



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 32/07

MINUTES OF THE April 12, 2007 Special Meeting

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

BOARD MEMBERS

Linda Day
Marnie McGrath
Jim Riggle
Matthew Wasse
Elaine Wine, Chair

STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Absent:

Steven Mako
Brandon Peterson, Vice Chair

As a quorum was present, the meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m. by Board Chair, Elaine Wine.

041207.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041207.11 Marvin's Garden Park
5400 Ballard Ave
Kathleen Conner, Seattle Parks Department

Application: Application to install one interpretive sign, one new tree and one commemorative ground plaque.

Staff Report:

Interpretive sign

- Final plaque for Ballard Historical Society historic marker project
- To be located parallel to 22nd Ave NW
- Size: 2 feet wide by 3 feet high, mounted on a square steel pole (3.5" x 3.5") 22" in height.

- Sign will be angled 45 degrees; overall height of the sign/stand will be 4 feet.
- Materials: Sign - black matte steel, with chemical etching (matches other plaques installed in the district). Sign stand – black matte steel.
- Method of attachment: Plaque will be glued to sign stand backing; sign stand will be screwed to the cement with four 3/8” screws. Holes in the cement will have cement glue in them to better hold the screws.

New tree

- To be located in north side of the park, in front of the cedar trees.
- Pacific Dogwood – 2-3” caliper in size, columnar in shape

Commemorative ground plaque

- Plaque commemorates the centennial anniversary of the annexation of Ballard to the city of Seattle in 1907.
- To be located near the base of the new tree, in the sidewalk area south of the landscaping.
- Size: 10” wide by 7.5” high.
- Material: cast bronze – brown pebbled background with a single line border
- Method of attachment: Inlaid in concrete, flush with concrete.

Exhibits Reviewed:

- Site plan
- Catalog cuts
- Photos
- Renderings

Relevant Guidelines:

Guideline Title	Page #
8. Landscaping	6
13. Signs	7

Applicant Comment:

Mary Fortino from the Ballard Historical Society clarified that two studs would hold the plaque to the sign stand.

Kathleen Connor explained that the Pacific Dogwood, a native species, would be watered for three years. If it were to die after that, it would be replaced.

Public Comment: There were no comments from the public.

Board Discussion:

Elaine Wine asked about the height of the interpretive sign. Mary Fortino explained that sign pole was industry standard, and that the sign had to be vertically placed to follow the layout of the photo.

Linda Day said the guidelines say that approval for plants is depends on the applicant's ability to maintain them. She asked who would clean up the leaves. Kathleen Connor answered that the gardeners in the Parks Department would clean them up.

Elaine Wine asked if the bell tower had been considered as a location for the interpretive sign.

Mary Fortino responded that the sign would not fit there because the tower is rounded and noted that there is already a lot of signage on it.

Board members expressed a concern that there would be too much signage in the park, however, they concurred that the plaques and the tree met the guidelines for signage and landscaping.

Motion: Marnie McGrath made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

MM/SC/MM/JR
5-0-0

041207.12

Ballard Landmark Inn
5312/5320 Ballard Ave NW
Loren Davis

Application: Application for rehabilitation of existing facades at 5312 and 5320 Ballard Ave NW, approval for materials and finishes on rear elevation, installation of new metal gate and exterior lighting fixtures. (Note: This item was tabled at the 4/5/07 BLD meeting.)

Application:

Staff Report:

April 5 Board review:

- The Board reviewed this application on April 5. At that time the applicant indicated that he would like to replace all of the wood in the storefronts, and that metal mullions would be installed to match the original mullions. Board members indicated that they needed more time to review the drawings and photo survey to determine if wholesale replacement of the storefronts would be appropriate.
- The Board informed the applicant on April 5 that the vinyl windows proposed on the rear elevation of the addition (portion visible to Leary Avenue NW)

were in conflict with the guidelines, because vinyl windows are prohibited in the district. The applicant suggested a different design solution, but no drawings were available for the Board to review.

- For the reasons cited above, the Board tabled the application.

Exhibits Reviewed:

- Photos survey of existing conditions
- Elevation drawings
- Section drawings
- Storefront and window details
- Color/material samples

Relevant Guidelines:

Guideline Title	Page #	Comments by ARC
Preservation Brief 11		
2 Secretary of the Interior’s Standards	5	2 (a), (b), (c) – find appropriate replacement mullion; (d) – acceptable to remove garage door and Wilson Ford box sign; (e), (f) (g)
4. Building Materials and Fixtures	6	Proposed gate and light fixtures meet this guideline.
5. Building Surface Treatments	6	Stucco on historic façade should be traditional stucco treatment.
6. Street Level Façade Proportions	6	Glazing proportions are in conformance with this guideline.

Applicant Comment: There were no comments from the applicant.

Public Comment: There were no comments from the public.

Board Discussion:

The Board discussed the specific details of the storefront replacements with the applicant. Most board members concurred that maintaining single glazing in the transom windows better conformed to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards because it would not require changing to a thicker muntin between each pane of glass.

The Board expressed concerns that the building would look new because so much of the building had been demolished and the storefronts would be wholly replaced. Board members asked that the applicant reuse as much of the glass in the transoms as possible.

Elaine Wine next directed Board members to discuss the proposed new recessed entry ways. She commented that the design of the entry ways appeared to have improved in response to the ARC’s recommendations.

Matt Wasse asked why the sidelite next to one of the entry ways was so small. Loren Davis explained that it was necessary because there would be a concrete column placed there to support the rooftop deck.

The Board next discussed the treatments proposed for the façade.

Matt Wasse expressed a concern that that finish would not look like traditional stucco. Loren Davis responded that the current finish would be stripped and replaced with stucco applied by hand. The current texture would be matched, and then painted.

Matt Wasse cited the guidelines where it says that colors should be “subdued”. He did not feel that white fit this description and that the color did not work in the context of the brick buildings around it. Loren Davis responded that they were trying to match the current color on the façade.

Other board members concurred that white might not be appropriate for the façade and the addition. The applicant was amenable to looking into alternatives and agreed to remove his request for approval of the colors from the application. The Board recommended a darker color that still maintained contrast between the trim and the façade color.

Loren Davis talked next about the new street tree. He explained that it would be a Honey Locust to match the existing street trees on either side.

The Board asked about notes on p. 12, which indicated that the wood studs on the low wall below the storefront windows would be replaced with concrete. Loren Davis clarified that the notes were incorrect, that the reconstruction would be as shown on p. 17, stucco over wood.

Loren Davis talked about the rear elevation of the addition, and the reasons for the materials he had chosen. He explained that the materials had to be consistent all the way around the courtyard. He said there was no mention in the National Register nomination of the relevance of the backs of buildings, and that the Board’s guidelines do not address how they are to be treated. He showed photos of the backs of other buildings in the District. He also showed a perspective sketch of the development from Vernon Place, as requested by the Board. He said they had changed the materials on the courtyard wall from ground face cmu to modular brick in order to conform to the guidelines. He showed where a trellis and new plants would be added to the courtyard wall.

He described the windows on the rear elevation, that were now changed to be double-hung rather than sliding, but still vinyl. He explained that if the Board were to approve the double-hung design, all the rest of the sliders in the courtyard would be changed to double-hung. He said with the trees in the courtyard and the trellis, only three windows would be visible. He confirmed that the windows

would be white, but could change to a different color if the painting scheme changed. He showed a sample of a beige alternative for the windows, “Desert Sand”.

Board members concurred that the change to the double-hung design improved the windows’ compatibility with the guidelines, but that vinyl is prohibited as a material. They also concurred that the change in the material for the courtyard wall from cmu to brick was compatible.

Loren Davis addressed the Board’s earlier concern about the number of materials to be used on the addition. He showed renderings of the south wall in both stucco and modular brick and offered flexibility. The Board took a straw poll and most members were in favor of the modular brick as currently approved.

The Board discussed the proposal for vinyl windows on the rear elevation and reiterated that vinyl would be unacceptable because the guidelines prohibit it.

Motion: Jim Riggle made a motion to approve the application as presented with the amendments by the applicant to withdraw colors from the application and for design changes to the courtyard wall and rear façade material, with the exception of the windows on the rear elevation.

MM/SC/JR/MW
5-0-0

Motion: Marnie McGrath made a motion to approve the windows on the rear elevation as presented.

MM/SC/MM/JR
2-3-0 (Linda Day, Matt Wasse and Elaine Wine against)

Heather McAuliffe explained to the Board that this failed motion meant that the applicant could not get his building permit. If it was not the Board’s intention to deny the permit, there would need to be a new motion that allowed the applicant to come back for final review of the material.

Motion: Matt Wasse made a motion to approve the windows with the condition that the applicant would return for final review and approval of the material for the windows on the rear elevation.

MM/SC/MW/MM
5-0-0

Heather McAuliffe reminded the applicant that he would need to submit an application for the final color scheme.

041207.2 BOARD BUSINESS: There were no items discussed.

041207.3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board members reviewed the minutes of the March 1, 2007 meeting.

Motion: Matt Wasse made a motion to approve the minutes as written.

MM/SC/MW/JR

5-0-0

041207.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR: There was no report.

041207.5 STAFF REPORT: There was no report.

Jim Riggle made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Linda Day seconded the motion.

11:24 a.m. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe
Board Coordinator