

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Bret Maddox, S.E., *Vice Chair*
Katie Chase
Edward Echtle
Ken House
Jonah Jensen
Megan Luce
Daniel Rahe
Duke York

Ross Buffington, Wedge Neighborhood Ex-Officio
Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
Tonie Cook, Landmarks Coordinator



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: August 8, 2012

LPC 69/12

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Commission Members in Attendance:

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Bret Maddox, S.E., *Vice Chair*
Ross Buffington
Katie Chase
Edward Echtle
Ken House
Jonah Jensen
Daniel Rahe
Duke York

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook
Tom Rutherford

Others Present:

Jeff Fraychineaud, Joy Caddock

Commission Members Absent:

Commissioners Megan Luce and Marshall McClintock

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioners Megan Luce and Marshall McClintock were excused.

B. Administrative Approvals

The Administrative Review Summary listing projects approved from July 14, 2012 through August 2, 2012 were accepted.

2. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Murray Morgan Bridge

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented the Staff Report. He stated that the Murray Morgan Bridge is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places; it is an early example of a vertical lift bridge, with a high deck and sloping grade in which, in December 2009, the City took over ownership, operation, and maintenance.

He noted the previous reviews by the Commission, including on March 23, 2011, the approval of the color scheme to paint the bridge black and retain unpainted, the aluminum truss over the lift span. On August 24, 2011, an update on the Murray Morgan Bridge improvements was presented.

Mr. Tom Rutherford, City of Tacoma Public Works Engineer, explained that the current proposal is to paint the counterweights and install letter signage on the counterweights, including "City of Tacoma" and "Port of Tacoma" which is similar to the signage shown in the ca 1915 historic photos.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation to be considered.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Staff Analysis to be considered.

1. Built in 1913, Murray Morgan Bridge, formerly the 11th Street Bridge, is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places. It is an early example of a center span lift bridge, with a high deck and sloping grade, and is the only bridge of its kind in Washington State.

2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this property, including new construction per TMC 13.05.047, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.

3. The two proposed new letter signs appear to have been an original signage feature on the counterweights, as shown in the historic photo ca. 1915, thus meeting Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation # 6, specifically, for, "...*Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*" The historical photo dated ca 1915 shows historical lettering on the counterweights.

4. The current option for the proposed signage color is Mount St Helens gray as submitted by applicant at the August 2, 2012 Commission meeting, which may appear to meet Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for appropriate methods affecting historic features.

Staff recommended adoption of the above analysis as findings, and deferred recommendation to the Commission pending the proposed signage color sample submitted at this Commission meeting.

Mr. Tom Rutherford corrected the signage size to 4' in width and 6' in height; he stated that the signage proposal recommended by a City Councilmember was for both signs as shown in the submittal packet; he circulated a color sample of the Mount St Helens gray planned for the counterweights and lettering.

Commissioner Duke York asked about the direction of the signs when installed.

Mr. Tom Rutherford explained that the sign for the Port would be placed on the west side and City of Tacoma (sign) on the east face, which are the directions when in transit.

There was clarification the letter sign type was without shadows and a recommendation was made by Commissioners to paint the edge of the letters black.

In addition, Mr. Tom Rutherford provided clarification, there was no additional lighting planned on the top of the bridge.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the analysis as findings and approve the counterweights and application of the lettering as submitted, including an advisory to edge the lettering in black, on the Murray Morgan Bridge"

MOTION: Echtle
SECOND: York
MOTION: Carried

The recommendation to include the advisory to edge the lettering in black was an acceptable motion amendment by Commissioners Ed Echle and Duke York.

B. 511 North K Street (North Slope Special Review Historic District)

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented the Staff Report stating that the existing detached carport structure and multi-family apartment building are noncontributing structures located at 511 North K Street in the North Slope Historic Special Review District. He reported this current application, to construct a new detached 32' X 20' garage at the rear of the property in the location of the existing non historic detached carport area and proposed materials and design, includes a gable 8:12 pitch roof, bevel siding, one North elevation man door, an overhead garage door on the East elevation; board and batten on the east and west elevations' upper gable areas with one vent in the gable area on the west side.

North Slope Historic Special Review Historic District Guidelines to be considered.

1. Height. Goal: Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. In the rehabilitation of existing buildings, the present height of the structure should remain intact. New buildings should step down to be comparable in height to adjacent structures.
2. Scale. Goal: Relate the size and proportion of new buildings to those of the neighborhood. Scale refers to a building's comparative relationship to neighboring structures, and its fit within the district. Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings, and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations. Scale is also determined by the proportions of the architectural elements within the composition of the individual building facades. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.
5. Roof Shapes and Materials. Goal: Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing Pivotal, Primary, and Secondary buildings where such elements are visible from the street. Typically, the existing, historic buildings in the neighborhood either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more, and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way, or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower. Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or widow's walks, to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.
6. Exterior Materials. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope Neighborhood were sided with shingles, or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco-covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.
9. Parking. Goal: Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Most early houses provided space for storing various means of transportation, from horses and carriages to automobiles;

however, these structures were nearly always entered from the alley rather than from the street...Setting garages and carport structures back from the front of the building reduces their visual importance.

Staff Analysis to be considered.

1. Modifications to the existing apartment building are exempt from design review as it is a non contributing structure located in the North Slope Historic Special Review District.
2. On February 18, 2012, the Commission discussed the proposed new construction of a detached accessory garage structure on a noncontributing property and requested design review for the purpose of consistency in design for the new structure.
3. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, new construction at this property per TMC 13.05.047, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its location within the North Slope Historic Special Review District.
4. The new garage is proposed on the rear elevation of the property as a detached structure, which will be visible from the alley. The structure will be located on the rear of the property allowing entry from the alley, which meets the North Slope Historic District Guideline number 9, *Parking, specifically for, "Minimize [ing] views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Most early houses provided space for storing various means of transportation, from horses and carriages to automobiles; however, these structures were nearly always entered from the alley rather than from the street...Setting garages and carport structures back from the front of the building reduces their visual importance".*
5. The proposed new garage with a height of 16 feet appears to meet North Slope Historic District Guideline number 1, Height, specifically for "...*New buildings should step down to be comparable in height to adjacent structures*".
6. The garage proposal appears to meet North Slope Historic District Guideline number 2, Scale, for "...*relate [ing] the size and proportion of new buildings to those of the neighborhood. Scale refers to a building's comparative relationship to neighboring structures, and its fit within the district...*"
7. The proposed gable roof with a 8:12 roof pitch meets North Slope Historic District Guideline number 5 for Roof Shapes and Materials with the goal of, "...*between 5:12 to 12:12...*"; the proposed building is not the primary structure on the property and it is located on the rear of the property which reduces its visibility.
8. The materials proposed for the garage, including bevel siding and some board and batten in two upper gable areas, appear to be compatible with traditional materials in the Historic District and meets North Slope Historic District Guideline number 6, Exterior Materials, specifically for, "...*New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood...*"

Staff recommended adopting the above as findings and approval by the Commission.

Property owner Mr. Jeff Fraychineaud commented that the materials on the exterior will be consistent with the main building on the property.

Mr. Reuben McKnight reviewed the previous recommendation by the Commission, which was to remove the building as a contributing building (to the historic district), resulting in noncontributing status.

Commissioner Duke York talked about the previous site visit on the property and commented that the proposal improves the property and neighborhood.

There was a motion.

I move that we, the Landmark Preservation Commission, approve the removal of the existing structure and approve the new garage construction proposal as submitted at property at 511 North K Street.

MOTION: York
SECOND: Jensen
MOTION: Carried

Chair Mark McIntire noted the written approval will be issued within the next few days.

C. 817 North I Street (North Slope Special Review Historic District)

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented the Staff Report stating that the property at 817 N I Street was constructed in 1890 and is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. He reported on the 2009 approval by the Commission to install shingle siding and stucco with half-timbers on the front façade. He explained that the current proposal is to remove the existing dilapidated rear second level porch and stairs and, in the same footprint area, replace it with an enclosed porch on the second level and potentially on the ground level or open on the ground level as an alternative option. He added, the new stairs will be constructed on the rear side elevation and, the proposal's purpose is to increase kitchen and livable space.

Additional information that he reviewed, follows:

The proposed hip roof pitch will match the existing (4/12) main portion of the house; painted cedar shakes matching the existing; Jeld-wen (or similar manufacturer) aluminum clad wood double hung and casement windows; a wood exterior door and one exterior French door will be installed on the ground level; window trim will match the existing window trim.

He noted the supplemental photos submitted by the applicant for this meeting.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting

On August 1, 2012, the property owners presented the plans to the Architectural Review Committee. Attendance included Chair Mark McIntire, and Commissioners Marshall McClintock, Ed Echtle and Ross Buffington, staff members Reuben McKnight and Tonie Cook.

Meeting comments, observations, and recommendations follow:

- 1) The owners presented a plan to replace an existing two level porch with an enclosed two level porch in the same footprint. An alternative showed the lower (ground) level left open.
- 2) Concern was expressed regarding the visibility, from I Street right-of-way, of the proposed side rear staircase and comment was made that the more typical location for stairs is on the rear. However, due to topography and space limitations, the owner would like to place the stairs on the side.
- 3) A suggestion was made to provide photos showing the views from I Street to determine whether the proposed stairs would be highly visible or not.
- 4) A recommendation for landscaping treatment on the side rear where and if the stairs are located on the side elevation.
- 5) A preference for enclosed walls on both levels was expressed.
- 6) If the lower level is left open, a suggestion was made to leave the braces (gussets) exposed and not covered with panelized materials.
- 7) A suggestion was made to provide photos on the rear of the house showing the backyard area.
- 8) It was noted that the house has been significantly modified many times, including during the historic period, and was likely originally a Victorian style.

North Slope Historic Special Review Historic District Guidelines to be considered.

6. Exterior Materials. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope Neighborhood were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.

Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.

9. Additional Construction. Goal: Sensitive locate additions, penthouses, buildings systems equipment, or roof-mounted structures to allow the architectural and historical qualities of the contributing building to be dominant. While additions to contributing buildings in historic districts are not discouraged, they should be located to conceal them from view from the public right-of-way. Some new additions, such as the reconstruction of missing porches or the addition of dormers in the roof, may need to be located on the front facade of the building. When an addition is proposed for the front of the building, appropriate and sensitive designs for such modifications should follow the guidelines for scale, massing, rhythm, and materials.

Staff Analysis to be considered.

1. The home on the property is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it was constructed in 1890. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building including new construction per TMC 13.05.047, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. The house had been altered including the installation of asbestos siding and vinyl windows and removal of a one or two story front bay during the 1950s; gable roof beams were added, possibly at the same time. In 2009, the Commission approved the installation of half-timbers and stucco on the upper front façade.
4. On August 1, 2012, the Architectural Review Committee reviewed the proposed plan for an enclosed or non enclosed two story replacement addition and rear side staircase. The preference was for a two-story enclosed addition and concern expressed on visibility of a side rear staircase.
5. The current proposal to remove a dilapidated two story rear porch structure and stairs and install a new one or two story enclosed porch area with cladding to match the existing cedar shingles meets *North Slope Historic Special Review District Guideline #6*, Exterior materials, for "...*Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials...*"
6. The proposal to match existing aluminum-clad wood double hung and casement windows appears to meet *North Slope Historic Special Review District Guideline #6*, Exterior materials, for "...*Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials...*" The Commission has approved new materials in traditional styles on newly constructed additions.
7. The proposed side rear staircase will be minimally visible due to topography, location and landscaping; therefore, it appears to meet *North Slope Historic Special Review District Guideline #8*, which states: *While additions to contributing buildings in historic districts are not discouraged, they should be located to conceal them from view from the public rights-of-way.*

Staff recommended adoption of the analysis as findings and recommended approval of the application as submitted.

Ms. Joy Caddock pointed out with the use of supplemental photos, that the house comes out about two feet into the side yard and the new stairs are about three feet wide, therefore about 1' of the stairs will be visible.

There was clarification on the side yard setback of about ten feet which is shown on the plot plan.

There was a motion:

I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the analysis as findings and approve the Architectural Review Committee recommendations and the proposal as submitted on the property at 817 North I Street"

MOTION: House

SECOND: Jensen

MOTION: Carried

Chair Mark McIntire stated the written decision will be forthcoming.

3. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Mark McIntire noted there were several items included in the Commission's meeting packets, including a letter to University of Washington Tacoma concerning the Prairie Line Trail.

4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. City of Tacoma Building Codes, Homeowner Information

Mr. Phillip Hill who is a former Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commissioner and historic property owner described his recent emergency work due to a sewer backup. He talked about properties built prior to current code and emphasized it was the responsibility of owners to understand the code. He said the City has an informational brochure for the public. He stressed the importance of providing this information to homeowners for environmental and expense reasons.

5. BOARD BUSINESS

A. Draft Wedge and North Slope Design Guidelines

Mr. Reuben McKnight reported that the 2012 work program includes the update to the existing design guidelines for Wedge and North Slope Historic Special Review Districts. He stated the guidelines had not been changed since the mid-1990s and that before the 2011 code amendment, the review was cumbersome because the guidelines remained in the ordinance.

He described the approach, which is to take the intent of the guidelines and make them easier to use based on typical kinds of projects; to make them consistent with and to incorporate the Secretary of Interior's Standards; and, to reflect more accurately the conventions the Commission operates under in certain types of projects.

He commented that he has been working with North Slope Ex-Officio Marshall McClintock and expects

additional feedback and suggestions on the draft from the Commission. He noted the addition of a policy statement on historic preservation and sustainability. He stated that the draft had intact language from the existing guidelines, Section 3 is for existing property and there is a section on new construction. He stated key issues include windows and retrofit, siding, exterior materials and garages; he commented on the inclusion of a reference to Public Works Construction Standards for driveways as well as including exemptions from design review. He added, the draft is currently at 17 pages (from about 30 pages) and is offered for review by the Commission.

Mr. Reuben McKnight talked about proceeding with public outreach in the North Slope and Wedge neighborhoods as part of the process in moving towards the public hearing in December; the Commission supported this idea.

He talked about the draft document; specifically needing review for meeting neighborhood objectives; I addition, for meeting the level of understandability and usefulness from the homeowner's perspective as well as the Commission and, the construction and design perspectives. He added, the document is meant to guide the Commission in decision-making but, it is also a guide to provide homeowners with a fair sense of what to expect if designing a project.

Commissioner Ross Buffington, Ex-Officio for Wedge Neighborhood, stated his support to get together with residents about the draft document.

B. Discussion on Rescission

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented information on past and current procedures in place to remove properties from the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, which currently can be initiated by a property owner or by the Commission. He described two examples of individually landmark buildings that may possibly be likely candidates considered for removal by the Commission; he talked about Staff recommendations for removal and having clear specific descriptions regarding the property's loss of landmark eligibility criteria.

Commissioners emphasized limiting the situation to individually listed properties versus properties within historic districts.

Commissioner Ross Buffington conveyed the August 1, 2012 Architectural Review Committee's discussion, including his agreement with North Slope Ex-Oficio Marshall McClintock, that the process be specific to individually listed properties and to use an approach of strict caution in any rescission decision approved by the Commission.

Mr. Reuben McKnight talked about recommendations that are appropriate to be initiated by the Commission and the difference versus a request filed by a property owner. He talked about staff advising property owners and the opportunity to batch together several properties to move forward as a group.

Commissioner Ken House talked about components of the current procedures, specifically, when owners must demonstrate "Undue Economic Hardship" and suggested a future review to tighten up and/or provide interpretation of hardship.

Commissioner Duke York talked about economic hardship as not being about the historic property but about the situation of the property owners.

Vice Chair Bret Maddox commented that the least expensive route is to not make the expense and through deterioration, the property becomes an economic hardship. He also made additional comments, including requests for economic hardship justification on elective projects such as new additions and, not for routine maintenance projects.

There were additional comments made about undue economic hardship including there is no provision to

excuse items such as ADA or electrical code compliance

Mr. Reuben McKnight summarized the discussion by recommending a review at a future meeting to provide clarification on the definition of economic hardship in preparation of the next code amendment review by the Planning Commission. He added that the background on this portion of the code was developed by a consulting group and was part of an ongoing debate in the 2010-2011 code review.

C. Other

Commissioner Ken House made a brief comment on England's value added tax refund procedures on historic preservation properties.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer