

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Bret Maddox, S.E., *Vice Chair*
Katie Chase
Edward Echte
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: September 12, 2012
Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

LPC 73/12

Commission Members in Attendance:

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Bret Maddox, S.E., *Vice Chair*
Ross Buffington
Katie Chase
Ken House
Jonah Jensen
Megan Luce
Marshall McClintock
Daniel Rahe
Duke York

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Denise Rakas
Jana Magoon

Others Present:

Seth Dowland, Adam Raygor, Mr. Raygor,
Dan Swanberg, Carol Magelssen

Commission Members Absent:

Commissioner Edward Echte

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

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioner Edward Echte was excused.

B. Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes of June 20, June 27, July 25, and August 8, 2012 were approved.

C. Administrative Approvals

The Administrative Review Summary listing projects approved from July 14 through September 5, 2012 were accepted.

2. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1610 North 6th Street (North Slope)

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the Staff Report into the record as follows.

Built in 1907, this front facing 1 ½ story home is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District. The current proposal is to remove the existing wood (5" lap siding) siding on the rear and south (alley) elevations and install 5" smooth Hardie Plank. The original existing trim and windows will be retained.

The request is due to failing paint and siding on the weather sides of the house. The owner consulted with two painting contractors, both of whom recommend replacement of the siding, as a professional paint job might last three to five years on the existing siding due to its condition.

The owner also consulted with a siding contractor, who estimated that 10% of the siding has failed due to cracking and about 50% significantly deteriorated on the south elevation, and on the rear elevation about 20% of the siding has failed and about 75% has deteriorated.

The owner explained that the siding and paint deterioration is not due to exterior moisture buildup but as a result of years of subpar maintenance and weather exposure.

In addition, the owner wrote in the application, "... in-kind wood siding is not feasible because of the cost and availability [lack of] high quality cedar and, new wood siding is less dense than the existing wood siding."

The applicant indicates that there will be minimal visual change to the appearance of the two affected elevations.

The original siding will be retained on the other two elevations.

North Slope Historic Special Review 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.

Analysis to be considered.

1. Built in 1907, this bungalow, located at 1610 N 6th Street, is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. 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 per TMC 13.05.047, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. The existing five inch lap siding is proposed for removal on the south alley and rear elevations because of lack of proper maintenance, decay, and weather damage due to exposure; the existing siding does exhibit damage, which is shown in photos submitted with the application and, is based on professional assessments showing 10 to 20% of siding failure (water moisture) and 50 to 75% deterioration.
4. The installation of five-inch Hardieplank horizontal smooth siding on other properties has been approved by the Commission.
5. The new siding will be installed on secondary elevations, on the rear and side alley elevations, which are less visible from Sixth Street.

6. The ability to match the existing wood lapped siding with inkind materials was considered by the new property owner, however, due to the extent of the siding needing replacement, its cost and the availability (lack of) of wood siding that exactly matches the existing wood, the proposal is for replacement, which appears to meet North Slope Historic Special Review District Guideline # 6, specifically, for, "*Us [ing] compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings, ...sided with shingles or lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths...*"

Staff recommended approval of the analysis as findings and recommended approval of the proposal by the Commission.

Mr. Seth Dowland, Property Owner, offered that the wood material would double the cost of the project and showed a sample of the proposed Hardie Plank material.

Commissioner Marshall McIntock commented that the North Slope Neighborhood association has always taken the position of not using Hardie Plank material particularly on visible elevations; he recognized the proposal is on secondary elevations and noted the elevation is somewhat visible from the alley.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the proposal for removal and replacement of siding on the rear and south elevations on the property located at 1610 North 6th Street"

MOTION: York
SECOND: Maddox
MOTION: Carried

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated that the written decision will be forthcoming.

3. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 1509 North 10th Street (North Slope Historic Special Review District)

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented the Staff Report and explained that a design review application is not submitted prior to a variance application decision. He stated that Jana Magoon, Land Use Administrator received a request for reconsideration on the recent denial of the variance request for a rear deck and stairs at 1509 North 10th Street, which is a contributing property located in the North Slope Historic Special Review District.

He stated that Ms. Jana Magoon is seeking feedback regarding the historic character of the neighborhood and the effect of the proposed exterior stair on the surrounding area. He noted correspondence, a copy of the decision, and context photographs are included with the weekly packet and no action is requested at this time.

Ms. Magoon commented that the project appeared to have merit, however, the denial was based on the character of the project on the neighborhood; the applicant requested re-consideration and submitted additional information including drawings and samples of similar projects in the neighborhood. She is asking the Commission for feedback on the type of proposed stair and deck as appropriate within the historic North Slope community. She emphasized that the scope is very narrow, asking for feedback on what the applicant has proposed shown in the re-submittal documents

Property Owner Adam Raygor stated that the 1920 home has always been a multifamily home; he is currently residing there and renting it, with the only access to the house from the alley; one purpose for the project is to provide better access for his grandmother other than the interior steep, narrow staircase and for an additional entrance to the home. He offered that he is open to the Commission's view and will build what is recommended.

He further explained that the landscape on the side of house will help to conceal the staircase (from the street) and the variance request is due to the small lot size of 43' X 50'.

Commissioner Duke York verified the small lot size, access from the alley, and the house is zoned for a duplex.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock commented that the North Slope Historic District Neighborhood Association submitted a letter that was after the comment deadline; he stated the association was opposed to granting of the variance because the stair was depicted as too large with the deck, and it was all visible from the front façade.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock explained the history of some of these houses that are now sitting in alleyways; some homes were originally constructed in other locations before the area was platted and the streets were installed so, a few houses were moved around where they fit best, resulting in placement on the alleys.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock then stated that the reason the association opposed the project is based on the North Slope Historic Special Review District design guidelines and given the relevance from the front of the house, the original design proposed would be inappropriate.

Vice Chair Bret Maddox asked for clarification on whether a stairway had previously been in that location. Property Owner Mr. Adam Raygor explained this was a new exterior staircase and there is an existing interior stairway. Mr. Raygor commented that the submitted picture does not reflect the new design submitted (re-consideration) and re-stated that he would construct anything the Commission wanted, including staircases that he submitted photo samples of and are located in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Duke York provided clarification on the role of the Commission, which is to review proposals and not design the projects; further, the Commission must base their review of proposals based on the design guidelines criteria rather than on projects in the neighborhood that were most likely constructed prior to the designation of the district.

Mr. Adam Raygor's father commented that he and his son recognize the existing stair and deck are too big, which he explained was partially built prior to the request for a variance application. He referenced the proposed new design, highlighting the copy of the Lowe's schematic with just a landing and staircase.

Commissioner Ken House asked for clarification on the process (on the current denial decision on the variance and reconsideration) and the Commission providing potential comments and feedback on a design at this time, and, he expressed concern about providing support for a design prior to a formal design review application submittal.

Ms. Magoon explained the variance process including the current denial, reconsideration, appeals and hearings.

Mr. Reuben McKnight described the request of the Commission, covering feedback on the basic concept of the design and the details (i.e. balusters, riser, etc) can be taken care of at later date in the design review application process; he continued stating that the feedback can be on the characteristics of the design, such as details that can help with blending into the neighborhood, and concerns such as expressed previously about the project's visibility, and if, the size can be reduced, and the use of vegetation as a possible mitigating factor.

Commissioner Ken House asked about Attachment A-1 on the Lowe's schematics, which shows a landing and stairs but, no dimensions are listed.

Commissioner Megan Luce commented that the existing partially built stair/deck was not appropriate because of its high visibility, therefore, it appears to modify the historic building. There was discussion on the vegetation and possibility of reducing the visibility and concern expressed that the vegetation would not always be there.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock commented that a similar project might be acceptable on the rear in some situations, however in this specific location, the distance required to build away from the electrical service and design guidelines emphasis on front facades, this is not an acceptable design to approve.

There were brief comments that the façade is an issue and the potential that the rear doors were installed without design review.

Ms. Jana Magoon made final comments thanking the Commission for their feedback.

Additional comments were made about the installation of the rear doors without design review approval by the present owner and any future applications would include this alteration to the house as a retroactive item.

NOTE: Chair Mark McIntire requested recusal from the subsequent briefing item, 1239 East 54th St, and delegated the item to Vice Chair Bret Maddox.

B. 1239 East 54th Street – J.M. Hendrickson Homestead

Vice Chair Bret Maddox introduced the agenda item and asked Mr. Reuben McKnight to read the Staff Report into the record.

Mr. Reuben McKnight reviewed the Staff Report as follows.

This is a request for feedback regarding a potential proposal to short plat and develop a portion of agricultural open space that is part of a homestead listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. Because of its current status as a City Landmark, presently any development on the site is subject to approval by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. However, a short plat does not require the approval of the Commission.

On November 29, 2011, the 3.78 acre J.M. Hendrickson Homestead was placed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The nomination included the house, garage, barn, site and historic landscaping, and was based on the following criteria:

- Criterion A, for its association with events contributing to broad patterns of Tacoma's history, specifically, the family retaining original ownership of the homestead and, as part of the third wave of Scandinavian immigrants, arriving in 1905, and before 1913 traveled by rail to Tacoma; in addition, Mr. Hendrickson was a Northern Pacific railroad engineer.]
- Criterion C, for its intact vernacular architecture, 'Craftsman inspired' house style, 1940s garage, and original barn, site and historic landscaping; and,
- Criterion F, for its unique location, situated on upper McKinley Hill within an urban environment, and working homestead landscape, with garden and livestock for most of its existence. In addition, the landscape is also included in the nomination for its continuation as a working landscape with a garden and livestock for most of its existence alongside an urban environment situated on upper McKinley Hill, five blocks from the streetcar line, and two blocks from the transit line on Portland Avenue.

At this time, the owner wishes to change the boundaries of the landmark designation for the purpose of selling a portion of the property in order to develop the parcel. According to the owner, this request is due to unexpected financial difficulties.

The purpose of the briefing is for the owner and developer to provide information on the proposal and to request feedback from the Commission regarding two options for shortplating: one that keeps approximately 1.4 acres of property with the original home and outbuildings, and a second that keeps 1.75 acres intact. Staff has discussed both options with the property owner and the developer.

Enclosed is a cover memo, boundary options, a copy of the nomination and Tacoma Municipal Code 13.07. *Standards to be considered.*

Because this is a proposal to develop open space on a historic homestead, it is an unusual situation.

Staff seeks guidance from the Commission on the most appropriate path to proceed with this proposal, if the Commission feels that it is an acceptable proposal.

Below are some possible paths to proceed:

1. De-list a portion of the property for redevelopment according to the rescission process in the code, thus eliminating its historic status and design review requirements. The code does not make a provision for de-listing properties partially or for boundary changes; however the rescission process is the only process in the code that is similar to the request.
2. De-list all of the property using the same process as above (for instance, if the loss of the open space causes the property to lose its historic significance)
3. Amend the designation boundaries administratively. The Commission could consider exempting in whole or in part design review on the new parcels.
4. Keep the designation intact and require design review on the new construction. This option lacks some assurances for the property owner and developer as to what would be considered appropriate or allowable by the Commission.

Mr. Reuben McKnight added that he briefly discussed this request with the City's legal department; he explained the existing rescission process is thorough with a public hearing, etc., which is the direct path for this request; he noted there is discretion for the Commission to provide direction.

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated that this is a briefing for feedback both on the proposal to develop a portion of the historic property, and also regarding process. No action is requested.

Mr. Dan Swanberg, HTMW owner, presented the property owner's request, which was due to financial and health reasons. He explained that prior to knowing fully about the historic landmark designation, his view on short plat was the most efficient process for this property, however, he is asking for the Commission's feedback.

Commissioner Ken House stated that during the nomination process of the property, he felt the house and outbuildings met the criteria (for designation) without the landscape. His observation is the nomination did include the surrounding property and was voted on as one package and, it was particularly unique because of the property.

Commissioner Ken House continued to pose questions and comments, including 1) the design review process is based on an agricultural landscape if a development application is submitted and, 2) the design review would be the about the impact of the proposed change to the historic landscape.

Mr. Reuben McKnight commented that the Secretary of Interior's Standards would apply to review permits as an agricultural open space and include the determination of what guidance would be provided by the Commission to a developer.

Mr. Dan Sandburg reviewed the available options for the property based on retaining the structures within the historical designation and reconfiguring the boundary.

Vice Chair Bret Maddox stated his support to retain the designated property as large as possible and did not oppose short platting, however, he expressed concern there is no previous process to follow, and the precedent for future rescissions. He observed that one view is to process a rescission of the entire nomination and re-application of a smaller area.

Commissioner Ken House was in agreement to retain as much of the property as possible; he stated he was not particularly opposed to shortplat, but was troubled by the process and justification of designation eligibility. He asked for information on amending the boundary administratively.

Mr. Reuben McKnight described the Commission's component, which is to decide what is acceptable to retain in landscape status, approving or moving forward w/shortplat, and to work out the issues as they come up. He stated that a partial delisting is similar to boundary adjustment, identifying property around the house and the barn instead of declaring each square inch is important to the designation but, rather to retain the look and feel that conveys that story.

Vice Chair Bret Maddox noted the City does not have farmstead review guidelines.

Mr. Dan Swanberg talked about the option of leaving the property all in designation and to come up with how to bring value to the lots.

Commissioner Duke York commented that the property is designated historical significance as a landmark and it (landmark status) doesn't change because of the owner's financial issues. He stated that we (Commission) need to deal with that issue and define it with more specific criteria and to do so before subplotting.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock stated financial hardship documents would need to be reviewed and decided upon by the Commission before rescission is decided. He talked about the fact that nothing changed to the house and property and it was appropriate the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommended it to the historic register; he commented that there is no reason to take it off the register to do these other things (i.e. development), no justification has been made to remove the property from the register.

Reuben McKnight talked about economic hardship findings and a provision of economic hardship in the rescission code; he noted that the Commission can make an appropriate decision, if there is no code to provide the detail.

Commissioner Megan Luce stated that this is a tough situation by being the only homestead on the Register, she talked about not setting a pattern of rescission and to review financial hardship as a first step.

Mr. Reuben McKnight put forward an option for discussion, with the largest amount of property retained, would the Commission consider a residential development proposal of part of the property, including the detail of how to review the proposed houses.

Commissioner Duke York posed, how the Commission digests putting houses in agricultural open space? Commissioner Ken House noted that barns, outhouses, and chicken coops are elements that typically do not survive, and that he was torn because the proposal does preserve those elements.

Commissioner Jonah Jensen reminded the Commission about the nomination's narrative discussing a family homestead on McKinley that does not go the way of other homesteads.

Mr. Dan Swanberg asked if there is a way that the square footage can be established so the criteria can be retained on the original parcel?

Vice Chair Bret Maddox stated that each situation on property is different.

There was discussion on ownership of a historic landmark and if ownership changes, does it initiate changes to the designation; it was explained that historic designation and design review are retained.

Mr. Reuben McKnight reviewed the photos of the property and structures on the property. He asked if the Commission would find it helpful to visit the property.

Commissioner Katie Chase commented that she would not necessarily support construction on the site whether it was subdivided (or not).

Commissioner Ross Buffington offered that there are three rescission criteria and it appears that economic hardship could be the only criteria applied for, in this case, noting the difficulty in altering the nomination because the landscape was included in the nomination.

Vice Chair Bret Maddox summarized the discussion as follows: It appears there is fairly strong resistance to new construction because the surrounding landscape portion is included in the designation; there does not appear to be full support to allow for rescission under the current criteria.

Ms. Carol Magelssen stated that the land has not been used as a farm since 1994; the land is overgrown and not an open field; she asked about the term "open space." She stated that she decided to designate the property as a landmark because she wanted to save her house; she noted the receipt of nuisance complaints from the City of Tacoma and the difficulty to pay the fines because of the overgrown fields.

Mr. McKnight provided clarification that the use of the term, open space, in this discussion is not for current tax use designation but, rather open space is used as a common general word term.

Commissioner Ken House talked about the possible circumstance of having difficulty to maintain historic structures resulting in financial hardship and potentially, in this case, with agricultural land, the challenge to maintain the land in a state the City is requiring. Then he posed whether the agricultural designation criteria can result in financial hardship.

Commissioner Daniel Raye commented on amending the designation when the entire property is included in the designation; he continued by noting, agricultural open land regulations are not in place and farmland is not necessarily a goal of the Commission.

Mr. Reuben McKnight talked about the application of Secretary of Interior's Standards with open space, which will recommend to keep it (property) open; he talked about the fact there has been no analysis of what the designation would be, if the property was reduced in size.

There was a brief discussion on not having precedent for amending landmark listings in the City of Tacoma and the challenge of understanding the cultural value of maintaining the entire property as a historic site.

The Commission agreed to schedule a site visit to the property.

5. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

Mr. Reuben McKnight distributed the latest edition of the Wedge and North Slope Historic Special Review District and Conservation guidelines. He asked for feedback on the guidelines as a reflection of the Commission's design review and decision process.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock announced the next meeting of the North Slope Historic Special Review District was scheduled to review the draft.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer