



The City of Seattle

Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

BLD 84/07

MINUTES OF THE September 6, 2007 MEETING

TIME: 9:00 A.M.
PLACE: Ballard Neighborhood Service Center
5604 22nd Avenue NW

BOARD MEMBERS

John Bureson
Linda Day
Steven Mako
Jim Riggle
John Widell
Elaine Wine, Chair

STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Absent:

Marnie McGrath, Vice Chair

As a quorum was present, the meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m. by Board Chair, Elaine Wine.

090607.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090607.11 Skarbos Furniture
5354 Ballard Ave NW
Ron Skarbo

Application: Install signage on awning.

Staff Report: Heather McAuliffe explained that vinyl lettering would be added to the awning. She distributed exhibits from the application for the Board to review. The relevant guideline was 13. Signs.

There were no comments from the applicant or the public.

Board Discussion: Board members concurred that the proposed signage met the sign guidelines.

Motion: Linda Day made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

MM/SC/LD/JW
5-0-0

090607.12 Ella Mon
5404 22nd Ave NW
Monica Treacy

Application: Alter storefront to include a new entry to match style and finish of existing entries; apply signage in windows of storefront.

Staff Report: Heather McAuliffe distributed materials from the application and said that the relevant guidelines would be 4. Building Materials and Fixtures, 6. Street Level Façade Proportions, 15. New Construction (f) and 13. Signs.

There were no comments from the applicant or the public.

Board Discussion: Elaine Wine said that the alterations to the storefront appeared to meet Guideline 4, because all similar materials were being used in the construction, and that it met Guideline 6., because the proportions of the glazing were appropriate. John Bureson said the design was consistent with the other storefronts on the building. Board members concurred that the proposed signage met the sign guidelines.

Motion: John Widell made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

MM/SC/JW/SM
5-0-0

090607.13 5129 Ballard Ave NW
Charlotte Stokes

Application: Application for approval of exterior stairway and rooftop deck. (Postponed from August 2 meeting)

Staff Report: Heather McAuliffe reminded board members that this application was reviewed by the Board at its August 2 meeting but had been withdrawn by the applicant. The applicant was now proposing amendments to the design of the exterior stairway and rooftop deck. Ms. McAuliffe reviewed additional background information on the application and cited the relevant guidelines:

Relevant Information:

- Building is a primary structure in the district.
- Building built in 1897.
- Rooftop deck and stairway are currently installed.
- At the August 2, 2007 meeting the Board reviewed a request to approve the deck and the stairway as they are currently designed. The Board indicated that the stairway was incompatible with the character of the District and made too great a visual impact. The applicant requested to withdraw the application and return at the next meeting.
- Applicant has amended the application as follows:

Rooftop deck:

- AMENDMENT: Deck would be pushed back 6’ from the side of the building.
- AMENDMENT: Material for railing would change from wood to black metal.

Stairway details:

- Visible from 20th Ave NW and Shilshole Ave NW
- Partially screened from Ballard Avenue by existing evergreen trees and fence
- Materials: black steel railing; plastic landings and treads.
- Method of attachment: bolted to bricks; bolts anchored with epoxy. Footing of the stair is bolted to concrete at ground level.
- AMENDMENT: Portion of the stairway between the landing and the roof would be removed.

Exhibits Reviewed:

- Site plan
- Photos of existing deck and stairway as they appear in sun and shade
- Photos of fire escapes that existing on buildings in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District or have been removed from buildings in the district
- Photos of decorative metal features on buildings in the district.
- Historic photo of 5129 Ballard Ave NW
- Rendering showing relocated deck with its revised railing design and the altered stairway.

Relevant Guidelines:

Guideline Title	Page #	Citation
2. Secretary of the Interior Standards	5	2. (i.) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

	<p>2. (j.) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.</p>
<p>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation & Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings</p>	<p>Building Exterior: <i>Roofs (Page 80)</i> <u>Recommended:</u> Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.</p> <p>Building Site (Page 105) <u>Recommended:</u> Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape. <u>Not Recommended:</u> Introducing a new building or site feature that is out of scale or of an otherwise inappropriate design. Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.</p> <p>Setting (Page 108) <u>Recommended:</u> Designing and constructing new additions to historic buildings when required by the new use. New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale design, material, color, and texture. <u>Not recommended:</u> Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting’s historic character, e.g., replacing picket fencing with chain link fencing. Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.</p>

Applicant Comment: Charlotte Stokes clarified that the deck itself could not be moved because of necessary structural bracing on the roof, but that the railing could be moved.

Public Comment: There were no comments from the public.

Board Discussion:

There was a clarification between the applicant and the Board about the rooftop deck railing's construction: it would be a "cable rail" constructed of a black steel top rail with additional cables below.

Board members concurred that the change in the railing design for the rooftop deck was a great improvement over the earlier design that was proposed, because it made less of a visual impact, and the color and materials were appropriate.

Board members next discussed the amended design for the exterior stairway. They acknowledged that removal of the section above the landing would partially address the concerns they had at the August 2 meeting about the visual impact of the structure, but determined that the remaining section below the landing was clearly visible and did not meet the guidelines because of its design.

Linda Day stated that any additions or alterations to historic buildings in the district should be compatible with contributing buildings in the district. She stated that the design of the metal stairway did not conform to the design of an exterior stairway of any building in the district.

Charlotte Stokes replied that she first applied two years ago for the stairway and was required to finish it. She provided additional information on the difficulties she had faced during the two years while applying for the structure.

Linda Day asked if the stairway was required by the Fire Department.

Charlotte Stokes answered that fire egress is needed from the upstairs bedroom.

John Widell stated that all of the fire escapes on the historic buildings in the district were ladders or switchbacks with landings.

Elaine Wine expressed a concern that the Board was being asked to approve a design that deviates from the guidelines in the district, based on an emotional appeal.

Linda Day cited p. 108 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings where it says, "New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale design, material, color, and texture." She said that the design of fire escapes in the district has always been angular; therefore the new design should be compatible with the other designs in the district. She said a spiral staircase was not typical in the district.

Steve Mako cited Guidelines/Specific 2 (c), which says, “Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.” He said that perhaps the design fits the period, but it is not found here.

Charlotte Stokes stated that a stairway designed with switchbacks would have to be wood; it would be bulkier and would take up more space.

Elaine Wine cited Guidelines/Specific 2 (b), which says, “The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.” She said that the faded historic sign on the façade was blocked by the structure.

Jim Riggle arrived at 9:55 a.m.

Linda Day cited Guideline 15 (a) where it says, “New construction shall be visually compatible with the predominant architectural styles, building materials, and inherent historic character of the District.” She said that the spiral design was not compatible with the building or the district.

Elaine Wine added that another section of Guideline 15 (a) also applied, and cited it: “The complexity of the form and shape of new buildings shall be compatible with, but discernible from, Contributing buildings. The degree to which a new building is simple or complex in form and shape shall be based upon the dominant characteristics of Contributing buildings.”

Board members concurred that the amended design of the exterior stairway as presented did not meet the guidelines.

The Board decided to split voting on the application into two parts: the rooftop deck and the exterior stairway.

Motion: John Widell made a motion to approve the amended design of the rooftop deck as presented.

MM/SC/JW/JB

5-0-1 (Jim Riggle abstained)

Motion: John Burreson made a motion to approve the amended design of the exterior stairway as presented.

MM/SC/JB/EW

0-5-1 (Jim Riggle abstained)

090607.14 The Ballard Loft
5105 Ballard Ave NW
Dan Murphy

Application: Extend existing entry in façade 6’.

Staff Report: Heather McAuliffe informed the board that the applicant had amended the application since the agenda was sent out, and was now requesting that the entry be extended 14’ instead of 6’ from the façade. She explained that the city’s Department of Planning and Development had required that the applicant find a way to meet fire exiting requirements, because there would not be enough separation distance between the two person doors in the façade. She distributed exhibits from the application and stated that the relevant guidelines would be Guidelines/General, 2. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, 3. Scale of Buildings and Structures, and 14. Additions to Existing Buildings.

Applicant Comment: The applicant explained that he had looked at two alternate solutions to meet the fire exiting requirements, but neither would work for him.

Public Comment: There were no comments from the public.

Board Discussion: John Widell stated that he thought the application conflicted with Guidelines 2 (b) and 2 (j) because of the impact to the building’s form. Elaine Wine said she did not think it met Guideline 14, which says it is not appropriate to construct an addition if “it will detract from the overall historic character of the principal elevation” and that an addition “shall be compatible with the existing building in mass, materials, color, and relationship of solids to voids in the exterior walls, yet make the addition discernible from the original.” She said that Guidelines 15 (a) also did not support the application, because the entry extension was not found as a form in the district. Most Board members concurred that the alteration would negatively impact the character of the building, which is simple in form with a flat façade and a roll-up door.

Motion: Steve Mako made a motion to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/JR/
2-4-0 (Day, Riggle, Widell and Wine opposed)

090607.2 BOARD BUSINESS: There were no items discussed.

090607.3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board members reviewed the minutes of the August 2, 2007 meeting.

Motion: John Widell made a motion to approve the minutes as written.

MM/SC/JW/SM
5-0-1 (Day abstained)

090607.4 **REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** There was no report.

090607.5 **STAFF REPORT:** There was no report.

Linda Day made a motion to adjourn the meeting. John Bureson seconded the motion.

10:50 a.m. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe
Board Coordinator