

Members

Ken House, *Chair*
Edward Echtle, *Vice Chair*
Katie Chase
Jonah Jensen
Megan Luce
Daniel Rahe
James Steel
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 Planning and Development Services Department

Date: June 12, 2013

LPC 55 /13

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ken House *Chair*
Edward Echtle, *Vice Chair*
Ross Buffington
Katie Chase
Jonah Jensen
Megan Luce
Marshall McClintock
Daniel Rahe
Duke York

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook
Amy McBride
Sue Coffman
Jim Duggan
Ryan Erickson

Others Present:

Rich Mullen
Michael Sullivan

Commission Members Absent:

Commissioner James Steel

Chair Ken House called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioner James Steel was excused.

B. Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes of May 8, 2013 were approved.

C. Administrative Approvals

The Administrative Review Summary listing projects approved from May 2013, through June 6, 2013 were accepted.

2. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1003 North Grant (North Slope)

Ms. Tonie Cook read the staff report into the record as follows.

Built in 1923 this bungalow is a contributing structure located in the North Slope Historic Special Review District. The current proposal is a retroactive application for the removal of three double hung wood windows and replacement with two vinyl insert windows; the third vinyl window is not installed at this time. A stop work order was issued because of working without a permit.

The application also includes the replacement of one non-historic opaque louver vent-type window with a vinyl single hung insert window, which would typically be an administrative review.

Tonie Cook met onsite with Mr. Mundell who reported the original windows were thrown away and described the condition of those windows:

- 1) the right double-hung window had missing glass in the lower sash due to the location of an air conditioner and the upper sash was missing with a board covering that space.
- 2) The condition of the lower sashes on the other two windows were both in a deteriorated to a point of falling apart in his hands and beyond repair and, the two upper sashes were about 50% gone.

Tonie Cook recommended Mr. Mundell obtain an estimate to install replacement wood windows.

Action Requested: Retroactive approval of removal of three double-hung wood windows and replacement with vinyl insert windows, retaining the wood trim; removal and replacement of one opaque vent bathroom window

STANDARDS

Guidelines for the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhood Historic Districts

General Preservation Principles

2. **Retain original materials.** The historic materials present on historic buildings should be retained wherever feasible.
3. **Repair before replacement.** Historic materials should be maintained and repaired when needed, including maintaining proper weather protection. Where repair is needed, it is desirable to remove as small an amount of material as possible.
4. **Replacement in kind.** If replacement of a historic feature or material is unavoidable, they should be replaced in kind with a visual and material match whenever possible.

Windows

Windows are a character defining feature of a historic home, reflecting both the time period of construction, the materials and craftsmanship of an era, and the architectural style of a building.

1. **Preserve Existing Historic Windows.** Existing historic windows in good working order should be maintained on historic homes in the district. The existing wood windows exhibit craftsmanship and carpentry methods in use at the time that the neighborhood was developed. New manufactured windows, even those made of wood, generally do not exhibit these characteristics.
2. **Repair Original Windows Where Possible.** Original wood windows that are in disrepair should be repaired if feasible. The feasibility of different approaches depends on the condition, estimated cost, and total project scope. Examples of substandard conditions that do not necessarily warrant replacement include: failed glazing compound, broken glass panes, windows, painted shut, deteriorated paint surface (interior or exterior) and loose joinery. These conditions alone do not justify window replacement.

Repair of loose or cracked glazing, loose joinery or stuck sashes may be suitable for a carpenter or handyperson. Significant rot, deterioration, or reconstruction of failed joints may require the services of a window restoration company. If information is needed regarding vendors that provide these services, please contact the Historic Preservation Office.

3. **Replace windows with a close visual and material match.** When repairing original windows is not feasible, replacement may be considered.
 - Where replacement is desired, the new windows should match the old windows in design and other details, and, where possible, materials.

- Certain windows products, such as composite clad windows, closely replicate original appearance and therefore may be appropriate. This should be demonstrated to the Commission with material samples and product specification sheets.
- Changing the configuration, style or pattern of original windows is not encouraged, generally (for example, adding a highly styled divided light window (where non existed before or adding an architecturally incompatible pattern, such as a Prairie style gridded window to an English cottage house).
- Vinyl windows are not an acceptable replacement for existing historic windows.

Depending on specific project needs, replacement windows may include:

- Sash replacement kits. These utilize the existing window frame (opening) and trim, but replace the existing sashes and substitute a vinyl or plastic track for the rope and pulley system. Sash replacement kits require that the existing window opening be plumb and square to work properly, but unlike insert windows, do not reduce the size of the glazed area of the window or require shimming and additional trim.
- An insert window is a fully contained window system (frame and sashes) that is “inserted” into an existing opening. Because insert windows must accommodate a new window frame within the existing opening, the sashes and glazed area of an insert window will be slightly smaller than the original window sashes. Additional trim must be added to cover the seams between the insert frame and the original window. However, for window openings that are no longer plumb, the insert frame allows the new sashes to operate smoothly.

ANALYSIS

1. This 1923 house 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 removal and replacement of the side elevation opaque louver vent type window with a vinyl single hung window meets the recommended guidelines per the administrative review procedures, Section 2, 1. 2. b) Windows, whereby, non-historic window replacement with like kind or a suitable upgrade.
4. The removal of three original double hung windows was completed without review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission as required by TMC 13.05.047. Since the installation of two of the three windows with vinyl inserts, the owner has applied for the building permit and the current design review.
5. On June 5, staff Tonie Cook visited the property with Mr. Rich Mundell who reported the removed windows were in the disposal and he described each of the window's condition, including one lower sash replaced with an air conditioning unit with a missing upper sash; two lower sashes that were visibly rotten; two upper sashes were rotten about 50% through.
6. The three windows are on the front elevation and quite visible from the right of way because of the corner lot location of the house. Nearly all of the remaining windows on the house appear to be original.
7. A retroactive proposal to remove three existing wood double hung windows and install three vinyl single hung windows does not meet NSHD Guideline #3, which follows: *Replace windows with a close visual and material match; specifically, Vinyl windows are not an acceptable replacement for existing historic windows.* The replacement is a single hung style and the trim was retained.

8. The proposal to remove the three double hung window does not meet NSHD Guideline #1, **Preserve Existing Historic Windows**, specifically, for, “*The existing wood windows exhibit craftsmanship and carpentry methods in use at the time that the neighborhood was developed*” and NSHD Guideline #2, **Repair Original Windows Where Possible**. *Original wood windows that are in disrepair should be repaired if feasible. The feasibility of different approaches depends on the condition, estimated cost, and total project scope. Examples of substandard conditions that do not necessarily warrant replacement include: failed glazing compound, broken glass panes, windows, painted shut, deteriorated paint surface (interior or exterior) and loose joinery. These conditions alone do not justify window replacement.*

Repair of loose or cracked glazing, loose joinery or stuck sashes may be suitable for a carpenter or handyperson. Significant rot, deterioration, or reconstruction of failed joints may require the services of a window restoration company. If information is needed regarding vendors that provide these services, please contact the Historic Preservation Office.

9. Staff recommended an estimate for three double hung wood windows be obtained.

Staff recommended adopting the above analysis as findings and the application be deferred to the Commission.

Mr. Rich Mundell reported that he is representing the property owner who is his sister and described the background on the property, including deferred maintenance over the years which resulted in a nuisance violation. He showed pictures of the house, before and after the repairs, stating his labor was without charge. He described the condition of the three dormer windows prior to the removal and disposal, including the challenge for the owner to save the money to pay for the roof replacement and painting.

He stated that his direction to the painters was to scrape and prime the house; he stated that all windows are original, some without glazing, He stated that once he started to tear the windows out, he moved forward with the removal. He stated the three windows were rotted out Douglas Fir and showed some wood that, he said, was from the rotten windows and the three original windows went into the disposal.

He stated that after the windows were removed, a stop work order was issued for working without a permit, which resulted in this current retroactive request for approval on window removal and replacement. He also stated that he installed the windows in good faith and understands the vinyl window material is not what is supposed to be there. He stated that the new windows now meet egress. He offered that the owner has no additional money.

He presented estimates for 400 Series Anderson Woodwright at \$511 per window.

Chair Ken House thanked Mr. Mundell for his information including the estimates.

Commissioner Duke York recused himself from the agenda item.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock who is North Slope Ex-Officio asked about next steps and if the owner will be moving back into the house. Mr. Rich Mundell responded that the owner has been living at the house for the entire time since she inherited it approximately one and a half years ago.

Wedge Ex Officio Commissioner Ross Buffington asked for clarification on the reference of being a retired contractor and Mr. Mundell corrected him, offering that he is a retiree from the City of Tacoma and had worked as a carpenter with the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Ross Buffington asked if he was aware of the permit requirement. Mr. Mundell stated yes. Commissioner Buffington asked Mr. Mundell about the 2011 code enforcement letter from the City, which stated the property's location in the North Slope Historic District and stated he is surprised that Grey Lumber would sell vinyl windows for a house located in the District. Commissioner Buffington complimented Mr. Mundell on all the work that had been done on the house but emphasized that the retroactive request could have been avoided.

Mr. Mundell expressed his apologies and stated he had to put windows into the openings after removing the windows since his contractors were ready to paint the house and could not fix them. He stated he did not know permits were required for windows.

Chair Ken House asked if the windows were in stock or ordered. Mr. Mundell stated the windows were ordered and it took five days to receive two of them.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock stated that many neighbors started to call him to report the windows were being removed. He recommended the Commission deny the retroactive application for window removal and replacement with vinyl windows with the exception of the louver side elevation window. He noted the denial is straightforward, based on the regulations in place.

Vice Chair Ed Echte stated that the Commission has approved vinyl material but the approval was in minimally visible areas and not on the full front façade. He noted that the financial issues mentioned can be dealt with through procedures.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, accept the analysis as findings, and deny the retroactive application for the removal of three historic wood windows and installation of vinyl windows; the side elevation louver style non historic window may be replaced with one vinyl single hung window"

MOTION: Echte
SECOND: House
MOTION: Carried

Commissioner Katie Chase asked about the approval of the removal of one nonhistoric louver style window and replacement with one vinyl single hung window, which was included in the motion.

Commissioner Duke York was recused from this agenda item and did not vote.

Ms. Tonie Cook stated the decision will be issued in writing to the property owner and will have ten days from receipt of the letter to appeal the decision.

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated the two approaches for appeal, either appeal based on financial or direct appeal to the hearing examiner.

3. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. Totem Pole

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report into the meeting record, as follows:

The Tacoma Totem Pole was commissioned by Tacoma civic boosters and curio shop owners Chester Thorne and William Sheard in 1903, and installed at a location near its present location the day before President Theodore Roosevelt arrived in Tacoma. Reported to have been carved at a cost of \$3000, the pole was intended to rival Seattle's infamous Pioneer Square Totem Pole and is symbolic of a broader historical narrative surrounding the role of the Puget Sound in the Alaskan Gold Rush and the internationally significant Alaska Yukon Exposition that was being planned for 1909. The symbols and carvings on the pole are of

unknown origin but are suggestive of Haida style of northwestern British Columbia. The pole is not of Coast Salish origin or design.

The pole has been undergoing a structural and condition analysis by the City this year. On April 12, 2013, during this analysis, structural engineers under contract with the City determined that there was a significant risk of structural failure due to rot and deterioration. The Public Works Director ordered the immediate temporary bracing of the pole, while city engineers began working on a strategy for long term external bracing.

PRIOR MEETINGS:

On April 24, 2013, staff briefed the Commission on the status of the pole and tentative plans to stabilize the pole. During this briefing, several Commissioners questioned the cultural appropriateness of the plan, due several cultural factors, and requested that staff further research traditional practices related to declining totem poles, the history and meaning of the Tacoma Totem Pole (including the significance of the symbolism), and whether the pole was legitimately carved.

On May 7, staff convened a working group to discuss and further research these questions, consisting of city engineering staff, the Arts Administrator, Historic Preservation Officer, Commissioner Elquist, and Shaun Peterson, a woodcarver and Puyallup Tribal member acting in a consulting capacity for the City. During this meeting it was affirmed that the traditional treatment of declining poles was to allow them to fall, or removal and allowing them to decompose. The outcome of this discussion was that most appropriate course of action for cultural and safety reasons was that the pole should be removed and relocated to a place where it could decompose, and that every interpretive opportunity to educate the public about the history and context of the pole, and totem poles generally, be explored.

On May 8, 2013, this discussion was reported to the Commission. The Commission responded that if this course of action was to be taken, that additional information would be needed regarding the actual safety issues and costs associated with stabilization, and additional analysis should be done regarding the history of the pole.

On June 4, 2013, the Tacoma Arts Commission convened a De-Accession Review Panel to consider the removal of the Totem Pole from the Municipal Art Collection, per the Municipal Art Collection De-Accession Policy. This panel consisted of Commissioners Elquist and Echtle, Dr. Robin Wright, curator of American Indian art for the University of Washington's Burke Museum, Lynette Miller, Head of Collections at the Washington State History Museum, and Jack Curtwright, owner of the Curtwright Gallery, which specializes in Native American Art. Among other items, the panel concluded that:

- The pole is not clearly Haida or Tlingit, but exhibits a mixture of traits, many of which appear strangely proportioned compared with examples known to have been carved by Native carvers.
- The execution quality of the pole is not high.
- It is possible that the pole was not carved by Native carvers but rather by others based on drawings or photographs.
- Its primary historical significance is related to the history of Tacoma, and not as a totem pole.

The panel voted unanimously to retain the pole in the Municipal Art Collection. The panel did not arrive at a consensus regarding the best approach to deal with the pole, other than to conclude that it should be preserved either standing, or stored protected in an indoor location.

NEXT STEPS

Three options for abating the structural risk of the pole have been identified with preliminary cost estimates.

A. Install a single 65' new pole with shaft footing to support the totem pole: \$44,000

This option would retain in place the pole with exterior bracing by erecting a new metal pole behind it. This cost estimate assumes the City would have to fabricate a new pole.

B. Install two 65' support poles with shaft footing: \$64,000

C. Remove and store indoors: \$24,000

This estimate only includes only costs associated with removing the pole and transporting it. It does not include any interpretive signs, curation, analysis, or site preparation work for final location.

Staff will provide further discussion of the Totem Pole and address any questions the Commission may have.

ACTION REQUESTED was for guidance and direction .

Mr. Reuben McKnight noted the minutes of the June 4, 2013 Tacoma Arts Commission's Special Meeting of the De-Accession Review Panel which voted to recommend to not de-accession the Tacoma Totem Pole from the Municipal Art Collection. He further noted the memo received from Ms. McBride reporting the June 10, 2013 meeting of the full Tacoma Arts Commission, which accepted the recommendation.

He stated that Ms. Amy McBride, Arts Administrator for the City of Tacoma, is available to respond to questions.

Commissioner JD Elquist, who is both on the Tacoma Arts and Landmarks Preservation Commissions commented on the recommendation based on the traditional view of a Totem Pole, which is in an upright position. He stated he is interested in the Landmarks Preservation Commission's comments. He explained that a cultural standpoint on totem poles is to let it rest in place, in a continual deteriorated natural state and, from his historic preservation perspective, a brace would not be historically appropriate.

Vice Chair Ed Echtle asked if the structural abatement cost differs significantly if the pole infestation mitigation is conducted while upright or down.

Mr. Reuben McKnight talked about removing most of the load and it has to be treated. He commented on the levels of analysis needed to understand the preservation and restoration requirements and the structural risks. He noted there is no money at this point and no plan nor guidance.

Ms. Amy McBride talked about the purpose of the de-accession panel which was to use their expertise; she commented on the pole's emerging story, including it being repainted a number of times, from "Paint Tacoma Beautiful" by firefighters to renowned Native American artist Lauren Wright.

She explained that life safety is the first risk, so it needs to be stabilized at a certain level of stasis to prevent further deterioration, cleaning of some of the surfaces, as well as protecting the open ends. She stated that if life safety is removed, then bringing it up to a level of being preserved and putting a preservation plan in place would be the next step. She noted the previous cost of full conservation was estimated at \$36,000 from a professional, a couple of years ago, and posed that the cost could be much less.

Commissioner Marsall McClintock asked why it would be much less than the estimate [of \$36,000]. It was explained that the review panel discussed nominal conservation, cleaning and stasis of further rot, at a much lower cost level without bringing it back to a pristine condition because it [original] is not there with so many additions over the years.

Ms. Amy McBride commented on the story coming out of this pole which is rich with information that needs to be told.

Commissioner JD Elquist asked about the possibility of using another available pole to stabilize the pole.

There was discussion on cost to stabilize the pole; there was mention of some money available to stabilize the pole; the several options to brace the pole. There was discussion on the different types of designated landmarks such as signs, Virginia V, the ghost sign and the breadth of the Secretary of Interior's Standards

including rehabilitation, preservation, restoration, and reconstruction; and there are best practices for Totem Poles adopted in other places, as well as Technical Papers for use by the Commission.

Chair Ken House asked about clarification on what the Totem Pole is; he noted it has been a part of Tacoma's history and in his opinion, the pole is better up than down if it is feasible and, the review of the pole is within the Landmarks Preservation Commission's purview.

Commissioner Katie Chase stated that since there is funding to stabilize it, it should be stabilized and then, a preservation plan prepared to provide guidance.

Comments were made on the existing location and understanding the importance of retaining the Totem Pole in this same location. There was clarification that this pole has been moved three times and, is now 75 feet from its original location.

Commissioner JD Elquist shared that there were many comments made about the pole and the many generations of people in Tacoma who have personal feelings about the pole. He further talked about the comments made by Shaun Peterson of the Puyallup Tribe, who explained that when totems end up in different areas (such as the Totem in Tacoma) it represents a conquered people. He stated that in his opinion, there is an opportunity to do something very strongly with the local tribe as well as what is done with the Tacoma Totem Pole.

Commissioner Megan Luce talked about the treatment of the Tacoma Totem Pole as a piece of art and, as an art piece, it makes sense to preserve it in place, however, as an archaeological or historical artifact, there may be a different approach selected for its future.

There were comments made about adding a new brace which will show a "differentiation" from the historic (part of the pole), based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Reuben McKnight emphasized there will be a physical and visual impact with the addition of a brace and there are best practices that can be utilized specific to totem poles, in which bracing can be an appropriate treatment that does not diminish its significance.

Mr. Reuben McKnight added there have been many good points made by the Commission. He added that the next step is to identify a course of action to move beyond temporary bracing especially as the weather changes.

Ms. Amy McBride talked about not having an option for a permanent location to store or move it; several places have turned down requests to move it. She added that storage eliminates access as well as the possibility of a long term plan.

Chair Ken House summarized the discussion including the Tacoma Totem Pole needing treatment to prevent future deterioration and provision for stabilization, and preparation of a contingency plan to provide guidance for the Totem Pole's future.

Commissioner Marshall McClintock asked about an assessment as to whether the preservation is conducted while it is still standing or down. Mr. Reuben McKnight stated that engineering needs to be done to know the best approach.

Commissioner JD Elquist asked about the whole integrity of the pole if it is on the ground and if it can be re-installed in an upright position.

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated there are real risks in moving it. He explained that additional information will be transmitted to the Commission.

B. Live Work Building Code update

Ms. Sue Coffman, Planning and Development Services, introduced Fire Department Chief Jim Duggan and Ryan Erickson, and Tacoma Power representative.

Ms. Sue Coffman presented the goals, background, changes, restrictions and requirements, considerations and next steps of the Live Work Building Code Amendments, which are outlined in a handout distributed to the Commission.

Commissioners discussed the size of water lines, combination fire/domestic meters, life safety, occupancy, both commercial, residential, State Building Council review, local adoption equivalency to the state/national building code, and number of exit requirements.

Mr. Michael Sullivan talked about the formulas used to calculate exits required in a similar proposal in another jurisdiction.

Ms. Sue Coffman stated she appreciated the comment (on exits) to continue their next work on specific case studies. She explained that the case studies are in the process of being identified by the Historic Preservation and Arts Departments.

Fire Chief Jim Duggan talked about the review of best practices in other jurisdictions to select appropriate programs for Tacoma.

There was discussion on timing, next steps and clarification that this amendment is for one-live/work unit.

C. Demolition By Neglect Ordinance

Commissioner Katie Chase disclosed her firm's involvement on the Demolition By Neglect Ordinance.

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented the update on the progress of the ordinance. He presented a slideshow that was also delivered to the Neighborhoods Committee last week, as follows:

The City of Tacoma has many distressed properties, some of which are listed on the National and Tacoma Registers of Historic Places, either individually or as contributing structures within listed historic districts. Long term neglect of a historic building becomes very costly to abate, and can lead to the loss of the building. Ideally, intervention early in the cycle of decline is less costly.

However, under the existing enforcement codes, including Public Nuisances (Tacoma Municipal Code 8.30) and Minimum Buildings and Structures Code (TMC 2.01), the options for proactively abating substandard building conditions before they threaten the safety and longevity of a building are limited.

To address these issues, the City of Tacoma is going to explore the development of an ordinance to prevent "demolition by neglect," along with the creation of an "emergency preservation fund" that could be used to help prevent the deterioration of the City's iconic historic structures.

ACTION REQUESTED: This is an informational briefing.

Mr. Reuben McKnight talked about scheduling a meeting with the North Slope and Wedge Historic District neighborhood groups to report on the progress of the amendments.

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. Letter of support: Frank Herbert Park

Commissioner Daniel Rahe added to the information provided at the May 22, 2013 Commission meeting, including Herbert's opposition to the Asarco smelter plant. He also noted that the naming authority of park owned property is Metropolitan Parks Board. He asked the Commission to consider a motion to prepare a letter of support to name the slag peninsula site as Frank Herbert Park.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, prepare a letter of support to name Frank Herbert Park to the slag peninsula area, which is owned by the Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma"

MOTION: York
SECOND: Jensen
MOTION: Carried

B. Other

Commissioner Jonah Jensen reported on the selection of the general contractor for the Washington Elementary School's construction; he also provided details on the acceptance of several proposed alternates and suggestion to schedule a Commission tour during the project.

Mr. Reuben McKnight reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule; he highlighted the potential rescheduling of the June 24th meeting to July 31, 2013.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer