MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission
Planning and Development Services Department

Date: May 6, 2015
Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Commission Members in Attendance:
Chris Granfield, *Chair*
Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*
Eugene Thorne
Laureen Skrivan
Jonah Jensen
James Steel
Marshall McClintock

Commission Members Absent:
Duke York
Jeff Williams
Lysa Schloesser
Lauren Flemister
Ross Buffington

Staff Present:
Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer

Others Present:
Joe Quilici
Judi Quilici
Jean Jones
Tom Rickey
Sharon Rickey
Stew Messman
Carla Skog
Bill Alland
Mike Fleming
Dean Wilson

A. SITE VISIT
4301 N Stevens Street (4:30pm)

B. SPECIAL WORK SESSION
Narrowmoor Conservation District Design Guidelines

Chair Chris Granfield called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Reuben McKnight noted that the purpose of the meeting was to review the amendments to the design guidelines proposed for the Narrowmoor Conservation District and provide feedback on any changes that should be included.

BACKGROUND
At the April 22, 2015 meeting, the Landmarks Preservation Commission requested a special working session to review the proposed conservation district, particularly the design guidelines.

Included in the Commission packet is the following:
- Draft guidelines with edits shown
- Draft ordinance
- Revised conservation district review schedule
- Covenant language for reference

The Landmarks Preservation Commission has provided direction on several key issues thus far.

<u>May 28, 2014</u>

The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the proposal. Staff provided a summary and stated that the neighborhood appears to meet the criteria in code for designation as a conservation district. Major points of the discussion included:

Issue	Response
The neighborhood coalition seems to be primarily concerned with maintaining views through height control. There was concern with the Landmarks Preservation Commission being placed in the role of reviewing heights for view protection, and whether this was an appropriate function of the commission.	Views are a consideration in the protection of the neighborhood, but there are other character defining elements of Narrowmoor that warrant protection.
The proposed controls (design guidelines) included in the neighborhood's proposal are vague, minimal and would be difficult to enforce.	Guidelines should be rewritten and expanded to address the requirements for a conservation district.

September 24, 2014

Staff briefed the Landmarks Preservation Commission regarding several amendments to the proposal that were recommended based upon the Commission's previous input, and presented a general framework for the design guidelines. At that meeting, the Commission found that the district appeared to meet the criteria for the establishment of a conservation district, per TMC 13.07.060, and that if a conservation district is established, it would require review by the Commission for new construction, additions to existing houses, and demolition per TMC 13.05.047.

Further, the Commission directed staff to develop guidelines to facilitate design review appropriate to the West Slope Neighborhood, to include guidelines for height, scale, massing, exterior cladding and materials, building form and shape, fenestration pattern and window materials, architectural details, additions, parking, main entrances, rhythm of openings, and accessory structures.

The Commission also determined that review of trees and vegetation is inconsistent with the scope and authority within conservation districts, and that a minimum lot size was not an appropriate approach to preserving the character of the neighborhood.

March 11, 2015

Landmarks Commission authorized a public hearing for April 8, 2015, and directed staff to modify language in the guidelines that referred exclusively to view protection.

March 22, 2015

The Commission provided specific feedback for certain aspects of the guidelines regarding window materials, massing, and determining height. A summary of the changes related to those and more recent feedback is included in the table below.

April 22, 2015

The Commission received a post hearing briefing and schedule update, and provided feedback regarding accessory structures and exterior cladding. The Commission directed staff to schedule a special working meeting on May 6 to go through the amendments to the guidelines.

The following table contains notes from the amendments, which staff will discuss at the meeting on May 6.

Page #	Section	Staff Comments/notes	Reason
3	I. About Design	Added advisory language notifying that there are	Public comment, staff

	Guidelines	private covenants that exist for the neighborhood.	recommendation
5,6,9	II. Narrowmoor Addition's Character	Changed references to the neighborhood covenants to present tense.	Public comment, staff recommendation
10	Additions - Site	Changed "footprint" to "area" for greater flexibility. Staff believes the intent of the language is to generally, not exactly, locate additions in the vicinity of the existing residence.	Public comment, staff recommendation
10	Additions-Height and scale	Changed to read "should maintain a setback of 30'" to be present tense (and not to imply the covenants are no longer valid).	Public comment, staff recommendation
10	Additions-height and scale	Changed the language to be clear that the guideline is a maximum. The intent is not to require a daylight basement. Also clarified that western=downhill.	Public comment, staff recommendation
10	Additions-height and scale	Added "generally" to the height limitation, and provided a method for height measurement, as well as a potential for alternative methods, so that the Commission has some flexibility in making a determination.	LPC guidance, staff recommendation.
11	Additions-height and massing	Removed language about north/south property lines due to ambiguity, added language allowing courtyards and attached garages, noting that courtyards and garages do not affect height or massing.	Public comment, LPC guidance
11	Additions – exterior materials	The commission directed staff to amend the guidelines making cladding guidelines advisory. Staff recommends that the commission should consider revising this directive to retain cladding as a design review requirement, but with refinements (such as for additions, the existing material on the house may be used on the addition, for example). Otherwise, it is important to note that this is a significant policy decision that, from a preservation perspective, departs from convention for design review districts. This potentially would allow inappropriate materials within the district (and siding configurations such as aluminum and T-111), which could significantly adversely affect district character over the long run. Added language about roofing materials.	LPC guidance
11	Additions – fenestration	Added language regarding egress.	LPC guidance, staff recommendation
11	Additions – fenestration	Removed prohibition of vinyl windows, added language prohibiting internal grids as directed by the Commission. It is noted in the guidelines that vinyl windows are generally not considered appropriate in historic contexts – and the Commission must determine whether the policy for conservation districts warrants permitting vinyl windows.	LPC guidance, public comment
13	New construction – site design	Removed language requiring same footprint for new construction as the original house.	Public comment, staff recommendation

13	New construction – site design	Removed language regarding height variances	Typo
13	New construction – site design	Clarified language regarding width to present tense to avoid implying covenants no longer are in effect. Added "frontage" for width.	Public comment, LPC guidance.
13	New construction – site design	Changed "outbuildings" to "accessory buildings" for consistency in terms.	Staff recommendation
13	New construction - height	Changed the language to be clear that the guideline is a maximum. The intent is not to require a daylight basement. Also clarified that western=downhill.	Public comment, staff recommendation
13	New construction - height	Added "generally" to the height limitation, and provided a method for height measurement, as well as a potential for alternative methods, so that the Commission has some flexibility in making a determination.	LPC guidance, staff recommendation.
14	New construction – form and massing	Removed language about north/south property lines due to ambiguity, added language allowing courtyards and attached garages.	Public comment, LPC guidance
14	New construction – exterior materials	The commission directed staff to amend the guidelines making cladding guidelines advisory. Staff recommends that the commission should consider revising this directive to retain cladding as a design review requirement. Added language about roofing materials.	LPC guidance
14	New construction – fenestration	Removed prohibition of vinyl windows, added language prohibiting internal grids	LPC guidance, public comment
15	Accessory structures	Revised language to address conflicts with covenants, address both uphill and downhill impacts, driveway width. Also added language that attached garages are the historical norm. However, staff suggests that the Commission may wish to consider keeping the guidelines consistent with zoning regulations and instead making a recommendation that some of the existing development standards be amended (such as the provision in the code for determination of "functional rear yard" which eliminates setback requirements for detached garages on lots with street frontage on both ends of the lot). In addition, where there is no "functional rear yard" current requirements require that an accessory building be placed behind the front plane of the primary structure, which in the case of Narrowmoor through lots, means that there are two front elevations (making detached garages very difficult to construct).	LPC guidance, public comment.

17	Demolition	Added language clarifying the relationship between demolition and remodeling. Corresponding language in the district ordinance is also proposed.	Staff recommendation

Mr. McKnight proceeded through the pages for which amendments had been proposed.

There was a question as to whether there was a definition included on what constituted a secondary structure or accessory building. Mr. McKnight responded that the secondary structure was a building other than the primary structure and would be changed to "accessory structure", the definition of which was in the zoning code. The zoning code definition of accessory buildings was read. There was a request for more distinction between structures like pool houses versus children's playhouses and temporary versus permanent structures. Discussion ensued.

On page 7 a Commissioner requested a modification to the 2nd paragraph language concerning view blockage.

On page 8 a mention of synthetic stone veneer being original material was questioned. A reference to standing seam metal roofs needed clarification as to whether it was specific to standing seam or metal roofs in general.

On page 10 Mr. McKnight reviewed changes to language to improve clarity and refer to neighborhood covenants in present tense. The word "generally" was added to the section on height limitation and a method for height measurement was provided.

There was a question on existing accessory buildings in excess of the amount allowed and if the loss of one would allow an exception where the structure could be rebuilt. Mr. McKnight responded that one interpretation would not allow it to be rebuilt, but it was not likely to be an issue based on the average lot size in the Narrowmoor.

There was a request for an explanation in the guidelines on the reason for 25% limit for total square footage of structures on the residential lot.

On page 11, there was a request to add the word "generally" to "do not affect massing" in the first paragraph.

For the section discussing exterior cladding and materials on page 11, Mr. McKnight reviewed the recommendation from the Commission to make cladding guidelines advisory. He commented that the recommendation of staff was to refine the cladding guidelines, but retain them as a design review requirement. Mr. McKnight went through the proposed revisions to the language in the exterior materials including the addition of language on roofing materials. A Commissioner recommended against regulating roofing materials. There was a comment that the reflectivity of metal roofs was a concern for residents. It was noted that increasing standards for energy efficiency would limit future roofing material options. Discussion ensued. Mr. McKnight agreed to review the language on roofing materials to incorporate Commission feedback.

For the section discussing fenestration on page 11, Mr. McKnight discussed adding language regarding egress and prohibiting internal grids. Language prohibiting vinyl windows had been removed.

There was a question regarding the last paragraph of page 12, as to whether an existing deck could be replaced without review. It was confirmed that decks could be repaired or replaced without review. There was a question as to whether large decks were historic to the district and whether Plexiglas rails were appropriate to the district. Mr. McKnight agreed to add clarifying language.

For the section discussing new construction site design on page 13, Mr. McKnight reviewed the proposed changes including removing language requiring new construction to use the original footprint, removing language regarding height variances, changing references to covenants to present tense, adding "frontage" for width, and changing "outbuildings" to "accessory buildings". There was a question as to the reasons for current frontage minimum. It was noted that the frontage requirements were due to concerns about inappropriate subdivision.

For the section discussing new construction height and scale on page 13, changes included clarifying that the

guideline is a maximum and adding "generally" to the height limitation. There was a question about whether a reference to "original Narrowmoor construction" was appropriate given that homes were constructed over a period of time. The language would be changed to clarify that it was a reference to a period of significance.

For page 14, Mr. McKnight reviewed the changes for new construction form and massing including removing language about north/south property lines and adding language allowing courtyards and attached garages. For the section on exterior materials, language had been added on non-reflective roofing materials.

For the section discussing fenestration patterns and window on page 14, Mr. McKnight noted revisions similar to page 11.

Accessory structures and garages on page 16 of the draft guidelines were discussed. Mr. McKnight reviewed the revisions proposed to avoid conflicts with covenant while incorporating feedback received. A Commissioner noted that there could be potentially 70 feet of separation between the house and the garage given the lot sizes, so code conflicts were unlikely. There was support for the 20-foot-maximum width of driveways as well as the 25-foot-setback requirement. A Commissioner noted that the height limitation could create challenges on steeper lots. There was a concern about measuring the setback from the street and Mr. McKnight agreed to revise the language to measure the setback from the property line. There were concerns expressed from residents of the neighborhood about the number of garages allowed. There was a recommendation to require that garage doors be oriented towards the street. There was a question from a resident on issues relating to variances possibly being used to avoid the conservation district regulations. It was suggested that a zoning amendment would be needed, should the conservation district be implemented. Discussion ensued. A Commissioner recommended the issue of multiple detached accessory buildings be forwarded to the Planning Commission, while suggesting that limiting to a single accessory structure would be preferable. The was some discussion of the appropriate height limit for garages, with residents in attendance expressing preference for 12 feet, while Commissioners felt that 15 feet was an appropriate limitation.

The guidelines for demolition on page 17 were discussed. Mr. McKnight noted the issue of establishing a distinction between a remodel and a demolition, which was defined in the code as removing defining features. The proposed language in the guidelines exempted the demolition of less than 50% of roof area or exterior walls, where the primary elevation remains intact. This would prevent scenarios where demolishing everything but a single wall could be classified as a remodel.

There was a question on how the Commission would be addressing sidewalks. Mr. McKnight responded that staff was suggesting a recommendation to the Planning Commission that streetscape development standards be adapted to have streetscape that is compatible with the neighborhood's character and the City's infrastructure requirements.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer