



The City of Seattle

International Special Review District

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

ISR D 166/16

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, July 12, 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
Miye Moriguchi, Chair
Herman Setijono
Valerie Tran
Marie Wong

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

071216.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
June 14, 2016
MM/SC/VT/MW 4:0:1 Mr. Setijono abstained.

Ms. Leong arrived at 4:36 PM.

071216.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071216.21 526 S. Jackson St. – Governor Building
Applicant: Michael Tilton, Berry Sign Systems

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed replacement of the interior-lit cabinet sign. Exhibits included photographs and plans. She said the Governor Apartments building was constructed in 1926. It is a contributing building located within the Asian Character Design District and the National Register District.

Applicant Comment:

Michael Tilton explained they will replace existing sign which is in disrepair. New sign will be scaled down for better fit into signband. They will do repairs to terracotta when removing existing sign.

Mr. Setijono asked if they will install power.

Mr. Tilden said there is power there now.

Mr. Martin asked about installation.

Mr. Tilton said they will make every effort to attach to the mortar joints instead of the terra cotta. They will repair prior penetrations into the terra cotta left from the old sign (to be removed).

Ms. Hsie asked about possible pigeon roosting issues.

Mr. Setijono said they could use spikes but noted the existing sign protrudes more than the new one will and they don't have a bird problem now.

Ms. Frestedt said they could revisit it if it becomes an issue.

Responding to clarifying problems Mr. Tilton said the new sign will line up with adjacent signage on the building. He said that the ends of the sign cabinet will be painted dark bronze to match window frames. He said there is just a small toggle on the end – no other switches etc.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martin said that the smaller sign will expose previously covered architectural elements and noted that pigeons have not been an issue in the past.

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 July 12, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed sign meets 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

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 & #10

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

071216.22

5th Ave. S. & S. King St. – Union Station Plaza

Applicant: Jennifer Lee, King County Metro

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of 10 perforated stainless steel bike lockers to be installed on Union Station Plaza. Dimensions: 8 lockers are 6.6' x 6.2' and 2 lockers are 6.6' x 3.2'. Lockers are each 4.25'h. Installation includes relocation of some existing benches. Exhibits included photographs, plans and samples. This site is located outside of the Asian Design Character District. Ms. Frestedt said the site is co-located within the Pioneer Square Historical District. The ISRD Board received a briefing on the proposal on March 22, 2016. See attached briefing summary. The Pioneer Square Historic Review Board received a briefing on April 6, 2016. Staff is concerned that the proposed design and materials of the bike lockers is not compatible with the design language of the plaza or with the historic character of Union Station, particularly as seen from S. King Street looking west. Staff expressed concern that the placement of the lockers near the wooden stage and the central plaza (zodiac) may impede community use of the space, for which it was designed.

Applicant Comment:

Jennifer Lee, King County Metro, explained there is great need for bike lockers and said what they are proposing is an on-demand system. She said that the lockers will be a benefit to the city and they will activate the plaza. She said since the last meeting they proposed a painted trim to the proposed lockers to complement the plaza features. She said they have a categorical exemption from the FTA because the lockers are removable and they're located outside of the National Register district. She said they relocated lockers based on CPTED recommendations; this will leave open space for circulation and they will keep benches for guardianship of area. She said benches were relocated to four other locations. She said they looked at other cities.

Ben Han, King County Metro, said the lockers in Oakland are in a historic plaza as well. He said the perforated steel is a graffiti deterrent.

Ms. Lee said the lockers will be maintained if tagged. She said lockers were relocated as per plans and said that safety and aesthetics were main concerns. She said that trim was added for aesthetic purposes. She said Metro police will monitor area. She said they propose to paint the lockers teal to match plaza pillars.

Mr. Martin asked if the lockers now located north were part of the original plan.

Ms. Lee said they were not; they were all grouped to the south and these were moved per CPTED recommendations.

Ms. Leong asked if they considered putting the cages downstairs, closer to the transit platform.

Ms. Lee said they did not because of security issues.

Ms. Leong asked her to expand on the safety issues.

Ms. Lee said she was not sure what security issues are.

Ms. Hsie asked for an explanation of the number of bike lockers and locations and if other sites were explored.

Ms. Lee said they got a grant that was originally for 50+ lockers.

Ms. Hsie asked where other lockers are located around the city.

Ms. Lee said Northgate, Eastgate, Bellevue, and Burien and noted they are all Park and Rides.

Ms. Leong asked if they had thought about installing lockers in SODO.

Mr. Lee said that Chinatown International District is a transit hub and why it was chosen. He said it is an opportunity to support bike travel to work.

Ms. Leong asked why not the lower level – there is lots of space.

Mr. Han said maintaining open space on the platform is critical for traffic circulation for egress / ingress. He said it is also a convenience factor to not to have to carry the bike down the stairs.

Ms. Lee said the tunnel closes at a certain time.

Mr. Martin asked if it is necessary to locate all of them upstairs.

Mr. Han said they can explore further but there are safety considerations.

Ms. Hsie said she understands efficiency but it is hard to understand why they are all located at one place – it places a heavy burden on this plaza. She said she appreciates the trim but the lockers are large and they can't hide. She said they will obscure pedestrian flow and location 3 narrows pedestrian thoroughfare; pedestrians should have priority.

Mr. Han said the CPTED report said the lockers would provide positive activation and natural surveillance. He said that spreading them out more provides more activation. He said the panels are perforated.

Ms. Frestedt shared a photo she took of the lockers that Metro installed at the Northgate Park & Ride.

Mr. Martin appreciated the ability to match the color palette but asked about other style options.

Ms. Lee said the locker is standardized and there are a limited number to choose from; the budget doesn't allow for art.

Mr. Martin noted the industrial aesthetic.

Ms. Lee said that transit is the primary user; she said she understands the desire for compatibility which is why trim was added. She said that grouping lockers provides ease in finding an open locker. She stated that the lockers are standardized across the system and that there was not a budget to cover art panels on the exterior or alternate designs.

Ms. Wong asked if the historic site referenced in Oakland, CA is comparable in size, activity and cultural significance.

Mr. Han said it is in the heart of a historic part of town and has similar issues but it is much larger than Union Station Plaza which is only 1/3 –1/2 its size.

Ms. Moriguchi arrived at 5:09 pm.

Mr. Martin talked about bulk versus impact and urban design issues; he said the lockers is not a compatible use with the pedestrian and congregation space in the plaza.

Ms. Leong agreed. She acknowledged the efficiency of use but questioned why it was not located on the lower level. She noted the visual bulk / impact of the cages and where they are proposed to be placed. She asked why not another location.

Mr. Martin asked if there was any public comment.

Public Comment:

Carl Leighty, Alliance for Pioneer Square (APS) Public Realm Coordinator, noted the dual jurisdiction of Union Station Plaza and said APS did not support this proposal. He said the lockers will block sightlines and are inconsistent with the district; this is a bad spot for them. He said that the CPTED report said they will create spots to allow negative activity. He said that even though they are made from a mesh see through material they will still create blind spots. He said that as a biker he prefers the lockers to not be in the tunnel because of having to carry his bike down the stairs – it isn't convenient. He said that the lockers would create more activity but he assumes most will be workers who will lock up bikes in morning and return in the afternoon to get them; bike parking is not the highest and best use here. He said the space would be better used as public space.

Ms. Frestedt read from public comment submitted by Sue May Eng, Chong Wa, who did not support the proposal (comment in DON file). She cited safety concerns and said it is not visually compatible.

Board discussion:

Ms. Wong expressed concern with the cost – benefit analysis. She said bikers are a relatively small population. She said this is a major transportation hub and lockers are for 36 bikes. She said the plaza is at risk; it was created as a public space for the community. She said the industrial design is not visually compatible; the use and design are in conflict. She said that even with perforations it will add more physical impediments in the district and could create more 'dynamic' spaces in the

district that the community is trying to avoid. She said the potential benefit is for a few and the potential risk is too great.

Mr. Martin said that progress had been made since the first proposal and the trim detailing is an aesthetic improvement but aesthetics are not fully resolved. He said he is glad seating number were not diminished. He noted concern with the mix of large physical objects for specific use – only bike storage; they are not hyper performing. He said they could be used to conceal bad behavior. He said the space is for movement and flow of pedestrians and as a gathering space and the lockers do not enhance that. He noted the industrial character and bulk of the lockers. He said that providing space for cyclists should be encourage and finding a way to make it easy and secure is important just not here in a large open space. He said he wants to see other options: change in form, materiality, size and bulk and to reduce visual impact. He said he wants to prevent the locker from being a concealment object; he said a cluster of two is prominent and close to gathering space. He said the three in the north impede pedestrian flow although it has less impact to social and cultural functions. He said to find ways to better fit into existing space.

Ms. Hsie expressed concern with this location. She said it makes sense to place them at Park and Rides; She said so many alternate modes already exist. She said the design of the lockers does not fit in with the grid. She said it doesn't enhance what is here. She said if the lockers were custom or had an art component or dimension that fit in with the grid then maybe she could support but it doesn't.

Ms. Tran agreed with comments her colleagues made.

Ms. Leong agreed. She said that she sees the use and practicality but that the cost is greater than the benefit; she said that it is a sacrifice to the overall district in design and use. She said to consider different location. She said that while it isn't as efficient downstairs it would inconvenience 36 people versus an entire neighborhood.

Mr. Setijono agreed.

Ms. Frestedt explained that two motions were provided as options and that board could also deny or defer to wait for additional information.

Ms. Hsie clarified that per what was presented all lockers need to be located as shown and asked if alternatives to the design or putting in a different location are not on table?

Ms. Lee said no.

Mr. Han said that he agrees with the industrial look, but that there isn't much that can be changed. Any changes would be pretty minor due to budget constraints.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend denial of a Certificate of Approval for site alterations.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of denial based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the July 12, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed site alterations do not meet the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:**

SMC 23.66.302 – International Special Review District goals and objectives

E. Improving the visual and urban design relationships between existing and future buildings, parking garages, open spaces and public improvements within the International District.

SMC 23.66.310 – Union Station Corridor goals and objectives

D. Open Space. Public open space has been included in development in the area, and if applicable to future development proposals, consideration should be given to the retention and enhancement of a linear open space along Fifth Avenue south of Jackson Street, as an open space resource and major focal point at the end of S. King St.

H. Pedestrian Environment. To provide a pedestrian link between the International District retail core and Pioneer Square, a pedestrian connection should be retained south of King Street. Consideration should be given to pedestrian improvements along Jackson Street and along Fifth Avenue between Jackson Street and Airport Way South such as streetscaping, widened sidewalks and benches, to "humanize" what are now vehicular-oriented streets.

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.

MM/SC/CL/HS 6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Moriguchi abstained.

Ms. Frestedt said the motion is a recommendation to the DON Director and does not preclude Metro from coming back with an alternate proposal.

071216.23

1025 S. King St. – Sierra School

Applicant: Philip Riedel

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a 4' high wooden, painted fence along the property line on S. King St. The design of the fence has been revised to be compatible with the red screen adjacent to the north side of the building. Exhibits included plans, photographs and sample. This site is located east of I-5, outside of the Asian Design Character District. S. King Street is a designated Green Street.

Ms. Frestedt said the Board recommended approval for installation of a basketball court and related landscaping revisions on June 28, 2016 and deferred action on the fence pending submission design alternatives that contribute to design continuity on the site.

Applicant Comment:

Heidi Deaver, NAC Architecture, presented revision to fence design to make it more compatible with what is there. She brought a material and color sample and went through drawing details. She noted the fence will be held back 10' on either side of the driveway and will be placed on the sidewalk side of the planting area. She said the color will match the existing screen.

Mr. Martin said it will be an asset to the neighborhood.

There was no public comment or further discussion from the Board.

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.

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

Secretary of Interior's Standard #9 & #10

MM/SC/VT/MM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071216.24

504 5th Ave. S. – Publix

Applicant: John Bartin, Clark Design Group

Ms. Moriguchi and Mr. Setijono recused themselves.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to:

- Reconstruct the historic canopy, including the addition of a proposed wooden soffit to match the new canopy on S. Weller St.
- Replace the existing lobby double entry doors with a single ADA-compliant door and reconfiguration of the vestibule.
- Install an access control box and mosaic tiles in the vestibule.
- Make revisions to landscaping.
- Make revision to materials in the light court roofs and two-level pedestrian walkway. Blue tiles will be replaced with standard roofing materials.

She said that exhibits reviewed included photographs, plans and specifications. The Publix Hotel was constructed in 1927. It is a contributing building located within the Asian Design Character District. A Certificate of Approval for signs, plantings and rooftop amenities was issued in January 2016. A Certificate of Approval for Use and Final Design for rehabilitation of the building was issued in August 26, 2014. It is the staff opinion that the canopy is a character-defining feature of the building. The preferred alternative for the canopy soffit (cedar wood) does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards

#2, #5 and #6. Staff recommends retaining the original design, with a seamed, sheet metal soffit.

Applicant Comment:

John Bartin, Clark Design Group, explained the original canopy has deteriorated and needs a complete rebuild. He proposed sheet metal for the façade and a steel frame and said it will be replicated exactly but with the exception of the soffit where they are recommending replacing it with wood to tie in to the canopies on the warehouse building. He said the wood soffit will also conceal the recessed can lights and prevent nesting birds. He said that the Dept. of Archeology and Historic Preservation determined that the wood soffit would provide no obstruction to tax credits. He referred to the construction documents and said the detailing and scrolling – everything – will be the same except for the wood soffit. He said the scrolling will be copper or zinc and will be painted.

Mr. Bartin explained that the double door configuration made it impossible to get adequate hardware to close and lock simultaneously. He said they now propose a manual door that will not need a push panel. He said that Option 1 will remove the double door and fill it in and Option 2 which is preferred will replace sidelight to fit in character of entry; existing sidelights will be used as a template for new. He said the access control panel used to be on the 5th Avenue side on a pilaster; Option 2 will now move it to an inside panel of the vestibule – it will be more secure and away from the right of way. He said that conduit will be exposed. He said they salvaged original brass plates to be reused on door.

Mr. Bartin said that they planned to restore the quarry tile but it is badly damaged so they propose to replace it with a black and white hexagonal tile similar to what is in the lobby now. He said that they had planned for in-grade planters along the east façade but because of a large grate beam they will use above grade planters instead. He said that a tree on Weller will not be planted now because of utility issues. He said that blue tiles that were to have been reused will only be reused on lower two roofs because the other roofs / breezeways are not structurally strong enough to carry the loads. Responding to questions he said that it is possible the unused tile could be used on the interior on public wall spaces.

Ms. Hsie said the grey roofing proposed now will be a downgrade from the blue tile.

Mr. Bartin said it is disappointing to eliminate the blue tile, but the courtyard roof can't handle the weight. He said that they went with the gray thinking it will look better than white and noted there is a limited palette to choose from. He said it matches the color palette – it is lighter than the gray on the panels – and noted that it isn't visible from the street.

Ms. Frestedt noted that board purview is for the view from the right of way; the board doesn't typically regulate roofing materials.

Mr. Martin asked about the lettering on the awning.

Mr. Bartin said there are two different font types and they are replicating both fonts consistent with the original.

Ms. Hsie asked if the cedar proposed for the soffit will match the wood on the entry doors.

Mr. Bartin said it would not but that it will match the soffits on the warehouse building (new construction). He explained that the cedar soffit is proposed to go in the short direction and not long direction.

Mr. Martin asked about the metal soffit.

Mr. Bartin said that it is a combination – sheet steel with scrolling and detail in copper or zinc, all painted black.

Ms. Hsie said the door replacement is a shame and asked if they considered widening the vestibule.

Mr. Bartin said no that it is less destructive to work with the doors than to modify the vestibule. Responding to clarifying questions he said that they considered other materials for the planters but settled on fiberglass for its durability and the ability to match color (dark gray). He said it is not super heavy which allows for better maintenance. He said the planter is very similar to the in-ground planter in the courtyard which is visible to the public.

Ms. Frestedt asked if gravel was considered for the lightwell roof.

Mr. Bartin said structurally it would be too heavy.

Ms. Leong asked what was going to be done with the blue tiles.

Mr. Bartin said they plan to incorporate it on the interior public spaces.

Mr. Martin noted that the roofing will not be visible to pedestrians at the right of way.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hsie said that while she appreciates the intention to provide a continuous streetscape with the wood soffits she said that design and preservation and restoration should be priority. She said this is a great northwest alternative but this building is special and it can be different. She said she prefers the metal soffit alternative.

Discussion ensued and board members agreed they supported what was proposed but wanted discussion about the canopy soffit.

Mr. Martin noted the tension between the importance of creating consistence and preserving historic element. He said there are lots of elements and the canopy is one of the character defining features of the building. He said he leaned toward keeping the canopy the way it is now.

Ms. Hsie cited Secretary of the Interior's Standard #6 which states that original features should be repaired or replaced in-kind. She noted that many historic canopies have light fixtures that extend beyond the soffit.

Mr. Martin asked if the light fixture original design.

Mr. Bartin said that it is and now they are adding two more – all similar.

Ms. Hsie said she prefers Option 1 – the metal soffit is indicative to when it was built. She said they are working hard to preserve it – it is a special building – and the soffit should be replaced with metal as it was originally built.

Ms. Tran said it is a character defining feature and should be maintained per SOI.

Ms. Leong and Ms. Wong agreed.

Ms. Hsie said she wants some documentation and material sample for the metal.

Ms. Frestedt said it could come for staff review.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior and site alterations, on the ***condition that the underside of the canopy be reconstructed consistent with the original design (seamed, sheet metal soffit) – Option 1 – subject to construction drawings submitted to Staff; public door Option 2.***

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 23.66.336 – Exterior Building Finishes

A. General Characteristics

B. Asian Design Character District

ISRD Design Guidelines

II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Secretary of the Interior’s 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.

#5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

#6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

#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/SH/CL 5:0:2 Motion carried. Mr. Setijono and Ms. Moriguchi recused themselves.

Mr. Bartin expressed concern that while they will closely replicate the canopy with modern materials and they will be careful how to create recesses the depth of steel is a bit thicker today than it was when first built. He said that the cove will not be achieved with the thicker modern steel.

071216.3 BOARD BUSINESS

Adjourn 6:47 pm

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