MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, June 9, 2015

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

Board Members Present
Stephanie Carrillo
Ben Grace
Carol Leong, Vice Chair
Martha Rogers, Chair
Joann Ware
Marie Wong

Absent
Miye Moriguchi

Ms. Rogers called the meeting to order at 4:33 pm.

060915.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
May 12, 2015

Ms. Wong arrived at 4:35 pm.

May 26, 2015

060915.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

060915.21 CDK Global
605 5th Ave. S.
Applicant: Jason Taylor, sign contractor

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of an internally-lit illuminated cabinet sign mounted flush with the building’s exterior, on the west façade. She said that dimensions are 27’
7” w x 40 ½” h x 9” d. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. She said the building is a non-contributing building located outside the Asian Design Character District. The sign will be internally-illuminated with white LEDs. The sign will replace the ADP Cobalt sign, which was approved in 2010.

Applicant Comment:

Jason Taylor explained that ADT Cobalt is now CDK Global and they are updating signage. He said the internally lit cabinet sign will be installed into mortar and they will utilize existing power. He said the background is opaque black and just the three circles and copy shine through. He said that white and green plexi will be used for the circles. He said that the eternal finish of the cabinet is black. He said signage will go on west elevation on 4th Avenue facing the stadiums. He provided photos of existing conditions and neighboring signage.

Mr. Grace asked if the dimensions are roughly the same as existing.

Mr. Taylor responded they are.

Ms. Rogers asked if the box is 9” deep.

Mr. Taylor responded it is.

Ms. Frestedt said that the color of the cabinet should be compatible with building face. She said these buildings were not constructed when the Guidelines were written.

Mr. Grace noted that Getty has a black background on their sign.

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

This action is based on the following:

The proposed work meets the 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 Awnings and Canopies, Façade Alterations, Security & Signs
II. Design Guidelines for Signs
A. Buildings with Multiple Tenants
C. Internally light signs in all locations.

Secretary of the Interior Standard #10

MM/SC/BG/CL 6:0:0 Motion carried.
Review and discussion of draft design guideline revisions.

Ms. Frestedt provided an updated draft of the guidelines. What follows are board member comments.

Mr. Grace said that in the second to last paragraph “…would lead to eventual deterioration of the neighborhood…” He said that deterioration is too strong.

Ms. Frestedt said that ‘sports stadiums’ are mentioned because the possible encroachment from the stadiums was a big driver in the formation of the district. She noted ‘sports stadiums’ will remain instead of their name because sponsors and names can change.

Mr. Grace said ‘period of significance’ is confusing for some community members.

Ms. Frestedt said it is the ‘peak period during which the bulk of development in the district occurred.’

Ms. Wong said that description could clarify any questions people may have.

Ms. Frestedt noted that eventually photos and graphical representation will be added. She said she will also include principles of preservation versus rehabilitation versus restoration; she suggested it could be included as sidebar. She said that FAQ was formatted differently. She questioned how general areas should be shown on the map (Nihonmachi, Chinatown, and Little Saigon).

Ms. Ware and Mr. Grace thought that the same map as used on the website should be used here.

Ms. Leong said she liked the map. She said that circles on map could overlap and then have a spine of each area for example: Japantown – Main Street; Chinatown – King Street; and Little Saigon – 12th and Jackson. She said it gives respect to each but also shows the overlap.

Board members discussed the history of the district and the change and movement of groups over time. It was noted that Dearborn may have been Japantown at one time and Chinatown was in Pioneer Square.

Ms. Wong said that the history of the district – even when in Pioneer Square – has always been PanAsian, always intermixed. She said it has never been one or the other. She said we should give credence to some division whether by spine or node. She said that Japantown had three different nodes going on all the time.

Board members discussed how groups should be shown on a map – which group, where and at what time. Recognition of the past is important and acknowledgement of the contribution of a community.

Ms. Wong said for newcomers to understand the district she said that a mental image associated with the map could be used. She said that the significance in identity informs people looking at the Guidelines. She said that part of tourism plays in with sustainability.
Mr. Grace said to include more about the history of Jazz on Jackson or the thriving Filipino community.

Ms. Wong said that papers acknowledged they lived in Chinatown but there wasn’t a ‘Manillatown’ per se here only in specific locations in the US.

Eliminate text after Japantown, Chinatown International District, and Little Saigon. She noted the changing boundaries of the district, the overlaps and presence of other groups. She said that the paragraph will set additional context and the spine idea makes sense.

Ms. Ware said that it would be cool to show jazz along Jackson and you could add history of when jazz was big there and history about where the Filipino community was and when. She said that you could encourage reference in the history of the site.

Ms. Frestedt said that the wayfinding element on 6th is starting to do that. She said that it is better as a community decision than a board decision. She explained that she provides much coaching and assistance to applicants before they come to the board.

Ms. Ware said that ‘storefront and exterior alteration’ is more easily understood than ‘façade alteration’.

Ms. Frestedt said she would add text about preliminary and final design approval. She said that there is a lot more in the Land Use Code and she said she is trying to make it more understanding for the layperson. She moved a paragraph about Certificate of Approval needs to be acquired before getting other building permits; apply for change of Use separately.

Ms. Leong asked about new business that doesn’t get information about working with the board.

Ms. Frestedt said that they would be in violation; she would try first for compliance; would go to DPD next; she would go to Law if other attempts fail. She said it is the property owner / manager’s responsibility to notify the tenants in their buildings. She said that interior work may be done but that they will be stopped at DPD. She said that all enforcement goes to DPD. She said that even if a permit isn’t needed a Certificate of Approval still is.

Ms. Ware suggested graphic showing the process and how it overlaps with DPD process and how it fits within the broader permit process.

Ms. Frestedt said that it is difficult to do that because each application is so different. She said that she has 28 days to review an application.

Ms. Ware said to show just sequencing, not timing.

Mr. Grace said that if infographic is done well it could be useful.
Ms. Frestedt said it might be possible to do if grant funds were obtained. She said that there is no one graphic that will apply to all applications. She said mostly she works with applicant on telephone or face to face.

Ms. Rogers said to eliminate ARC paragraph at the bottom.

Adjourn 5:45 pm.

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