



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 249/08

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, September 23, 2008

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

#### Board Members Present

Jerry Chihara  
Misun Chung-Gerrick  
Weng Chan  
Joshua Osborne-Klein

#### Staff

Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Robert Ha  
Amalia Gonzalez-Kahn

Vice Chair Misun Chung-Gerrick called the meeting to order at 4:35 pm.

#### **092308.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*August 26, 2008*

MM/SC/JOK/JC 3:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Osborne-Klein abstained.

#### **092308.2 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

092308.21

#### Seattle Oriental Art

661 S. Jackson St.

*Applicant:* Thu Tang (owner), and Cao Hoang, contractor

Ms. Frestedt read the Staff Report for proposed installation of an 18'w x 3'h aluminum business identification sign. The sign will have a white background with red and green vinyl adhesive lettering. No illumination is proposed. Drawings and photographs provided for review. The proposed signage meets the allowance pursuant to SMC 23.66.338. Ms. Frestedt noted that the proposed location would obscure the transom windows, but is consistent with other storefront signage on the building. She said there is another pending application that will be considered at later date for installation of the security gates that are on the storefront as well as the window film.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Osborne-Klein stated that it appears from the photographs the transoms on the other building storefronts are much bigger so they are not completely obscured.

Ms. Frestedt said she thought the windows are the same size but the signs are smaller so the proportions appear different.

Ms. Frestedt stated the proposal should be reviewed for its consistency regarding signage on adjacent storefronts, as well as the amount of signage and proposed installation.

Applicant Comment: There were no applicant comments.

Board Questions:

Misun Chung-Gerrick asked the applicant to clarify the color of the signage.

Mr. Tang provided vinyl samples and said it would be red and green on white aluminum with an aluminum frame. They will drill into the mortar so as not to damage the building.

Mr. Hoang asked if the phone number was shown.

Mr. Tang thought the sign looked better without the phone number.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the proposal did not include the phone number. She said the applicant could consider adding vinyl lettering to the window within the door so as long as the amount of signage is pursuant to SMC 23.66.338.

Mr. Chihara asked if the sign had already been installed, since the photos show signage in the window.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the existing sign is a temporary banner that will be removed when the new sign is installed. The banner should have received approval and she has met with Mr. Tang; he was not aware of the Review Board and District Guidelines when he moved in.

Mr. Osborne-Klein asked the applicant if they wanted to proceed with this proposal or if they wanted to include additional information on the sign and come back because the Board can only approve what has been submitted.

Mr. Hoang stated they wanted the sign up ASAP so will move ahead as it and will do vinyl on doors.

Mr. Chihara asked if the sign is in a frame.

Mr. Tang said yes; the frame is about 1" thick.

Ms. Frestedt asked the applicant to explain the frame because it is not reflected on the drawing submitted with the application.

Mr. Tang said there is a small edge made out of aluminum that will surround the sign.

Mr. Chihara stated it looked better with the frame and asked how the framing structure would attach to the brick.

Mr. Tang said it will sit close to the wall.

Ms. Chung stated she understood why the applicant wanted the sign in the transom area after looking at other storefronts in the building; ideally the Board would like to see alternatives that do not cover the transom windows, but because of other stores she understands the proposal. Referring to the sign on the business next door she reiterated that the applicant's sign would look better recessed and not sticking out like the adjacent business sign.

Mr. Hoang agreed.

Ms. Frestedt recalled when the gift shop toward Maynard opened, the Board had reviewed the sign and Mr. Chihara commented the transom windows wouldn't be obscured. She noted that nearly every business within the building has signage in a similar location so it may look incongruent to located signage above the windows. She said, ideally none of the signs would cover the transom windows but the Board can't require that at this point.

Mr. Osborne-Klein responded that looking in the long term, if the board keeps authorizing signs to block the windows, it will continue. If the Board feels that ideally it wants these signs up higher then at some point the Board needs to start stating that.

Mr. Chihara stated that he was reluctant to penalize the applicant but would like to have Staff or someone speak with the building owner and talk about future plans because he does see this as a character defining element on the building. It is too bad that this is the precedent that has been set. He agreed with Mr. Osborne-Klein and said the recommended looking at the long term vision.

Ms. Frestedt concurred and stated she would send a letter to the owner suggesting a formalized sign plan for the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Frestedt suggested if the Board is in favor of the frame she will ask for detailed drawings of the framing. She asked the Board if they would like to have the applicant seek approval for the framing detail from the Architectural Review Committee or if staff approval would suffice.

Mr. Osborne-Klein suggested in light of framing issue and the fact that applicant isn't 100% committed to the sign design the Board might consider deferring.

Mr. Chihara noted the applicant was interest of getting the signage up they would not pursue change. He stated if the frame was in the range of the 1" thickness that was described he would be okay with Staff review of the frame.

Action:

I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage, subject to Staff approval of the framing. This action is based on the following:

SMC 23.66.338 – Business identification signs  
E. Illumination

ISRD Design Guidelines  
II. Storefront and Building Design Guidelines  
Design Guidelines for Signs

MM/SC/JOK/JC 4:0:0 Motion approved.

Ms. Frestedt requested that Mr. Hoang provide detail drawing of sign showing dimensions for the proposed frame. She said as long as it is consistent with the Board's approval she will issue the Certificate of Approval once she receives that from him.

092308.22

Chinatown Building

605 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

*Applicant:* Rodrigo Del Carpio, Freeman Fong Architects

Ms. Frestedt explained that the application is applying for proposed revisions to Use and Preliminary Design of a six-story mixed-use building, consisting of: street level retail on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor; administrative offices (4,559 sq. ft.) and medical offices (4,559 sq. ft.) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors; ten residential units on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors (4,559 sq. ft. per floor), and 6<sup>th</sup> floor penthouse (4,559 sq. ft.). Parking for six vehicles will be provided on the ground floor interior.

She explained the applicant has given three briefings to the ARC and/or full Board since March 2008. The briefings took place on March 25; July 14; and September 9. The Certificate of Approval for Demolition is still active, pending approval of the revised preliminary design. The applicant will not be required to submit a new application for Demolition. She said on August 2, 2007, the Department of Planning and Development issued a Declaration of Non-Significance (DNS) with conditions for the initial proposal. No environmental impact statement was required. DPD has determined that the revised proposal will not trigger a new SEPA review and that the previous decision is upheld. She said this review does not consider of materials, colors or final design; that will be part of a separate Certificate of Approval application for final design.

Mr. Del Carpio explained the changes that have been made since the last briefing. He said they have enlarged the retail spaces. He provided a 3-d view for Board review. He noted that the penthouse is not visible from the street. The entrance has been moved from the center of the building to the side and is the entrance to the whole complex. He said the floor to ceiling height for the lobby is roughly two stories to give a strong feeling to the entrance. Drawings of the garage entry were distributed; specific design will be part of a later application. Mr. Del Carpio provided a spec sheet of the proposed cladding material, a terra cotta project which has the feeling of brick.

Ms. Frestedt passed the sample to the Board and reminded them that finishes are not part of this application.

Mr. Del Carpio said there will be three materials: exposed concrete, the brick and white aluminum. The volume of the building is simple and basic. He said the bay windows were design to allow for more natural light and noted that the design features a mixture of old and new elements.

Ms. Frestedt added that recessed windows have been added to the south and west elevations to help break up the blank façade. She said this had been a concern for members of the Board and ARC. She summarized that the other major change was the configuration of the retail spaces at the ground level; previously there had been one entry for the retail spaces proposed and it has been reconfigured to allow individual entrances to be more compatible with the retail type throughout the district.

Mr. Del Carpio said they proposed to create a building that responds to the neighborhood. They studied how to break the volume down. He said the penthouse will be set back, and they are using some elements that are very popular in the neighborhood, like the bay windows. They are breaking the mass of the walls with the horizontal lines on both streets. They want to regenerate the whole block; the building will connect to others in the area. He said in the future there will likely be a solid block of similar height buildings and in thinking about the building itself they are creating a nice elevation of Weller Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue that responds to the neighborhood but also in those two elevations that be covering in the future they still have security in terms of having windows in the two elevations.

Mr. Del Carpio referred to the south and west façade drawings and explained the niche spaces will have light for security. They will be at the pedestrian level and will break the scale of the building with the horizontal lines. The niches are 4” deep and will be lighted. They modified the interior layout to accommodate retail rather than garage at the pedestrian level.

Ms. Chung Gerrick asked Mr. Del Carpio to clarify if there is more glass under the bay window.

Mr. Del Carpio stated there was and the elevations show that it is a clear window under the bay window.

Mr. Del Carpio explained that the doors will be glass; they will be completely transparent and they want to discourage the future lessees from putting anything on the windows in order to keep the transparency into the space.

Ms. Chung-Gerrick asked about the parking configuration.

Mr. Del Carpio stated it would meet Code requirements because they will still have more than 20 feet clearance.

There was a brief discussion about the bay window configuration.

Ms. Frestedt advised if the Board approves the application she will make a notation on the plan and that it will need to be corrected in the final design review.

Ms. Chung-Gerrick thanked the applicant for the revisions, which make the project more contextual and pedestrian friendly. She asked for clarification about the roof design.

Mr. Del Carpio said it will be completely flat. There will be a wood deck which will be surrounded by pots with vegetation; the pots will not be visible from the ground. The planters will be metal.

Ms. Frestedt requested a perspective drawing from the street.

Mr. Osborne-Klein also appreciated the overall concept and the responsiveness to Board concerns as well as drawing in elements from other parts of the neighborhood.

Mr. Chihara noted the proposed mixed use is compatible with and consistent with the Design Guidelines. He thought the street level uses are appropriate. The parking is minimal to facilitate the use of this proposal and it is positive that retail is not being lost to parking. The scale and massing seem compatible with the rest of the District. Setting the penthouse back from the main exterior walls on the primary sides of the building helps to address the massing and scale issue that makes the building more compatible with the District.

Mr. Chen said the height and design are compatible with the District.

Mr. Del Carpio stated they were happy with the final design.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the International Special Review District Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Use and Preliminary Design per the applicant's submittal. This action is based on the following:

This application does not include: Exterior building materials and colors, exterior lighting, construction details, exterior mechanical equipment on the face or rooftop, or a building sign plan. These items will be submitted in a separate Certificate of Approval application.

This application meets the following sections of the SMC Chapter 23.66:

- 23.66.030 - Certificates of approval - Application, review and appeals
- 23.66.320 - Permitted uses
- 23.66.326 - Street-level uses
- 23.66.328 - Uses above street level
- 23.66.332 - Height
- 23.66.334 - Streets and sidewalks
- 23.66.324 - Parking and access

MM/SC/JC/JOK                      4:0:0    Motion approved.

**092308.3                      BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Frestedt made an announcement about the upcoming elections and distributed invitations to the October 21<sup>st</sup> Boards and Commissions reception.

**092308.4                      ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

092308.41                      Hop Thanh Supermarket  
1043 S. Jackson St.

Annie Che, business owner representative and Erwin Angulo, contractor, summarized the proposal to install a roof feature to the storefront of the Hop Thanh Supermarket. Mr. Angulo stated that the proposed canopy has a metal roof, wooden posts and includes a short wooden

fence at the sidewalk level. The goal was to provide greater weather protection over the produce displays. Mr. Ha assisted with Cantonese translation in describing the Committee's concerns to the applicant and her father, Mr. Che.

The Committee provided feedback on the proposed materials and design.

Mr. Chihara advised the applicants that the structure should be more substantial in its form and materials. He questioned whether or not the proposed materials would meet the City's building code and suggested that they consider a higher quality material. He indicated that the design is less of an awning and more like a roof appendage or roofing system.

The Architectural Review Committee stated that the Board is supportive of outdoor displays and that activation of the street is a benefit to the District.

Ms. Chung Gerrick expressed concern that the proposed design is out of character with the building type. She would like to see alternatives that are designed in the language of the building.

Mr. Angulo stated that cost is a determining factor in the proposed design.

Ms. Chung Gerrick suggested that they consider other roofing materials, perhaps something transparent. She also recommended larger wooden posts instead of 4x4s to express the structure more.

Mr. Chihara stated that he didn't have any problems with the concept, but that more details are needed regarding the type of construction and materials. He said the wooden railing looks more residential than commercial. He recommended a pre-manufactured metal railing that would be more in style with the building.

The Committee recommended that the owners work with a structural engineer and confirm the Code requirements with DPD.

## **ADJOURN**

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