but may be permitted as accessory uses.

Applicant Comment:

Malcom Harris explained the need to establish accessory use for parking lot. He explained that two parcels have been used for parking since the 1960s but they are also used for drill team practice and for school activities. He said that a system has been instituted where only employees, visitors or staff can park. He said they will lock off the gates and will post signs at three locations on chain link fences that parking is for Chong Wa only.

Responding to questions about existing public uses, such as the basketball hoops, Chong Wa member Sue May Eng said no changes were planned. It was noted that Chong Wa may at a later date install an electric gate.

Mr. Harris said a placard will need to be placed in the window of cars authorized to park in the lot.

Ms. Frestedt noted that if any changes are planned for the physical site to come back for review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Tuck Eng, Chong Wa board member, said they are working with the City. He said that Chong Wa is a non-profit that provides community service and needs the revenue. He said they have allowed dumpsters to be placed there for community events. He said it is odd that they can't use it as a commercial property.

Ms. Frestedt said it would require legislative action to change code to allow principal use surface parking.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for use and signs, 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 January 12, 2016 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 23.66.320 – Permitted uses

SMC 23.66.338 – Signs

F. Surface Parking Lot Signage

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/HS/MM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011216.21

Fruit Bliss Café

414 8th Ave. S.

Applicant: Xiao Song, business owner

Ms. Frestedt presented the proposal on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed replacement of the sign face on the existing interior-lit cabinet sign. Exhibits included plans, photographs and material samples. This business is located within the Asian Design Character District. Ms. Frestedt said the sign is Lexan with vinyl graphic. She said the existing sign box will be used she will just slide in new piece of Lexan.

Ms. Moriguchi said it is straightforward.

There was discussion about the translation and differences between the Chinese and English language text.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Board members had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for signage, 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 January 12, 2016 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 23.66.338 – Signs

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs

MM/SC/MM/HS 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011216.22

Publix

504-510 5th Ave. S.

Applicant: Susan McNabb, Graham Baba Architects

Mr. Setijono and Ms. Moriguchi recused themselves due to their respective affiliations with the project.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed building signage and tenant sign plan. She reported that building signage consists of:

- Restoration of the canopy signage on the west façade. No illumination is proposed;
- Installation of illuminated, steel letters mounted to the canopy on the south façade;
- Installation of a neon blade sign on the east façade; and,
- Application of vinyl decal window signs.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the building sign plan identifies the type and preferred location(s) of tenant signage allowed. She explained the proposed outdoor furnishings for the courtyard and rooftop patio and exterior building amenities (bike racks, waste receptacles). Exhibits included photographs, plans and specifications. She said the Publix Hotel was constructed in 1927 and is a contributing building located within the Asian Design Character District. A Certificate of Approval for revisions to the final design, related to window and paint colors, was issued in November 2015. A Certificate of Approval for Use and Final Design for rehabilitation of the building was issued in August 26, 2014.

Applicant Comment:

Susan McNabb identified on plan elevations proposed signage locations. She explained that the east elevation fronts the courtyard and parking lot; a blade for each tenant is proposed. She said a neon sign is proposed at the back entry to the Publix lobby. At the north entry to the Publix and at the north façade of the warehouse areas have been designated for tenant signage – flat building signage and blades. She said that at the Publix entry historic canopy will be refurbished and signage will be added to glass on doors – antique white vinyl laser cut. She said that footers will also be antique white vinyl laser cut with building name, info.

Ms. McNabb said that they will put in a new canopy at the S. Weller entrance; letters on the building will be powder-coated to match blackened steel. She said that letters will be lit from the front and light mechanism will not be visible. She said that the blade will be a folded piece of blank metal onto which the tenant can laser cut their name/logo; she said they will be lit by LED strip. She said at the east entrance to the Publix lobby they propose a neon sign in black powder-coated metal housing to act as a ‘small marker’ for the back entry. She said that white vinyl lettering will adhere to windows. She went over material specifics and said that they will provide guidelines for tenants about what is the sign plan allows.

Ms. McNabb said the furniture proposed for the courtyard and the penthouse is durable, clean, Asian-inspired, and easily moved and stored. She said that two arc shape bike racks are proposed and one set of trash and compost receptacles. She said the furniture for the penthouse is lower-scale and not visible. She provided cut sheets and material and color samples; to-scale drawings/construction documents were provided as well.

Ms. Rogers asked if there would be lighting on the main sign on historic canopy.

Ms. McNabb said there won't be on the sign itself – there is lighting within the canopy - previously approved - that will light the sidewalk below.

There was discussion about the proposed placement of the blade signs as shown on the sign plan.

Ms. Rogers said that south portion is not historic building and the architecture is not as critical; she suggested attaching to the beam across the top of the door.

Ms. McNabb concurred. Responding to questions she said that the signage on the front door will be at pedestrian height.

Mr. Martin asked about window applied tenant signage.

Ms. McNabb said they could have that as long as it isn't obstructing the view.

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. McNabb explained the integration of the neon into the blade sign.

Ms. Tran asked about the location and quantity of bike racks.

Ms. McNabb said there would be two racks, providing spaces for a total for 4 bikes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the board could recommend re-alignment of north and south of entry signs subject to review and approval by staff or for further board for review. She noted that each sign once proposed will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Tran said she likes that the furniture is movable.

Ms. Rogers reiterated her concern about sign that doesn't reinforce architecture and suggested lining it up with pilaster. She said there is not vertical other than pilaster in storefront area.

Ms. Wong asked if the entry way south of main entry is recessed.

Ms. McNabb said it is.

Ms. Wong commented on blade signs lining up with vertical elements there as well and noted the stronger relationship to vertical elements.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for building signage and site plan, conditional upon submission of a narrative and corresponding plans that the location of blade signs will align with historic framework of building.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the January 12, 2016 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 23.66.338 – Signs

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards:

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

#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/VT/MW 4:0:2 Motion carried. Mr. Setijono and Ms. Moriguchi recused themselves.

011216.24

Sunny Massage & Spa

661 S. Jackson St.

Applicant: NuYing Yang, business representative

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed request for retroactive approval of a change of use from “retail” to “service” for a massage spa. She said the proposed request for retroactive approval of signage, consisted of 5 window signs or posters and two illuminated open signs. She explained the proposed request for retroactive approval of window treatments, consisting of opaque curtains and yellow fabric behind the transom windows.

Exhibits included photographs and plans. Ms Frestedt said the Evergreen Apartments building was constructed in 1916 and is a contributing building located within the Asian Character Design District and in the Retail Core where Street-level Uses are required. She reported that the proposed use is not one of the preferred uses outlined in SMC 23.66.324 – Street-level uses, and it is the staff opinion that it may be better suited for a second story space that is not at ground level. Staff has discussed the transparency requirement with the business owner and expressed concern that the window treatments, as proposed, do not comply with the provisions of SMC 23.66.336 B. 4. Transparency Requirement. Staff recommended exploration of alternative approaches for providing privacy screening for customers while maintaining the transparency requirement.

Applicant Comment:

Nu Ying Yang said they didn’t know the rules about use and transparency.

Ms. Frestedt summarized her work with the applicant to inform him of requirements and noted that the case has been referred to DPD and Law for further enforcement.

Mr. Yang said they want the curtain because non-customers walk in and bother employees. He said it is too bright with the curtains open. He said since receiving a letter about the curtains that they have been opened.

Mr. Setijono asked if massage was performed in the lobby.

Mr. Yang said it is – they have three rooms and five recliners in the lobby. In response to a question, he confirmed that there is also a window and curtains along the alley (east façade).

Ms. Frestedt said this window is visible from the right of way and also subject to Board review. She said she has only seen curtains closed. She noted transparency requirements and Code.

Ms. Rogers suggested putting something 3' back from window.

Public Comment:

Nelson Nakata, property manager, asked whether or not it would be okay to put up screening, set back from the window.

Ms. Frestedt said that setback may be acceptable if they could put something there to activate the space. She said there are options for the transom window as well. She said the yellow color as presented is abrupt.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Moriguchi said that the opaqueness doesn't meet the Code and noted there are options that could solve issues. She said they could work with setback screening elements, a picture, transoms, and other ways that are not set directly against the window and are more contextual with the architecture of the building. She suggested a different color for the transom window treatments, as well.

Ms. Tran suggested a setback or screen or a transparent film for transom.

Board members preferred that the curtains be removed and applicant use screens or an alternative treatment that allowed more transparency. Members stated that the Code is clear about transparency and street level uses.

Mr. Yang said they are going to sell the business.

Mr. Nakata said that regarding the sale there is no approval or exchange of lease until issues are resolved.

Ms. Moriguchi said that the signage is ok but she did not support the curtains.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for use and signage and *deny* the request for window treatments, as proposed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval for use and signage and denial of window treatments based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the January 12, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed use and signage 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 23.66.320 – Permitted uses

SMC 23.66.324 – Street-level uses

SMC 23.66.338 – Signs

The proposed window treatments do **not** meet the transparency requirements of SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes. The window treatments fully obscure visibility into the storefront. Therefore, the Board recommends *denial* of the window treatments, as proposed. This action is based on the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance:**

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

- A. General Requirements. To retain and enhance the visual order of the District, which is created by existing older buildings that provide unique character and form through their subtle detailing and quarter-block and half-block coverage, new development, including exterior remodeling, should respect the architectural and structural integrity of the building in which the work is undertaken, through sympathetic use of colors, material and style. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area.
 - B. Asian Design Character District. The boundaries of the Asian Design Character District of the International District are as shown on Map B for [23.66.326](#). To strengthen and preserve the existing Asian architectural character of the Asian Design Character District, tiled awnings, recessed balconies, heavy timber construction, and materials and colors as specified below are encouraged.
4. Transparency Requirement. Street-level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Transparent surfaces shall be provided for at least 50 percent of the exposed street-facing facade measured between sidewalk level and a height of 10 feet or the height of the second floor level, whichever is less. The average height of window sills shall be no greater than 3 feet above the sidewalk. A decrease in the percentage of required transparency may be permitted by the Board if:
 - a. There is a design constraint, such as permanent wainscoting, and removal or alteration would detract from the structural or architectural integrity of the building; or
 - b. The existing layout of the building or other physical constraints such as the placement of load bearing walls or columns creates a hardship. If transparency requirements are reduced, wall murals, landscaping, colored awnings, display cases, or other means appropriate to the setting shall be provided to create visual interest.

MM/SC/TM/MW 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Frestedt reiterated to the applicant that the window treatments as proposed were denied.

011216.3 BOARD BRIEFINGS

011216.31 525 Yesler Way
Presenter: Paul Hanson, NK Architecture

Design briefing on Preliminary Design of a new 7-story mixed-use building with one level of underground parking, with a focus on the design of the east-facing courtyard.

Ms. Frestedt provided an overview of the site and feedback from the first briefing. She stated that the Board had been supportive of orienting the courtyard to the east, pending additional information about the relationship of the courtyard to the right of way.

Paul Hanson and Emily Evenson, NK Architects, Marc Angelillo (developer), and Karen Kiest, landscape architect, presented via PowerPoint; full report in DON file. Following is a summary of Board questions and comments.

Mr. Hanson noted the importance of the east orientation to allow light into the childcare facility and reviewed pros and cons of different massing options. The team presented detailed massing options A – D, noting that D is the preferred alternative. He identified entries/exits around the site and went over the building program and noted that the planter at the courtyard is part of the stormwater approach. He said that the goal is to retain the sidewalk where it is and improve plantings along the street. There was a discussion about the grade and related challenges along the site. There was a presentation of possible approaches to a decorative fence or treatment along the courtyard; this area has not yet been designed. He said there would be future presentation/discussion of security and signage. There was a discussion of the trees to the east of the site, noting potential ties to the Japantown community. There are plans to put in something similar, possibly using a graft of the existing tree(s).

Ms. Moriguchi asked the length of the courtyard along the street.

Mr. Hanson said it is 40’.

Ms. Moriguchi asked about the massing scheme, seeking clarification of the two tones of grey bars on the rendering.

Mr. Hanson said the north and south bar with separator in middle – courtyard on one side and the other side roof deck. He said they tried to break the mass with color bring the bars down and break color.

Ms. Moriguchi said she liked how the two entries are clarified and the two story lobby addition helps. She said the large planting is sort of a barrier to creating a space for interaction. She noted the amount of proposed planting.

Mr. Kiest said that they could have a stop for people.

Mr. Hanson said they are discussing that – it could be a plaza type space but noted safety and security issues with the children’s play area.

Ms. Frestedt noted the possibility of senior rest stops and mentioned the importance of creating safe spaces or spaces that do not become problem areas or places to hide.

Ms. Wong asked about the stand of trees; she disclosed that she has been asked by the Green Space Coalition to look at the history of the grove of trees.

Mr. Angelillo said they have been working with the Green Space coalition to explore options for the trees on site. He said they are looking to preserve heritage of trees.

Ms. Frestedt said it is important to continue to look at compatibility with Japantown as a whole and consider, what is it about the design that says that it’s located within the ISRD?

Mr. Martin said he enjoyed the preferred scheme Option D. He said it does justice to the courtyard to break up the massing and activate the space. He noted the bright bold color for the bar in the massing drawing and asked if the intent was to be bold or subtle.

Mr. Hanson said it will be more subtly reflected.

Mr. Martin said he has yet to see a strong connection with Nihonmachi. He said color alone doesn’t speak to the connection and history and he suggested perhaps there are ways to creatively bring that influence to the design of the courtyard separation.

Ms. Rogers agreed with massing option D. She noted the playfulness at the connections encouraged continuing this with material and textures. She said to open up form and not block it all in. She said to add more interest in the back of the courtyard to add visual interest, referencing the photo of the Wing Luke Asian Museum on the cover sheet.

Mr. Hanson said maybe they could do something within the courtyard space to promote that.

Ms. Rogers said to create movement with material and close up have texture with landscape. She said the design from the street into the courtyard is key.

Mr. Angelillo said there are requirements for outdoor space for childcare.

Mr. Moriguchi supports the preferred massing option and said it helps define uses.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

The Board agreed they were supportive of massing option D and recommended to continue working on the courtyard design.

Ms. Moriguchi suggested the softening of the edge, making it more urban without being barricaded.

Ms. Kiest said they are exploring how to protect the children and see into space.

Ms. Moriguchi appreciated the open-ness and suggested breakdown scale.

Ms. Rogers said not just look down but looking across.

Ms. Moriguchi said to pick up on playfulness.

011216.32

10th & Jackson

Presenter: Chris Olson, Nystrom + Olson Architecture

Informational briefing on proposed demolition of four buildings and proposed new construction of a 7-story mixed-use building with one level of underground parking on five parcels east of I-5 in Little Saigon. Alternate massing studies will be presented.

Keith James, Inland Real Estate (developer), Cara Bertram (SCIDPDA), Chris Olson, from Nystrom + Olson, presented.

Mr. James said that his firm is a Spokane-based developer that does senior and affordable housing that they build and own. He said that this proposal is a direct response to the Mayor's call for affordable housing. He stated that they are collaborating with the SCIDPDA and have met with leaders in Little Saigon.

Ms. Bertram went over context of the four buildings on the five-parcel site and provided a summary of the historic property report (full report in the DON file). She explained the history of the buildings on site and noted the lack of integrity.

Ms. Frestedt reiterated the assumption that there would be no issues with proposed demolition. Board members agreed and stated that they were okay with proceeding with review of redevelopment plans.

Mr. Olson, Nystrom & Olson Architecture presented three massing schemes, showing a mixed use building with 247 units, fronting S. King and S. Jackson Streets. He presented three massing options, stating that all options are the same in regards to massing and density:

Scheme A presents parking garage entry off Jackson. Commercial on Jackson and King; a terraced plaza would be needed on King to deal with the grade. He said the residential units abut I-5.

Scheme B provides low commercial on King and Jackson with terracing on King. He said that parking would be accessed on 10th via internal ramp. He said that commercial, common space, ADA, emergency vehicle access and tenant parking

would be along 10th Avenue. He said that residential units would be elevated off sidewalk.

Scheme C – the preferred option – provides secured parking with access off King. He said residential entry would be off King. He said that commercial will be on Jackson. He said that access to the parking garage would be at Jackson and 10th with commercial at the corner. He said that there will be a 1 ½ - 2 story commercial base. He said there would be a small residential courtyard, commons space as well as residential units. He said that I-5 climbs along the site; they have pulled the building back 55 – 60 feet from the freeway.

Ms. Frestedt went over the provisions of SMC 23.66.308 and noted preferred uses east of I-5, encouragement of pedestrian oriented uses, commercial activation, and minimization of vehicle impacts. She said that the board would consider how proposal responds to provision of code and Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. James said he heard from the community about the need for parking and the more commercial, the better.

Public Comment:

Diane King, property owner, asked about the planned number of units and parking spaces.

Mr. Olson said they plan 247 units all affordable ‘workforce’ housing. He said that 50 – 60 parking places are proposed in the garage and 6-10 at grade.

Ms. Rogers asked about massing – volume at the main level. She asked which option provides the most commercial space.

Mr. Olson said at this point it is just a box and they have not yet studied massing; all three schemes are similar. He said that common space for residential use in Scheme C is greater now. He said they want to create a more substantial base. Amenity will carry from the sidewalk up and the uses will blend. He noted that the volume of common space exceeds commercial space.

Ms. Moriguchi said that there is more opportunity with scheme C to interact with the street. She said there is opportunity to create interesting space because of the grade changes. She said it will be important how those spaces are treated.

Mr. Olson said that there is a green street that they will respond to.

Mr. Martin said it would be great to see more about the design at 10th & Jackson. He said to connect the stair climb to Jackson and said that all options play well to corner but that C is the best.

There was interest in and discussion about further understanding the opening along 10th Ave. S. at grade.

Ms. Moriguchi said there is a big opening with parking at street and asked how that will look / feel. She said she would be interested to see it pulled back, possibly allowing for greater width at the sidewalk.

Mr. Olson said that they wanted options for parking in front of resident courtyard.

Mr. James said the courtyard will be secure and not open to the public. He said they will look at how to safely gate it in a safe and welcoming way. He noted public safety issues and said they are looking at how to treat it as a welcoming opening.

Mr. Olson said they could tuck the entrance back.

Ms. Moriguchi said to pull the commercial along the periphery but more interactive and less gated. She said to weave in the programmatic parameters. She wanted to see the interface of a person going to lobby – aesthetically programmatically.

Ms. Rogers said to think of the 224' along 10th as an opportunity to break up at least as experienced from the street. She said the parallel to I-5 is not as critical where the other three are.

Mr. Setijono suggested putting parking to exterior wall.

Ms. Rogers asked about mechanical units.

Mr. Olson said they will be smaller and spread out throughout the roof and garage; there will be no giant air handling on roof. He said there will be stair to roof and elevator over-runs there.

Ms. Rogers asked about a roof deck.

Mr. James said they will have to meet the green factor; he noted the courtyard will be well landscaped. He said they are budgeting for noise issues.

Ms. Frestedt noted the presence of the Green Street and access along S. King St.

It was noted that ground floor study perspectives are needed rather than bird's eye view.

A member requested to further define Option 3 at multiple levels.

Ms. Moriguchi asked about the need for two curb cuts for parking.

Ms. Rogers asked if they looked at ways to activate the opening so that it's not just parking. She said breaking up the length along 10th and S. Jackson will be key.

Mr. Setijono suggested maximizing parking in the garage.

Ms. Moriguchi asked if it was necessary to create such a large opening for so few parking spots; it is an opportunity for breakup of façade. She questioned the need parking for emergency vehicle.

Mr. James said it could be a police substation or staffing spot.

Ms. Rogers said that it should be integrated parking but should be welcoming as part of the street experience. She said that perhaps how it's shown in the rendering may be problematic. Think about the integration as part of the entry. She said some hotels succeed at creating a vehicular entrance as part of the street experience.

Mr. Martin asked if they have a 'no 10th Avenue car access' option. He would like to see an alternative that consolidates the access into a singular entry.

Ms. Moriguchi said she would like to better understand movement and flow in and around the site. She said it's hard to evaluate the parking entry along 10th without knowing more.

The following was a summary of the board's request for the next briefing:

More information about articulation and massing of the building.
Focus on street perspectives and breaking down the building at the street level.
Detail, articulation, fenestration, entry.
Flow, how enter and exit.
Bring summary of community outreach to next presentation.

011216.4 BOARD BUSINESS

The Board voted to select the chair and vice chair at the Jan. 26th meeting.

Adjourn

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