



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 191/16

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, August 9, 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

080916.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 12, 2016

MM/SC/CL/TM 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

080916.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

080916.21 600 5th Ave. S. – Chase Bank at Uwajimaya Village

Applicant: Jason Taylor

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of an ATM machine, metal infill panels and light fixture on the south façade; to paint the sheet metal awning blue; and the proposed signage relocation of an existing sign on the south façade and addition of signage. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples.

Uwajimaya Village is a non-contributing building constructed in 2000. The work location is outside of the Asian Design Character District.

Ms. Moriguchi recused herself.

Applicant Comment:

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Jason Taylor oriented board members to the site plan.

Randy Zeigler, Stantec, explained they plan to relocate the existing letter set and stack it. She said they will paint the awning which circles around to the end as shown on page 6 Uwajimaya Blue. She said they will add an ATM surround and use metal infill panel for existing storefront.

Mr. Taylor said they will keep the Chase sign on the east elevation.

Ms. Zeigler noted ATM surround on page 8 which she said is a branding element and said they will add ADA signage. She provided night views of existing ATMs to show illumination level.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the rendering and plan differ on alignment of ATM and metal panels.

Julie Croasdell, Stantec, said the ATM will be within the first panel of glass but slightly off center; the frame will align with the storefront frame.

Ms. Zeigler said they have to have a certain door swing; Stantec will provide a new frame to line up with window mullion. She said that frame detail is shown on page 10.

Mr. Setijono asked for clarification on awning painting.

Mr. Taylor said they will paint the top blue just where the Chase space is.

Ms. Leong noted the board recently reviewed illumination on another bank project and discussed type of lighting and lumens.

Ms. Zeigler said light is required and specs are included in packet.

Ms. Croasdell said there is lighting around the casing around the ATM and a light was added under the awning.

Applicants directed board members to various sheets related to lighting detail: pages 13, 16, and A-4.

Mr. Martin asked why the ATM and frame are not centered in the window pattern.

Ms. Croasdell cited page A-2 and said clearances are needed on the interior for the ATM so they had to shift to the left.

Mr. Martin asked if they looked at alternatives.

Ms. Croasdell said they did but they wanted to keep double doors; there isn't much space and this made the most sense.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Leong said lettering is existing and she had no issue with it. She said she had no issue with the ATM, sign, light.

Ms. Frestedt said the panel alignment is reversible and is on a non-historic storefront outside the Asian Design Character District. She said this configuration may not be appropriate on another building.

Mr. Martin agreed and said the design is not the strongest; the applicant acknowledged that and gave reason for it. He said in this case it is okay.

Board members discussed casing options: blue to match the ATM back panel or match the window frame. There was agreement that the framing will be as proposed.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and signage, as proposed, with ATM casing in color: Chase 49353.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the August 9, 2016 public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

The proposed exterior alterations and signage 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 23.66.336 – Exterior Building Finishes

A. General Requirements

C. Exterior alterations outside of the Asian Design Character District

SMC 23.66.338 – Signs

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

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

080916.3 BOARD BRIEFING

080916.31 616 8th Ave. S.
Applicant: Jeff Wells, Studio19 Architects

Briefing on proposed demolition of a one-story commercial building and Preliminary Design (bulk/massing/scale) for new construction of a 14-story mixed use building, to include 7 levels of hotel, 6 levels of apartments, 2 levels of condominiums and 3 levels of below-grade parking. The total building area is approximately 230,000 sq. ft.

Jeff Wells and Hui Tian presented via PowerPoint (report details in DON file).

Mr. Wells oriented board members to site and said the proposed building will be residential and mixed use (14 stories at 150'): ground floor retail, hotel, apartments, and condos on top. He went through the presentation materials. He said that the property is located outside the Asian Design Character District (ADCD) and stated an intent to incorporate some of the ADCD elements into the building. He said there will be three stories of underground parking. He explained the intent to demolish the existing building and presented three massing options being explored. Option A has an open courtyard to the south; setbacks; retail storefront; brick wraps part of the building and it is more modern at the top. Option B adds a modern approach to a pagoda feature for tower. He said that preferred Option C has brick lower level and modern upper with set back at condos. He said the roof feature will show an Asian influence. He said the dual tower with center pushed back for open space and landscape to tie to the green street. He said that proposed materials are corten, brick, wood, a metal screen with an Asian theme.

Mr. Wells said they have been working with the hotel on vehicular access. He said access on Lane would work because it is a dead end. He said they will work with neighbors on final location.

Public Comment:

Ron Chew, executive director of the ICHS Foundation, provided an overview of the services they provide and expressed concern for patient access in an already congested area. He said that the scale is substantial and noted how bad parking is. He said he was trying to visualize the impact of the proposed project on sunlight and parking. He advised the applicants to take into consideration that 8th Avenue is a cultural corridor.

Teresita Batayola, ICHS, asked the price point for residential.

Mr. Wells said market rate.

Ms. Batayola said development is wanted and appreciated but she expressed concern that the building could become a fortress. She said she wants to see shadow and wind studies. She said the building will face an elderly assisted-living facility and Head Start program and that sunlight is important. She said they don't want a wind tunnel. She said the green street should have community amenities. She said that Marriotts are typically not in community settings. She said the ID has lots of history and culture and that is very important. Regarding commercial operations, she said they don't want a big, loud nightclub and reminded the presenters that neighboring assisted living houses frail elderly; that facility has been there since 1997. She said the ID Village Square serves families with children. She said it is important that this development be a part of and not apart from the community.

Mike Omura, SCIDPDA, asked if a traffic analysis has been done.

Mr. Wells said they have one and they will provide it at next meeting. Responding to questions he said they propose 175 parking spaces - .75 per unit. He said that the commercial space on the first floor will likely be restaurant for the hotel; it will be situated within the hotel lobby and open to the public.

Mr. Omura expressed concern about access and said that there are vans that come four or more times per day to pick up and drop off clients. He said it is hard to maneuver on the

dead end street now and he expressed concern about increased traffic. He noted concern for the elderly and children in the area with 175 cars going in and out of the garage. He said his preference is for traffic access off 8th instead of Lane which is a green street.

Mr. Wells said the City prefers Lane.

Emi Mizuki, administrator for Legacy House, noted the frequency of emergency vehicles that come to Legacy House.

Mr. Wells said they will have loading on their property, located in the garage; it won't be on the street.

Ms. Batayola said yellow school buses drop off and pick-up in addition to the Access vehicles – it is very busy.

Mr. Omura said they need turn around space and noted impacts to Access vehicles. He said the traffic study should take these factors into account.

Andrew Moll, resident, said the proposed development is larger than anticipated. He appreciated Ms. Batayola's comments about the building feeling set apart from the community. He said that parking is already difficult and he questioned the quantity of parking in the facility. He said there is lots of walking and people experience the neighborhood on foot. He said he hopes they have plans for traffic calming.

Mr. Chew said he appreciates the redevelopment and bringing in energy he said to find ways to make it more integrative and not a big dinosaur that is a walled off entity unto itself. He said it is a tricky balancing act. He said the size will dwarf everything. He said to continue the conversation with the neighbors.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the board will consider the Preliminary Design proposal in light of the underlying zoning and how the proposed massing maintains compatibility and responds to character of the neighborhood. She asked the community members to consider that in providing feedback to the Board.

Board Comments:

Mr. Martin said the zoning is aspirational to bring more development in these areas. Directing his comments to the design team, he said the building is a transition and to think about the impact on what comes next. He would like to see elevation studies with the existing buildings and showing datum lines and to understand how the design relates to existing adjacent buildings. He said it's hard to put the massing studies into context. He said the retail space should be visible, transparent. He said to talk about the concept of entry points.

Mr. Wells said the main pedestrian entrance will be on 8th with the secondary entrance to hotel on Lane. He said the restaurant could be accessed on 8th or Lane. He said the restaurant will be very casual, banquet style with a bar in the back. He said the residential entry will be on 8th with a plaza and green space.

Mr. Martin asked him to speak to their concept of green space and how the massing relates to the District's Asian character.

Mr. Wells said there will be setback spaces, trees, green street trees on Lane, and public plaza amenities.

Ms. Tian said most of the neighborhood language is from the early 20th Century. She said they will take language from that and make it a bit more modern. She said they will draw the window pattern from the surrounding buildings and materials/colors from the district. She referenced the extruded roof overhang. She said the terrace is more of an abstract influence.

Ms. Leong said she appreciates the effort with roof design, incorporation of brick and the articulation of the windows. She directed the applicants to continue to draw inspiration from the community for design and suggested providing a history of the neighborhood in the lobby. She said overall she feels positive about the project. She said this is the first large project and there is a responsibility because it will be the first of many. She said this is a strong community with lots of history; she said to add to that and not take anything away. She said she wants to see a parking study and noted that parking is near impossible here and that impacts the small businesses. She said to preserve the energy of business community, and be mindful of the health care services and the elderly here. She asked how loading would work.

Mr. Wells said guests will pull into the loading area on site, check in and then move to the garage.

Ms. Moriguchi asked for site views because the massing concepts are hard to understand without the overall context. She said to show how the green spaces relate to the building; how cars move about the space; how green space interacts; and to work with the community and adjacent neighbors for how things are playing out at ground level. She said she wants to see concepts of how people will move along the ground plane.

Ms. Leong asked if they have reached out to neighbors yet and advised that they reach out to the multiple organizations and noted they each have unique perspective.

Ms. Moriguchi said she wants to see neighbor response to Lane St. access issues. She said she wants to see the design more integrated.

Ms. Hsie said it is interesting to see the massing broken down into two towers on the south side and would like to see more exploration of how the massing will be addressed from the north façade. She requested more studies showing how the north façade would be treated. She appreciates the brick as an effort to tie into the neighborhood. She said this is a community-oriented board. She asked what spaces are public and how those engage the public.

Mr. Chew asked if they had considered fewer than 14 stories.

Ms. Tian said want to maximize capacity.

Ms. Leong noted the siting next to I-5 and asked if they had looked at window transparency, noise, air issues.

Ms. Moriguchi agreed with Ms. Hsie about the incorporation of brick. She said the massing and introduction of materials will make a difference. She would also like to see elevation studies.

Ms. Hsie recommended bringing back iterations of all three; she cited 23.66.336 'retain visual order'. She wants to see iterations of Option B to understand the visual order. She said to look at what makes it unique to the district. She said she wasn't sure Option C has influences from the district. She said the roof overhang emphasizes the height.

Ms. Moriguchi asked about the pagoda theme and how was rigor applied.

Ms. Wong stated that the building will have a tremendous impact on the character of the district and the future direction of development. She said to look at how the building will fit in with the context of the adjacent streets. She said to speak with the community and bring back their concerns to the board. She noted confusion with the pagoda reference; a pagoda is a religious structure and she felt confusion with seeing a sacred space in a modern high-rise building.

Ms. Tran noted the diversity of retail in the district and asked if there would be multiple tenants or just one on the ground floor.

Ms. Tian said the site is a little of 20,000 square feet and with lobby there is not much room left.

Ms. Leong said that two 3,000 square foot spaces could be made.

Ms. Frestedt cited 23.366.24 – Uses subject to special review, which includes hotels, and said outlines criteria for review, including but not limited to impacts to the cultural, economic, social, historical and related characteristics of the district, particularly those characteristics derived from its Asian heritage.

Mr. Omura said that in this district most storefronts are in plane with the building, but in this instance the retail is pulled back from the right-of-way.

Ms. Moriguchi said that pulling the building toward the sidewalk is more urban in nature and that she was not sold on the massing in general. She asked if they have explored the urban context. She requested street-level views and perspectives as well as outreach to the community.

There was a recommendation by staff to bring the responses to the Architectural Review Committee.

080916.4 DESIGN GUIDELINE WORK SESSION

Board review and discussion of proposed guideline revisions. The focus of this session will be the guidelines for exterior building materials, detailing and colors. This session is rescheduled from the June 14th meeting.

The session began with a discussion Exterior Materials, Detailing and Colors (p. 14 of draft), starting with a discussion of 5. Materials and Detailing, section e, regarding

windows. There was a discussion about energy code, window profiles and relief. The board asked staff to revisit 5.e. considering different material and construction types. It was recommended to differentiate between old and new construction.

The board recommended providing language that strengthens fact that windows are character defining features. A member suggested focusing on characteristics, quality and relief/depth/detailing rather than singling out particular window materials (i.e. vinyl).

Regarding the reference to a “window survey” the board suggested being more specific and clear about what is being requested from the applicant to get more concrete information.

Ms. Frestedt: from a developer standpoint vinyl is cheaper in the immediate sense but warranties are not consistently honored over lifespan. Vinyl windows cannot be repaired like wood or other materials can.

Mr. Setijono: vinyl meets energy code.

Ms. Frestedt: negotiation between HP and SDCI and wood can be used and still meet code.

Ms. Hsie: ground level should be wood but above street level vinyl is ok.

Ms. Moriguchi: noted need to meet energy code; colors available.

Ms. Hsie: white is the cheapest and colors are 15% more.

Ms. Frestedt said to step back and to think about what is aesthetically most appropriate for district. She said that vinyl can have a flat appearance without the relief that historic windows have.

Ms. Hsie: see flatness with Hardi panels.

Ms. Leong left at 6:30 pm.

Ms. Moriguchi: look at qualities, detail and relief and what other options can provide a relief.

Ms. Hsie: look at how to achieve visual interest, order and depth with detailed characters.

Ms. Moriguchi: describe the character of the district – how people interact with the first floors; materials just part of this; encourage careful design of a letter material; think about how they come together. Pay attention to adjacent buildings.

The discussion then turned to colors (Guideline/Specific 7. Exterior Colors).

Ms. Hsie noted a tendency toward references and images about Asian culture – red and yellow.

Ms. Moriguchi stated that colors are trendy; it would be nice to outlive trends.

Ms. Frestedt noted section 7B – provide color options; how might it read in a different color scheme.

Ms. Hsie: consider complementary relationship to the fabric of whole block.

Ms. Moriguchi: palette of historic colors; use of ‘timeless’ is ambiguous.

Ms. Hsie recommended defining pedestrian level = 2-4 stories? To 6th floor?

Mr. Martin: 2 – 7 stories – 5/2 – is area of interest.

The board discussion turned to the topic of “street activation” and the relationship of building design to the street at the pedestrian level.

Ms. Moriguchi stated that activating the street need to be intentional, provide reasoning; define this further beyond transparency; make is meaningful, useful.

Mr. Martin spoke to the relationship between storefront and streetscape. He said that attention to both the storefront and streetscape design lead to engagement and activation of the space.

There was discussion about the relationship between storefronts and the pedestrian right-of-way and some desirable qualities (large windows, sidewalk cafes, etc.)

Ms. Frestedt stated that she could add to the General Guidelines on page 8.

Ms. Moriguchi stated that the use of windows is opportunity to provide relief in facades; add to building articulation. She suggested adding a section on storefronts: arrangements, details, organization, glazing. She cited SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes, A. General Requirements, which refers to “existing older buildings that provide unique character and form through their subtle detailing...”

Ms. Hsie agreed and noted the recent emphasis on massing and materials; she noted the importance of subtle details.

Ms. Moriguchi said there are different ways to create interest with windows.

Ms. Wong left at 7:20 pm.

The Board agreed about the importance of community outreach by the developers for bigger projects.

080916.4 BOARD BUSINESS

Adjourn 7:25 pm.

rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov