MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, October 23, 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
Russ Williams

Absent

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

102318.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
July 24, 2018
MM/SC/EC/SLT 5:0:0 Minutes approved.

102318.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

102318.21 800 Maynard Ave. S. – RDA Building
Applicant: Hannan Tukosky, Mastec

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed revision to existing minor communication utility equipment. Exhibits included photographs, plans and photo sims. This building is located outside the Asian Design Character District.

Applicant Comment:

Bertrand White, who presented on behalf of Hannan Tukosky, went over drawings detailing the equipment changes – replacement of panel antennas, remote radio heads,
amplifier. He said that some re-orientation will be needed as additional equipment will be installed.

Ms. Hsie asked why they were being replaced.

Mr. White said there is a new spectrum, requiring updated equipment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined that the changes would be minimal and that they 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 exterior 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 October 23, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:

**SMC 23.66.332 – Height and rooftop features**

**Secretary of the Interior 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/SLT/EC 5:0:0 Motion carried.

102318.22 669 S. King St. – Louisa Hotel

*Applicant:* Bob Hale, Rolluda Architects

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed modifications to existing fire escape. Exhibits included photographs and plans. The Louisa Hotel was constructed in 1909. It is a contributing building located within the Asian Design Character District.

Applicant Comment:

Bob Hale, Rolluda Architects, said the fire escape had been red-tagged by the Seattle Fire Department, necessitating removal or replacement in-kind.
Ms. Frestedt went over a couple of approaches that have been used in the past; she noted the fire escape on the King Street façade at the Publix Hotel that had been removed, due to similar structural integrity issues and the proximity to China Gate. In contrast, the fire escape on the east side of the Milwaukee was modified to retain as much character-defining features as possible, while altering it to prevent use for fire egress. She said the windows were sealed so there would be no confusion with a fire exit / access. She said that additional information about the fire escape would be needed to consider full removal rather than modifications. She asked the team to clarify their preferred alternative. She said the Board could approve, approve with conditions, deny or defer if additional information is needed.

Alexandra Moravec said the safest option is to remove the fire escape. She said to decommission it, the Fire Department needs to say it is not needed for access and then coordination with SDCI would be done to remove landings and treads.

Mr. Hale said the fire escape is not prominent nor is it on a primary façade. He said they are using historic tax credits so will need National Park Service (NPS) approval. He said they will decide which option based on NPS approval. He said the fire escape would need extensive restoration and the bolts are rusted through.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked about attachment.

Mr. Hale said some areas are just loose; the wall will need to be repointed and patched.

Mr. Williams asked if they propose to remove the standpipe as well.

Mr. Hale said yes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Legon-Talamoni supported removal because it was damaged in the fire and is a risk to the public. He said it is not prominent from the street – it is in the alley. He said it is a vandalism and safety hazard.

Ms. Hsie said she supported removal for safety reasons. She asked if it is a decorative item at this point and if it is architecturally significant to the design.

Mr. Hale said it is not decorative, it is straightforward and utilitarian.

Ms. Frestedt said that a fire escape tells the story of the function of the building and as character defining element. She said it was removed at the Publix but the fire escape at the Milwaukee was more ornamental than most. This one is visually prominent from King but is on the alley; a case could be made that it is character-defining for the alley.

Ms. Chan said she was worried about safety.
Mr. Williams noted he leaned toward removal because of safety and vandalism issues. He was interested in what NPS had to say relative to preservation.

Mr. Hale said it is accessible from the window.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked about window plan at that location.

Mr. Hale said they will be regular, operable windows.

Ms. Moravec said in restoration plan the windows could be opened; decommissioned, the windows would be grated. At the Milwaukee they are inoperable.

Ms. Chan asked if there was going to be retail in the alley. If you want to keep historic elements, the fire escape helps tell that story.

Mr. Martin said in contrast the Publix had a detailed assessment of costs and why they wanted to remove it. He said it is worth getting that information. He said it is a public safety hazard. He also referenced the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #3 and cited SMC 23.66.336 a. He said there’s a tension there.

There was a question if the fire escape could be repaired and used as usable outdoor space. Mr. Hale confirmed that would not be allowed. The rails do not meet code.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior 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 October 23, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:

Secretary of the Interior Standards
#2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

MM/SC/EC/SH 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Frestedt appreciated the applicants’ willingness to explore options.
Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed modifications to the existing canopy. The depth of the existing canopy will be reduced to prevent impact from repeated hits by box trucks and oversized vehicles. The original sheet metal configuration will be replicated and replaced. Exhibits included photographs and plans. The NP Hotel was constructed in 1914. It is a contributing building located within the Asian Design Character District.

Applicant Comment:

Bob Hale said the canopy was restored 20 years ago and it gets hit often. He provided a photo of existing conditions and noted that the decorative medallions are still manufactured. He indicated on the photo and drawings where they propose modifications. He said they will restore the structure frame or replace it in-kind. They will re-do the roof membrane, use same attachment, and paint it. He said Nick Vann, DAHP, was supportive of the plan; his comments were provided to board. They will truncate metal on the short side so the overall character is preserved.

Ms. Hsie asked if the whole canopy will be removed, cut back and replaced or if they will do the work offsite.

Mr. Hale said they could either do it in place or off site, but in place may be more efficient.

Public Comment:

Mike Omura, SCIDpda property manager, said they have been bothered by canopy situation for a long time. He said the proposal is a great solution. The PDA is in full support.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hsie asked if shortening by 1’ is enough to prevent the canopy from being hit.

Mr. Hale said it complies with SDOT minimum.

Ms. Frestedt said there is a 5’ minimum so they could go back a bit further.

Ms. Hsie suggested shortening up to a full medallion. Other board members supported the proposal and noted it maintains the original look.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations with allowance that the design team and owners can removed up to one full medallion from the rear end of the canopy.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 23, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.
The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines**:

**ISRD Design Guidelines**

**II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines**

A. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront.

**Secretary of the Interior Standards**

#2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

MM/SC/SH/EC 5:0:0 Motion carried.

102318.24  

501 S. Jackson St. – Buty Building  

Applicant: Shari Rust, New Image Creative

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for retroactive approval for business signage, as installed. Exhibits included plans and photographs. She said the Buty Building was constructed in 1901 and 1911. It is a contributing building located within the Retail Core and the Asian Design Character District. The Board recommended approval for a Change of Use in September 2017 and for signage in Oct. 2017. The installation does not comply with the Board’s recommendation for approval for signs, which was conditional upon centering the two open pan channel letter signs over the windows on the north and west facades, as discussed at the meeting of Oct. 24, 2017.

Applicant Comment:

Craig Rust, New Image Creative, said they have been in business for 35 years; he apologized for miscommunication that occurred which resulted in the installation location. He said it was a sheer oversight. He noted the importance of the building and attachments and he said they built a special raceway for a precise installation. He said that everything was approved excluding window graphics, the permit package was submitted and approved, paperwork with red highlighted notes in file. He said the installers didn’t install consistent with the approved plans. He said he is now asking for approval to leave the installation, as is, for the following reasons: the historic nature of the building; a steel beam was installed behind the wall because the brick and mortar can’t support it. He said the contractor re-sealed it behind the wall, so they’d have to get in and open it up again. He said he takes responsibility for the error and will do what the Board wants.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Martin confirmed there are raceway signs on two facades that are not centered on window.

Ms. Frestedt noted what was approved versus what was installed.

Ms. Hsie appreciated the applicant taking responsibility; she said while it is minor, it is noticeable.
Mr. Rust said it would take a lot of alteration to get it back.

Mr. Williams said it is very unfortunate.

Mr. Rust said they have done several historic buildings and they are cautious and careful; they had to get permits and work with two different offices.

Mr. Martin concurred that it was very unfortunate. He said he didn’t want it to be a pattern – installation contrary to what was approved. He said clearly it was an accident related to complications with permitting. He said the applicant came back to board to address it. He said that what it would take to realign it is substantial.

Mr. Williams reiterated that it is unfortunate; he questioned the magnitude to right it.

Ms. Frestedt said the board should not consider cost as criteria for consideration.

Mr. Rust said the steel I-beam is difficult to access; it is a complicated and tricky installation on a fragile building. The sign has a lot of weight so it needs attachment to the beam. He said if the Board feels this needs to be centered, he’ll do what it takes to get it right.

Ms. Chan said it is installed and it would create more harm to building to re-install it. She wanted to make sure there was no precedent or standard that this could happen again.

Mr. Martin said the structural integrity of the building should weigh in as well as other approvals.

Ms. Hsie said she leaned toward denial. It is a prominent corner in the district. She cited SMC 23.66.338. She said the board put its foot down that all the signs be ordered and organized. She said there is a lot going on, centering the sign on the windows would help.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni thanked the applicant for taking responsibility. He agreed that it is a prominent corner and the first thing people see when entering the district. He said signs in the district are important and communicate a sense of place. He said we owe it to the community to do what is right and what was originally approved.

Mr. Rust said they tried to upgrade the building, the transom was replaced.

Ms. Hsie said the raceway was painted red, it was brick color before. She noted that it was not painted brick, as proposed.

Mr. Rust said it was supposed to match brick.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend denial of a Certificate of Approval for a revision to business signage installation, as proposed.

This recommendation takes into consideration that the sign was not installed in accordance with the approved, stamped plans which specified that the sign needed to be centered over the storefront windows and takes into consideration that the placement of the sign, as installed off-center with the storefront, is not compatible with the architecture of the building.
The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of denial, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 23, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed revised signage installation does not 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 23.66.338 - Signs**


450 S. Main St. – KODA

*Applicant:* Yang Lee, KMD Architecture

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a chain link fence with privacy screening. Exhibits included plans, photographs and specifications. The ISRD Board recommended approval of a Certificate of Approval for Use and Preliminary Design for new construction of a mixed-use building (KODA) on October 9, 2018.

Mr. Martin recused himself.

**Applicant Comment:**

Yang Lee, KMD Architecture, explained that the parking lot operation has ceased, and they want to protect the site for a couple months until they start construction. He said the proposed fence will be temporary; it will be installed behind the trees and will have two gates. He provided a sample of proposed mesh and said the preferred transparency is 70%.

Mr. Williams asked the intent.

Mr. Lee said it is to secure the site; there is no parking, the lot is empty, and they don’t want people to dump trash dumping or parking for free there.

Mr. Williams asked the duration.

Mr. Lee said they hope to start when approved and will then put up a construction fence.

Ms. Frestedt clarified that only preliminary design is approved and they can’t start construction until final design is approved.

Ms. Chan asked if they will add lighting.

Mr. Lee said no, that they would need electricity to do that.
Ms. Chan asked if they were worried people will hop the fence.

Mr. Lee said yes.

Mr. Williams noted his concern that the fence will become more of an eyesore than an empty lot. He preferred that a cleaner come through and pick up trash. He said a fence will get tagged and he didn’t see the benefit to have it fenced.

Mr. Lee agreed but noted it is temporary and the mesh could be replaced. He said they want protection for a groundbreaking ceremony.

Mr. Williams asked if they will be accessing the site on a regular basis; how will they know if the fence is tagged?

Mr. Lee said the contractor will monitor it. He said the owner’s representative, Richard Gee, will be the only one to park there and he will check it every day. He said it is important for the image of DaLi to ensure the site is in good condition. If anything is wrong, it will be fixed.

Public Comment:

Tanya Woo, Louisa Hotel, said they have experience lots of break-ins during rehabilitation of building following fire. She said they have had to use barbed wire. She said they come everyday to find graffiti and trash tossed in. She said it would be helpful to have a clear fence to have visibility in to see trespassers.

Mike Omura, SCIDpda, said he didn’t understand the need for fencing right now and he was dismayed they weren’t allowing parking until the construction starts. He said there is a critical need for parking. He suggested opening up for hourly parking. He questioned why two driveways in are needed. He said it looks like a driveway for circulating. He said once construction starts there will not be a lot of trash at that point. He said the construction fence will be up for a longer time.

Ms. Frestedt noted her concerns with the proposed fencing, but the owners wanted to pursue it. She referred to past discussion about the proposed fencing at Spic and Span site on S. Dearborn, where the plan was to activate the fencing with art.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni concurred with Mr. Williams concerns and noted transparency would alleviate concerns. He said he was supportive as long as there is suitable transparency.

Ms. Chan agreed that the fence wasn’t necessary, but wanted to see more transparency if allowed. She said it will be a hotbed for bad activities and said transparency should be at least 50%; it will help but it won’t prevent.

Mr. Williams said he was leaning toward ‘no’. He said it is a missed opportunity as an owner to be compassionate to the community. He said a
fence equals graffiti wall. He said it is the right of the owner to have a fence but he didn’t support the screening.

Ms. Hsie agreed and cited SMC 23.66.342 a. She said the lot was parking and no screening was needed. She agreed it is a missed opportunity to invite community involvement. She said a fence suggests ‘you are not wanted here’.

Mr. Lee said they want the fence for their ground-breaking ceremony – only two to three days.

Mr. Williams asked if it will be for staging.

Mr. Lee said there will be a tent and shovel.

Ms. Hsie asked about chairs, set up, duration of ceremony, breakdown.

Mr. Lee said it is hard to pinpoint exact days.

Ms. Chan asked if the fence is for aesthetic purposes for one ceremony.

Mr. Lee said yes but it is also about security, so it won’t be an eyesore. He said that one-week would work.

Ms. Frestedt said if it is more of a special event to consider conditioning the motion with time parameters.

Ms. Chan said she preferred no screen.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for site alterations, on condition of 50% transparency screen, installation lasting no longer than one week from installation date.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 23, 2018 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed site alterations meet the following sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:

Secretary of the Interior 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/EC/SLT 4:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Martin recused himself.
Jackson Hub – Right-of-Way

Presenter: Paul Roybal, King County Metro and Brad Topol, SDOT

Briefing on proposed changes to sidewalks, curbs and ramps

Paul Roybal, King County Metro, explained the proposal to make changes to sidewalks, curbs, ramps. He said with buses coming out of the tunnel, improvements will be made to accommodate the additional bus activity on the street. He said it will be put into place by September 2019. He said there will be enhancements and maintenance.

Brad Topol, SDOT, explained the proposed travel lane adjustment at 4th and Jackson and said the existing lane is wider than standard so they will expand the sidewalk into that lane. He said they will replace all ADA ramps. He said there will be no impact to westbound travel lanes. He said they will replace the sidewalk at 5th Avenue north of Weller. He said there are a variety of pavements; they will repair and replace and fix drainage issues. He said that the pedestrian island at 5th and Jackson they will make the island more conspicuous and an increase pedestrian crossing time. He noted the heavy vehicle use at Jackson.

Mr. Roybal provided a map of bus stop improvements and indicated where those improvements will be. He said that at 4th and Jackson transit island they will add shelter capacity, add ORCA reader, electronic sign, move information sign further north; on a raised structure it is more complicated. He said they will expand the existing shelter, remove rail at back end to allow a third bus stop. He said they will expand two separate stops south of Jackson. He said that at the northbound stop east of 5th and Jackson they will swap bus shelter for smaller one with panel on north side and relocate bus stop sign to back. He said that at the southbound stop at 5th and Jackson they will replace the old sign with new style and build foundation to support sign. He said that they will replace existing asphalt with concrete panels.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Williams, noted dangerous conditions for both cars and pedestrians and asked about widening the pedestrian zone and reducing the traffic lane at 4th and Jackson.

Mr. Topol said two lanes will remain and said that one is wider than usual.

Mr. Martin asked if there is a maximum curb height.

Mr. Topol said 6” is preferred; a standard curb might be 7-8”.
Mr. Legon-Talamoni departed at 6:30 PM.

Ms. Hsie asked about consideration for bike lanes.

Mr. Topol said the shared lane marking will be shifted and will match condition across the street.

Mr. Martin asked if they were doing anything to prevent cars from making right turn on red.

Mr. Topol said they could look at it.

Ms. Hsie asked why the railing is in place at 4th and Jackson.

Mr. Topol didn’t know but suggested it might be to prevent vehicle mounting of sidewalk.

Ms. Chan said she uses that stop and it would be helpful to alleviate the congestion there.

102318.32 1029 S. Jackson St. – Acme Farms
Presenter: Bill Barton, Tiscareno Associates

Ms. Chan recused herself.

Ms. Frestedt introduced the briefing on exterior design and signage associated with application for Final Design. She said the focus of this briefing will be on revisions to colors/materials, fencing and building signage.

Bill Barton provided an overview of the project, board comments, and the design iterations to date, (PowerPoint in DON file). He said the board previously supported changing the Jackson residential entry canopy to an accent color; changing the primary gate material to vertical wood slats; creating a material transition from metal panel to the ‘wood block’ at the Jackson residential entry with an expressed frame; light fixtures and placements. He said the board asked them to look at gate at Chiyo’s Garden for a good example for the opacity of the north and south gates. He said board supported the “Creek” color scheme without additional horizontal bandings and asked the team to consider options for different color treatments of the expressed frames on Jackson Street.

Mr. Barton said the proposed gates at Jackson façade and King Street will be identical, with 62% opacity. He said they explored window frames expressed as metal box frames that wrap all around windows; they will project 6” off the building face. He said that Option 1 is less cohesive, and he went through colors options and said the preferred option, Option 2, with dark frames (bronze). Option 3, has accent color inside frames only. He said the bronze frames tie to colors along the retail base and provide contrast in the façade without trying to compete with street-level activity. He said there will be typical signage for over and under the canopies, a main residential entry sign,
pedestrian-level signage, branding signage over market entry on Jackson Street, and smaller, more muted residential entry sign on King Street.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Gate

Ms. Hsie supported the approach, with adequate thought put into transparency. She said the graphics tell a story and the wood slats add warmth.

Mr. Williams agreed.

Facade on Jackson Street – Colors/Window Frames

Mr. Legon-Talamoni appreciated alternatives being presented as it helps to visualize the options. He supported the preferred option and said it is a nice contrast to the rest. He said Option 1 is too playful.

In response to a question, Mr. Barton said the framing will be 1/8” thick aluminum with a 6” projection.

Mr. Martin echoed Mr. Legon-Talamoni’s comments. He said he was happy to see the exploration of weaving concept.

Ms. Hsie said the board said it was OK to drop the concept of weaving all together and go with a more playful façade.

Mr. Barton said they investigate the cultural appropriateness of the weave concept; they went to Little Saigon and did a charrette where they got good input. He said the weave was picked up on but is not intended to be super literal but more figurative.

Mr. Martin said he supported the preferred option.

Ms. Hsie agreed with the dark frame option. She noted the orderly pattern at Hana that was inspired by industrial style buildings. She said the Hardi panel color is fine but to explore other panelization.

Sign Plan

Ms. Hsie said she hoped that Sign A will be distinct and have Asian character; she said to approach this with extra care.

02318.33 715 S. King St. – Uncle Bob’s Place
Presenter: Doug Leigh, Mithun

Mr. Williams recused himself. Ms. Chan returned to board table.
Ms. Frestedt said this is an informational briefing on the Preliminary Design (bulk/massing/scale) proposal for new construction of an 8-story mixed use building with ground floor retail. The focus of this briefing will be on the exploration of adding an additional story (the project was initially presented as a 7-story building).

Leslie Morishita, Interim, said they added one floor for a total of 126 low income housing as directed by Office of Housing to get more units at this time of unprecedented gentrification.

Doug Leigh, Mithun, said the scope has increased to add one story and another 22 units. He said it will be six stories of wood construction over two stories of concrete. He said there will be no roof deck, loading will be more restricted, and the former courtyard will now be a lightwell; these items are added to departure request.

Casey Huang, Mithun, said that they will now build eight stories; the allowable zoning is 85’. She said that seven stories will be residential; ground floor will be retail with building support and residential amenity functions. She said they studied two parcels to the north where zoning is up to 85’. She said they provided view studies with potential future development. She referred to a physical model and said they propose a lightwell now instead of a courtyard to make the floor plate bigger. The opening will face the west to allow more sunlight. She said the green roof will provide bio-retention. She said the impact to view from Kobe Terrace Park is minimal. She went over the site plan and said the long, recessed area has been shortened a bit to keep outdoor space. They will keep the corner with chess table set up and perhaps have sliding windows to provide an indoor/outdoor connection. She said a ramp for residential entry was originally shown outside and has been moved inside now. She said a recessed entry is being explored and they will come back and show detail.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hsie asked if did additional massing strategies now that they are adding another story.

Ms. Huang said they thought about it but given the goal to maximize capacity they feel opening the lightwell facing west is the right answer. She said they have program asking for full floorplate to get all the units in. She said floor-to-floor height is the same; they will explore some details relating to tradition building.

Mr. Leigh said flipping the lightwell introduces solid walls. With lightwell on west, they get more views and sunlight.

Ms. Hsie said it is a dilemma and the need for housing and larger units. She said with every high rise that comes in there’s a lot of care need for how the massing is expressed. She recognized the need to maximize the floor plate and
asked if this is the best solution. She said the board needs to see options. She said the lightwell is oriented in the correct direction. She said adding a story adds massing and asked if there is a solution that reduces the massing.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni expressed concern about the length of the uninterrupted façade. He said it looks like some decisions about windows have been resolved. He said the expression of windows could break massing up.

Ms. Huang said the massing approach is compatible with adjacent buildings on S. King and along 8th Ave. S. Buildings are placed tight to sidewalk and they are building on that pattern. She noted the tall levels and strong base in district. She indicated on drawings how the are trying to have a strong transparent base as there is in existing buildings. She noted the window patterns organized in punched openings. She noted the vertical slot and how they have pulled back balcony elements.

Mr. Leigh said they looked at a ‘donut’ scheme.

Ms. Hsie appreciated the explanation. She said other buildings are built out to the property line, but they don’t go up to 85’. She said the explore how the datums relate to adjacent buildings. She wants to see iterations of how building will tie into set datums. She said this is one of the first buildings pushing past that height. So much massing is reliant on expression.

Mr. Martin said a lot of massing is successful. He wants to see alternative exploration to look at it in context with other buildings. He said as they carry the massing concept up, explore if there is a way to relate to heights and datums of other buildings. He said the reinforce the visual order.

There was a discussion about Preliminary vs. Final Design and what is included in each.

Ms. Hsie said they have done a great interpretation of other buildings, but it is hard to look at blank walls and give it a pass. She said the use of brick will provide depth to the massing.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni understood the desire to not compromise real estate and suggested to explore strategies to break down the massing.

Mr. Leigh said they will do it more incrementally.

Ms. Frestedt said once there is feedback from the Board that the overall form is headed in the right direction the Board can start to talk about materials. She said to have the next level of discussion if it helps in the discussion of breakdown of the building.

There was discussion about the community space proposed for S. King Street.

Mr. Leigh said light is a big element; operations and level of activity are not known yet.
Ms. Huang said the room will be mixed use for community and the neighborhood, but it is party room for the restaurant.

Ms. Chan said she was worried about activation of alley way.

Ms. Huang said it used to be an alley but is not vacated. She said it belongs to the adjacent property owner.

**102318.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Frestdt reported that four candidates are running for Position 5 and three are running for Position 3. She said the election is November 20; a press release will go out in next week. She did outreach in Little Saigon and over 100 new registered voters were added.

Adjourn

Rebecca Frestdt, Board Coordinator
206-684-0226
rebecca.frestdt@seattle.gov