

Core Area – Including National Historic District

1. What features, forms and materials do you think work best for new construction in the “Core” and National Historic District area?

- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **features** for this area include:
 - Arched windows and doorways (tall and narrow)
 - Canopies over sidewalks
 - Cornices
 - Decorative facing
 - Defined entries (covered)
 - Details that add charm (ornate twists)
 - Punch windows on 2nd story
 - Roof-slopes (similar to variety of existing buildings)
 - Sashed windows
 - Store-front windows (non-square and tall)
 - Transom lights / glass above sidewalk canopy
 - Use of lines or window lines to separate stories
 - White accents on brick
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **forms** for this area include:
 - Human-scale first floor and entries
 - Large first floor, clear commercial window
 - Parapets
 - Proportions of storefront to 2nd story
 - Small residential / office space above
 - Structures similar to Ken Imus' and Ebenal buildings
 - Tall street level floor with canopy
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **materials** for this area include:
 - Any materials that mimic the existing structures or do not contrast too badly
 - Brick (craftsman style ok)
 - Crown Molding (Clapboard)
 - Masonry (Chuckanut Sandstone foundation)
 - Paint (in historical colors – brick/earth tones)
 - Sandstone
 - Stone
 - Stucco
 - Wood
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Articulation (building plane)
 - Buildings should front the sidewalk
 - Flexibility and common sense
 - Height – keep under 50 feet / 4 stories (no taller than existing historic buildings)
 - Height – should be 3 stories max (not 2 stories)
 - Include more variety of historical forms (too “Disneyland” perfect)
 - Keep compatible with existing historic buildings (style / feel should agree)
 - Street grid should be short square blocks
 - Utilize Victorian / Arts & Crafts features and elements
 - Window height and rhythm
- Additional comments:
 - One story for the Eclipse seemed like a missed opportunity
 - Village Books is a nice building
 - Acceptable Pictures: #1-7, 9 (materials add to charm), 13-17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27
 - #10 – yellow color is not good
 - #19 – could be darker / more historic color

2. What has not worked in the “Core” and National Historic District area?

- Respondents felt that the following things have not worked in this area:
 - Angled parking
 - Concrete
 - Efforts to break up building bulk
 - Large glass / steel window fields on upper levels
 - Large / massive building footprints (cover too much area)
 - Large signs
 - Lighting that is direct and glaring on pedestrians
 - Linear “boxie” / modern look
 - One-story square buildings
 - Paint (instead of brick)
 - Parking District
 - Pop-outs and turrets
 - Sealed 2nd-story windows
 - Solid blocks of building (eliminates off-street parking)
 - Stucco that blocks view corridors
 - Chuckanut Square, Eclipse Bookstore (large sign) Garden Plaza (cinder block) Harris Square (dark courtyard), Joinery (not well-matched to historic buildings), Key Bank (no street presence / garish external lights), McKenzie Square (upper floors don't work), Muljat buildings (blocking view corridors), Public Housing Authority tower renovation (needs depth / texture to façade and roof line), WECU / Fairhaven Pizza Building, Winn's Drive-In
- Additional comments:
 - Apparent requirement that commercial space at street level seems squashed at Fairhaven Gardens
 - Economics drives growth
 - Lack of parking on Finnegan side makes finding tenants difficult
 - Making everything look the same
 - Materials / architecture features should be left to the architect
 - The façade of historic on new buildings is not attractive
 - The Planning Department does not work for this area
 - Vague language / lack of code (“harmony of scale”)
 - Picture #29 is a good source for corner design
 - Unacceptable Pictures: #2, 8-12
 - #5 – ugly
 - #8 – signs (bold color)
 - #13a – Rounded top
 - #14 – balcony railings
 - #16 – corner turret (rounded), rounded window on 2nd / 3rd stories, top of bay
 - #17 – bump-out, flat aspect from lack of detail
 - #18 – New Orleans style
 - #19 – construction is weak
 - #24 – shape of windows
 - #26 – too massive / not compatible
 - #30 - ugly

3. Do you think the “Core” and National Historic District should be subject to design review?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should be** subject to design review.

Influence Area

1. What features, forms and materials do you think work best for new construction in the “Influence” area?

- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **features** for this area include:
 - Angled entrances
 - Arched windows (lots of them)
 - Decorative cornices
 - Historic design (using features like the Village Books building)
 - Large window along street level (tall - not square)
 - Window framing / curves (not just vinyl inserts)
 - Window proportions
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **forms** for this area include:
 - 1st –story retail / street level commercial
 - Cornices
 - Height
 - Less bulk and height to reflect core
 - Maximum of 3 stories
 - Pillars
 - Roof edges
 - Roof slopes / lines that are interesting
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **materials** for this area include:
 - Brick
 - Brick / Concrete combination... Brick / Wood combination
 - Lapsiding (horizontal)
 - Paint (in earth tones)
 - Stone
 - Wood
 - Wood / Concrete combination
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - 12th Street Village corner buildings
 - Buildings should be consistent and close to core
 - Buildings setback from sidewalk
 - Compatibility with the Core area
 - Integrity without monoculture
 - Street grid
 - Variety and similar colors
- Additional comments:
 - City should supply specific guidelines
 - Future development / redevelopment should be compatible with existing structures
 - If designed to meet the guidelines, permits should be issued without over-reaching by staff
 - Acceptable Pictures: #1(brick), 3-7
 - #6 – Great textures, cornices, roof and balcony
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #2 – does not look like it belongs
 - #2-6, 8-9, 11 – too linear / modern
 - #4 – too plain / not welcoming
 - #30 – blocks water views from visitor first entering town

2. What has not worked in the “Influence” area?

- Respondents felt that the following things have not worked in this area:
 - 1-story buildings next to taller structures
 - 5-story buildings or any buildings over 3-stories
 - Blank walls
 - Buildings that are not pedestrian-scale
 - Bulky buildings / Massive building footprint
 - Cinder-block
 - Concrete
 - Fake muntins on windows
 - Lack of graceful lines
 - Large, outward-sticking cornices on Harris Square
 - No historical feature represented
 - Pop-outs and turrets
 - Railings on decks – too modern
 - Weird, modern shapes
 - Windows that are too modern or small and square
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Buildings like Banner Bank, Chuckanut Square Building and Haggens do not work
 - Not splitting the blocks between the Core and Influence areas
 - City Planning Department has not established guidelines to build by
 - Design features are inferred and not in code
 - Individual planners influence developers & the public as to their own opinions (which are often absurd)
 - Height limits should be imposed towards the water
 - Parking in front of building
 - Stanello’s could have used a few windows on the south side
 - Vague language does not work
- Additional comments:
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #2 – square blocks, too modern
 - #3 – balconies, windows / finishes look cheap and dated, too tall, block shaped
 - #4 – parapets, roof-line too soft
 - #5 – windows / finishes look cheap and dated, not historic, too tall, block shaped
 - #7 – poor adaptation of craftsman
 - #8 – too tall, block shaped, blank wall, bulk and height
 - #9 – needs historical character, large exposed parking lots, reflects a mausoleum
 - #10 – boring, reflects a mausoleum
 - #11 – no windows, not welcoming, tomb-like, does not represent Fairhaven, reflects a mausoleum

3. If the “Commercial Core” was extended down Harris Ave, what visual design cues should be drawn upon for new construction?

- Respondents felt that the following things should be considered
 - A warehouse design that mimics piers and historic warehouses
 - A welcoming gate
 - Brick buildings of varied bulk fronting the sidewalk
 - Brick / Wood
 - Build right up to the sidewalk
 - Consider using characteristics from the “core area”
 - Good sidewalk interface
 - Historical buildings in the core area
 - Lots of textures with varied features / provide a historic feel
 - Maximum of 3-stories with reasonable height and bulk
 - Nothing higher than 5-stories
 - Pedestrian friendly

- Under-ground power lines
- Wide sidewalks with tree-lines forming a canopy over Harris
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Impose height limits to preserve views / preserve water view corridors
 - Keep the essence of a town that is on the water
 - Maintain the topography going down the hill
 - Provide a range of permitted choices and alternative receiving discretionary review by DRB
 - Thematic unity along Harris – significant extension of the historic district
 - Views from the water and the boardwalk
- Additional comments:
 - #1, 4, and 7 are good examples

4. Do you think the “Influence” area should be subject to design review?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should be** subject to design review.
 - For major features – entries, primary pedestrian locations, signage, roof lines, access points, and windows
 - Need criteria that addresses location / heights adjusted to fit hills

5. Do you think the “Influence” area should have a different type of review than the “Core Historic District”?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should not** have a different type of review.
- Some respondents felt the review process should be the same, but maybe less stringent in what is allowed, less overall design control
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Allow mid-century modern designs
 - Create a unified development ordinance for the entire UVP boundary
 - Divide “influence” area between urban section near the “core” and the working section – consider appropriate design and scale
 - Expand the “core” and “influence” areas around the center
 - Keep attractive, safe and accessible
 - Keep with the design of the “core” area
 - Make a pleasant transition from the Core Historic District
 - Make it human-scale, bike-friendly and encouraging to the community
 - Maintain waterfront view
 - Retain some structure from the 40’s and 50’s era

Approach Area

1. What features, forms and materials do you think work best for new construction in the “Approach” area?

- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **features** for this area include:
 - Good landscaping – more trees / plantings
 - Large open spaces
 - Window proportions on 1st-story retail
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **forms** for this area include:
 - Industrial designs
 - Let industrial buildings appear as such
 - Long warehouses on fish processing piers
 - Shabby old buildings (VW Mechanic’s shop)
- Respondents felt that some of the acceptable **materials** for this area include:
 - Brick / Historic look
 - Brick / Masonry
 - Historical materials that work well with type of industry at the Port
 - Metal
 - Wood
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - All areas should have same features, forms, and materials
 - Create pathways for pedestrians through nature areas
 - Figure out the use of “approach” area – industrial / light-manufacturing
 - Keep a working waterfront area
 - Off-site parking with weekend shuttle to “core”
 - Use all features of the “core”
- Additional comments:
 - Bus / Amtrak Station and the Ferry Cruise Terminal are good examples of what is wanted
 - Good public transport
 - Transition to more “white collar” buildings
 - Acceptable Pictures: #1-2, 7-8
 - #2 - Arches
 - #10 – Industrial roofs
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #1 – “rustic” kind of marine feel does not work
 - #7 – “rustic” kind of marine feel does not work

2. What has not worked in the “Influence” area?

- Respondents felt that the following things have not worked in this area:
 - Blocking Harris view corridor at end (west)
 - Buildings that are taller than 5-stories
 - Chainlink fence
 - Lack of character and well-kept marine area
 - Lack of value along Harris
 - Large bulk buildings and warehouses
 - Most of the buildings in this area
 - No trees or foliage
 - No unification
 - Poor maintenance / no paint
 - Skateboard shop
 - Squared brick of the train station
 - Vacant lots
 - Wood-frame industrial buildings – reaching end of useful life

- Additional comments:
 - Design Review should follow
 - Encourage investments (south of McKenzie)
 - Impose height limits towards the waterfront
 - Keep light-industrial options open
 - Planning Department does not work
 - Prime location for redevelopment
 - Unacceptable Pictures:
 - #2 – windowless, decaying
 - #3-6 – decaying
 - #8 – needs landscaping, shed roof, overly modern
 - #9-11
 - #11 – metal warehouse, overly modern

3. Do you think the “Approach” area should be subject to design review?

- The majority of the respondents felt that this area **should be** subject to design review.
- Some respondents felt that it was necessary but would like the following considered:
 - Design standards should be somewhat relaxed
 - Not too strict
 - Only to provide suggestions for compatibility / articulation
 - Only for major elements – entries and pedestrian interface
 - Waterfront should have same regulations of the “core”

4. Should the review be different from the Core and National Historic District or “Influence” areas?

- Some respondents felt that this area **should not have** a different type of review.
 - The review criteria for the core should extend to the waterfront and include the docks.
 - Should not be as stringent.
- Some respondents felt that this area **should have** a different type of review.
 - Provide list of permitted palette and advise on all other components
 - Assure similarity of scale and use – not materials or looks
- Respondents would also like the following to be considered:
 - Allow less historical influence – but keep in character with “core” and “influence” areas
 - Do not allow City Planner opinions
 - Emphasize pedestrian, bike and public-friendly transportation / mobility
 - Establish design guidelines – grant approval if they are met
 - Encourage dock and pier type development in industrial areas – mechanical and arch features
 - Encourage view toward the historical setting – DO NOT require it
 - Landscaping should be attractive
 - Most historical uses were oriented towards the waterfront industry – this should be maintained through code guidelines governing buildings
 - No neon signs, chain shops, or tacky stuff
 - Preserve the Native American historical uses focused on water access to “core” through beach access
 - Signage
 - Significant development should be added to “core” or subject to historic review
 - Under-ground power lines
 - View corridors down Harris should extend to water
 - Waterfront should include historical regulations related to water views and waterfront access

Comments

- A local historic district, if possible, would be a good step
- All three areas should have a historical area design code – the code must be clear and enforceable
- Angled parking does not work
- Avoid overcrowding (use setbacks) and monotony of street scape – work to achieve human-scale
- Buildings with brick and wood facades should be encouraged (concrete and stucco looks out of place)
- Consider building height minimums and maximums – also FAR
- Do not let parking / auto-centrism impinge on historic character
- Downtown Fairhaven has become a successful business area because of the core historic buildings
- Effort should be made to preserve the historic buildings
- Historical buildings and design review is what has made Fairhaven a commercial success for tourists
- “Influence” and “Approach” areas should be combined and have the same code
- Keep out cheap looking materials and franchise-based designs
- Maintain on-street parking – perhaps add adjacent parking outside the “core” area
- Maintaining the atmosphere is key to the continued prosperity of that area
- Need Design Review Board – maybe same one that does downtown
- Preserve current views and view corridors
- Possibly a point system to earn design requirements, like Santa Fe
- Sign regulations are good – nothing lighted or flashy / no electronic or moving signs
- The zoning should be divided:
 - One for the “core” – strict design review should be established
 - One for the “influence” area
 - One for multi-family and single-family