



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 205/17

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, October 10, 2017

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

Board Members Present

Eliza Chan
Stephanie Hsie, Vice Chair
Sergio Legon-Talamoni
Carol Leong
Tiernan Martin, Chair
Herman Setijono
Valerie Tran

Staff

Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Chair Tiernan Martin called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

101017.1 APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

August 8, 2017

MM/SC/CL/HS 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

101017.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

101017.21 913 S. Jackson St. – Thai Binh Apartments

Applicant: Peter Kanyer, Katerra

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed revisions to the final design of a 6-story mixed-use development, including: Revisions to the design of outdoor seating/benches; exterior lighting plan; garage doors and the design of an exterior stairwell on the west façade; proposed installation of screening around rooftop mechanical equipment; proposed building and residential window colors, and confirmation of the material/finish for a portion of the exterior cladding (Preferred option: Cedar Nichiha Panel). She said that signage will be submitted as part of a separate application. The zone is DMR/C 65/65-85. The site is

located outside of the Asian Design Character District and the Retail Core. 10th Ave. S. is a Class II Pedestrian Street. S. King Street is a designated Green Street. On February 14, 2017 the ISRD Board recommended approval for Final Design. During that meeting, the Board *deferred* action on the following, pending submission of final design details and alternatives:

- The faux-cedar finish for portions of the exterior cladding;
- The final design of garage door panels;
- Exterior seating – bench design;
- Exterior light fixtures.

Ms. Frestedt said that a Certificate of Approval for Demolition, Use and Preliminary Design was issued in January 2017. She said it is the staff opinion that use of a faux-wood grain design on a non-wooden material is in conflict with the intent of SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes A. General requirements, because it is not a material finish sympathetic to or found elsewhere in the District.

Ms. Tran arrived at 4:39 pm.

Applicant Comment:

Peter Kanyer provided an overview of the project to date and the deferred items that would be presented for review.

Bench

Keith James, Inland Construction, said they worked with Friends of Little Saigon (FoLS) who recommended a bench style; they were able to find one similar but of commercial grade. He said that the bench will be black and will have a center divider.

Building Lighting

Mr. Kanyer said after input from the FoLS they found lighting of commercial grade. He said light temperature will be in keeping with the district. He said lighting will be flush mounted at the building face. There will be lighting over the west side man doors as well as canopy lighting.

Garage Doors

Mr. Kanyer said they had originally proposed one solid and one vented garage door; now both will be vented. He said venting will be in a brick pattern, varied dark bronze to match other metal work on buildings.

Rooftop Screens

Mr. Kanyer said screens are the same color as other metal work on the building. He said they will be perforated and won't be detectable from street view.

Resident Window Frames

Mr. Kanyer said the window frame color will be dark brown 'ash', which matches other metal on the building; windows are a vinyl product.

Color Palette

Applicants provided a material board and indicated placement on the building. They provided preferred and alternate schemes; a faux cedar and a solid brown were presented for accent. Three whites were proposed to provide a varied, textured look to the main body.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

Mr. Martin went over relevant Code sections.

Rooftop Screens

Mr. Martin asked about color and material.

Mr. Kanyer said the metal will match metal on rest of building.

Stair Screen

Mr. Martin asked about removal of the green screen around the exterior stair on the west façade.

Mr. Kanyer said there were complications regarding maintenance and the ability to lock the stairwell down. He said they reconfigured the stair to make it less visible.

Mr. James said it is not a tenant or community space; it is utilitarian space for gas meters, etc.

Mr. Kanyer said the fence around will be ornamental, not chain link.

Bench

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. James provided a photo of the bench design initially suggested by the FoLS.

Materials/Finishes

Ms. Frestedt said her concern with the cedar is less about the color; it is about the faux wood grain.

Ms. Hsie asked about the corner treatment and reveal.

Mr. Kanyer said there is a trim reveal – a piece of metal; as shown in original set of drawings.

Ms. Hsie asked if the steel gray accent piece is flush with gray bands.

Mr. Kanyer said they show a wide reveal of 8” flashing in the same color; metal is prefinished.

Mr. Martin asked if the varied whites differ enough to be read as differentiated.

Mr. Kanyer said it will look deliberate, not accidental. He said there will be a greater percentage of brighter white with less of the alternating colors.

Ms. Hsie said in the construction drawings the planks are horizontal and asked if it will be more striated / broken up.

Mr. Kanyer said they aren't but they could be.

Discussion:

Ms. Hsie said it is a nicely organized building. She suggested putting joints neatly at windows. She said there is no need to use three colors of white; the building is broken up well with grills, vents, etc.

Mr. Martin supported the reduced amount of variation.

Mr. Martin provided Code references and SOI 9 and 10. He said this building is outside the Asian Design Character District where the preference for earthy, wood is not as strong. He read from SOI 9 and noted new should be differentiated from old. He said that faux wood patterning on a non-wood panel and questioned how that would relate to real wood elsewhere in the district.

Mr. Setijono said Nichiha has a 20-year warranty; real cedar has less longevity and requires more maintenance.

Mr. James said they interpreted the SOI as it relates to historic rehabilitation or adjacent to historic structure. He said this is new construction and it is not as applicable.

Ms. Frestedt read from SMC 23.66.336 – A. General Requirements and C. Exterior design outside of the Asian Design Character District. She said applications are reviewed on a case by case basis.

Mr. Kanyer said it is fiber cement with wood fibers engrained in. He said it is concrete panel like Hardi-panel; it is prefinished in the factory. He said there is no need to paint; it is factory finished.

Ms. Frestedt asked if this same color was available in a smooth finish. The applicants confirmed it is. Ms. Frestedt said that would resolve her concerns.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni said real wood can't be used. He supported the applicant's preferred alternative. It provides a softer look, is used as an accent and he noted the harsh site next to the freeway.

Ms. Leong concurred. She said ideally actual wood is used but it is not practical here. It provides a softer look to the building and differentiates itself as new construction. She said it would not be appropriate on an existing building.

Mr. Setijono concurred.

Mr. Martin said the entire façade is not proposed, it is just an accent; it is more suited to an accent.

Ms. Hsie said the chosen material is appropriate – the grain is molded into the product. She said vinyl would not be appropriate as it does not have the same depth and texture.

Mr. Setijono said what is proposed is the best product.

Ms. Hsie said it is proposed to be used as an accent; it is durable and unlike vinyl, it has depth and texture like wood.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni said it is a better look; it is warmer, softer, and provides a nice relief from other materials.

Ms. Chan supported a single, muted tone of white rather than three varied.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni agreed and said the push-pull with the materials is success; having three whites takes away from the success of what they are doing.

Ms. Hsie appreciated the applicants' reaching out for Friends of Little Saigon input and said it helps with the decision. She said now that the green screen is solid she had concerns about lighting and possibility of dark corner there and asked them to pay attention to that.

Mr. Kanyer said there are lights under the canopy in that area.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for revisions to Final Design, at 913 S. Jackson St. cedar wood Nichiha. The Board supports the proposed material because the building is new construction and it is being used as an accent versus wrapping the building; it is durable and has the depth and texture of wood; and the single muted tone of Nichiha rather than the three-color variation of whites. This is an extension of the approval that was granted in February 2017.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the October 10, 2017 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:**

SMC 23.66.302 – International Special Review District goals and objectives

SMC 23.66.332 – Height and Rooftop Features

SMC 23.66.334 – Streets and Sidewalks

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

- A. General Requirements.** To retain and enhance the visual order of the District, which is created by existing older buildings that provide unique character and form through their subtle detailing and quarter-block and half-block coverage, new development, including exterior remodeling, should respect the architectural and structural integrity of the building in which the work is undertaken, through sympathetic use of colors, material and style.

Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area.

- C. Exterior Building Design Outside the Asian Design Character District.** Outside the Asian Design Character District, earthen colors and masonry construction with nonmetallic surfaces are preferred. Concrete construction will also be permitted if treated in a manner or incorporated into a design that provides visual interest and avoids large unbroken surface areas.

SMC 23.66.342 – Parking and access

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

#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/CL/HS 7:0:0 Motion carried.

101017.22

510 5th Ave. S. – Publix Apartments

Applicant: Todd Walton, Centerline Solutions (for AT&T)

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed use and installation of Minor Communication Utility equipment on the roof of the newly constructed portion of the Publix Apartments. The zone is IDM 75/85-150. The site is located within the Asian Design Character District and the Retail Core. This project is SEPA exempt.

Applicant Comment:

Todd Walton explained additional communications equipment are needed due to a gap in coverage. He said the ‘macro-site’ will include nine antennas; three antennas per sector. He provided rooftop site plan and indicated proposed equipment locations. He said they typically screen antennas but he noted they have been encouraged not to screen in Special Review Districts.

Ms. Frestedt explained that often the enclosure has massing that exceeds the size of the equipment, creating a greater visual impact. She said what is appropriate on a new building is different from what is appropriate on an old building; review is conducted on a case-by-case basis. She said that equipment should be pulled back from edge as much as possible to minimize visual impact.

Discussion ensued about why this building was chosen instead of another one.

Mr. Walton said that they have to lease space on buildings and this requires property owner consent. He said if the equipment is too high up there is a poorer level of service due to “shadow areas”.

Mr. Legon-Talamoni asked if research has been done on health and noise impacts of antennas on residents.

Mr. Walton said the FCC does not require it. He said that the City requires a Radio Frequency report, produced by a licensed engineer. He can't speak to the health impacts. He said signage is place on site which includes information on outputs.

Ms. Hsie asked if similar equipment has been approved elsewhere.

Ms. Frestedt noted the RDA Building on Dearborn and the Gee Oak Tin Foundation Building on 7th.

Responding to clarifying questions, Mr. Walton said the equipment is for AT&T service only. He said equipment is needed to fill a gap in coverage. He said research is done on the number of dropped calls and that information is compared with propagation maps that show antennae and coverage. He said cell sites are expensive and they only put them in where needed to justify the expense.

Public Comment:

James Lee, resident in Uwajimaya Village, received a notice in the mail about this installation. He said it is hideous to see a cell tower on the building and he noted it will be seen from the newly expanded part of Hing Hay Park. He expressed concern about the radio frequency microwave radiation that will be put out. He said safety isn't proven. He said a cell tower is not in keeping with the district. He expressed concern about radiation exposure. He said that not enough due diligence has been done to place the equipment away from where people reside. He was concerned about aesthetics, safety, property value. He asked what other entities are reviewing this.

Ms. Frestedt said the board reviews changes to exterior of building and a Certificate of Approval is issued if approved; a Certificate of Approval is needed prior to issuance of other permits.

Mr. Walton said they are exempt from SEPA, but that they will need an Administrative Conditional Use Permit. He noted the challenge with alternatives being the same types of buildings and the population density here. He said the FCC requires submittals and construction permits.

Mr. Lee expressed concern about the expansion of equipment.

Ms. Frestedt said if upgrades or changes are made it will need board review.

Mr. Walton said it is a normal size cell site, not a hub or central site or "switch". He said it is a single, stand-alone cell site.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Leong thanked the presenter and the public for their questions and responses. She expressed concern about pedestrian visibility and if this one is allowed, what about future applications. She preferred to see this on a taller building where it is not visible and was concerned that this site is proposed because others didn't respond.

Mr. Martin said that as a resident he depends on cell service. He said the tall buildings next door (Union Station) would not be a visually impactful. He said this placement sets up precedent. He questioned what template or guidelines could they go by to minimize impact.

Ms. Hsie wanted to see graphics, documents, showing gap in service; what is the need and why is it going here. She asked what is the difference between this installation and a flagpole. She said the equipment is ugly and she preferred screening.

Mr. Martin asked what other types installations would be feasible that would have less visual impact; what would tripod installation, sent back further from the parapet, look like? He said he wants to see alternatives and assess will have the least impact.

Ms. Hsie asked where the signs will go.

Mr. Walton said they will go at the stairwell entrances and anything that accesses the roof.

Mr. Martin said he doesn't have enough information to determine whether this is optimal design for this location. He requested more information on alternatives if not on elevator enclosure; if located, as proposed, but with screening; any other preferred alternative to reduce the visual impact as much as possible; different types installations of a mechanical nature, large mass and viable options.

Ms. Frestedt suggested a photo simulation showing what alternative would look like; setbacks; visibility of equipment, proximity to edge of roof.

Ms. Leong commented on the visual impact on the building from the perspective looking east; it's very tall.

Ms. Leong said it impacts the look of the building / elevator penthouse.

Board members discussed objectives and noted the placement has an impact on the visual order of the neighborhood with a conspicuous position on the roof. Board wants to see alternatives that focus on masking the equipment itself; see alternative where equipment is located elsewhere and minimizes the overall visibility from the street.

Ms. Frestedt cited SMC 23.57.014 B1 and B3 and said it should be set back toward center as far as possible; preferably on a secondary façade, or on a primary façade only if impossible elsewhere. Does not hide, damage, or obscure architecture; pain screen or other means to make less obtrusive.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board defer consideration for a Certificate of Approval due to insufficient information to move forward; Board requests alternative locations with and with masking; construction drawings showing each viable option.

The Board considered the **following applicable sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance:**

SMC 23.66.302 – International Special Review District goals and objectives

SMC 23.66.320- Permitted Uses

SMC 23.66.332 – Height and Rooftop Features

SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes

A. General Requirements. To retain and enhance the visual order of the District, which is created by existing older buildings that provide unique character and form through their subtle detailing and quarter-block and half-block coverage, new development, including exterior remodeling, should respect the architectural and structural integrity of the building in which the work is undertaken, through sympathetic use of colors, material and style. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area.

B. Asian Design Character District. Asian Design Character District. The boundaries of the Asian Design Character District of the International District are as shown on Map B for [23.66.326](#). To strengthen and preserve the existing Asian architectural character of the Asian Design Character District, tiled awnings, recessed balconies, heavy timber construction, and materials and colors as specified below are encouraged.

1. **Materials.** Building facades are limited to earthen materials such as brick, concrete, stucco and wood. Other materials may be used if approved by the Director of Neighborhoods. Brick and concrete may not be painted unless approved by the Director of Neighborhoods. Stucco may be used in conjunction with other contrasting materials such as dark stained wood. Decorative ceramic glazed roof tiles are encouraged, as are tile awnings and marquees if appropriately integrated into the overall design.

2. **Colors.** Building facade colors must be reviewed by the Special Review Board and approved by the Director of Neighborhoods. Colors shall be compatible with those of adjacent buildings.

3. **Surfaces.** Textured concrete, brick and wood surfaces are preferred over non-textured surfaces. Recesses and voids that break up monotonous surface areas and create visual relief are encouraged. The design and location of mechanical equipment visible from the street must be reviewed by the Board and approved by the Director of Neighborhoods.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

#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/CL/VT 7:0:0 Motion carried.

101017.3 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Frestedt provided an update on the upcoming ISRD election and went over nomination and voter registration deadlines. As of meeting date no nominations had been received.

Board members discussed having a retreat to pass on institutional memory. Overarching issues to discuss include affordable housing, Asian character, health impacts, among others. Ms. Leong said it is a lot of information to cover in two hours.

Ms. Frestedt said there will be a bulleted list of topics. She will send out a Doodle Poll for possible meeting dates.

Adjourn 7:30 pm.

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