



#### Members

Chris Granfield, *Chair*  
Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*  
Duke York  
Jonah Jensen  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Jeff Williams  
Eugene Thorne  
Laureen Skrivan  
Lauren Flemister  
Ross Buffington, *Wedge Neighborhood Ex-Officio*  
Marshall McClintock, *North Slope Ex-Officio*

# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

#### Staff

Reuben McKnight, *Historic Preservation Officer*  
Lauren Hoogkamer, *Historic Preservation Coordinator*

Date: April 8, 2015

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

#### Commission Members in Attendance:

Chris Granfield, *Chair*  
Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*  
Duke York  
Eugene Thorne  
Laureen Skrivan  
Jonah Jensen  
Jeff Williams  
James Steel  
Lysa Schloesser  
Lauren Flemister  
Ross Buffington  
Marshall McClintock

#### Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith

#### Others Present:

Geoff Corso  
Patricia Lecy-Davis  
Ron Hjelm

#### Commission Members Absent:

Chair Chris Granfield called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**
2. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - A. Excusal of Absences
  - B. Approval of Minutes: 3/25/2015

The minutes of 3/25/2015 were approved as submitted.

#### C. Administrative Review

- i. 3/20/15: McCarver Elementary School 2111 S J Street (parapet coping)
- ii. 3/24/15: 822 N I Street (stairwell)

3. **PUBLIC HEARING**
  - A. Proposed Narrowmoor Addition Conservation District

Commissioners Skrivan and York recused themselves from the hearing.

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

#### BACKGROUND

In December 2013, the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition submitted a request to the City for an "area-wide rezone" to begin the process of establishing a Conservation District Overlay in the West Slope Neighborhood, for the purposes of protecting neighborhood architectural character. The proposed conservation district includes four plats, the first of which was filed in 1941, encompassing approximately 300 homes, constructed predominantly during the 1940s through the 1960s. Most of the original houses are simple one story homes with two habitable levels (the lower floor being a daylight basement) oriented to maximize views of the Tacoma Narrows.

In order to preserve the neighborhood’s character, and to ensure quality and compatibility of future construction activities, the original developer established covenants placing restrictions on design, construction, and land use within the plats.

The conservation district proposal arises from the neighborhood's difficulties in ensuring new development is consistent with the perceived character and design intent of the neighborhood.

**PROPOSAL HISTORY**

In 2007, at the request of the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition, former Mayor Bill Baarsma and the City Council provided funding to the Historic Preservation Program to conduct a study of the feasibility of creating a new midcentury historic district in the West Slope Neighborhood. In 2009, the consultant, retained by the City, released a report that recommended against designating a historic district in the neighborhood due to a lack of historic integrity. However, the report also recommended the City explore revising the “conservation district overlay” tool to allow for standalone conservation districts, which might then be more appropriate for this area.

In 2011, with the support of the neighborhood, the City modified both the Comprehensive Plan and regulatory code to allow the conservation district overlay to be used as a standalone district (previously it was only used as a buffer zone around historic districts).

On September 24, 2014 the Commission voted to accept a review schedule for this district.

On March 11, 2015, the Commission voted to release the nomination with proposed boundaries (below) and design guidelines for public comment and to schedule a public hearing for April 8, 2015.

**Review Schedule:**

Date	Items	Description
December 1, 2008	Study commissioned to review West Slope Neighborhood as a historic district	
April 16, 2009	Neighborhood Information Meeting, Tacoma Nature Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of neighborhood history, discussion of survey methodology</li> </ul>
January 2010	West Slope Historic District Study (“Painter Report” released	
April 29, 2010	Neighborhood Information Meeting, Geiger Elementary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of report; community question and answer session</li> </ul>
June, 2011	Comprehensive plan and code amendments adopted for standalone “conservation districts.”	
November 2013	Application for Conservation District submitted to the City of Tacoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff review and discussion with applicants</li> </ul>
May 28, 2014	Briefing to the Landmarks Preservation Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feedback and guidance</li> </ul>
June 2, 2014	Briefing to the Neighborhoods and Housing Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feedback and guidance</li> </ul>
September 24, 2014	Presentation to the Landmarks Preservation Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance, direction</li> </ul>
November 5, 2014	Briefing to the Planning Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informational</li> </ul>
November 18, 2014	Neighborhood Information Meeting, Titlow Lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community meeting; introduction of scope and content of design</li> </ul>
February 5, 2015	Design Guidelines meeting, Titlow Lodge	

		guidelines for a conservation district
March 11, 2015	Presentation to the Landmarks Preservation Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of draft ordinance and design guidelines; authorize public hearing notice</li> </ul>
April 8, 2015	Public Hearing, Landmarks Preservation Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public testimony</li> </ul>
April 10, 2015	Public Comment period closes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public testimony</li> </ul>
April 22, 2015	Presentation to the Landmarks Preservation Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review public testimony; provide feedback</li> </ul>
May 13, 2015	Presentation to the Landmarks Preservation Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings and conclusion/recommendation to Planning Commission</li> </ul>

A postcard mailer was sent on March 15, 2015 with a notification of the Public Hearing as well as a Business-reply postcard questionnaire regarding the proposed district. Recipients included: 1) taxpayers of record within the proposed district as well as within 400' of the district boundaries, 2) occupants within the same area as the taxpayers list, 3) neighborhood council chairs, 4) Landmarks Preservation Commission distribution list, and 5) interested City staff and individuals. Notice was also published in the Tacoma News Tribune on Saturday, March 21.

In addition, an informational webpage was established at <http://www.tacomaculture.org/westslope.asp>.

The packet for this hearing includes:

- The district map, which outline the proposed boundaries.
- The draft code language, which establishes the district and its boundaries and enables the adoption of design guidelines.
- The draft design guidelines, which address height, scale, massing, window patterning, etc., as required by TMC 13.05.047 and TMC 13.07.070. This is an administrative document that will guide the Commission in reviewing proposals for new construction, demolition, and additions to existing structures in the district. If the district proposal moves forward, the design guidelines will be fully illustrated to assist property owners designing a project.

**PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES**



**EFFECTS OF DESIGNATION**

If the conservation district is designated, the Landmarks Preservation Commission will adopt design guidelines for new construction, demolition, and additions. In coordination with other existing zoning and development standards, new construction and significant modifications to existing development within the Conservation District will be regulated through the Landmarks Preservation Commission process under these new design guidelines, pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 and TMC 13.07.070.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

There is no action required.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the commission keep the comment period open until April 10, 2015.

Chair Chris Granfield called the public hearing to order and reviewed the procedures, noting that after the end of the public comment period the Commission would consider the comments and the application at the April 22<sup>nd</sup> and May 13<sup>th</sup> meetings. The representative of the application was invited to speak first. The following citizens testified:

- (1) **Dean Wilson, Co-Chair of the WSNC:**  
Mr. Wilson thanked the Commission for initiating the concept of standalone conservation districts for the City of Tacoma and that he hoped they could be a model for future conservation districts to come. He stated that Narrowmoor was worthy of preservation. He commented on the covenants put in place having initially preserved the area as intended, but over time having proven inadequate. Intrusive construction has in some cases lead to lawsuits which have proven expensive and time consuming. They wanted to evolve design guidelines that would preserve the best examples of their architecture while providing flexibility for individual preferences and new construction techniques. He stated that they had been collectively praying for over a quarter century for a way to preserve Narrowmoor for future generations and the proposed solution could be the answer to their prayers.
- (2) **Deborah Anderson, granddaughter of Eivind Anderson:**  
Ms. Anderson spoke of her grandfather who emigrated from Norway and eventually created the Narrowmoor neighborhood. She reviewed how her grandfather conceived of the design for the neighborhood with low slung homes that blended into the land forms. Even as a child she could recognize that what he had created was unusual, innovative, and exciting. She saluted the efforts of the WSNC to preserve the integrity and character of the Narrowmoor neighborhood for generations to come.
- (3) **Mark Lewington:**  
Mr. Lewington commented that he supported the WSNC efforts to create a conservation district, adding that the covenants were an important factor in his decision to move to the West Slope but have proven imperfect. He stated that the conservation district would give them a more certain and efficient means to enforce standards, which is currently done through a slow, expensive, and stressful legal process. The conservation district would provide more clarity for residents as well as builders and most importantly an enforcement mechanism.
- (4) **Jim Schock:**  
Mr. Schock commented on having been a building and plat designer, once having won a Seattle MBA award for plat design. He reported that he had been member of a design committee that provided design guidelines to preserve the character and integrity of the neighborhood. He also worked for a company that inventories every lot in Pierce County and he attested that there are not many large lots left. He felt that there was a need to preserve these types of homes.
- (5) **Jean Jones:**  
Ms. Jones commented that both she and her mother were residents of the neighborhood and that they had been able to live peacefully in the neighborhood because of the covenants. She reported that in the last few years their covenants have come under attack resulting in lawsuits between neighbors and that they needed

