MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, June 28, 2016

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

Board Members Present
Stephanie Hsie
Carol Leong
Tiernan Martin, Vice Chair
Herman Setijono
Valerie Tran
Marie Wong

Staff
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent
Miye Moriguchi, Chair

062816.1  CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

062816.21  1025 S. King St. – Sierra School
Applicant: Philip Riedel, NAC Architecture

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed work consists of: installation of a 4’ wooden high fence along the property line on S. King St., installation of a concrete basketball court on the grounds and revision to the landscaping plan surrounding the basketball court. Exhibits reviewed included plans, photographs and samples. She reported that this site is located east of I-5, outside of the Asian Design Character District. S. King Street is a designated Green Street. The Board recommended approval for signage and a classroom addition on January 26, 2016. The Board recommended approval for use and final design on February 24, 2015. She said that due to this site’s location along a Green Street, location of the fence between the landscaping and the right-of-way is not ideal. She said, from the staff
perspective, alternatives that add visual interest to the right-of-way would be preferable.

Applicant Comment:

Philip Riedel, NAC Architecture, oriented board members to the site and work that has been done thus far. He explained that they propose to put in a small half-court basketball court in the side yard to replace a portable hoop. He said they will also put in a ramp from the desk to the basketball court area. He said they propose to put up a fence along the street trees to communicate that the parking lot is private property, not public space.

Lisa Corry, Cascade Design Collaborative, went over existing landscaping, which consists of bamboo with river rock. She said they propose to make the bamboo area smaller and to add a new walkway. She said they will add bio-retention plants that are native and adapted to this site. She said they will do more dry river concept and less bamboo. She said the proposed fence will go behind the basketball backstop and will be pretty shielded by plants. She said the existing 10’ fence will remain.

Executive Director Melia Burns explained that their parking lot is seen as public space and they want the small fence to provide clear delineation between public and private space. She expressed security concerns.

Mr. Riedel said they want to present a welcoming façade to the neighborhood yet provide indicator of the line between public and private spheres. He said the wood fence will be 4’ high with 4” slats with 2” between as indicated on drawing. He said there will be no visual barrier, per CPTED principles; you can look over the fence into the parking lot. He said the cedar wood will be stained to keep brown tone longer.

Mr. Setijono said his only concern with would slats is that they’re prone to graffiti.

Mr. Riedel said they are aware and will take care of it as it happens.

Ms. Burns concurred with Mr. Riedel.

Mr. Martin asked why they’re proposing a wood fence that departs from the design language of the existing screening element adjacent to the building.

Mr. Riedel said they want to make it barely noticeable and not be imposing.
Ms. Frestedt asked if landscape barriers had been considered, as an alternative.

Ms. Corry said the plants there will get to 3’ tall but are still relatively small.

Mr. Riedel said the fence will be a more formalized indicator of private space.

Ms. Hsie said she recognized the issue and said the fence is an interesting intervention. She said the wood material is a different language for the building and seems out of character. She suggested taller shrubs.

Mr. Riedel said that they had recently restriped the parking lot and noted that the fence proposal is a bit of an experiment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Tran recommended replicating the red metal fence that is part of the school; it would show that it is part of the school.

Ms. Wong agreed with Ms. Tran and said the color would integrate with the existing fence and send a message. Plain cedar will invite graffiti.

Ms. Hsie said the basketball court is appropriate. She said she would like to see the fence reflect the character of the neighborhood, rather than introduce a residential-style picket fence.

Mr. Martin said the basketball court is a welcome addition; it is well-buffered. He suggested using the form and color of the existing fence for continuity of expression. He said the fence makes sense but to tie it to the school.

Ms. Leong agreed with her colleagues. She said the new fence should mirror what is there in color, style and materials.

Mr. Setijono said he had no issues with the basketball court. He said that painting the cedar fence red would be an eyesore.

Board members agreed that they had no issues with the basketball court but that the materials of the fence should mirror existing fence in front of the building.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for site design at 1025 S. King St with
proposed 4’ high fence design to mirror existing material, color, lattice dimension of existing wood fence in front.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 28, 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 Design Guidelines:

Secretary of Interior’s Standard #9 & #10

MM/SC/CL/HS 2:4:0  Motion failed. Mmes. Wong, Tran and Hsie and Mr. Martin opposed.

Discussion ensued and board members agreed that they supported the basketball court but that they want to see alternative designs for the fence taking into account board comments.

Ms. Hsie made a new motion.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for site design at 1025 S. King St with basketball court as designed and exception of fence; alternative designs of fence taking into account board comments and that promoted and preserves the history of the context of the school and references the red screen on site.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 28, 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 Design Guidelines:

Secretary of Interior’s Standard #9 & #10

MM/SC/SH/CL 6:0:0  Motion carried.

062816.22  Right-of-Way – Canton Alley
Applicant: Amanda Tse, SDOT

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed alley improvements, including repaving the north half of Canton Alley between S. King and S. Weller Streets. Proposed work includes installation of charcoal-colored concrete
pavers in the center of the alley, lined by a runnel for drainage and cement panels. Exhibits reviewed included plans and photographs. Ms. Frestedt confirmed that Canton Alley is located within the Asian Design Character District and National Register District. She said that the alley abuts the East and West Kong Yick buildings, both contributing buildings within the District. The Board receiving briefings on Historic Alley revitalization and right-of-way improvements in September 2012 and September 2013, respectively, including alley repaving, signage and festival-style lighting. An earlier version of the proposal included plans to engrave or add text to the concrete pavers. Later phases of the project may involve additional enhancements.

Applicant Comment:

Amanda Tse, SDOT, went over the funding and collaboration with SCIDPDA. She said they are now fully funded and have resumed design; they hope to start construction in September. She provided context of the work in the alley and said they plan to repair the deteriorating conditions and settlement issues on the northern portion of the alley. She said they have a geotechnical consultant to investigate. She went over design in detailed drawings – concrete paver strip in middle with 2” deep 1’ wide runnel for draining that will bring water to a catch basin. She showed in photos the parameters of the work and explained the drainage plan. She said the 4’ wide paver section will be sandwiched between 1’ wide runnels and drain pipe will go in the gravel layer; she went over layering details in plans.

Ms. Tse further explained that there have been sidewalk issues and they will add some structural fill in the areaway to provide better structural support. She said they have received some federal funding and have been working with DAHP and NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act)-related requirements.

Ching Chan, SCIDPDA, explained the overall intent and vision for the alley and noted the activation efforts. She said they want to make the alley more walkable and to bring back the storefronts that once lined the alley. She said they have gone through a huge community process and have partnered with Pioneer Square in alley revitalization efforts. She said they have held off on stamped pavers at this time and are looking into the potential of selling pavers to raise funds to do the rest of the work.

Ms. Frestedt explained the past proposal to stamp the pavers, noting that wasn’t part of the proposal presented today.

Ms. Chan indicated that alley lighting and signage would come later, under a separate proposal.
Responding to questions Ms. Tse said they would like to finish the alley paving but need additional funding and haven’t started that yet.

Ms. Wong disclosed that she is one of the directors of Kong Yick and worked on the alley restoration committee. She recused herself.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Tse described the runnel and indicated on plan where they are.

Ms. Chan said that events planned to activate the alley include the Night Market, Jamfest, and Dragonfest among other things. She said activities keep the activation and interest going.

Ms. Tran asked about maintenance issues and what would happen if work must be done within the alley.

Ms. Tse said, if such work is needed the City would pay for replacement of the pavers.

Public Comment:

Ching Chan supported the project.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martin said it is unfortunate they can’t do the whole alley but he said this is a first step. He said they are leaving room to transform the alley to the whole vision.

Ms. Leong concurred with Mr. Martin.

Ms. Frestedt suggested that the board members to speak to plans to protect the area during work, in light of concerns that were raised during the areaway work on S. Jackson St. in front of the Far East.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for Street Use on the northern portion of Canton Alley between S. King Street and S. Weller Street condition on SDOT submitting contractor’s plan for securing the area and storefronts during scope of work.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 28, 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 Design Guidelines:

SMC 23.66.302 – International Special Review District goals and objectives
SMC 23.66.334- Streets and sidewalks
Secretary of Interior’s Standard #9 & #10

MM/SC/SH/VT 5:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Wong recused herself.

062816.3 NEW CONSTRUCTION DESIGN BRIEFING

062816.31 913 S. Jackson St.
Presenter: Chris Olson, Nystrom + Olson,

Design briefing on Preliminary Design of a new 6-story mixed-use building. Preliminary design consists of the bulk, height and scale of the proposed development. The proposed development includes approximately 247 apartment units and 88 parking stalls.

Ms. Frestedt provided a brief overview of the project and stated that the focus of this briefing would be on the S. King Street façade and overall project massing.

PowerPoint in DON file.

Keith James, Inland Real Estate/developer, noted that the team is still awaiting the final determination from SDOT on vehicular access.

Chris Olson provided context of the site. He explained they submitted for MUP/SEPA in March. He said they met with SDOT and SDCI on access issues and noted that update today would be based on comments at last board meeting. He said that they integrated King Street units into grade and broke up the top in different ways. He said that they are proposing vehicle access off King and since they last briefing, they have removed stairs from the south side. He said the auto court off of 10th Ave. S. has been modified and reduced to a small guest parking area. He said they show ground level retail and commercial space and two formal access points with vestibules and awnings.

He provided renderings of options explored:

Option A: Presented first time; extruded box with pop outs.

Option B: more vertical; recess every other unit; breakdown further with material; doesn’t help identify neighborhood; pop façade creates variation at parapet and helps breakdown mass.
Option C: larger expansion of wall; small cuts in building; flat.

Option D: more playful, but did not the right approach for this site.

Option E: breakdown mass more; nod toward portal; fortress feel.

Preferred option is a hodge-podge with recesses and corner pop outs that create a formal structure with break up between corners. He said that the concept behind this option was to anchor corner, break up facades and establish corner at the ground level. He said it will be more articulated with different materials and shadows with different depths. He noted knuckles and turned up corners at the canopy. He noted step outs of multipurpose room and creation of green walls on King Street. He said building is set back on King Street so there is a large sidewalks – perhaps add planters or bays. He noted the double height space on one end of storefront where they could put in a horizontal curtain wall. Brown screen would come out from under I-5. Regarding design, color and proportion inspiration: He provided images used for inspiration including Vietnamese architecture, weaving, color, structure; strong vertical and horizontal lines.

*Mr. Setijono left at 6:10 pm.*

Ms. Frestedt noted SMC 23.66.336 A and C – goals and objectives- and Secretary of Interior Standards.

Ms. Leong asked about their process to incorporate neighborhood character.

Mr. James said they want to avoid kitsch. He explained their exploration of the history of Vietnam, French colonialism and control over time; color, proportion, what is made there, ornament.

Mr. Olson went over inspiration images and noted fenestration patterns and columns with strong vertical lines. Did research on colors – selecting gold.

Ms. Leong said they are on the right path and to keep going – look at the wealth of details in the neighborhood and continue to work them into the building.

Mr. Olson said that elements and signage will add personality/culture as well.

Mr. James noted the board comments about anticipating smaller storefronts.

Mr. Leong said that night time the board see the project she’d like to see how they treat the lower level. The building will be a huge contributor to the district and to the pedestrian experience. She said that color and texture are what they want to see more of and how the district can influence residential levels.
Ms. Hsie said she appreciated the studies and that the woven textiles inspiration is interesting; however, she noted the design inspiration on page 9 and said she didn’t see how they represent the cultural, economic, historic qualities. She noted the call in the Land Use Code to enhance the visual order. She asked why the window sizes differ, and she said this is an opportunity ornamentation and signage.

Mr. Olson said they will have larger windows in living rooms and smaller in bedrooms; all windows being the same size would be prison-like.

Ms. Hsie commented on the challenge of the very large site and noted the opportunity to use earthen materials - wood or masonry - for warmth and character.

Mr. Olson said they could use masonry at grade level and said above they proposed using 18” x 10’ cement board (considering product Nichiha) in three different textures.

Ms. Hsie noted the Code-required enhanced urban design with visible corridors, pedestrian realm. She said it would be useful to have head-on elevation with cut line of earth so you can see enlarged view of relation to retail.

Mr. Martin suggested variation at street level and the keep it flexible to accommodate different size typologies in retail etc.

Mr. Olson said they will break into their own pieces. He noted that the amenity space could have its own language and be different from the commercial space.

Ms. Frestedt said many buildings in the district have mezzanine space which are differentiated from the retail space.

Mr. Martin said the southeast corner provides a real opportunity with retail and mezzanine at the corner. He said he would be interested in seeing perspectives of this element. Noted importance of keeping the pedestrian realm in mind. He asked about the staircase / green wall.

Mr. Olson said the stair was internal before so they added units and moved the stair outside; they will integrate green screen to the outdoor covered stair. He said the stair is inside the fence.

Ms. Hsie said Option B is interesting – it starts to take the donut and break it into different bars. She said the ins and outs and bays are sympathetic to the district. She said the last option has a more vertical element and she said to continue to study it. She said the textured surface and earthen materials are encouraged and she’d be interested in seeing further material studies.
Ms. Leong said she liked the piece coming out on Option A. She said she likes the texture and noted there are buildings with different textures in the district. She said options D and E have fortress feel and do not fit in the district.

Mr. Martin said he agreed with comments on D & E. He said he’s seen buildings like this in China and that they’re imposing. He said to reference the scale of the buildings in the district – the variation of parapets, break up of street wall. He said the preferred option is the corner knuckle. He noted a preference for marrying this with Option B.

Ms. Hsie agreed. She suggested incorporating some Option A well.

Mr. Olson said they take this seriously and have been here a lot. He said it is a tall order on this side of the freeway – how it will be a gateway on this other side.

Ms. Leong said to keep doing what they are doing.

Ms. Hsie said to look at the district as a whole, including incorporating influences west of I-5, as well.

Mr. James said new buildings have flat facades and variation in color; they want to create more variation.

Ms. Hsie said to look at earth materials and textures. She said that some of the new buildings don’t fit the character of the neighborhood. She said the Publix project is beautiful and uses modern applications.

Mr. Martin suggested a study of fenestration alternatives within the preferred or hybrid options.

Ms. Leong appreciated the textures and said she wants to see earthen materials.

Ms. Frestedt said she heard support of a hybrid of preferred option with elements of A and B with more refined studies of those options and deeper level of fenestration – how the window form is incorporated within the hybrid; desire for texture and earthen materials.

Ms. Leong said retail will be key and recommended adding smaller retail spaces. How will this building relate to the character of smaller storefronts elsewhere in the District?

Public Comment:

Dennis Chinn, Asian Plaza, said there are six different options of the same building. He said to make it interesting – step it back so that it is not so massive and Pentagon-like. He said the frontage along Jackson will be huge. He said maybe do
two buildings or entrance treatments. He said to use architectural design in structure. He said the building structure is a long corridor of doors in a donut; he said we wants something new. He said to think about how it feels on the street. He said that 20 feet up if it looks like a block house it will look like that in 20 years.

Mike Omura, SCIDPDA, said the developer met with the community twice and he commended them for their outreach efforts. He commended them on their response to comments regarding King and to move units off second floor. He expressed concern about the wide sidewalk / plaza and said to consider the horizontal plane so it doesn’t look like a big sidewalk. He noted the proposed King Street Greenway and wants to make sure that the development captures some of the early discussion around the greenway plan. He said to find opportunities to capture retail tenants. He noted there are two separate initiatives: greenway and the Little Saigon Streetscape mater planning efforts underway.

Mr. Martin asked if there was any way to have a stairway connection from S. Jackson St. to the amenity space? Looking for ways to give residents access to all streets and help break up the scale of the façade.

062816.4  BOARD BUSINESS

Adjourn  6:55 pm

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