



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 214/24

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, November 26, 2024

Time: 4:30pm

Place: Hybrid Meeting

Board Members Present

Heather Hargesheimer

Kyle Jacobson

Nella Kwan

Adrian Lam

Gary Lee

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Eric Chan

Samantha Wong

Chair Adrian Lam called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

ROLL CALL

112624.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

112624.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

112624.21 Right-of-way between 807 S. King St. and I-5 overpass

Record number: DONH-COA-01471

Applicants: Ali Lee and Tom Im, Friends of I-5 CID

Proposed installation of a Smartflower solar array and Emergency Hub storage box in the vacant right-of-way

Mr. Lee recused himself.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a Smartflower (solar array) and Emergency HUB box on WSDOT right-of-way. Exhibits included photos and renderings.

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

Presentation documents in DON file.

Ali Lee provided context of the site. She proposed installation of a Smartflower unit which would provide backup power and battery, Starlink wifi, and camera. The solar powered unit would be placed adjacent to emergency hub box. She provided specifications and noted installation of the Smartflower unit would be on 10' – 12' concrete base; the unit would be out of reach but would not exceed height of the I-5 bridge. The unit would be independent and is not tied into the grid. Responding to clarifying questions, she explained that the concrete base would be painted with anti-graffiti paint in gray making it easy to maintain. The emergency hub box would remain maroon, which is standard for all hub boxes. She said the installation would be part of a 5 – 6-year project, multiple agencies are involved and that this site would serve as a model.

Mr. Lam asked if the Smartflower was considered a utility or art. He commented on the sequencing of this project and asked why the Smartflower would be installed before anything else.

Ms. Lee said WSDOT considers it art, noting it is independent of the electrical grid. She said other sites are also installing the Smartflower.

Ms. Frestedt, referencing the site plan, noted that the bulk of other activation work planned for under I-5 is not yet funded or finalized.

Mr. Jacobson said it is that is lacking in much else. He said graffiti would be likely and it would ideally be nice to see more color.

Ms. Kwan said it is a creative use of space. She asked about safety and relationship to the fence when the petals open and close.

Ms. Lee said the unit on the concrete pad would sit 10' high and would have a smooth surface, therefore, difficult to climb. She said there is lots of traffic in the area. The fence is 2' away from all elements.

Ms. Frestedt read board member Samantha Wong's comments (full document in DON file). Ms. Wong expressed concern that the site would encourage encampment. She asked about noise impacts during operation and beautification strategies.

Ms. Lee said there haven't been complaints from locations that are up and running. She said there was a Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) review.

Board members were in support of the overall concept. Discussion was focused on lack of clarity of the location of the Smartflower's footing, the need for scale detail on the plans and confirmation of the location of the gate. Board members wanted to ensure appropriate siting that would not create hiding spots or unsafe conditions. There was agreement that the motion would be conditioned on the applicant providing a scaled site plan with dimensions and graphic representation of siting.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval for installation of a solar Smartflower and Emergency Hub box on the vacant right-of-way adjacent to 807 S. King St., per the submitted application materials with the condition that the applicant provide a site plan showing accurate locations of Smartflower and hubbox.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the November 26, 2024 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This action is based on the following applicable relevant Standards:

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/HH/KJ

4:0:0

Motion carried.

112624.22

418 8th Ave S. – Hip Sing Association Building

Record number: DONH-COA-01405

Applicants: Larry Feinstein, attorney, and Tony Wong, Hip Sing Association

Proposed request for retroactive approval of paint colors for the west façade

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed request for retroactive approval to apply paint to the west façade of the building. Proposed color: Glidden “Sweet Spiceberry” PPG1059-7. She said the Hip Sing Association Building was built in 1910 and is listed as contributing building to the Seattle Chinatown National Register District. It is located within the Asian Design Character District.

Ms. Frestedt said the south and west facades are buff-colored, hard-fired brick, with cast stone decorative elements. The east façade is a dark colored, soft-fired brick. She noted that the applicant provided an alternative proposal for paint colors within the application submittal.

Larry Feinstein, attorney, said he represents the Gee How Oak Tin Association, next door, as was asked to represent Hip Sing. He explained there were challenges with the building sited next to the freeway and there are persistent issues of graffiti on the south side of the building. He said the building looks dilapidated and the association wants to improve the appearance. He said restaurants on the ground floor are not going well and upper floors are

vacant. He said Hip Sing started in 1904 and described the role of the association, helping residents.

Mr. Feinstein said the south side of the building was painted many times and it is the City's position to paint over graffiti. He said Mr. Wong was not aware that permission was required to paint the building and he apologized. He said to remove paint and graffiti would cost \$365,000. He asked for retroactive approval for the red paint applied to the west façade. He said red was chosen so the building would match the brick building next door. He said they were willing to consider repainting a lighter color, cream or beige. He noted the cost and bids received for repainting. He spoke about the hardship of having to repaint and noted it would take a while to come up with the money. He said they would buy paint if the city would provide the labor.

Mr. Lam acknowledged that the building is an important and contributing building to the district. He said the Board looks to guidance from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and cited Standard #3 - *"Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken."*

Mr. Jacobson asked how similar issues had been handled in the past. He said best practice is that brick is not painted. He noted the challenge of graffiti issues.

Mr. Lee asked if the applicant was proposing to paint the south façade.

Ms. Hargesheimer said she used to lead tours with the Architecture Foundation and this is one of her favorite buildings. She said she can understand how the applicants came to this decision.

Mr. Feinstein noted that the painting was done to cover graffiti and that the Gee How Oak Tin Association used the same color.

Mr. Lam noted the visibility of the building which sits on a corner. He said the SOI Standards frame the board's discussion. He said he understood the desire to cover graffiti, but painting is not advised for masonry buildings. He said this building is a contributing building in the district. He noted the textural quality of having different colors throughout the district.

Ms. Frestedt said the board must adhere to the Land Use Code and SOI Standards. The Standards discourage painting historic unpainted masonry. Instead, graffiti on unpainted masonry should be removed rather than painted over. She said had the applicant come to the board first, alternate means would have been discussed. She asked the board to consider the applicant's request to leave the paint as it is and discuss potential alternatives to removal.

Ms. Hargesheimer said if the building was to be painted, she would prefer to see the building painted to be consistent with the original color because of the contributing nature and corner lot siting. She appreciated the applicant providing options and bids.

Mr. Lee agreed.

Ms. Kwan did not have a preference on color.

There was discussion about accent colors on the building. Mr. Jacobson said that low contrast of repainting would look different.

Mr. Lam said ultimately, painting the building will not look like the original. He said the closest thing they can get to is with paint, since restoration (removal) would be challenging. He said when picking the color, it needs to be done on site, a chip would not be sufficient.

Ms. Hargesheimer concurred with Mr. Lam and said that the proposal should include color of the windows and trim. She said the motion should be conditioned on submitting color for review.

Mr. Lam suggested using the unpainted south façade as a reference and guide in color selection.

Staff read written comments submitted by Board member Samantha Wong (in files).

Mr. Feinstein said they would do their best to make both sides look like one building.

Mr. Lam reiterated guidance in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, including Standard #8 and cautioned about chemical and abrasive treatments.

Board members unanimously agreed there was not support for leaving the painted west façade color as is.

Board members agreed that there wasn't enough information to make take action on the proposal to repaint a different color.

Mr. Lee suggested that the applicants come back with a proposal for different color scheme. It was recommended to include at least two different colors to include highlights and subtle differences.

Ms. Hargesheimer noted the difference in the color of stone headers. She appreciated the submission of multiple bids and the applicants concern about the building.

There was discussion about approaches for testing best colors, such as a mock up of a small section of the building. Board members were aligned in the request for details about a new color scheme and suggested including details on color, trim, mockup, and rendering showing proposed intent.

The application was tabled pending more information, including steps and preparations, the final scheme and details about which elements will be painted, differentiation of the trim and windows and intention to have both facades match one another, including the lower grey section of the south façade.

112624.3

Staff Summary and Board Business

Ms. Frestedt confirmed this would be Ms. Kwan's final meeting and thanked her for her service on the board. She reported the election outcome: Samantha Wong was elected to position #5 and Jade Yan to position #3.