the conservation district to preserve the peace.

- (6) **Joe Quilici:**  
Mr. Quilici commented that he and his wife had resided in the Narrowmoor area for 41 and a half years. He commented that when he moved into the area there were gravel streets, vacant lots, and some of the original homeowners. He acknowledged that change will happen but added that it is important to preserve. He spoke in approval of the City Council, The Planning Commission, and the Landmarks Preservation Commission for being open to a creative idea on how to preserve their neighborhoods. He commented on a letter he was submitting to Chair that discussed several topics. He added that it is important that the design guidelines acknowledge the covenants and also that there is a necessity to have a variance for garages on the west side of a property. He requested that the Landmarks Preservation Commission accept the proposal with his recommendations. He commented that the letter sent out by the MBA reflected a position was contrary to Tacoma's adopted land use and neighborhood policy.
- (7) **Stewart Messman:**  
Mr. Messman commented that both he and his wife moved into the Narrowmoor area a year and a half ago. They were drawn to the neighborhood by the quality design, low profile homes, and spacious yards. He added that they were looking forward to preserving the character of the neighborhood into the future.
- (8) **Ann Brock:**  
Ms. Brock commented that she was supportive of the intent of the conservation district, but was concerned because she had purchased a lot to build a home and the present design would not be allowed by the proposed guidelines. She felt that vinyl windows should be allowed because the material is superior to aluminum or wood. She felt that concrete siding should be allowed because it is more resistant to rot.
- (9) **Jane Evancho:**  
Ms. Evancho expressed support for the conservation district and shared that she and her husband had lived in the Narrowmoor area for over 30 years. She described the neighborhood as a distinct community with unique characteristics like unique mid-century modern homes and large lot sizes. If the style of the neighborhood were to change she would be likely to move away. Ms. Evancho urged the Commission forward the matter on to the Planning Commission.
- (10) **Tom Oldfield:**  
Mr. Oldfield commented he did not feel that the conservation district was the right solution to the issues that were being raised. He noted that he had been associated with the development since 1973 and had owned a house there for the past seven years, having recently demolished the old house to build a beautiful new one. He commented that the new home has not received criticism for any aspect of its design. He commented that the primary issue is views and the conservation district does not address it because it does not address vegetation. He briefly discussed the reasons he built a new home, specifically the roof structure that creates a low ceiling on the west side of the house. He noted that the windows and siding on the home would also have been against the conservation district guidelines. Mr. Oldfield concluded that there was not a unity of design in the neighborhood and there were other ways of preserving the through-and-through nature of the lots.
- (11) **Karen Kelly:**  
Ms. Kelly, discussed having lived a mile from the Narrowmoor area for 34 years and having wanted a home with a view. She found a home in the Narrowmoor neighborhood 3 years ago and has found that there is a sense of community in the neighborhood that is created by the layout of the homes and the orientation of the streets. She commented that she was confused by the MBAs opposition to the conservation district which would be necessary to prevent the progressive loss of the unique and irreplaceable quality of their neighborhood. Ms. Kelley urged the Commission to support the establishment of the conservation district.
- (12) **Billee Brown:**  
Ms. Brown commented on moving to Tacoma in 1959 and eventually moving to the Narrowmoor area to retire after looking at homes throughout the greater area. She stated that the West Slope was an established neighborhood with a rural feeling and homes that were laid out in a manner to give space, privacy, and allow

views. They had believed that with the covenants it would remain that way, but it has not been enough. A conservation district would maintain the ambience that they love, while allowing the updating of homes to improve efficiency and all minor additions. She hoped that the Commission would take the request seriously and act upon it as soon as details are finalized.

(13) Jeremiah LaFranca, Master Builders Association of Pierce County:

Mr. LaFranca stated that he was commenting on behalf of the 650 members of the MBA, which had submitted a letter on February 11<sup>th</sup> in opposition to the conservation district. He commented that they were opposed to the district, but not the ideals of the coalition. He felt that the common neighborhood feature of a low building height was not justification for imposing a conservation district. He proposed denying the application and instead seeking an overlay that would accomplish the goals to protect views without the time and cost of design review guidelines for remodels and construction of new homes. He requested that the Commission deny the application and recommend that a zoning overlay be pursued.

(14) Chris Osgood:

Mr. Osgood commented on having moved to the neighborhood in 2004 because of the size of the lots and the views, which he had thought would be protected by covenants. He related how the home behind him had been torn down to be replaced with a home that would block his view. He commented on the number of new homes that are being constructed against the wishes of the neighborhood as people inherit and sell properties. He noted that it was expensive to sue and the builders would eventually win because they can afford to spend more money on lawsuits. He expressed interest in keeping the homes and lot sizes the way they are. He added that if the lots continue to be subdivided and the homes continue to be raised up it will no longer be a unique and attractive neighborhood.

(15) Carol MacKinnon:

Ms. MacKinnon shared that she had been a resident of the Narrowmoor area since 1985. She commented that she was content with the guidelines so far as they were protecting the lot size and the openness. She felt that the look and feel was because of Eivind Anderson's vision and his legacy was in the covenants. She objected to speaking of the covenants in the past tense in the guidelines, and felt that they should be acknowledged as being alive and enforceable. She expressed concern that the guidelines were too generous in the allowing a square footage to be divided between multiple accessory structures while the covenants only allowed a single detached building.

(16) Anders Ibsen, City Council:

Councilman Ibsen spoke in support of the proposed conservation district. He expressed gratitude to the city staff, the volunteer commissioners, and the neighbors who have been diligently working on the issue. He noted that he was not a resident of West Slope and only had the privilege to represent the people present. Councilman Ibsen observed that the people who move in to the West Slope have certain expectations for the quality of life they will have and the certainty of what is going to happen in their neighborhood. He believed that people on both sides of the issue have the best intentions, but felt that the status quo was insufficient and neighbors should not have to resort to lawsuits. He thanked the Commission for taking on the issue and thanked the attendees for their participation in the hearing.

(17) Michael Fleming:

Mr. Fleming commented on having lived in Narrowmoor since 1985. He noted a lawsuit that occurred shortly after he moved to the neighborhood, in which a third story was added to a home, demonstrating that it has been an ongoing issue. He commented that they thought they had protections where it turns out they do not. He noted that the homeowner in the lawsuit won on appeal, which resulted in more 3 story homes along the perimeter of the neighborhood. He discussed the efforts to create the conservation district and spoke of the time, effort and money invested in that purpose. He recommended some refinements to the design guidelines relating to the footprints, not prohibiting vinyl windows, and an alternative approach to deal with trees. He thanked the Commission for listening to the feedback.

(18) Paul Martin:

Mr. Martin commented that he was a resident of Narrowmoor in the lower corner of the neighborhood where

the impacts would only affect him, but not his immediate neighbors. He discussed how he loved the area and how he had sought a home there. He noted that the house he moved into still needs a lot of work since they moved in, but his neighbors are happy because they know he has been improving the home. He noted that the home was built in 1949 and had an addition built in 1963. He commented that he might want to increase the square footage, but wouldn't do anything to impact his neighbors views. He supported some aspects of the proposal but felt he should be able to expand his home if it would not impact anyone's views. He commented that he would like to preserve the character of the neighborhood, but did not want to give up a future opportunity to increase the size of his house if it would not affect his neighbors.

Seeing no more citizens coming forward, Chair Granfield declared the public hearing closed.

#### 4. DESIGN REVIEW

##### A. 727 Commerce Street (Old City Hall Historic District)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

##### BACKGROUND

Built in 1887, this building is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District. The applicant is proposing a 21.25"x32" (4.75sf) blade sign that will project 40" from the wall, from a decorative steel bracket. The bracket and sign will be black with gold lettering. The sign material will be aluminum composite with vinyl. The top line will be 2.5" tall and the bottom line will be ¾" tall. The sign will be 12' from the ground and be bolted to the existing stucco and plywood wall.

##### ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

##### STANDARDS

##### Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

##### ANALYSIS

1. The building is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior changes.
2. Sign does not destroy historic material and it is differentiated from the existing historic material. It's massing, size, and scale are compatible with the building's architectural features.
3. Sign can be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

##### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application

Patricia Lecy-Davis, the owner, commented that they hoped to bring something aesthetically pleasing to the area.

There was a motion.

*"I move to approve the application for 727 Commerce Street as submitted"*

Motion: Jensen  
Second: Flemister

The motion was approved.

B. 701 N J Street

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1901, 701 North J Street is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing exterior work that includes replicating the original metal roof cresting; replicating the original built-in gutters and cornice; and replacing the existing back porch.

Originally, the house had ribbed metal roof crests, which were lost when the house was reroofed in 1990. This project entails replicating the original crests based on photographs. The crests will be created out of the zinc product, Rheinzink "Pre-weathered Pro Graphite-Gray." The main crest will be 22" high with 1.5" ribs every 14," while the addition roof crest will be 16" high. Both crests will have a ball finial of spun zinc at the ends. The applicant has provided images of the mock-ups.

In 1999 the original gutters were replaced with wood gutters that have three, unsealed, sections. These gutters are now failing and the applicant would like to replace them with Plymouth Bay Fiberglass replicas created from the original drawings and historic photographs. The original gutters were built into the cornice. This work would include repairing the original fascia and soffit. The applicant has provided images and research supporting the use of fiberglass on historic structures.

During the 1999 remodel, the back porch was enclosed to create a breakfast nook and mudroom and a new porch was added. Currently there are problems with the side sewer and the basement; the applicant would like to remove the existing porch to fix the issues and then rebuild it. The new version would have a concrete pad underneath and more closely resemble the existing original front porch. The stairs would be moved from the east side to the north side and a box rail would be added to the east side, which would match the west side rail. Wrought iron handrails would also be added, currently there are no handrails. The decking would be 4" tongue and groove with steps that have 11.5" treads and 7.5" risers with rounded nosing. The porch would have Doric columns to match the front porch. Materials would be fir with cedar shingles. During the process, a two-paned basement window would be revealed and renovated, with security bars on the interior.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

##### **Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Guidelines for Porches**

1. Retain existing porches and porch details. The original design elements of existing historic porches, when present, should be maintained. Major changes to configuration or ornamentation should be avoided. Missing or deteriorated details, such as columns and railings, should be repaired or replaced in kind.
2. Avoid adding architecturally inappropriate details. Items such as porch columns reflect the architecture of the home. Tapered columns atop piers are emblematic of Craftsman homes, but are not appropriate on Victorian era houses. Likewise, scrollwork, turned posts, or gingerbread are not appropriate on a Craftsman home. Replacement elements that have no historic design relationship with the architecture diminish the historic character of the building.
3. Replace missing porches with designs and details that reflect the original design, if known. Avoid adding conjectural elements. Photographic or other documentary evidence should guide the design of replacement porches. Where this is unavailable, a new design should be based on existing original porches from houses of similar type and age.



4. In certain cases, building code may trump preservation guidelines. For example, historic railing height may be considered a life safety issue, and new railings are generally required to meet building code. In these cases, innovative approaches may be needed to retain the appropriate scale and appearance.

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings**

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired

**ANALYSIS**

1. This building is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The porch is not original, but will be replaced with a design and materials that are based on the other existing porch. Currently, there are no handrails.
3. Columns will be similar to the existing front columns.
4. The historic character of the roof crests and gutters is being restored according to original drawings and historic photographs.
5. The proposed material will match the original gutter and cornice system.
6. No historic material is being destroyed. The new work is compatible with the massing, size, scales, and architectural features of the existing historic material.
7. Both the gutters and porch could be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application

Mr. Marshall McClintock reviewed pictures of the home from 2002 and 1907, calling attention to the Heath addition and the roof crests that they would be adding. He discussed a photo showing one of the remaining ridge crests from 1988, that was able to provide some details on the appearance of the crest. He reviewed efforts to find the appropriate size for the crests leading to a mockup of the crest which would be made with Rheinzink, the original having been made with galvanized iron. The Rheinzink would patina to dark grey. Samples of the proposed roof shingles were shown. Ms. Lysa Schloesser asked how the ridge crests would be manufactured. Ron Hjelm, Phase II, Inc., provided detail on the process of individually piecing them together and installing them on the roof.

