



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 242/19

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, October 22, 2019

Time: 4:30pm
Place: Bush Asia Center
442 S. Main St.
Donnie Chin Community Room

Board Members Present

Stephanie Hsie, Chair
Yuko Kunugi
Russ Williams
Tanya Woo
Andy Yip

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Sergio Legon-Talamoni

Chair Stephanie Hsie called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

102219.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review of minutes deferred.

102219.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

102219.21 1253 S. Jackson St. – Little Saigon Housing

Applicant: Michele Wang, Runberg Architecture Group

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed building identification signage to be installed on the canopy at the building entrance. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. This building is under construction. It is located East of I-5, outside of the Asian Design Character District and Retail Core. The design of the new mixed-use building was approved prior to the ISR D boundary expansion in 2018.

Applicant Comment:

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Michele Wang, Runberg, explained that the LIHI Board selected the name An Lac. The location was selected to be visible from the street. She said the round emblem will attach to wall with image of bird on a branch over water which symbolizes tranquility.

Ms. Hsie asked if there was opportunity to include Asian characters.

Ms. Wang said that was not part of the client's proposal.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Hsie said the application was straightforward.

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 October 22, 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 District Design Guidelines:**

SMC 23.66.338 – Signs

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 & 10

Mr. Williams arrived at 4:40 pm.

MM/SC/YK/TW 4:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Williams abstained.

102219.22

504 5th Ave. S. #109 – Dough Zone

Applicant: Tracie Skiles, Berry Sign Systems

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed replacement of the graphics on two (2) illuminated 2-sided projecting cabinet signs. Exhibits reviewed included plans, photographs and samples. The Publix Warehouse building was constructed in 2015-2016. It is adjacent to the historic Publix Hotel (1927), which is a contributing building located within the Asian Design Character District. A Certificate of Approval for the existing signs was approved in July 2017.

Applicant Comment:

Tracie Skiles, Berry Sign Systems, said the existing sign is hard to read; they propose replacing cabinet and graphics. Two new blade signs will replace existing and will reuse existing attachments. She said changes create consistent

signage. Signs are internally illuminated; parking lot one will not be lit and there is no power there.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Hsie said it was straightforward and almost in-kind; they are re-using the same mounting.

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 October 22, 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 District Design Guidelines:**

SMC 23.66.338 – Signs

ISRD Design Guidelines for Signs

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards #9 & 10

MM/SC/TW/AY 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Agenda reordered.

102219.4 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Frestedt provided election updates. She noted the increase in numbers of people registering to vote. She said the nomination deadline is today. She said there are at least two for each position thus far. She said four candidates have been interviewed for vacancy.

102219.3 BOARD BRIEFINGS

Public Comment Procedures for Board briefings:

Verbal comment will be limited to twenty-five (25) minutes total, with two (2) minutes allotted to each speaker. Individuals speaking on behalf of a group or organization will be allowed four (4) minutes. Please sign in when you arrive at the meeting and indicate yourself as a speaker, if you wish to speak. As there will be limited time for verbal comment, we encourage people to submit letters of written comment that can be shared with the Board members in advance of the meeting. Please submit them prior to Monday, Oct. 21st at 4:00pm. Comments can be emailed to rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov, or mailed to Rebecca Frestedt’s attention at: Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, ISRD Board, 600 4th Ave, PO Box 94649, Seattle, WA 98124-4649.

102219.31

206 5th Ave. S. – 206 Place
Presenter: Eli Hardi, Hewitt

Mr. Williams recused himself.

Briefing on proposed new construction of an 8-story mixed use development (condominiums). The focus of the briefing was on proposed further refinements to the design of the building exterior and site. Project includes proposed demolition of the existing one-story commercial building. Ms. Frestedt confirmed that this is a briefing only and that no formal actions will be taken at this meeting.

Ms. Frestedt said the underlying zone is International District Residential (IDR 45/125-270). This site is located outside of the Asian Design Character District/Retail Core. The proposal is for an 8-story Mixed use Residential (condominiums) and commercial (1.740 SF) Proposed units: 65. Proposed parking: None. Departures requested: *SMC 23.53.030 F1 – Minimum Width Required for Existing Alleys (See sheet 35 of briefing packet)*

Ms. Frestedt stated that briefings were held on March 26, 2019 and December 11, 2018. She referred to the staff summary, distributed to the Board, that listed topics discussed bring the briefings, along with applicable Code sections, design guidelines and standards.

Design package in DON file.

Julia Nagele, Hewett, explained this was the third briefing; she directed board members to page 4 of the packet for background of project. She said a summary of community outreach events is provided on page 7. She said they propose an infill building between two parcels in the middle of the block. She noted adjacent future development site could produce a taller building due to the zoning. She said the proposed design is a barbell configuration with two internal lightwells. The residential entry / garden will be an open-air passageway. She said they calmed the west façade and it now has a more vertical read. She said the fenestration is now inspired by the Ascona windows in proportion. Spandrels are at floor level in a basket weave approach. Soldier coursing echoes basket weaving. She said there will be nice corners for retail. She noted wood slat idea as a garden gate to make a more artistic design and warm up entry. Soffit will be wood. Vertical relief wood elements will be used in landscape development. She said they will make the lightwell special. Exhaust louvers will be integrated into the façade. She went over residential gate studies that will warm up entry condition and façade studies:

East Façade (alley)

The lower part of façade pushed back 2' for required alley dedication. They proposed to push the lower two levels back, which will require an exception; carry façade down like the Ascona; and set back at top and bottom. Painted cement board; operable light windows, similar in design to 5th Ave façade; exhaust element.

South Façade

The south wall is a party wall. They propose a classic barbell sign. They propose to engage a local artist, graphic wall art.

North Façade

Ascona adjacent; will be more straightforward; concentration really on lightwell.

Eli Hardi, Hewitt, said the landscape architecture will be done in house. He said it is an urban infill site. He said textures and materiality will be natural materials and stone. He said there will be only one tree because of power pole. He said the gate is for residential use only but will draw eyes in to the lightwell courtyard. He said the roof top terrace has been pushed to the west wide; green roof is sparse. He said right of way alley improvements will be to just the center of alley because of slide issues. He said regrading will need to be done. He said the goal is to clean up the alley and introduce light.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hardi said they will separate out the art for separate review.

West Façade

Ms. Hsie appreciated that windows open.

Mr. Yip thanked the team for taking the Board's comments to heart and giving more functionality.

Ms. Kunugi said they listened to board suggestions; building feels less dense; it works as designed; feels easier with neighboring building; nice that windows open.

Ms. Woo agreed; appreciate changes made.

Ms. Hsie: good job of modern interpretation of older character building. She said the building order is characteristic of the District; looking forward to details; material transition at corner and how does it transition at the cornice.

Ms. Kunugi: agreed with proportion preferred for the alley façade. She asked what is happening across alley.

Mr. Hardi parking lot is located 20-40' up, above rockery. It's not a drive-through alley; more a person alley.

Ms. Hsie was interested in proposed treatment at the base². She expressed concern about the strong white/dark color contrast.

Discussion of ground floor design on west façade

Mr. Hardi described a glass corner and residential entrance, not open to the public, but visible through.

Ms. Kunugi asked if it would be lighted at night?

Mr. Hardi: yes; tree, and planting and landscape lighting planned.

Ms. Kunugi: nice can see in.

Ms. Hsie said when they come back, she'd like to see lighting detail, soffit conditions, material/design details on the south-facing wall; very interesting way opens up; public can enjoy landscaping. Commended for including water feature.

Mr. Hardi said they consider it like a portal.

Mr. Williams noted the inclusion of Flexipave in the tree bed. This generated a discussion of material and design options within the right-of-way.

Mr. Hardi: 2 x 2 grid for main sidewalk. Flexipave is preferred treatment for tree beds. Looks like asphalt; it is porous and there is no erosion to tree beds and it protects roots. Flexipave will go entire length for 60' of consistency.

Ms. Frestedt expressed concerns about the amount of material proposed, noting that this material does not exist elsewhere in the District. Usually only in tree pit, not whole walkway. She recommended exploring options, including other materials.

Ms. Kungui agreed; product is not seen here; not sure it will fit visually. Concern about depth perception and seniors may avoid walking there; it might deter traffic.

Mr. Hardi said the best comparison is a synthetic race track. He said it is fixed in place; it is poured in place and adheres. It has a bit of give, spring.

Ms. Hsie said the Board wants tree to live. She said she wants to see material minimized. Provide options that keep the tree alive.

Ms. Kunugi asked about alternatives.

Mr. Hardi: will ask City.

South Façade/Proposed mural

Ms. Kunugi said the idea for a mural is super exciting. She asked about placement.

Mr. Hardi said they want artist to take the lead on whether east or west side of the facade.

General Landscape

Ms. Hsie requested a planting plan.

Mr. Hardi they originally proposed two trees. Power pole prevents tree planting and they followed SDOT's requirements for the right-of-way.

Ms. Hsie said that she heard general support for the project.

102219.32

614-620 Maynard Ave. S. – Elgin Hotel/adjacent warehouse

Presenter: Li Alligood, Otak

Briefing by Li Alligood, Otak and James Wong, Vibrant Cities, on proposed redevelopment plans for the properties at 614 Maynard S. (Elgin Hotel/Bush Garden) and 620 Maynard Ave. S. (warehouse). The focus of this briefing was on partial demolition of the 614 Maynard Ave. S. building and further exploration of façade design and massing options for the proposed development. Ms. Frestedt confirmed that no action will be taken at this meeting.

Simultaneous Chinese interpretation was provided by two Community Liaisons.

Ms. Frestedt acknowledged the high degree of public interest in the project and the at-capacity room. She said she will look for a larger room for future meetings about this project. She noted that several community members voiced concerns about the interpreter who was hired for the May briefing; she confirmed that the Dept. of Neighborhoods (DON) will not hire that interpreter again. She said DON recognizes the harm done and takes concerns seriously. She introduced two interpreters in the room (Lillian and Elise) who are part of the City's Community Liaison program and working in an outreach capacity in the neighborhood. She said they will provide interpretation. The City embraces Race and Social Justice and has made changes to how we do work. She pointed out written comment cards and invited community members to submit written comment; she said the City will translate comments written in language.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that this is a briefing only and no action would be taken at the meeting. She provided a summary of the existing buildings, age and location. She said the zone is International District Mixed 85-170 and said that Maynard and Lake are both designated Green Streets and that the site is located outside of the National Register District and Asian Design Character District. She said there were two past briefings, on July 24, 2018 and May 28, 2019 and a site visit August 27, 2019. She said the intention of the site visit was to give members of the Board an opportunity to see the conditions in the structural report and application firsthand and receive an overview of the materials from the structural engineer. She introduced the developer, James Wong from Vibrant Cities and the design team from Otak.

Presentation packet in DON file.

Mr. Wong introduced himself and described his longtime connection to the district. He said the Chinatown International District must evolve; Vancouver is empty, and business is down. Portland Chinatown is hard to find. Seattle must evolve so it doesn't end up like Vancouver and Portland. She said the CID is for everyone; all income levels and ages. They want to create housing for all people who want to live here. 63 business owners signed a letter of support for the project; they want people living here to support businesses. He said they plan to develop a Chinese-inspired building.

Gary Riddick, Otak, directed board members to page 2, a table of board comments and their responses to them.

Bruce Zhong, DCI, structural engineer said the 614 Maynard building was constructed at three different times: 1910 one-story and basement; 1913 two floors were added; 1920 – parapet. Two floors were added on to original roof; building settling; slab cracked and warped; wood structure condition is rotten and damaged; floor joists are rotten, and connections have failed. He said the building is unsafe. He said the combination of the poor soil condition with the building construction makes it really hard to do a retrofit. Different construction from other buildings in CID and Pioneer Square. 75% of the wall surface is in poor condition. The north and south intended to be party walls and never intended for them to be seen.

Mr. Zhong referred to the proposed façade retention on p. 18 and 19 of the presentation materials. He said that only the west wall would be retained. They would catalog the brick, carefully remove it, then demo the wall and build it back up again. He said the brick would look exactly the same and meet structural code.

Mr. Riddick went over proposed tower massing options, identifying changes made since the last briefing. He went over strategy alternatives in the presentation packet, noting that Option 5 is preferred. He said they wanted an accentuated glass corner that rests on a base, the seeping roof form honoring a Chinese motif. He said they grouped floors to alter scale and used fenestration to quiet the building down. He explained the inspiration for color and materiality and proposed Beijing brick in gray for three stories. He noted the grid and connecting units as solid, open, broken up. He referenced the setback, sweeping roof form, lattice work detail at the gasket and the moongate feature into the residential lobby. He said the language between the tower section is purposeful; noted indented balconies on land street with rail work. He said the tower 20' setback adds to continuity of the street level. When set back, he said you're experiencing a three-story building. He said they broke the building down to identifiable parts. He said nearby potential development sites are 170'.

Mr. Reddick provided views from Kobe Terrace Park and 8th and Lane. He said there will be 800 – 1000 square feet of retail space, all with street level presence/access. He said the garage entry will be on the alley; the brick there is in the worst conditions. He ended with a series of questions for the Board, as noted on p. 41 of the presentation packet.

Public Comment:

Beth Ku, resident, said the neighborhood supports the project. She expressed concern over safety issues as a top priority; said the project will help with safety which is the number one issue. She said the building will provide market rate and senior housing.

A man who identified himself as Jimmy spoke in Chinese. A Community Liaison provided interpretation in English. He said lived and worked in the neighborhood for 20 years and has owned several businesses. He didn't understand why anyone would oppose the project. 63 businesses support the project and as well six business associations. He said 400 resident signatures of support were obtained.

Erin Demmon, Pacific Rim Condos, expressed concern about the health and safety of the community. She said the developer, James Wong, is 4th generation and local. She said he is passionate that the community be healthy and safe. She hoped the development of the project will build bridge of friendship. There are lots of challenges; community space is needed.

Tony Au said he agreed with Jimmy. It is a wonderful building and he can't wait for it to be built. He asked why it is taking so long and said it should be built.

Dan Chan said he is active with Denise Louie and Chinatown overall. He said he supported the project and said affordable housing and density are needed near transit hub. He said there are five to six projects that are all affordable housing; mixed income is needed including middle and high. He said the district should not be a 24-hour shelter. He said he did not support the roof form.

Nicole B., is a resident and involved in community leadership. She said Uncle Bob asked her to move here. She said there are many Asians here, other than Chinese, who live in the District. She said civil rights leaders met at Bush Garden. She said a design element is needed to preserve the culture and prevent demolition.

Jacqueline Wu, OCA Greater Seattle, opposed demolition of the Bush Garden – it sets a precedent for erasure of culture and history. She said it is important to promote, preserve, and perpetuate culture. She said this project goes against the ISRD goals. She said it threatens affordability and leads to displacement. The project will have a negative impact and will displace elders and low-income people. She said the proposed development is too tall.

Tiffany, doctor at ICHS, said the community is home to immigrants and refugees, low income. She expressed concern that wealthy professionals will not have ties to the neighborhood.

Abigail Juaner, Equitable Development Manager at Puget Sound Sage, said they should build on existing community and building the community with a shared vision. This is a historically marginalized community; this proposal undermines community efforts. This needs to be a community-led development. The CID needs to remain home to immigrants, refugees and communities of color. The Jasmine project will not serve CID because it is not aligned with the values of the community.

Ms. Frestedt asked community members to identify if they were speaking on behalf of a group or as individuals.

Derek Lum, Interim, said the project should be one in which everyone participates, especially marginalized groups. He said to preserve the Bush Garden building. The proposed scale is incompatible, too high and would tower over the National Register District. Once pieces of history are gone, they are gone for good. He said large-scale, profit-driven projects lead to rising property values and displacement. Chinatown is disappearing. He said this project offers little benefit to existing business owners; it is driven by profit and not community.

Dennis Su said he was in the same peer group as Uncle Bob. He referred to the Jackson Street vision, which he worked on. He referenced a poster carried by some in the audience that shows a ghost. He said, "we should be ghost busters."

Maun Louie, Beacon Hill resident. He said that he belongs to three family associations and he knows James Wong. He noted the turnout of public and appreciated that people care. He asked what people can provide to make the district better and said James is trying. He said if you oppose the project, tell us what you can do.

Felicity Wong, former Chinese Chamber of Commerce President, said safety is important and if a new building helps, why not?

Faye Hong, read a letter from Nora Chan, who “supported the project which offers a balance and mixed incomes to live here to support businesses. It will be safer, more people, and more opportunities for small business. The design is nice and respects CID culture. It won’t kill existing buildings; there are opportunities for new business”.

Elaine Ishihara, API Coalition, said the organization is located in the CID; the CID is her community; her parents grew up here. It is a place of acceptance after WWII. The district is a cross-cultural API community and that is how it was organized. She said she wants to maintain the historic integrity of the neighborhood. She said you can’t fight development, but you can work together to create development that helps the community. The project is not based on things relevant to the community; it is about attracting cool people. It won’t affect safety. History will be lost; once the building is gone, history is gone.

Karen Akada, Bush Garden restaurant, said once you lose the building, you lose the history. It’s not just Chintatown, it’s called the CID for a reason and you can’t erase community. She said the proposal is out of scale with the neighborhood.

Erin Shigaki, Minidoka Heritage Association said she is 4th generation and was raised in the CID community. She opposed the development. The building is important to the community; celebrations were held there, and people healed from forced incarceration. The proposed project does not serve the majority of the CID in price or scale. She said the soul of the district is threatened by development. She said development must remain inclusive for the community to thrive.

Henry Liu said to focus on people and culture within CID. He said if you want to focus on the community, focus on the people. He said that form follows function.

Maris Zivarts, Unite Here Local 8, said the project does not address the issues of existing residents. He said the CD will be lost; preserve the identity of the district. He did not support the project – it is out of place and does not fit in. It will be a massive eyesore and is misguided. She said those who fought to keep the community in place would be appalled.

Board Comments:

Ms. Hsie said she appreciates the public turn out and passion in the room. Ms. Hsie said before the Board can move forward on any discussion about the massing and materials, the Board need to determine whether or not they have enough information about the existing building. She read some of the questions that the Board has had for the design team. The Board has asked many times about why the building cannot be preserved. We have heard a lot of reasons why the building cannot be preserved as it is today, but considering adaptive reuse, why is demolition the only option at this point? We liked to understand about why more of this building can’t be preserved. There’s been a request for further study and response to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. She referenced #1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 as also relevant. She read those Standards. She said before we move further, it’s important whether the Board communicates whether they have enough information on that point or what additional information is needed.

Mr. Yip said it is the job of the Board to look at both sides. He appreciated the site visit and information provided by the design team. He said that he believed the Board had enough information on this and the applicants have done their due diligence. He said he had enough information.

Ms. Kunugi appreciated the design team providing documents, site visit, life threatening conditions. Want to see what it would look like to save building; without seeing that it is hard to understand why that is impossible. It is important to community; it would help make sure we look at “best and most options” before making a decision.

Mr. Williams thanked team for site visit and information. He asked about the retention of west façade – proposal to dismantle and reconstruct to original state. In current seismic code condition – would you go below current grade? How far down would you go? Want to know current structural system impact. He asked out the treatment of the north wall - shared wall or two separate walls? What is preventing water intrusion?

Mr. Riddick said it is a separate wall for each building. ½” air gap between buildings.

Mr. Williams said he wanted to understand how they will support the adjacent wall. What would it look like to preserve facades?

Mr. Zhong said they could think of other methods, such as bracing from outside. He didn’t propose this because the brick quality is so bad; it turns into powder. The floors are not connected. As an engineer he is concerned with public safety. He said they can talk about how to preserve culture in design; the building is a public hazard.

Mr. Williams has there been any thought given to how to give a nod to the preserving history within the building?

Mr. Riddick said they talked about ways to include pictures, historic and stories in the building. He said he had been practicing architecture for 45 years and has been the principal on several adaptive reuse buildings, He said the sentiment for this building is not for the brick and window frames, it’s the memory of what’s happened in the building. He said they dove deep into building to understand every piece, what could be resurrected. He said he wouldn’t say the building is a hazard if he didn’t think he could support it. To rehab/retrofit/remodel you need to have something there to start with. This building does not.

Ms. Hsie clarified that they are proposing to take the building apart brick by brick.

Mr. Riddick said there isn’t anything to start with. If they hollow the building out, the brick can’t support itself so what would they be saving?

Ms. Woo appreciated the due diligence but wanted more information to confirm without a doubt that it can’t be saved. She asked the applicants how much of the west façade can they reasonably salvage? What happens if the brick falls apart? How will they find 100-year-old replacement brick? Are shear walls and tie ins possible?

Mr. Zhong said the wood frame is rotten; epoxy won’t hold; they pulled out anchor and brick turned to powder. He said they can think about other methods. He said they must

think about construction safety for workers. He said they could possibly reuse brick from the other walls.

Ms. Hsie said from what she's hearing, can't move forward with massing of the tower. There are still questions about the base. We haven't received the information we've asked for an in turn haven't given clear enough direction. On most projects we wouldn't look at materials/details at the third meeting when the Board hasn't even got past whether building can be demolished. Appreciates concern for safety. What's important is that what is built at the podium and the tower that goes with it, give direction that fits in with the neighborhood context. It's become obvious that this building has cultural and historic significance. And, a part of the review district is to promote, preserve and perpetuate the cultural, economic historic and otherwise beneficial qualities of the area. She said the design that has been presented hasn't honored what's culturally significant and relevant about the building. Saving façade is probably an easy out. With the proposal, all memories of the Bush Garden and what they added to the district would be gone. A lot of strategies assume that you can wipe the podium and only preserve the façade. We want to hear other options. She said she is curious to hear from other Board members.

Ms. Kunugi agreed with Ms. Hsie. Would like to see preserving option. Recognize structural constraint. Think out of the box. Wants to see study of it to prove that it's not an option. We need agreement on existing building before focusing on replacement building design.

Ms. Hsie said to think about why building is culturally significant. It's not about each individual brick, it's about history of what happened in the building. How are you preserving community and promoting welcoming, active and engaging space? Preserving brick isn't enough.

Mr. Yip agreed that the Board needs to give clear guidance to design team. To Board members: let's agree with what would it take to be convinced? What is cost? Is it feasible? Determine what is needed.

Ms. Frestedt reminds the Board that decision doesn't need to be unanimous. Ultimately, it will be a majority of board that determines outcome. There is space for disagreement but it's important that the Board provide clear direction what is wanted to move forward.

Ms. Woo suggests providing exploration of what it would take to save building, by bullet points, perhaps. Reinforcement footings, wall ties... Show what was explored, who looked at it; showing that all roads lead to one place would help.

Mr. Williams said there's a need for understanding what's been explored. Recognized extensive deep dive into structural components. If building needed to be preserved, what would those steps be? Provide an understanding of what would be involved so we can move forward from that perspective. Need to discuss that scenario.

Ms. Hsie said the importance and cultural significance involves understanding the history of space. Asks the applicant's to come back with a list of historically significant people that have been through the Bush Garden: politicians, activists, community leaders. That's where this cultural, historic significance is. Provide understanding of how many relationships forged here. To Mr. Wong: Not a criticism. The spirit of what you're trying to do is really great. If you can't preserve the brick, can you create a plan that preserves the shell and

footprint of the building? That's one way to preserve it. If not, demolish the whole thing. Then that gives you the freedom to be creative.

Mr. Wong said, those are two very different options. The team has through this through a lot. Diagrams created; spent months on with experts on rehabilitation of the building. Bruce and Gary have done multiple buildings, and this is unique geotechnically. They worked on Wing Luke. The ground is shoreline, solid ground at alley; the goal is to do something great. It is not about money; they could make money elsewhere. It is a personal project. They've seen disinvestment in other NW Chinatowns. They don't want that here. They looked at how to save the building. Concern about worker safety.

Ms. Frestedt said she's hearing that the Board has requested things that they still haven't received responses to. Recommends that the team go back and provide a summary response to points raised by the Board, including other alternatives; if you were thinking big, what would that look like? She said from the staff perspective she had been under impression that the plan was to stabilize west façade like the Louisa; wasn't until receiving the latest packet that she realized the plan was to demolition and rebuild the west façade. At what extent is that saving the building? A response back that touches on the elements and shows studies not yet presented to the Board is recommended.

Mr. Wong said, so how about if we go to back to the drawing board and look at what it would take to save west façade way you thought we were going to do it and not take apart brick by brick, like Louisa.

Ms. Woo would like more information; share information about why more of the building cannot be saved.

Ms. Frestedt said this has come up during multiple meetings.

Mr. Wong must not have communicated that. It's our responsibility, we thought we had responded to that. What are we saving? Listed things that can't be saved (foundation, floors, walls).

Ms. Hsie said putting bricks back is not enough; the façade is not enough. Honor the building. If you told me at the first meeting that the plan was to put the façade back, she would not support that. Could demolish if design honored the history. Saving just the façade.

Mr. Wong we're doing what the Louisa did, saving the façade.

Ms. Frestedt said when you come back, the team should speak to how do different solutions respond to 23.66. of the Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ultimately, that is what the board has to act on.

Mr. Wong, Option 2 is what if we came back with a totally new design?

Mr. Hsie, but still need to address Tanya's ask – why more can't be saved.

Mr. Wong said Johnson Partnership's report said this building does not convey historical significance.

Ms. Hsie, countered, but it conveys cultural significance, that is why this is different. That's why building here is different from building elsewhere, like Capitol Hill. This ISRD also preserves cultural significance. Notes that the team is in a tough spot.

Mr. Wong asked for more clear direction.

Ms. Hsie asked how other Board members feel about just saving façade.

Ms. Kunugi would be more supportive of a new building if it honors cultural significance and events. Current proposal is limiting. Most important thing is not about the actual building. People want to know this is where Bush Garden was located, these things happened. Supports Ms. Woo's list – doesn't have to be pretty, just show. Honor what community concerned about. Enhance documented history of the building, history, significant events, people. Property possesses something important. Want project to be something all are proud of.

Ms. Hsie said to look at other developments in the district (Koda, Hana, Acme site). How can you open up the building to provide more access? There are projects that have come through that have made strides to do that.

Mr. Yip said there are many ways to improve what you have right now, but unfair for us to tell you different directions due to the amount of work you've done so far. If you demolish building and start fresh you can be creative. Intention to save façade is good but is not enough for the community. Do something new and creative that community will support. We have only seen the option to take it down brick by brick. Show options that work and don't work; show board exploration was done. Show us why won't work. If all alternatives don't work, go back to the drawing board and start again.

Mr. Wong said because site is at Maynard and Lane wanted Chinese architectural element because it is in Chinatown. Want to be intentional about designing a building with Chinese community in mind.

Ms. Hsie said that's one opinion. You need a community outreach plan. You said at the beginning this is supposed to be for everyone. What will make the building fit in is not the motifs, it's how it will be used. Focus now on massing and use. Massing right now doesn't fit into the core of the District. It's a false gesture at this point to put the bricks back up. Look at massing and height and then uses.

Mr. Wong said supporting small retail important. Our proposed street level is dedicated to retail. This is how we thought it was best to support community. Asks Board for direction about uses.

Ms. Frestedt said what she's hearing is a disconnect between saving façade and tower design. Board should give concrete input on what is needed to move forward. She said Board members have summarized many of their requests. Come back to the Board with a more robust historic property report that responds to community and Board concerns. She said she also heard that if full demolition were to occur, what would massing and design look like? Looking back to meeting in May – issues with podium not fully resolved. Board needs to uphold 23.66 and also give feedback about what will inform successful projects.

In response to a comment from the design team, Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the Board had seen all reports.

Ms. Woo said the Board hasn't seen a scenario to save building; exploratory documents, techniques used, are they useful and if they will work.

Ms. Hsie said all documentation has been from perspective why it is falling apart and must be torn down. If given a challenge to save the building, what would you do?

Mr. Riddick said the building is symbolic of emotion built up over 40-50 years of history. We're being asked to grasp abstract of feeling and work that into the building. We have intimate knowledge that hasn't been in the report yet that goes into every element of the building currently there. There is no column, joist, footing or slab that can be saved. Building could be recreated, but you'd have to level it and recreate it. No place to take it back to. Frustrated they haven't been able to communicate that. I can't go on having the Board hold out hope that some part of the building is salvageable.

Ms. Hsie said to show documentation for this. If building cannot be saved, do you have enough direction to start designing?

Mr. Riddick said we're going to have to rethink and remake the gestures made at the sidewalk. If we want the project to continue, we need to come back and show that we've listened to what you've been saying.

Ms. Hsie commented on the importance of diverse community outreach.

Mr. Wong spoke to 63 letters of support and 400 letters from seniors.

Ms. Frestedt said that those have been distributed to the Board. (Copies in DON file)

Ms. Hsie said we also want to see that you've met with SCIDPDA, Interim, and other stakeholders and encourages you to continue doing that. Encourage look at other projects, facing similar challenges. It's also tough when you come with fully baked renderings, with materiality. It helps to come back incrementally.

Mr. Wong said we understand it is iterative. The rendering is imaginative. We will take feedback. He summarized what he heard from the Board.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards does not support favoring just the façade. She said that where there is a historic resource, repair rather than replacement is preferred. Referring to earlier comment to reuse brick from other facades. Can they really be integrated back on? They were not intended to be face brick.

Mr. Zhong reiterated poor foundation and supporting soil. Would require piles going down 25'. No parking could be allowed.

Ms. Hsie said that's what we want to know, what we haven't seen. Demonstrate what it would take. Show foundation, reinforcing floor diaphragms, roof, walls.

Ms. Frestedt said that's what needs to be documented.

Mr. Wong said second option is maybe we go back to the drawing board and look at what we can create that honors the space and community. Is that what the Board wants?

Ms. Woo wants to see report first.

Mr. Williams said to ask questions of yourself, what would it mean if we tear building down? What would that look like. Costs associated with taking brick down and putting back up. Asked would massing strategy be different? Pay tribute to history of the building. What would it look like to have a clean slate?

Ms. Hsie said to take to heart some of the things that you've heard from the community about the tower. The transition is jarring. Need to make the transition between the height of the character district and the tower. What could help the transition?

Ms. Kunugi said for clean slate scenario, recognize community's voice. What have you found as a guide to design the new building; how would you apply that? What is the inspiration? Before coming back with massing studies, maybe this is what you come back with. Don't worry about building design yet, come back with concept.

Mr. Wong said he would take that to heart.

Mr. Riddick said I think we've heard you and what we have what we need to move forward.

Mr. William asked if the Board has provided enough direction so that the next meeting is fruitful?

Ms. Hsie said next time come back and start by telling us why this site is historically and culturally significant. Tell us why the site is important and lead with that. Honor that.

Mr. Wong said we did that.

Ms. Hsie said slowly, more and more of the building got demolished.

Ms. Frestedt thanked community for participation. Noted passion on both sides.

Adjourn 8:25 pm.

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