



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 30/07

MINUTES OF THE March 15, 2007 Special Meeting

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

BOARD MEMBERS

Linda Day
Steven Mako
Marnie McGrath
Brandon Peterson, Vice Chair
Jim Riggle
Matthew Wasse
Elaine Wine, Chair

STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

As a quorum was present, the meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Board Chair, Elaine Wine.

031507.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031507.11 Olympic Athletic Club
5301 Leary Avenue NW
Jim Riggle

Application: Demolition of two existing buildings at 5214 and 5216 Ballard Avenue NW and preliminary design approval for construction of a four-story mixed use building.

Elaine Wine explained that the application would be reviewed in two parts: new construction and demolition. She asked the applicant to make a presentation on the proposal.

Gordon Lagerquist was the applicant's representative. He introduced his partner, Gene Morris. They distributed copies of a proposed timeline for the project.

Department of

Gordon Lagerquist showed the Ballard Avenue elevation and explained that it would be four stories, approximately the same height as the Olympic Athletic Club, 50 feet at the maximum.

He showed an elevation of the building facing 20nd Ave NW. At this end of the building, the height would be slightly less than 40 feet. He explained that all of the new building would be in the district except for the small triangle of land that faces 20th Ave NW. It is only about 600 square feet, with a 40-foot section on 20th NW. A small part of the four-story building would be visible from 20th NW.

Gene Morris next talked about the proposed demolition to enable the new construction. He explained that the brick building (5216) and the smaller wood building (5214) would both be demolished. The brick building was formerly used by Ballard Hardware and the wood building was currently occupied by an engineer. He explained that they proposed to demolish the wood building first, and the brick building later. Heather McAuliffe clarified that neither building could be demolished until the Certificate of Approval for the final design had been issued. Gene Morris clarified that they would like to demolish the wood building after receiving final design approval and demolish the brick building in the fall, after the building permit had been issued. He said they did not want to demolish the building before they had permission to build the new building. He stated that before demolishing the brick building, they would provide a financial approval letter from the lender.

Staff Report: Heather McAuliffe read the staff report and distributed photos and plans. She reminded Board members that this review would be for massing and scale only, and that the applicant would return later for the final design details. The relevant guidelines for the new construction were Guidelines/General #1, 1. Scale of Buildings and Structures, and 15. New Construction Guidelines A. Design, B. Site and C. Height. She gave additional background information on the buildings that were proposed to be demolished. The brick building was built in the 1920's and was listed as a tertiary building in the National Register Nomination because it had been largely altered before the district was formed. The wood building was listed as an intrusion because it was built after the period of significance (1890's to 1930's). She explained that the Board's guidelines define only primary and secondary structures to be "contributing" buildings and therefore both of the structures would be considered "non-contributing". She reminded Board members that at previous briefings by the applicant, they had indicated a willingness to allow demolition of the two buildings to enable construction of the new building since the 1920's building no longer possessed enough historic fabric and the other building was an intrusion.

She went over the proposed timeline: The applicant was applying for preliminary design approval today in order to be able to obtain the Master Use Permit and to apply for financing. The applicant intended to return in July to apply for the final design approval. Upon receiving the final design approval, they would apply for the building permit. They hoped to have a letter of financial approval from the

lender available by August. They intended to demolish 5216 Ballard Ave NW by December 15, 2007. They anticipated starting construction in January. She pointed out that per the timeline, the applicants proposed to demolish the wood building in July, after receiving the final design approval.

She gave a summary of the Board's concerns about the demolition from the previous briefings and made staff recommendations. She stated that the Board was concerned about the negative impact to the district if there were to be a lag in the time between the demolition and the new construction or if the new building was never built after the demolition.

She recommended that the Board issue a Certificate of Approval with the conditions that the applicant submit proof of financing and that the new construction be started within a designated period of time. She explained that both these conditions are routinely imposed in the International and Pioneer Square review districts and had been imposed when the Sunset Hotel was demolished to allow new construction.

She cited additional conditions imposed on a preliminary design approval by the district ordinance, submittal of final design details and a Certificate of Approval from the Board before a building permit could be issued.

She also recommended that the Board consider citing section 25.16.100 C. in the ordinance to provide clarification for the applicant, explaining that it ties the expiration of the Certificate of Approval to the life of the building permit.

Linda Day asked the applicants for confirmation that they planned to demolish the larger building and would start construction immediately. The applicants confirmed this was the case. They also confirmed that demolition would not occur before the building permit was issued.

Heather McAuliffe confirmed that the condition requiring the proof of financing would mean that neither building could be demolished until it had been received by staff. She explained that the outcome would be that the smaller building could not be demolished in June as planned, but rather in August (when the applicant expected to receive the proof of financing).

Applicant Comment: There were no further comments from the applicant.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate for Historic Seattle, introduced herself. She explained that she was there to observe and take information back to her organization. She was interested in the impact of the project on the district. Heather McAuliffe stated that she could make the application available for her review.

Board Discussion:

Elaine Wine reviewed the guidelines cited in the staff report and summarized the Board's feedback on the guidelines to the applicants during their briefing on March 1.

She cited General Guideline #1, 1. Scale of Buildings and Structures, which states that "Scale shall be maintained consistent with the qualities of the continuum of the District." She said the Board had indicated that the proposed height of the building, 50 feet, was consistent with the scale of the district and noted that there are several other buildings of similar height or higher in the district. She next cited Guideline 3. Scale of Buildings and Structures, which states that "The scale of all structures, in relationship to other structures and spaces, is important. The scale shall continue to be small and relatively uniform." She said the Board's feedback had been that because the building met other parameters set by the guidelines such as height restrictions and setbacks, that the proposed massing met this guideline as well. She next directed the Board to Guideline 15. New Construction Guidelines. She went through sections 15 (a), (b) and (c). 15. (a) states that "Massing of any new building must be consistent with Contributing buildings." The Board had identified that there are other contributing buildings in the district that are of similar massing. 15 (b) states that "In terms of setback, orientation, spacing, and distance from adjacent buildings, new construction shall be compatible with Contributing buildings." Board members had concurred that the new building would be in conformance with this guideline. 15 (b) states that, "A new building shall be no taller than 50 feet (measured from the center of the street-facing façade to the highest projection). Elevator penthouses, parapets and mechanical equipment may exceed the 50-foot height limit but shall be evaluated for their overall impact to the building and the District." She stated that the building would not be taller than 50 feet. Although there was no information on proposed information on the rooftop equipment at this time, the guideline allows for the equipment to exceed the height restriction and the Board would be able to review this additional information during the final design review. Board members had indicated that they would likely recommend approval of the project for massing and scale.

Elaine Wine solicited further comments from the Board. There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

Elaine Wine next introduced Board discussion of the demolition proposal. She said that the Board had asked at the briefing for further clarification of the proposal. She said there were some reservations that there could be an extended length of time after the demolition that the lots could be vacant before construction. She noted that the timeline the applicant had submitted today was helpful in understanding the process. She solicited the Board for questions related to the timeline.

Marnie McGrath asked if the given date of demolition was the date that it begins or the date that it would be complete.

Elaine Wine asked how long it would take to demolish the two buildings.

Gordon Lagerquist answered that there were two buildings to demolish and two dates for demolition. The smaller building could be demolished in an afternoon. The larger building probably would take the same amount of time, depending on what could be salvaged from it. It would take a week at the most to demolish the larger building.

Brandon Peterson asked the applicants why they were proposing to demolish the smaller building first, then the second building and then obtain the building permit.

Jim Riggle explained that he was interested in tearing down the smaller building first because it is an intrusion and (the area behind it) looks like a junkyard. He cited also the need for parking in the district. He indicated his willingness to tear the buildings down at the same time if it was what the Board wanted.

Board members were divided in their opinions about how the demolition might impact the district if the smaller building were removed in advance of the new construction.

Brandon Peterson explained that it would create a void where there was not one earlier.

Elaine Wine cited a concern about the potential for a six-month lag between the time of the demolition and the start of new construction. She also cited a negative impact on the pedestrian environment.

Linda Day stated that a large part of the lot where the small building is located is open space and that she did not feel that removal of the smaller building would significantly change the character of the lot. Jim Riggle confirmed that the building occupies 22% of the lot.

Elaine Wine said she felt the two buildings were tied together because they were both proposed to be demolished and replaced with one building. If one building was removed and the new building was not built, she did not think this would be beneficial for the district. She stated that the guidelines discourage new off-street parking. She said she did not think it was a good idea to set the precedent of demolishing a building before new construction starts.

Linda said she felt phasing the demolition was appropriate because the property was already cut through and the building was small. If the existing building were built from façade to façade, she said she would not be in support of demolishing it because of the impact to the district.

Steven Mako supported demolition of the smaller building for a parking lot because it would allow for more parking on a temporary basis and would improve the aesthetic appeal of the property, which currently has junk stored on it.

The Board determined that requiring a completion date was more appropriate than requiring a date for the construction to start. The Board discussed with the applicant what would be a reasonable amount of time for completion of the project. It was decided that two years would be sufficient time to complete construction. The Board acknowledged that it was possible for the applicant to obtain an extension if necessary.

Jim Riggle stated that he was retracting his request to demolish the smaller building in advance. He said that it would be demolished at the same time as the larger building, immediately before the construction would start.

Board members agreed that the conditions recommended by staff should be adopted.

Motion:

Brandon Peterson made a motion to approve the massing and scale of the new building

MM/SC/BP/LD
6-0-0

Motion:

Brandon Peterson made a motion to approve the demolition of the two buildings with following conditions:

- 1) Submittal of the final design and all of the information listed in Seattle Municipal Code section 25.16.080 subsection A2; and
- 2) Obtaining a Certificate of Approval from the Ballard Avenue Landmark Board for final design prior to issuance of permits for any work including but not limited to demolition affecting 5214-5216 Ballard Ave NW;
- 3) The Certificate of Approval issued for this application is valid for the life of the permits issued by the Department of Planning & Development;
- 4) Proof of interim and long-term financing from the applicant for the replacement structure before demolition shall be submitted to staff;
- 5) New construction must be completed within two years.

MM/SC/BP/MW
5-0-1 (Steven Mako abstained)

Jim Riggle rejoined the Board.

031507.2 BOARD BUSINESS

Linda Day asked who is responsible for cleaning the street, the city or property owners. Heather McAuliffe said that she would find out and let the Board know. The Board was also interested in knowing the current schedule for the city's street sweeping of the 5400 block of Ballard Avenue.

031507.3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No minutes were available.

031507.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

There was no report.

031507.5 STAFF REPORT

The owner of 5229 Ballard Ave NW is working to reconfigure the gas meters in front of the building to be less visible. If he places the meters in a row without a bench, it will require Board approval. If the approved bench fits over them but with minor design changes, Heather McAuliffe has informed the owner that it will not require further Board approval. She stated that the changes are to be made in April.

Brandon Peterson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Steven Mako seconded the motion.

10:45 a.m. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe
Board Coordinator