Mr. McClintock discussed the exterior back porch, which was built in 1999. He noted challenges from a collapsed sewer line that will require them to demolish the back porch so the sewer line can be excavated. To replace the

previous porch, they were proposing a redesign that extended the small stairs across, eliminated the stairs on the other side, and used columns and box rails that would more appropriately match the front porch. Mr. Duke York commented that the design on the back porch was much better than what was there now. Mr. York asked if they could access the sewer through the side of the house. Mr. Hjelm responded that the method they were using was the best they could find for connecting the two sewer lines, adding that it would be better for getting equipment in and out as well. It was noted that there was only a partial basement under the house.

Gutters were discussed. The current gutter was a wood gutter made in three sections and glued together, which was not how wood gutters were typically made and would last only 15 years. Removal of flashing revealed that the original gutters were integral built in gutters. A photo was shown where the current gutter had been cut to demonstrate the deterioration that necessitated replacement. A photo from 1988 was displayed, showing how the original gutters would have looked on the house. Mr. McClintock related how blueprints showing the porch and porch gutters were found in a wall by an electrician. Noting that the piece of molding comes down below the shelf, they were proposing dropping the shelf of the porch gutters to accommodate the fiberglass gutter. The profile of the upper gutter was shown, which would be the basis for the design they would be using. Referring to the drawing that demonstrated the shallow depth of the gutter, Mr. James Steel commented that the gutter depth might have varied in slope to create positive drain. Mr. McClintock reviewed how they were proposing replacement of the 1999 gutters, and provided some details on methods and materials to be used.

Mr. York commented that he appreciated the efforts to replicate the Rhodes house as it was originally. He asked if they would be setting precedent by allowing fiberglass gutters. Mr. Reuben McKnight responded that it is not setting precedent as typical gutters did not require a permit and given the effort to research to establish the original profile and look. Discussion ensued. Mr. McClintock noted that they were not removing original material.

Mr. Steel asked about if they were repainting and what colors they would be using. Mr. McClintock responded that they would be painting the main body of the house Roycroft medium brown for the shingles, Irish cream for the trim, and Olympic Range green for the porch floors. Samples of the proposed colors were provided to the Commission. Ms. Schloesser asked if he had any sense of what the original colors were. Mr. McClintock responded that the roof and body of the house were cedar shingles with a dark wood stain, similar to the restored exterior of Titlow Lodge

Commissioners expressed appreciation for the level of effort to replicate the original materials and the level of documentation.

There was a motion

*"I move to approve the application for 701 N J Street as submitted."*

Motion: Jensen

Second: Schloesser.

## 5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### A. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer provided an update on the following events and activities:

1. CLG Training Recap
2. April APA mobile workshop
3. **May 2015 Preservation Month**
  - a) Kickoff Event (7-9pm @ The Arts and Crafts Press, May 1<sup>st</sup>)
  - b) Historic Homes Tour (Tacoma Historical Society, May 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup>)
  - c) Photo Scavenger Hunt (1-4pm @ Earthwise, May 2<sup>nd</sup>)
  - d) Preservation Month Proclamation(City Council, May 5<sup>th</sup>)
  - e) Amazing Preservation Race, (11am @ Tollefson Plaza, May 9<sup>th</sup>)
  - f) City of Destiny Poetry Slam: Hilltop Edition (6-9pm @ Sure House Church, May 15<sup>th</sup>)
  - g) Tweed Ride (10:30am @ Point Defiance Pagoda, May 30<sup>th</sup>)

h) Closing Ceremony/Awards (2pm @ Foss Waterway Seaport Museum, May 31<sup>st</sup>)

4. Holiday Heritage Dance (6-9pm @ Titlow Lodge, November 13<sup>th</sup>)

**6. CHAIR COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer