



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 83/19

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, May 14, 2019

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

#### **Board Members Present**

Stephanie Hsie, Chair  
Yuko Kunugi  
Tim Lee  
Sergio Legon-Talamoni  
Russ Williams  
Tanya Woo  
Andy Yip

#### **Staff**

Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### **Absent**

Chair Stephanie Hsie called the meeting to order at 4:40 pm.

#### **051419.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 23, 2018

MM/SC/SLT/RW 3:0:3 Minutes approved. Mmes. Kunugi, Woo and Mr. Yip abstained.

November 13, 2018

MM/SC/SLT/RW 3:0:3 Minutes approved. Mmes. Kunugi, Woo and Mr. Yip abstained.

#### **051419.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

051419.21 609 S. Main St. – Panama Hotel

*Applicant:* Lisa Dutton, Zocalo Studios

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed change of use from a pharmacy to an art gallery. She said that exhibits reviewed included plans. The Panama Hotel was constructed in 1910. It

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

is a contributing building located within the Retail Core where Street-Level Uses are Required.

Applicant Comment:

Lisa Dutton, Zocalo Studios, said the artists have been in Seattle for 30 years and thanked staff for navigating the application process. She said the space will operate as an art gallery and provide active retail, providing vibrant and colorful activation to the area.

Spike Mafford, Zocalo Studios, provided a photo of the 912 square foot space and said the storefront is on S. Main; it will activate the area and will be interesting to look at. He said he is primarily a photographer, but also builds light boxes.

Ms. Hsie asked if they will have signage.

Ms. Dutton said nothing is planned at this time. She said they were exploring the possibility of displaying the Tokuda Pharmacy sign if that would be in compliance.

Ms. Frestedt referenced SMC 23.66.338 H. Miscellaneous signs. She said that signage under 4 square feet, gold leaf / decal on the interior window, doesn't require approval.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for use at 609 S. Main St.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the May 14, 2019 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:**

**SMC 23.66.320 – Permitted uses**

**SMC 23.66.326 – Street-level uses**

**Secretary of Interior's Standard #10**

MM/SC/AY/TL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

051419.22

669 S. King St. – Louisa Hotel

*Applicant:* Bob Hale, Rolluda Architecture

Ms. Woo recused herself.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed work includes the following: replacement of storefront transom glazing; installation of a gate between the Louisa and the Gee How Oak Tin Building on the alley; replacement of a door; and modifications to the design of the storefront bulkheads. Exhibits reviewed included plans, photographs and paint samples. The Louisa Hotel was constructed in 1909. It is a contributing building located within the

Asian Design Character District. The Board approved building signage and sign plan in Feb. 2019.

Applicant Comment:

Bob Hale, Rolluda Architects, said they are two to three weeks from occupancy and are doing finishing touches. He said the transom replacement glass has lots of broken pieces and is difficult to match. He provided samples of different stains they experimented with.

Alexandra Moravec, Barrientos and Ryan, explained that the original glazing is leaded and has small grooves or waves in it. It's no longer made. She said four stains were explored; the gray stain is the closest match to the appearance of the original glass.

Mr. Hale said they are not able to rearrange the original panes, because they are custom-sized.

Ms. Frestedt said she did a site visit and could confirm that clear glass was a poor match, but that the painted version is pretty close, color-wise.

Mr. Hale went on to explain the plan to add concrete curbs at the bottom of storefront aprons. He noted there were originally windowpanes below the aprons which provided light to the basement. He said they tried to match the geometry and scale of the original panels. He said they matched the sash. He said the transom sill was wrapped with wood trim which is starting to sag. He proposed adding a 2" steel pipe column behind the corner mullion in the storefront. He said at the northeast space the 1970s aluminum door and sidelight will be replaced with wood. He said paired doors to the stair entrances will be replaced with one 3'6" door; trim will be reused. He explained that a metal gate and fence will be added at back garbage dumpster area, a shared area with Gee How Oak Tin.

Ms. Moravec explained this will replace a fence that was damaged during construction. Adding the fence will create a safe space in the back alley.

Mr. Hale said the gate will be painted Mallard Green and will match alley storefront and garage doors. Responding to questions he noted page 3.02 and said originally the wood sat on sidewalk; just a curb will be added to lift wood off ground and prevent rot.

Ms. Kunugi asked if the gate was based on any previous historic design.

Mr. Hale said historically there was no gate there; the gate was added in the 1980s. He said the gate will be set back about 6'; it will be locked with panic hardware on inside.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked about the pipe column in the storefront.

Mr. Hale said it is in the bay window that has an angular vestibule.

Ms. Moravec said it is not highly visible. Responding to questions about the gate setback she said the Gee How Oak Tin Association wanted trash area there. She said the door must swing out and the dumpsters will mostly be behind the gate.

Ms. Hsie noted previously approved lighting in the area and said there will be a gooseneck unit at the garage and standard exterior downlights in the area.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hsie said the change from metal to wood door is straightforward as is the addition of trim at the stair.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked the shape and color of the pipe at the corner mullion.

Mr. Hale said it will be round and will be painted black.

Ms. Hsie asked about the glass.

Ms. Moravec said all historic windows will be removed, restored, and replaced.

Ms. Hsie asked if the gate would be decorative.

Ms. Moravec said decorative options were considered but due to budget considerations were determined not to be a focus.

Ms. Frestedt said the gate design is consistent with what the board has expressed a preference for.

Ms. Hsie said the setback here makes sense because of neighbors. She said it is in line with color and finish of what has been done before.

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 May 14, 2019 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This action meets the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:**

**SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes**

**A. General Requirements**

**B. Asian Design Character District**

**1. Materials**

- 2. Colors
- 3. Surfaces

**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.

**#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/SLT/AY      6:0:0      Motion carried. Ms. Woo recused herself.

Ms. Moravec thanked the board.

Ms. Woo returned to the table.

051419.23

Right-of-Way along 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. between S. King & S. Weller

*Applicant:* Bradley Topol, SDOT

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed removal of a guardrail in a bus zone. Exhibits reviewed included plans and photographs. This is part of a series of improvements proposed within the Jackson Hub pedestrian and transit area.

Bradley Topol, SDOT, explained the need for additional space for expanding bus rail on Jackson. The guardrail was installed in the 1980s for crash avoidance but has been determined to be not necessary anymore. He said there is a higher than average curb. He proposed to unbolt the unit, cut down to sidewalk level and grind down to make it ADA compliant.

Ms. Frestedt said this is part of planned improvements within the Jackson Hub area. She said the area is co-located in the International Special Review District and Pioneer Square Preservation District.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for site 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 May 14, 2019 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This action meets the following sections of the **International Special Review District Ordinance and applicable Design Guidelines:**

**SMC 23.66.334 – Streets and sidewalks**

MM/SC/AY/TL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**051419.3 BOARD BRIEFING**

051419.31 Presentation of the Draft ISRD Design Guidelines  
*Presenters:* Grace Kim and Margaret Knight, Schemata Workshop

Ms. Frestedt said that this will be a presentation by Schemata Workshop on the final draft of the ISRD Design Guidelines. There will be a 25-minute presentation, followed by time for questions and feedback. There will be an opportunity for public comment. She said written comments can also be sent via email or added to comment cards. She said this is a briefly only and that the Board will not take action on the draft at this meeting. There will be a separate Public Hearing will be scheduled in the near future.

Ms. Frestedt went over the process timeline. She explained the Guidelines are support to the Land Use Code and do not replace or revise it. She said the code grants the Board the authority to adopt standards. She said the City Attorney will review the proposed changes. She said that board review of the guideline changes will be posted publicly and there will be a public comment period. She said she had recently been asked about translation of the draft. She said the Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs (OIRA) recommends prioritizing translation of smaller one to two-page advisory documents. She said she was interested in hearing back from the community on this. She said there are many new construction projects in the district, and it is important to have initial guidelines adopted. She explained that SEPA would be required. She added that the guidelines are a living document that can be revisited.

Grace Kim and Margaret Knight, Schemata Workshop presented via PowerPoint (detailed report in DON file). They provided an overview of the District walking tours and workshops, that started in February of 2018, that helped inform the draft guidelines. They explained the process and structure of the draft guidelines.

Ms. Frestedt acknowledged the efforts of community members, who served as readers and provided wonderful feedback that helped inform the History section.

The following are board and public questions and comments.

Public Comment:

Betty Lau said that there is a lot to like in the document. She said she likes the glossary and the drawings with labels. She said more care is needed in the district-wide guidance and specific location guidance and how the areas are referred to. She said west of I-5 is two neighborhoods – Chinatown and Japantown. She said that two to three recommendations that could be in Districtwide section are culturally relevant in the west section. She said Little Saigon should be included in districtwide. She said she sent a draft of her comments to Ms. Frestedt. She said she appreciated all the work and it seems like a vast improvement over what they had in the past. She said it is badly needed. She said there have been public opportunities to weigh in. She said that someone is finally taking this seriously and is taking input.

Brien Chow said the International Special Review District name was given in 1973. He said that someone gave three neighborhoods the name International District which started identity theft of three neighborhoods. He said up to 1999 a community compromise calls it the Chinatown International District (CID). He said that no one likes it. He said each side has to give something up. He said the district name should be changed to the Chinatown Japantown Little Saigon district as a name that more adequately describes what the district is. He said CID is a compromise name. “International” means the whole world and it should represent three neighborhoods.

Ms. Frestedt changing the name of the District would require legislative action and is outside of the purview of the guidelines.

Mr. Chow asked that the name be corrected.

Board Comments:

Ms. Hsie thanked Mmes. Kim and Knight for their hard work and said they had done a good job of leading the community discussion. She said they have been well-organized, and the language used is digestible for anyone. She said the imagery and diagrams are well done and the references are helpful.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni expressed gratitude and thanked Mmes. Kim and Knight for their hard work and outreach to the community. He said the draft is well-structured with consistent layout and format. He said there is nice to have graphic and picture information. He asked if they talked about purview or limitations of ISRD board role and noted that questions about the role of board had come up.

Ms. Kim said that they didn't include that since the legislation that created the district describes the role and purview of the board.

Ms. Frestedt said the workshops included a “launch pad” of issues and topics that came up that were out of the scope of the guidelines. She said comments beyond that scope can be routed to her.

Ms. Kim said there is a frequently asked questions section and it could be included in that context.

Ms. Kunugi thanked Mmes. Kim and Knight and noted the draft has a great format. She said it is very helpful, even for architects. She said the document is to help navigate through the Seattle Municipal Code and doesn't override it. She said the graphic section is handy and useful. She said it would be nice to see a graphic for transparency and street frontage, similar to the one created for signage.

Ms. Knight said that signage was at top of the list of proposals, so it was a priority. She said other items could have that level of detail.

Ms. Frestedt noted it was a fine balance to provide information without being overwhelming. She said basic terminology of signage is universal and included in frequently asked questions.

Ms. Hsie offered comments based on things that come before the Board. She encouraged applicants for new construction or large projects to come in and brief the Board early in the design process. She said the historical part is helpful. She referenced Public Life, Section 2, B4 and the language about enhancing visual interest and color. She added that buildings rely on color to create mass and interest; color doesn't necessarily reflect culture. She was expressed concern about the phrase "visual interest". She said she would rather the guidelines encourage a stated intention around color and how it is used.

Ms. Frestedt said blue text indicates it was added or revised since August. She said part is from comments after review by City Attorney office or comments from earlier drafts. She said she was glad Ms. Hsie brought it up because color has come up many times. She said the board has spent a lot of time discussing color to encourage creativity and exploration while not creating a distraction. She said it could be removed but it would eliminate the discussion of color.

Ms. Hsie said it is dangerous to put 'visual interest' next to color. She said they need to put the intention behind it. She said it needs to be compatible with neighborhood and provide relief so there is not the same color on every block.

Ms. Kim said when doing public walks, color came up again and again; it is an important part of the identity and culture.

Ms. Hsie said that is important to add to the draft.

Ms. Kunugi commented on the importance of material type in conjunction with color.

Ms. Hsie noted section D. Awnings and Canopies, #6: is canvas preferred? What about pigeon issue?

Ms. Frestedt noted NPS Brief on Awnings and Canopies that speaks to a preference for fabric or canvas awnings, but this does not prevent other options; it provides guidance but is not a mandate.

Ms. Hsie suggested to refer that document instead. She said there are some great modern canopies in the district.

Ms. Hsie referenced Building Design: C, New buildings and additions



She said the diagrams are really good. She said historic buildings have punched openings but that is not all there is – there are different scales of expression. She said a finer grain scale shows a sill above the window and secondary characteristics. She said it should be pointed out that ‘punched windows’ is being interpreted in a way that ends up with a flat façade. She said to give context on the site and program and how it relates to the building. She said including topography is helpful – especially for a new building. She said recessed balconies as an adaptation should be preferred. She said projecting balconies in district are not common.

Ms. Kim noted the insightful comments about what is unique in this district and how it is distinguished from Ballard and Capital Hill.

Ms. Hsie said guideline #7 is important and should be moved up. She said that all historic buildings do that; interior use is the most unique aspect to be celebrated. She said that #8 should encourage semi-public spaces as well.

Ms. Kunugi agreed and said that indoor – outdoor opportunities mean more to neighborhood if accessible. She said new building should have language about making human scale elements. She said in Asian cities or towns it is fun to find alleys. She said they are so small scale and are very different from other American cities.

Ms. Hsie agreed. She said the images chosen are good. She said they have done a good job on multi-generational design. She said it is great for all age groups.

There was discussion about Guideline D5 Tall buildings. There was concern about that terminology.

Ms. Hsie said that the District is still establishing what fits in context for 5-6 story buildings. She said it will take time to determine that. She said she would rather see modest, but rigorously patterned buildings, avoiding misused references – too shapely, loud towers. She wants to see the same rigor in the lower building. She recommended consideration of internal uses. She said that expression of amenity spaces could be unique.

Ms. Knight said to avoid South Lake Union-style buildings – that opens the door too wide.

There was discussion about the approach to tower design and the importance of views from multiple perspectives, including from I-5.

Ms. Hsie said defining ‘Asian character’ is very hard.

Ms. Kim said towers in Asian cities are interesting; she noted a square with circle cut out and said they are indicative of being Asian.

Ms. Hsie said designers should put intention behind design interest so it is understandable.

Ms. Kim said seeing different tops on buildings could identify district.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni said there should be distinction between top and lower part of building.

Ms. Hsie said that other points talk about relationship at both. She said the pay attention to how top reflects culturally in a unique way. She said Section 4 A 2 should mention support of small business sizes.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni appreciated the introduction and the mention of types of businesses that characterize the CID.

Ms. Hsie suggested adding a photo of the artwork at the Sup Shop. Said it is an interesting reference, symbolic of culture.

Ms. Kunugi noted Sign Section, Section C: in blue text, item 8: three or more tenants in building; how to look at signage for building as a whole – unified, professionally done. She noted the Kong Yick West Building. She said to have different designs is ‘good chaos’ and to open up the sign code to allow for that.

Ms. Woo said that a sign plan helps with leasing for new tenants.

Ms. Frestedt said the intention is for a building owner to establish parameters that allow for flexibility in type, where installed. She said on a historic building it will minimize penetrations to the building. She agreed it shouldn’t be homogenous and expression of some chaos should be allowed. She questioned if the language should be revised to emphasize or allow additional flexibility.

*Mr. Yip departed at 6:37 PM.*

Ms. Kunugi said it is helpful to look at all signage at once, to connect visually but to make sure flexibility is allowed.

Ms. Kim said what is vibrant about Asian cities is signage and the chaos of that signage. She said that wouldn’t work in other neighborhoods here.

Ms. Hsie said to show photo or graphic examples that reflect flexibility of types of signage.

Ms. Woo said a signage plan works for a building and is helpful for tenants.

Mr. Williams thanked Mmes. Kim and Knight for their hard work and said it is apparent much time and hard work was done. He asked how location-specific goals for development were derived. He said it seems like goals for development west of I-5 is left up to interpretation of developer and what the Code provides. He asked if there are other ways of stating it. He noted Point 2 ‘compatible in scale and character’ and asked, with up-zoning how do those come into play.

Ms. Knight said that the workshop focused on goals of what is important at a high level and is meant to set the stage for what follows. She said for a larger building they would look at the Tall Building section as a reference.

Ms. Frestedt clarified that the underlying zoning determines the maximum height, but then a designer must work to relate new construction to the surrounding context.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni said he liked #4. He said B3, minimize visual presence of trash areas should be moved to ‘Guidance Everywhere’.

Jacqueline Wu, community member, expressed concern about shadows from high rises and the impact to other buildings and people particularly those suffering from trauma and mental health issues. She said a 17-story building taking the place of Bush Garden will have impacts to children, and traffic and tree canopy. She said cherry trees were cut before they had a chance to bloom. She said goals should include reasonable solar and air circulation to adjacent buildings. She said view impacts related to Kobe Terrace are studied but not those from other spaces. She said there are vulnerable people here. She said she is familiar with the architectural firm and that they design communal spaces. She said most firms don't know how to conduct community processes and tell the community they can't speak. She said the public art process is 'art-washing' without keeping use. She said the heart and soul is the community. She appreciated the time and effort put in and said it is great to allow regular folks to understand the process. She said to add the International Examiner to community interest list.

Ms. Frestedt said outreach and best practices about how to conduct outreach resides outside of the Guidelines.

Ms. Wu said it should be made mandatory.

Ms. Hsie said this board routinely asks about outreach. She said the board composition changes and it is worth putting it somewhere that requires outreach in case there is a board that doesn't ask.

Mmes. Kim and Knight expressed gratitude to the board and community for staying in the process with them and providing feedback.

Ms. Frestedt commented on the valuable input and feedback and asked any additional thoughts to be sent to her.

**051419.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

**Adjourn 6:56 pm.**

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