

**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: October 14, 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  
 Jeff Williams  
 James Steel  
 Lysa Schloesser  
 Ross Buffington  
 Marshall McClintock

**Staff Present:**

Reuben McKnight  
 Lauren Hoogkamer  
 John Griffith

**Others Present:**

Jeff Stvrtecky  
 Tyler York  
 Chris Bolander  
 Chelsea and Chris Bolander  
 Connie Guffey  
 Caela McKeever  
 Sarah Bentley  
 Scott Rhodes  
 Nelson Martelle

**Commission Members Absent:**

Jonah Jensen  
 Lauren Flemister

Chair Chris Granfield called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**
2. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - A. Excusal of Absences
  - B. Approval of Minutes: 9/9/15

The minutes of 9/9/15 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

- C. **Administrative Review:**
  - 414 N Sheridan-Windows and siding;
  - 808 N Ainsworth-Garage siding;
  - 718 N Ainsworth-Porch replacement

3. **TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES—PRELIMINARY REVIEW**
  - A. 710 South Anderson Street

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

**BACKGROUND**

The Modified Gothic/Gothic Revival style Epworth LeSourd United Methodist Church was built in 1926. It is nominated under Criterion A for its association with Tacoma's Epworth Methodist Episcopal Church, organized in 1889, and the LeSourd Church, organized in 1907; Criterion B for its builder, J.E. Tuell, and its architect, George W. Bullard, who designed many of Tacoma's prominent buildings; Criterion C as an example of the Modified Gothic/Gothic Revival style; and Criterion F as an established and familiar visual feature in Tacoma. Significant dates include 1926, its build date, and 1944, when the church bells were added and the church became known as the Chapel of the Chimes. The Tacoma Musical Playhouse has recently purchased the vacated church building.

The building is nominated under the following criteria:

- A. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- B. *Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- C. *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;*
- F. *Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or City.*

#### **REQUESTED ACTION**

Determination of whether the property nominated to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places appears to meet the threshold criteria for nomination, and if so, scheduling the nominations for public hearing. The commission may forward all or part of the nomination for future consideration.

#### **EFFECTS OF NOMINATION**

- Future changes to the exterior will require approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to those changes being made, to ensure historical and architectural appropriateness.
- Unnecessary demolition of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places is strongly discouraged by the municipal code, and requires approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
- Future renovations of listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places may qualify for the Special Tax Valuation property tax incentive.
- The property will become eligible for the Historic Conditional Use Permit.

#### **STANDARDS**

The threshold criteria for Tacoma Register listing are listed at 13.07.040B(1), and include:

1. Property is at least 50 years old at the time of nomination; and,
2. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association such that it is able to convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. At 89-years-old the structure meets the age threshold criterion.

The exterior of the church retains a high degree of integrity. A wrought iron gate and fire escape were added to the education wing. Wrought iron was also added to the arches of the education wing. A mural was also added to that section, which will likely be removed.

The applicant commented that she knows Tacoma Musical Playhouse has done a terrific job of repurposing old buildings and they wanted to continue that with this building. She noted that they might make some interior changes for ADA compliance, but that they had no interest in exterior changes.

Mr. Reuben McKnight commented that staff was supportive of the nomination, noting that the adaptive reuse of urban historic churches was a priority. He commented that when they find a use that can go into one of these spaces and preserves the building it is something they encourage.

Vice-Chair Chase commented that she felt it was a great nomination, but should not be nominated under criterion B.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis as findings and schedule the Epworth LeSourd United Methodist Church nomination for a public hearing and future consideration at the meeting of November 18, 2015."*

Motion: York

Second: Williams

Commissioners concurred with removing criterion B from the nomination.

The motion was approved.

#### 4. SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

##### A. 1015 North 11th Street (North Slope Historic District)

As the applicant was not present, Mr. Reuben McKnight suggested that if the Commission had any questions, they could defer and seek additional information. Mr. McKnight noted that the additional square footage added to the building had been taken out of the valuation. Commissioners had questions on some of the items as to whether they were for the addition or preservation. Commissioners concurred with deferring to a future meeting for more information.

There was a motion.

*"I move to defer to the October 28<sup>th</sup> Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting."*

Motion: Steel

Second: Williams

The motion was approved.

#### 5. DESIGN REVIEW

##### A. 321 North J Street (North Slope Historic District) Windows and porch

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### BACKGROUND

Built in 1890, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing removing all of the exterior siding and replacing the first floor siding with tongue and groove cedar and the second and third floors with smooth-faced cedar shingle siding. The proposed materials and configuration are consistent with the historic photos included with the application. Currently, the siding is inconsistent, leaking and deteriorated. The front, third story gable windows have been replaced with aluminum frame windows. To meet egress requirements, the applicant would like to replace them with crank-open, wood Marvin Ultimate casement windows that replicate the look of the original double-hung windows with a horizontal bar. The trim style will be replicated from the existing windows. The front porch posts and railing are deteriorated and not original. The porch surface is also deteriorated. Based on historic photos, the applicant would like to replicate the original porch style and height of 24" for the railing. The new railing would continue down the porch stairs on both sides. The porch surface would be replaced with Azek PVC decking, which is a material that has previously been approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

#### ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### STANDARDS

##### Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Windows, Siding, and Porches

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 conditions, 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 window 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 none existed before, or adding an architecturally incompatible pattern, such as a Prairie style gridded window to a 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.

**4. Non-historic existing windows do not require "upgrading."** Sometimes the original windows were replaced prior to the formation of the historic district, and now must be replaced again. Although it is highly encouraged, there is no requirement to "upgrade" a non-historic window to a historically appropriate wood window. For example, a vinyl replacement window may be an acceptable replacement for a non-historic aluminum horizontal slider window, especially if the historic configuration (vertically operated sash) is restored.

**5. New Window Openings/Changing Window Openings**

- Enlargement or changes to the configurations of existing window openings is to be avoided on the primary elevation(s) of a historic building within the district. In specific cases, such as an egress requirement, this may not be avoidable, but steps should be taken to minimize the visual impact.
- Changes to window configurations on secondary (side and rear) elevations in order to accommodate interior remodeling are not discouraged, provided that character defining elements, such as a projecting bay window in the dining room, are not affected. A typical example of this type of change might be to reconfigure a kitchen window on the side of a home to accommodate base cabinets
- In general, openings on buildings in the historic district are vertically oriented and are aligned along the same height as the headers and transoms of other windows and doors, and may engage the fascia or belly band that runs above the window course. This pattern should be maintained for new windows.
- Window size and orientation is a function of architectural style and construction technique. Scale, placement, symmetry or asymmetry, contribute to and reflect the historic and architectural character of a building.

**6. Sustainability and thermal retrofitting.**

- a. Window replacement is often the least cost effective way to improve thermal efficiency. Insulation of walls, sealing of gaps and insulation of switch plates, lights, and windows, as well as upgrades to the heating system all have a higher return on investment and are consistent with preservation of the character of a historic home.
- b. Properly maintained and weather stripped historic windows generally will improve comfort by reducing drafts.
- c. The energy invested in the manufacture of a new window and the cost of its purchase and installation may not be offset by the gains in thermal efficiency for 40 to 80 years, whereas unnecessary removal and disposal of a 100 year old window wastes old growth fir and contributes to the waste stream.

d. If thermal retrofitting is proposed as a rationale for window replacement, the owner should also furnish information that shows:

- The above systematic steps have been taken to improve the performance of the whole house.
- That the original windows, properly weather stripped and with a storm window added, is not a feasible solution to improve thermal efficiency.
- Minimal retrofit, such as replacing only the sash or glass with thermal paned glass, is not possible.
- Steps to be taken to salvage the historic windows either on site or to an appropriate architectural salvage company.

#### **Guidelines for Exterior Siding and Materials**

1. **Avoid removal of large amounts of original siding.**
2. **Repair small areas of failure before replacing all siding.** It is rarely advisable to replace all of the existing siding on a home, both for conservation reasons and for cost reasons. Where there are areas of siding failure, it is most appropriate to spot repair as needed with small amounts of matching material. Where extensive damage, including rot or other failure, has occurred, siding should be replaced with as close a material and visual match as is feasible, including matching reveals, widths, configuration, patterns and detailing.
3. **Other materials/configurations.** It is not historically appropriate to replace deteriorated siding with substitute materials, unless it can be demonstrated that: • the replacement material is a close visual match to the historic material and can be installed in a manner in which the historically character defining details may be reproduced (mitered corners, dentil molding, etc); and • replacement of the existing historic material is necessary, or the original material is no longer present; and • there is no feasible alternative to using a substitute material due to cost or availability.
4. **Avoid changing the appearance, pattern or configuration of original siding.** The siding type, configuration, reveal, and shingle pattern all are important elements of a home's historic character.

---

#### **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.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The windows identified for replacement are not original. The new windows would be closer in style and material to the original windows, based on historic photographs.
3. The trim would be replicated from the existing windows.

4. The current siding is deteriorated and has been patched in an inconsistent manner.
5. The new siding materials and configuration are consistent with the original materials and based on historic photographs.
6. The current porch elements are not original and the porch surface is deteriorated.
7. The new design will be similar to the original style and is based on historic images.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Tyler York commented that the clients wanted to spruce up the home. He noted that old photos had been discovered and shared with the Commission. He felt that the plan of action would restore the home to its original luster and take care of the deteriorated siding and some other issues the home was having.

Commissioner York recused himself. He noted that the stairway on the side of the home that was built in the late 1930s and would probably be rebuilt. Mr. Tyler York reported that the top floor was an apartment and that rebuilding the stairway would be part of a separate application.

Mr. Marshall McClintock commented that he knew the owners and that it looked like a great proposal. He noted that the historic photos showed two types of porches. Mr. York confirmed that the older style would be used. Mr. McClintock asked about the details under the gable and Mr. York commented that they were seeking to replicate them.

Commissioner Williams asked if the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor window was currently the same size as in the historic photos. Mr. York responded that it was and they were planning on replacing the existing slider window with a wood window.

Commissioner Steel asked why they were using casement instead of double hung windows. Mr. York responded that they were doing so because the windows were for a bedroom and that the large double hung windows would be out of place. Commissioner Steel noted that he was concerned that the casement window would not appear the same as a double hung. Mr. York noted a previous situation where a casement window had been used and couldn't be distinguished as different from the street.

There was a motion.

*"I move to approve the application for 321 North J Street as submitted."*

Motion: Steel

Second: Schloesser

The motion was approved.

#### **B. 1310 North 5th Street (North Slope Historic District) Windows and door**

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1891, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The proposal is to replace the front, second story bedroom windows and the windows in the rear upstairs bedroom, which have deteriorated and contain mold. Currently, these windows are not operational and one has been damaged by a bullet. The single-hung windows will be replaced with the Andersen A-Series double-hung windows. The application also includes replacing the side entry door, which is minimally visible from the side alley, and contains an electric pet door that the current owners do not need. There is also a gap at the top of the door. The door will be replaced with a Jeld-Wen six-paneled white fiberglass door.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

## STANDARDS

### Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Windows and Doors

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 conditions, 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 window 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 none existed before, or adding an architecturally incompatible pattern, such as a Prairie-style gridded window to a 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.
4. **Non-historic existing windows do not require "upgrading."** Sometimes the original windows were replaced prior to the formation of the historic district, and now must be replaced again. Although it is highly encouraged, there is no requirement to "upgrade" a non-historic window to a historically appropriate wood window. For example, a vinyl replacement window may be an acceptable replacement for a non-historic aluminum horizontal slider window, especially if the historic configuration (vertically operated sash) is restored.
  5. **New Window Openings/Changing Window Openings**
    - Enlargement or changes to the configurations of existing window openings is to be avoided on the primary elevation(s) of a historic building within the district. In specific cases, such as an egress requirement, this may not be avoidable, but steps should be taken to minimize the visual impact.

- Changes to window configurations on secondary (side and rear) elevations in order to accommodate interior remodeling are not discouraged, provided that character defining elements, such as a projecting bay window in the dining room, are not affected. A typical example of this type of change might be to reconfigure a kitchen window on the side of a home to accommodate base cabinets
- In general, openings on buildings in the historic district are vertically oriented and are aligned along the same height as the headers and transoms of other windows and doors, and may engage the fascia or belly band that runs above the window course. This pattern should be maintained for new windows.
- Window size and orientation is a function of architectural style and construction technique. Scale, placement, symmetry or asymmetry, contribute to and reflect the historic and architectural character of a building.

**6. Sustainability and thermal retrofitting.**

- a. Window replacement is often the least cost effective way to improve thermal efficiency. Insulation of walls, sealing of gaps and insulation of switch plates, lights, and windows, as well as upgrades to the heating system all have a higher return on investment and are consistent with preservation of the character of a historic home.
- b. Properly maintained and weather stripped historic windows generally will improve comfort by reducing drafts.
- c. The energy invested in the manufacture of a new window and the cost of its purchase and installation may not be offset by the gains in thermal efficiency for 40 to 80 years, whereas unnecessary removal and disposal of a 100 year old window wastes old growth fir and contributes to the waste stream.
- d. If thermal retrofitting is proposed as a rationale for window replacement, the owner should also furnish information that shows:
  - The above systematic steps have been taken to improve the performance of the whole house.
  - That the original windows, properly weather stripped and with a storm window added, is not a feasible solution to improve thermal efficiency.
  - Minimal retrofit, such as replacing only the sash or glass with thermal paned glass, is not possible.
  - Steps to be taken to salvage the historic windows either on site or to an appropriate architectural salvage company.

---

**Guidelines for Doors**

1. **Avoid enlarging or moving an original entry opening**, unless you can provide documentary evidence to demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with typical designs for houses of the time period, or that the change will restore a previously altered condition.
2. **Retain historic entry doors whenever feasible.** Replacement doors should, where possible, match the original door in design and other details, and materials. In many cases, for security or cost reasons, a non-custom door in alternative materials may be proposed; in these cases, the door should appear to be wood (painted fiberglass doors molded with panel indents may be acceptable; faux wood finishes tend to be inappropriate) and should be compatible with the architecture of the house (Craftsman doors should not be proposed for Victorian era houses, for example).
3. **Avoid faux treatments.** Faux wood textures, frosted glass, and gold or silver caming (lead work in stained glass) is not appropriate for use in the historic district.
4. **Avoid nonhistoric configurations.** Double entry doors were not common in the historic district, and are discouraged unless it can be demonstrated that this was an original feature to the building.

**ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The windows are deteriorated and currently inoperable; they contain mold and a bullet hole. Two of the windows are located on the second story front and one on the rear second story.
3. The proposed replacement windows are the Andersen A-Series double-hung windows, which have been allowed in the district.



4. The door is minimally visible and contains a large pet door. The proposed replacement is visually similar to the current door.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Chris Bolander noted that there was a door with a pet door that he felt was not appropriate for a historic home and they were seeking to replace it with more of a traditional door. He commented that window deterioration was wide spread and that if they looked at where the hinges came together there were gaps from deterioration. He added that they were looking to make the windows functional and energy efficient.

Mr. Marshall McClintock noted that Alice Beek had resided in the home. In 1897 she was awarded the Grand Prix of Paris award for her art and lived in the home from 1907 to 1957. He added that during her residence she was an art teacher at Annie Wright.

Mr. McClintock asked if there was a plan to replace what appeared to be a window that had been covered over. Mr. Bolander responded that they were not planning to at this time. Mr. McClintock asked if the windows were single hung or double hung that had been painted shut, noting that most of the windows from the time were double hung. He commented that the deterioration appeared to be not severe and that repair and weather stripping could potentially address the issues that had been reviewed. Commissioner York agreed that the windows were probably double hung that had been painted shut and that he did not see anything preventing repair, which was more in tune with the guidelines.

Commissioner Steel reviewed the guidelines which required them exhaust all restoration options before replacement could be considered. He recommended that the applicants consult with a company that specializes in restoration for the cost of restoration or a letter verifying that the windows cannot be repaired. Commissioner Steele also suggested that Commissioners could make a site visit to look at the windows in person.

Mr. Bolander noted that they had concerns about the lead paint in the windows presenting a potential hazard in their child's room. He expressed concern about how long the process of restoration would take. Commissioner York discussed the restoration process. Mr. Bolander asked why the Commission preferred original windows to in kind replacement. Mr. Steel responded that there are many historic features that are distinct and not replicated by modern manufacturing. Discussion ensued with the applicant seeking clarification on what information was needed.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the replacement of the door, but defer decision on the windows."*

Motion: York

Second: Schloesser.

The motion was approved.

#### **C. University of Washington Tacoma (Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District) Signs**

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The University of Washington Tacoma is proposing "W" blade signs for three of its buildings in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District. The buildings include 1918 Pacific, which is noncontributing to the district, and 1730 and 1720 Pacific, which are contributing. The aluminum signs would be painted gray and purple, as seen in the application, with "Tacoma" in white letters. The aluminum "W" would be cutout. The signs would be 2'4" high and 2'7" wide. They will be 8' from grade level. The signs would be attached at the mortar joints.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

## **STANDARDS**

### **The Union Depot/Warehouse District Design Guidelines for Signs:**

#### **General:**

1. All new exterior signs and all changes in the appearance of existing exterior signs require Landmarks Preservation Commission approval. This includes changes in message or colors on pre-existing signs.
2. If there is a conflict between these standards and the requirements in the City's Sign Code, the more strict requirement shall apply.

#### **Location and Size of Signs:**

1. Signs shall not dominate the building facades or obscure their architectural features (arches, transom panels, sills, moldings, cornices, windows, etc.).
2. The size of signs and individual letters shall be of appropriate scale for pedestrians and slow-moving traffic. Projecting signs shall generally not exceed nine square feet on first floor level.
3. Signs on adjacent storefronts shall be coordinated in height and proportion. Use of a continuous sign band extending over adjacent shops within the same building is encouraged as a unifying element.
4. Portable reader board signs located on sidewalks, driveways, or in parking lots are prohibited.
5. Existing historic wall signs are a contributing element within the district and should be restored or preserved in place. New wall signs shall generally be discouraged.

#### **Messages and Lettering Signs:**

1. Messages shall be simple and brief. The use of pictorial symbols or logos is encouraged.
2. Lettering should be of a traditional block or curvilinear style which is easy to read and compatible with the style of the building. No more than two different styles should be used on the same sign.
3. Letters shall be carefully formed and properly spaced so as to be neat and uncluttered. Generally, no more than 60 percent of the total sign area shall be occupied by lettering.
4. Lettering shall be generally flat or raised.

#### **Color:**

1. Light-colored letters on a dark-colored background are generally required as being more traditional and visually less intrusive in the context of the Union Station District's predominantly red-brick streetscapes.
2. Colors shall be chosen to complement, not clash with, the facade color of the building. Signs should normally contain not more than three different colors.

#### **Materials and Illumination:**

1. Use of durable and traditional materials (metal and wood) is strongly encouraged. All new signs shall be prepared in a professional manner.
2. In general, illumination shall be external, non-flashing, and non-glare.
3. Internal illumination is generally discouraged, but may be appropriate in certain circumstances, such as: (i) Individual back-lit letters silhouetted against a softly illuminated wall. (ii) Individual letters with translucent faces, containing soft lighting elements inside each letter. Metal-faced box signs with cut-out letters and soft-glow fluorescent tubes. (iii) However, such signs are generally suitable only on contemporary buildings.
4. Neon signs may be permitted in exceptional cases where they are custom-designed to be compatible with the building's historic and architectural character.

#### **Other Stylistic Points:**

1. The shape of a projecting sign shall be compatible with the period of the building to which it is affixed, and shall harmonize with the lettering and symbols chosen for it.
2. Supporting brackets for projecting signs should complement the sign design, and not overwhelm or clash with it. They must be adequately engineered to support the intended load, and generally should conform to a 2:3 vertical-horizontal proportion.
3. Screw holes must be drilled at points where the fasteners will enter masonry joints to avoid damaging bricks, etc.

### ANALYSIS

1. This property is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. 1918 Pacific Avenue is noncontributing and Landmarks Preservation Commission approval is not required for signage.
3. The proposed signs are appropriate in material, size and location. They do not dominate the buildings' facades and they coordinate with adjacent signage.
4. The lettering is simple and brief as prescribed in the design guidelines.
5. The signs utilize minimal colors, including light-colored letters on a dark background.
6. No lighting is proposed.
7. The signs will be attached through the mortar joints and not the brick faces.

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

The applicant commented that the proposal was an extension of a previously discussed signage package. He commented that they wanted something that could speak in a voice of its own on Pacific Avenue and call out specific access points to the campus. The design was intended to be evocative of the new big W at the top of the stairs.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application as submitted for the three blade signs at 1918 Pacific, 1730 Pacific, and 1720 Pacific."*

Motion: Chase

Second: York

The motion was approved.

#### D. University of Washington Tacoma (Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District) Awnings Guidelines

---

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

The University of Washington Tacoma is seeking approval for its awnings guidelines, which the university can provide to tenants who wish to differentiate their storefronts from their neighbors and create visual variety. The proposed guidelines would set parameters that have been preapproved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The University is requesting that modifications that conform to these guidelines, once approved, be allowed upon administrative approval from the Historic Preservation Office. Proposed changes that do not conform to these guidelines would go through the typical Landmarks Preservation Commission design review process. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the proposed awning guidelines on July 22, 2015.

The guidelines would require that all awnings: have rectangular fronts and wedge-shaped ends; relate to the storefront window bays and not cross pilasters; have open ends; utilize Sunbrella brand awning fabric that is loose-laid over the frame; awnings may appear operable, but must be inoperable. All awnings on individual buildings will be required to have matching valances and attach to the window frame or mortar joint in a manner that does not harm character defining features. Awnings may be solid or striped (no patterns), but must be complimentary to the storefront paint scheme. Only up to 25% of the awning or valance may be covered with text or imagery. Blade signs must be lower than the awning frame to be visible.

Some of the fabric colors and patterns have been removed from the guidelines according to the Commission's request on July 22, 2015.

### ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the proposed design guidelines.

## STANDARDS

### Design Guidelines for the Union Depot/Warehouse District

6. **Awnings.** Awnings have been a traditional addition to the facades of buildings within the districts and shall be encouraged within the districts as a functional exterior feature. All awnings shall be compatible with the historic character of the buildings and shall be based in design upon historic counterparts. They shall also:
- Reflect the shape and character of the window openings;
  - Be, or appear to be, retractable in the form of historic awnings;
  - Constructed with canvas-like fabric rather than high gloss in texture;
  - Not be back-lit or translucent;
  - Be in colors and/or patterns which complement the building and have basis in the historic record;
  - Be attached to the buildings in a manner which does not permanently damage the structure or obscure significant architectural features.
- F. The Landmarks Preservation Commission may, at its discretion, waive mandatory requirements imposed by Section 13.07.290 of this chapter. In determining whether a waiver is appropriate, the Landmarks Preservation Commission shall require an applicant to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that, because of special circumstances not generally applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of those mandatory requirements of Section 13.07.290 would be unnecessary to further the purposes of this chapter. Such waiver shall not exceed the requirements set forth in the underlying zoning district, except where specifically provided for in TMC 13.06A.070.B. (Ord. 27748 Ex. A; passed Oct. 14, 2008; Ord. 27429 § 3; passed Nov. 15, 2005)

## ANALYSIS

- This property is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
- Awnings are encouraged by the district design guidelines.
- The proposed guidelines for awnings correlate with the district design guidelines.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

The applicant noted that he would be continuing a discussion from a previous meeting with additional information and samples of awning fabric. He reported that they were seeking for approval for guidelines for buildings on Pacific Avenue and clarified the standards and guidelines being used to inform their decisions. He discussed historic images of awnings noted the awnings on the West Coast Grocery and Garretson, Woodruff, and Pratt buildings. He also discussed images of contemporary awnings that still fit a historic context.

The proposed awnings were discussed. They were now proposing a valance with a frame to be more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Frames would be constructed from metal and would have a simple orientation on the building. The spacing would be tied to the openings and never across the pilaster. The applicant commented that they would be using the same brand for all fabric and limiting which colors are available. The awnings were proposed to be placed at the transom where the blade signs currently exist. As a result, they were proposing lowering where the blade signs were currently located. The proposal would allow each building to choose a unique valance that would be consistent across the building. The frame attachment would be also be identical for every opening on each building. The goal would be to place the awnings only where they minimize obstruction of historic features and attach only to the window frame or the mortar joints. The full range of available fabric colors was shown and the applicant commented that the goal was to not allow loud colors, but allow some flexibilities. Commissioner Schloesser suggested that they reduce the options by at least 50% and remove some of the more extreme options. The applicant discussed allowing limited space to be available for branding. They were seeking to allow flexibility on placement with a maximum of 25% of the valance face covered.

Commissioner Steel commented that he views awnings as a building element and that historic precedent shows that buildings have the same color of awnings and only vary with the logo on the awnings. He commented that they could potentially have four different tenants with radically different colored awnings. He commented that he had no problem with awnings, but did not want four different colors across one building. The applicant responded that it was not a permanent

change and that it reflected the contemporary purpose of awnings. Discussion ensued. Commissioner Williams commented that he also felt concerned about multiple colored awnings on the same building due to the large variety of colors proposed. He suggested that he would be okay with subtle variations. Vice-Chair Chase recommended going with a color palette based on the approved paint colors and deferring to administrative approval.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the proposed design guidelines for the awnings and moved blade signs for University of Washington Tacoma with the condition that they choose awning colors that are in keeping with the historic palette that we have already approved and that the blade signs be no lower than eight feet."*

Motion: Chase

Second: York

The motion was approved.

E. 716 Pacific Avenue (Old City Hall Historic District)  
Paint

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1888, this building is a contributing property in the Old City Hall Historic District. The applicant is seeking retroactive approval for painting the Odd Otter Brewing Company storefront Glidden Bright Sailing Sky Blue with a burnt orange trim at the base of the building. The upper floors of the building were not painted. This does not include the adjacent storefront, which has also been painted.

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

### **STANDARDS**

#### **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.
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 property is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. No historic material was destroyed or removed.
3. The paint could be removed and/or repainted without harming the building's historic integrity.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Ms. Sarah Bentley commented that they choose the color based on the context of the area to draw attention to the storefront. She reviewed that they had painted over a greyish green. Ms. Bentley added that they had a tempered glass window with crack that they were interested in replacing. Mr. Reuben McKnight commented that they could replace the glass at the staff level, but window configuration changed would have to go through design review by the commission.

Commissioner Steel commented that the storefront does not appear original and, if it were found that it was not original, he could see justification for painting the sections different colors. He added that he could accept painting the area between the arches and transom windows, but the pilasters and area above the transom should be the same across the building. It was noted that the glass in the transom windows had been painted over previously.

There was a motion.

*"I move to retroactively approve the application for 716 Pacific Avenue, the Odd Otter brewing space, for painting of the outside of the building with the added condition that the pilasters and the area above the transom windows be repainted to the existing dark green body color of the building."*

Motion: Steel

Second: Schloesser

The motion was rejected unanimously.

Discussion ensued. Commissioners concurred that the paint should be removed from the transom windows if possible and that the building should be uniform from the transom windows up.

There was a motion.

*"I motion to approve the retroactive application for 716 Pacific Avenue with the conditions that the paint below the transom window can remain the blue color that it has been painted, the pilasters and area above the transom windows needs to be painted the same dark green color as the rest of the body of the building, the transom window frames and mullions need to be painted the same color as the rest of the windows on the building and the paint needs to be scraped and removed from the individual glass window panes in the transom window if there is glass in the transom windows. The adjacent Vincero space, which has similarly been painted, could be administratively approved at the discretion of staff."*

Motion: Steel.

Second: York

The motion was approved.

F. 1135 Tacoma Avenue South (Individual Landmark)  
Rehabilitation

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

---

## **BACKGROUND**

The 1905 Hammer Building is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The proposal includes installing sprinkler heads at existing openings; installing dark bronze or black gooseneck lights, as shown in the attachments, on the north elevation; repairing the existing stucco; bracing the parapet, which will not be visible; installing replacement doors on the east elevation where the historic doors no longer exist; installing an external non-combustible exit balcony and stair, as required by the Tacoma Fire Marshal, and installing Sunbrella 3'x11" awnings with 5" lettering, as specified in the drawings. The custom awnings will be either fixed or retractable; they will be either black or River Rock, as shown in the color samples. Any detailing or lettering will be off-white or Clarksville Grey, as shown. The guardrails will also be custom. The doors will be fiberglass Milgard Clad doors with divided lites, as shown. The doors will be painted to match the wood windows.

## **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

## **STANDARDS**

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

1. 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.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
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 property is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The historic character of the property is being preserved. No historic material is being removed. The staircase is being added to the rear elevation.
3. The exterior stucco is being repaired.
4. No historic material is being destroyed. The new work is differentiated from the old and compatible in size, scale, and material.
5. The new work could be removed without harming the integrity of the historic property.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if the proposed paint colors were for the side of the building as well. The applicant responded that it was for the whole building.

Mr. Reuben McKnight commented that the building was a rehabilitation started by a previous owner in 2004 and that there was the intent to put an exterior stair on the back of the building at the time. The 2004 proposal had gone partially through the Landmarks process. The applicant commented that they were still intending to construct the proposed exterior stair. Mr. Marshall McClintock asked what material would be use for the stairs in the back. The applicant commented that the stairs would be non-combustible material and the rest of the detailing would be tube steel.

Chair Granfield asked about the lighting on the upper level of the northern elevation. The applicant responded that historic photos showed gooseneck lights there and the intent was to bring the lights back. Chair Granfield asked if there would be signage on the awnings. The Applicant responded that there is no current tenant for the commercial space so there is currently no graphic that would go on the awning.

There was a motion

*"I move to approve the application for 1135 Tacoma Avenue South as submitted."*

Motion: Steel

Second: Williams

The motion was approved.

## 6. BOARD BRIEFINGS

### A. Seymour Conservatory (Individual Landmark)

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

## BACKGROUND

Built in 1907, the Seymour Conservatory in Wright Park is an individually listed landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The project team will brief the Landmarks Preservation Commission on plans for a proposed addition. The team would like the Commission's feedback on:

1. Approaches to connections to the existing buildings:
  - a. On grade through the wall, or
  - b. Below grade through the floor.
2. The relationship of the site to the existing and proposed buildings:
  - a. Preserving views to the Conservatory from west, north and south
3. Spatial order
4. Replacement of the original wood facades at existing entries
5. The importance of maintaining the east entry as the primary entry

Mr. David Strauss discussed the proposed addition to the 1907 building. He noted there were significant views of the building including the southwest, northwest, and the iconic eastern view. Consideration for the sightlines and the existing

trees was discussed. Mr. Strauss commented that they were seeking to expand the building by 11,500 feet. He reviewed the design principles including memory, deference, and balance. Multiple options for site configurations were reviewed including a building on a terrace, beneath a terrace, or digging into the ground. Connection strategies were reviewed including connecting at the level of the conservatory or connecting through a sub level. Four conceptual illustrations for the addition were discussed. Commissioner Williams asked if the option where there was connection on the south and the north needed both connections. It was noted that the intent of the two connections was to allow a natural path through the addition. Commissioner Williams asked if they could do two underground connections. It was noted that the above ground connection would be needed for loading or access for events.

Mr. Marshall McClintock noted that a number of concerns: the proposed addition would remove the slope that gets used for sledding in the winter; they would be putting a major structure on a small park; and the addition would presumably be used for weddings, taking money away from nearby historic churches. Mr. Strauss commented that they had an alternative that preserved the sledding slope. Mr. Ross Buffington commented that he was struck by what a small amount of the plan went to supporting the existing conservatory. Vice-Chair Chase commented that she understood wanting to expand program space, but questioned why it needed to go into Wright Park. Commissioner York commented that he could understand wanting to make the conservatory less awkward for large groups, but that accommodating large groups is not historically what the conservatory is about. Commissioner Steel commented that the whole park was an arboretum and a way to reinforce that would be to not connect the addition to the greenhouse. He discussed having a building that was more informed by the geometry of the park and cares less about connecting to the greenhouse. He commented on preserving the iconic views of the conservatory and the slope, suggesting that the challenge was in finding a site on the park as a whole rather than adjacent to the conservatory. Commissioner Schloesser concurred that connecting to the greenhouse was unnecessary. Commissioner Williams expressed opposition to anything that connects to the greenhouse, if a building is needed in the park at all. Commissioner York commented that the circuit concept would best for connecting the conservatory, but that he not convinced that it is the right place for this kind of building. Chair Granfield expressed concern about the scale of the building and its impact on the walkability of the park.

A representative a Metro Parks reviewed that the 2004 Master Plan from had gone through full the public process with the larger design. She noted that the funding for the addition had been included in a bond. It was noted that the purpose of the discussion was to consider what changes could be made to the proposal to make it work best. Commissioners requested to review the nomination of the park to determine what the character defining elements were.

## 7. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### A. Bylaws and Inventory Review

Mr. Reuben McKnight reported that they were doing some cleanup and were including the a number of changes. A proposed change to the Conditional Use and Variance policy would provide a role for the Landmarks Commission for Conditional Use Permits (CUP) within historic districts to provide guidance to the staff reviewing the CUP. The change would ensure that the planning review won't put the Commission in a position where they might have to reject something approved by a City Planner. Another proposed change would add Historic District guidelines as a standard to review special tax evaluation projects that are in historic districts. On page 13 of the Bylaws, clarifying language on the periods of significance had been added and redundant design guideline interpretations had been eliminated. On page 19 of the Bylaws, quarterly deadlines for nominations had been removed. Mr. McKnight noted that staff was requesting authorization to put the items out for public hearing.

Mr. Marshall McClintock provided a review of structures to be considered for addition to the North Slope Historic Special Review District Buildings Inventory. He commented that after reexamining their list, they had identified three buildings from 1889 that were not on the contributing list. The following buildings were discussed:

- 902 North Cushman. Built in 1889. There was a half story that had been removed. It was currently historic non-contributing on the National Register.
- 1017 North Cushman. Built in 1889. The home was designed by architect R.D. Duff
- 1315 North 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Built in 1889. It was noted that the entryway had been added in 2007 at the location of a window.
- 1118 North 12<sup>th</sup> Street. Built in 1948. It was a large ranch style home with an underground garage and wrap around corner windows.



- 1220 North J Street, built in 1951. It was listed as contributing on the National Register.
- 1320 North 8<sup>th</sup> Street, built in 1951 on a property likely subdivided off the adjacent Borhek property.

Discussion ensued. Commissioners agreed to add the 1220 North J Street and 1118 North 12<sup>th</sup> Street homes to the Inventory as contributing.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the changes to the bylaws and inventory, specifically 1220 North J Street and 1118 North 12<sup>th</sup> Street, to be included as contributing."*

Motion: Chase

Second: York

The motion was approved.

#### B. Commissioner Term Expirations

Mr. Reuben McKnight noted that a large number of Commissioner terms were expiring on December 31, 2015. Online applications for reappointment were due October 26.

#### C. Events and Activities Update

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

1. Hollywood by the Sea: A Holiday Heritage Swing Dance (6-9pm @ Titlow Lodge, November 13<sup>th</sup>)

##### **2016 Save the Dates**

2. Heritage Funding Program Workshop, January 2016 TBD
3. CLG Commissioner Workshop (9:30am-4pm @ Tacoma Convention Center, March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016)
4. Wood Windows Workshop (1pm-4pm @ Earthwise Tacoma, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016)
5. Historic Preservation Month, May 2016
  - a) Kick-Off with Historic Tacoma (May 6, 2016)
  - b) Historic Homes Tour with Tacoma Historical Society
  - c) Amazing Preservation Race
  - d) Tweed Ride
  - e) Poetry Slam
  - f) Awards Ceremony (1pm-3pm, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016)
6. Neighborhood History Walks with the Councilmembers, June 2016 TBD

#### 8. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer