



The City of Seattle

## International Special Review District

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

ISRD 102/09

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, March 24, 2009

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

#### Board Members Present

Robert Ha  
John Bisbee  
Weng Chan  
Joshua Osborne-Klein  
Jerry Chihara  
Bill Lee

#### Staff

Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Misun Chung Gerrick

Chair Robert Ha called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m.

**032409.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
*February 10, 2009 and February 24, 2009*

**Postponed**

**032409.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

032409.21 Nichiren Buddhist Church  
1042 S. Weller St.  
*Applicants: Thomas Kelly and Michael Waite*

**Signage:** Proposed installation of a wooden display sign to be set in concrete footing located to the East of the main church building.

*Mr. Chan arrived at 4:36 p.m.*

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to construct and install a wooden public display sign to the east of the church in front of the rental hall. The wood will be finished with a clear polyurethane coating. The sign will be placed in concrete footing. Half of the sign's display area will allow for changeable plastic letters and the other half will include a cork posting board. The frame

dimensions are 7'h x 5'w. Ms. Frestedt noted that the church is located outside of the Asian Character District, east of I-5. Exhibits included drawings and photographs.

*Mr. Bisbee arrived at 4:39.p.m.*

Michael Waite described the natural wood sign and said it would be on a concrete base in the grass. The wood is old fir and will be sanded and finished. The materials and labor will be donated.

Ms. Frestedt cited Seattle Municipal Code 23.66.338C and explained she had talked to Kent Hunnicutt, City Sign Inspector in DPD, and given the nature of the applicant as not being a business this would be acceptable.

There was discussion about a Washington Supreme Court ruling regarding regulatory authority over religious institutions. Ms. Frestedt said she was grateful the church was working with the Board and has been sensitive to the District rules and standards in preparing their proposal.

In response to Board questions Mr. Waite said there had been another free standing sign on the property and pointed out where it had been; they chose another location in front of a more neutral part of the building.

Mr. Chihara thought it was a good plan and appreciated the inclusion of Asian themes. He said it an appropriate sign. He said if lighting is considered in the future to be as non-intrusive as possible but he didn't think that lighting was necessary.

Mr. Waite said their logo is visible but the purpose of the sign is to provide information about services etc.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

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

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

SMC 23.66.030 – Certificates of approval – Application, review and appeals

Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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/BL/JC

6:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Osborn-Klein noted for the record that he voted to approve this because he did not consider this a business identification sign.

032409.22

Unicos Crepes

421 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

*Applicants:* Yumu Steinman and Wan (Jino) Yoon, business owners

*Signage:* Request for retroactive approval of a neon business identification sign and menu signage displayed in the storefront windows.

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for retroactive approval of a 30”h x 30”w neon business identification sign and poster-size menu signage to be displayed in the storefront windows. She distributed drawings and photographs to the Board. She added that neon is an encouraged element in the District. She said the content of the poster sign does not conflict with SMC 23.66.338; however, the size prevents visibility into the space and limits transparency.

*Applicant Comment:*

Jino Yoon explained that only two out of nine windows will be covered, one with a poster and one with the neon sign. He apologized and said he had not been aware of the requirements to come before the Board.

Ms. Frestedt stated the neon sign was appropriate and met the guidelines although she wasn’t sure about the poster but the Board could approve it given the appearance from the exterior and the amount of glazing. She expressed concern about setting a precedent.

Mr. Chihara stated the poster is on the rear portion of the space and not the primary area of the business. He said it is reversible if the business changes. He said wouldn’t want this to be precedent-setting because in general the transparency requirement is met elsewhere in the space. He was supportive of the application as proposed.

The Board was generally supportive of the application; there was enough transparency and that the business brought liveliness to the space.

*Public Comment:*

Jim Graham, architect, suggested putting the poster 2” – 3” from the glass rather than taped to the glass.

Scott Shapiro, building owner, supported the signage and thought there was enough transparency with the other windows.

Relevant sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Guidelines:

SMC 23.66.030 – Certificates of approval – Application, review and appeals

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes  
B. Asian Design Character District

4. Transparency

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs  
E. Illumination

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs  
II. A. Buildings with multiple tenants

**MM/SC/JOK/JC**

**6:0:0 Motion carried.**

032409.23

American Hotel Building  
520 S. King St.

*Applicant:* Leann Crist and Jim Graham, Graham Baba Architects

Signage and Paint Colors: Proposal to repaint the exterior of the American Hotel Building and add building identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to repaint the entire building exterior and add building identification signage. The signage consists of: the text “American Hotel” to be painted directly on the building in three locations; vinyl window decal signs on King St.; painted 6” steel cut letters to be attached to the top of the canopy above the King Street entrance. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. The American Hotel was built in 1925 and is a contributing building within the District; the building is located within the Asian Design Character District; the size of the sign proposed on the north façade exceeds the allowance for a single face sign pursuant to SMC 23.66.338 D.3. She said it was appropriate and she supported it as proposed.

Jim Graham explained they would use precut letters out of aluminum which would be painted.

Leann Crist said they tried to keep to earthen colors. She provided a photo of the gate and said they tried to pull out detailing on the building with paint color in a way they existing paint does not.

Mr. Osborne-Klein confirmed that the signs were okay as long as they met the sign face requirement. Ms. Frestedt concurred and said the only place they do not meet the sign face criteria and that has to do with the size of the sign on the north façade because it exceeds the overall allowance for a single face sign which is 75 square feet and this is approximately 106 square feet.

Mr. Graham said they had explored smaller sign sizes but it looked awkward on the façade if brought down to the 75 square feet.

Ms. Frestedt spoke to the paint colors used at the storefront level and said she believes the proposal will bring continuity to the entire building.

Mr. Chihara was encouraged by the application and said the corner is a very important one in the District. It enhances the character of urban fabric at the corner and is an important step in revitalizing it. The selection of color was good and it enhances the character defining elements of the building. He supported the application in its entirety.

Public Comment:

Jan Johnson, Panama Hotel, thanked the owner for commitment to the community. She was supportive of the application.

Alan Kurimura, Uwajimaya, supported the proposed renovation. He liked the color scheme and hoped it would be a catalyst for other changes on King St.

Board discussion:

Responding to a clarifying question Mr. Graham said the size of the letters will be relative to the proportion of the building across that and it looks out of scale for that point of facade. He said the proposal seems more suited at the proposed “over the limit” scale. He also expressed concern about the legibility of a smaller sized sign.

Mr. Chihara noted the proportions made it consistent with the banding under the cornice line and it seemed consistent with what happens on the southeast side.

There was discussion about code allowing an exception in the case of hardship due to topography or similar conditions and giving the Board the discretion to make the call.

Ms. Crist said it is basically the only point of signage visible from north or east of the building. Given that people will be coming by foot after using the rail system, bus or ferry up Jackson they want the identifier to be on the building and be easily legible. She directed the Board to drawing A004 and said 6” free standing letters on the canopy would denote the point of entry and there would be decals flanking the entry. They have added the decal signs in the window flanking the door; if someone were inside, they could look out below the sign but outside pedestrian eye level would be just above the decal sign.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said the decals are an exception from the sign area and would apply because it is not abutting the street.

**Action:** I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the paint colors and signage, as proposed.

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

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval – Application, review and appeals.

No person shall alter, demolish, construct, reconstruct, restore, remodel, make any visible change to the exterior appearance of any structure, or to the public rights-of-way or other public spaces in a special review district, and no one shall remove or substantially alter any existing sign or erect or place any new sign or change the principal use of any building, or any portion of a building, structure or lot in a special review district, and no permit for such activity shall be issued unless a certificate of approval has been issued by the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

- A. General Requirements
- B. Asian Design Character District
  - 2. Colors

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signage  
Specifically, please review the following provisions of this section:  
B. Permitted signs;  
D. Permitted sign area

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

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

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

**MM/SC/JC/JOK**

**6:0:0 Motion carried.**

032409.24

HTK Building

513 Main Ave. S.

*Applicant:* Jerry Chihara, architect

*Mr. Chihara recused himself.*

**Exterior alterations:** Proposal to remove the neon “noodle bowl” sign, located on the Northeast corner of the building.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to remove the neon noodle bowl sign at the NE corner. Exhibits included photographs and elevation drawings. The HTK Building was constructed in 1924. The building is located within the Asian Design Character District and listed as a contributing building within the National Register District. The neon noodle bowl sign has been modified over time and is not original to the building. She said the Board approved a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations on January 30. On Feb. 10, 2009, the Board deferred a decision on removal of the noodle bowl pending submission of additional information about the condition of the sign, its attachment and the feasibility of rehabilitation.

Mr. Chihara provided a structural integrity assessment and an assessment from a sign company, TubeArt. He explained Uwajimaya had expressed an interest in moving the sign to their building. Restoring the sign would cost approximately \$12,000. From a visual inspection it was hard to determine the integrity of the attachment is but due to the length of time it has been up there it is not code compliant and because of age are compromised. There is corrosion on steel parts but there are no life/safety issues from that. If the sign remains at its current location attachment devices would have to be redesigned and re-attached to bring up to current code.

Messrs. Ha, Chan and Bisbee appreciated Mr. Chihara’s efforts in finding a new home within the District for the sign and both supported removal. Mr. Bisbee said \$12,000 is a good example of costs.

Mr. Osborne-Klein wanted to hear what alternatives had been considered.

Public Comment:

Alan Kurimura, Uwajimaya, expressed interest in have the sign rehabbed and kept in the District and said based on the proposals he received – to remove, refurbish and reinstall the sign and add tax, permits and engineering – the cost would be closer to \$15,000. He said he believed the bowl had been manufactured using a wheel – a technique that is not used. They are already exploring options on where to place it at Uwajimaya.

Jan Johnson, Panama Hotel, was supportive of Uwajimaya taking and refurbishing the sign but noted the sign should stay where it is because it is a unique wayfinding sign; she is disappointed the owner doesn't want to keep it. She went on to say that people appreciate that the Panama has original elements.

Mr. Kurimura said it is an iconic sign at 6<sup>th</sup> and Main but he wants it to stay in the neighborhood.

Board Discussion:

Discussion ensued about the role of the Board considering the historic significance of the sign and whether or not the proposal complies with the rules and the intent of the guidelines for the District. Mr. Chihara noted that while the sign is not in good condition it is not in imminent danger of collapsing.

Members of the Board stated that the preference was for the sign to remain where it is but with the absence of that as a real option, the choice would be to remove, restore and relocate it within the District.

Mr. Bisbee said it was unfortunate the owner doesn't see the value in keeping the sign in its current location. He said the owner should be encouraged to do the right thing and refurbish the sign but he would support removal to save it and is glad Uwajimaya wants to take it.

Mr. Ha supported removal of the sign.

Mr. Chan supported removal.

Mr. Osborne-Klein strongly opposed removal of the sign and said there is no guarantee it will stay in the District; he preferred the sign remain where it is. At its current location it is iconic and is a wayfinder. He said the number one priority should be to keep it where it is.

Mr. Lee said he would reluctantly approve and hoped it would find a good home.

**Action:** I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations at 513 S. Main St., as proposed.

The proposed alteration 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

ISR Design Guidelines

II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

**#2.** The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

**MM/SC/WC/JB**

**4/1/1 Motion carried.** Mr. Chihara recused himself.

Ms. Frestedt reiterated the preference for the sign to be restored at its current location and said it is unfortunate the owner will not restore it. It is the nature of this Board's work that when a proposal comes forward, hearing the evidence the Board has to make a decision. Each application is looked at on a case by case basis.

**032409.3 BOARD BRIEFING**

032409.31

Chinese Southern Baptist Church  
515-517 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

*Applicants:* Sik Wong, Ivan Leung, Andrew Ng and Joseph Huang

Briefing on proposed demolition of a portable structure and new construction of a 2-story educational building adjacent to the church.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed construction of a 2-story educational building adjacent to the Chinese Southern Baptist Church. She said the project includes demolition of an existing non-contributing one-story portable building on the south side of the church property. Four briefings have occurred to date: 5/22/07, 6/13/07, 9/6/07, and 2/26/2008. The applicant submitted for an application for a Master Use Permit on May 7, 2007. A SEPA DNS (Determination of Non-Significance) was issued by DPD in June 2007. She noted that the project is outside of the Asian Design Character District; therefore, the specific Design Guidelines for the Asian Design Character District do not apply.

Ms. Frestedt stated that since the last Committee briefing, the applicants have reconfigured the building entries and stairwells. The current proposal includes doors on the north and south ends of the building, with no opening on to 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. She summarized recommendations from the 9/6/07 ARC meeting: Avoid monochromatic colors. Consider creating bands of different colors or materials to break down massing and minimize the scale. Follow the proportion and horizontal orientation of the brick on the church. She said the ARC supported the proposal to use shake on the upper portion of the building and recommended aligning the band to the roofline of the church and carrying it around the building. ARC members also recommended maximizing separation between buildings. Regarding window type, consider aluminum or fiberglass windows.

Ms. Frestedt then explained recommendations from 6/13/07 ARC meeting: Install operable windows instead of sliders on upper levels and fixed windows on the ground floor. Make upper story windows more proportional to the existing church windows and center them over the 1<sup>st</sup> story windows. Expand window size on upper levels and add horizontal cross bar. Extend the building line on the north and/or south elevations to create a parapet, to add a more distinct

form. The ARC supported parking screening and said that current screening may be sufficient. Incorporate low maintenance ground cover to meet a portion of landscaping requirements.

Feedback from 5/22/07 ARC/ISRD meeting: A stated a preference for maximizing the landscaping on the site rather than trying to meet a set amount. A reduction is favorable to a complete waiver. Add ample lighting to the exterior. Lighting could serve as a design element, as well as provide increased security. The Committee supported the overall siting and massing of the proposed building.

Feedback from 2/26/08 ARC meeting: The ARC was supportive of the proposed wood trim aluminum windows. ARC members stated that the scale, proportions and fenestration of the new building were compatible with the District. ARC members said they would be willing to consider Hardi plank. The Committee also considered proposed colors and asked the applicants to return with a color mock-up of the building.

#### Applicant Comment:

Sik Wong explained that building code requires a 4' landing on the stair. He said the stair on the south side will go to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. He pointed out the changes that had been made in window type and rhythm of fenestration.

Joe Huang, architect, said they were concerned about keeping enough landing space. He talked about the selection of the grey color Hardi-plank and the dark charcoal shingle roof. He spoke of the durability of the Hardi-plank material.

Ms. Frestedt explained that historic boards often are not supportive of Hardi-plank but the committee has supported it here because the building will be secondary to the church building. She asked the applicant to talk about the roofing material because the ARC was not supportive of the earlier proposed asphalt shingles which may have had to do with the amount of asphalt that would be on the roof and it didn't seem characteristic of the District and would be a disproportionate amount that would be visible from the street.

Mr. Huang said it did not appear to be excessive.

Mr. Chihara said the earlier form of the roof is what they were reacting to and it is now played down and the ends are captured by a stepped wall. It seemed residential in scale and character on top of a massive building. Now the stepped flat wall sections terminate the gable roof and seemed more in keeping with the church.

Ms. Frestedt noted earlier transparency issues and how to design to respond to DPD Code requirements. She was initially concerned with eliminating the entrance on to the street because it would detract from pedestrian orientation of people coming and going out on to 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She said the guidelines and Code don't require an entrance on 10<sup>th</sup> so it is something for the Board to consider and discuss. It will be important that the transparency is retained in terms of making sure there aren't window coverings etc. that would block off the building from the street.

Mr. Wong said they took out the basement so there will be no parking – just an education building.

Mr. Chihara said on one hand the building defers to the landmark building but also has compatibility between new structure and old. ARC had asked that the rhythm of windows – window openings – that the buildings speak to each other in that respect. He didn't think they needed to create the false arch on the new structure - just repeat rhythm and proportions on the original building.

Mr. Osborne-Klein said it was a well thought out proposal.

Ms. Frestedt said it has come a long way. She asked the Board to comment on the color scheme.

Mr. Huang understood from the last meeting was they don't want to try to match the color of the brick which would be impossible. If the Board wanted the color on the new building to be closer to the color on the main building they could do that.

Mr. Osborne-Klein preferred to have them distinguished and didn't want to detract from the historic building.

Mr. Ha thought the gray went well with the brick.

Mr. Bisbee commented on the rhythm of the original building referencing the secondary and asked why the Hardi-plank was chosen.

Mr. Huang explained it was chosen for the durability and that it would be maintenance free.

Mr. Chihara asked if they looked at the possibility of not having equal sections for the double hung windows. He said if it is done with a smaller upper light it may help with security because the window could only be opened the amount of the upper light.

Ms. Frestedt suggested the presenter prepare a material board and have sets of colored drawings and come before ARC once the application is final as a preliminary step before going before the full Board so it will give the ARC a more thorough vision of what the new building will be.

Mr. Chihara asked if the windows would come up to the wood siding and if they would be wrapped them with wood trim.

Mr. Huang said it will be trimmed.

Ms. Frestedt said that when they come back to ARC the Board will also consider the landscaping and asked if they would be adding trees.

Ivan Leung expressed concern about plantings for health and safety reasons.

Ms. Frestedt said the rendering needs to be precise to show what the landscaping is proposed.

Mr. Chihara said SDOT would have requirements on street trees.

Mr. Huang said they planned on exterior building lights they just haven't decided exactly where.

Ms. Frestedt advised that detail needs to be shown on the drawings as well as specification sheets.

Mr. Chihara said that DPD would require a hood on lights to reduce glare on exterior mounted light fixtures and recommended talking to DPD about what is allowable.

Public Comment:

Michael Waite, Nichiren Buddhist Church, said the proposal is a great improvement; more security and brighter lighting in that area will be good.

No additional parking will be added.

#### Applicable Guidelines

Architectural Character:

Exterior materials:

#### SMC 23.66.336 - Exterior Building Finishes

- A. General Requirements. New development should respect the architectural and structural of buildings in the District through use of sympathetic colors, material and style. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area.
- C. Exterior Building Design Outside of the Asian Character District  
Outside the Asian Design Character District, earthen colors and masonry construction with nonmetallic surfaces are preferred. Concrete construction will also be permitted when treated in a manner or incorporated into a design that provides visual interest and avoids large unbroken surface areas.

SMC 23.47A.016 – Landscaping and Screening Standards

**032409.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

#### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

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