

Members

Katie Chase, *Chair*
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*
Duke York
Lysa Schloesser
James Steel
Jeff Williams
Eugene Thorne
Lauren Flemister

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
Lauren Hoogkamer, Historic Preservation
Coordinator
John Griffith, Office Assistant



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: April 27, 2016

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Chase, *Chair*
Duke York
Eugene Thorne
Jonah Jensen
Jeff Williams
James Steel
Lysa Schloesser
Lauren Flemister
Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer
John Griffith

Others Present:

Stephanie Goffin
Lewis Pugh
Anthony Guido

Commission Members Absent:

Chair Katie Chase called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 04/13/16
- C. Administrative Review: 502 South Sheridan – window restoration

The consent agenda was approved.

3. SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

- A. 1415 North Steele Street (North Slope Historic District)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

OVERVIEW

WAC 254-20 enables local governments adopt local legislation to provide special valuation of historic properties that have been rehabilitated. With regard to the application review process, state law authorizes local historic review boards to determine:

1. Whether the property is included within a class of historic property determined eligible for special valuation by the local legislative authority under an ordinance or administrative rule (in Tacoma, this means properties defined as City Landmarks);
2. Whether the property has been rehabilitated at a cost equal to or exceeding 25% of the assessed improvement value at the beginning of the project within twenty-four months prior to the date of application; and Whether the property has not been altered in any way which adversely affects those elements which qualify it as historically significant.

If the local review board finds that the property satisfies all three of the above requirements, then it shall, on behalf of the local jurisdiction, enter into an agreement with the owner which, at a minimum, includes the provisions set forth in

WAC 254-20-120. Upon execution of said agreement between the owner and the local review board, the local review board shall approve the application.

Per TMC 1.42, the Tacoma Landmarks Commission is the local body that approves applications for Special Tax Valuation.

ANALYSIS

Property Eligibility:	Contributing Property, North Slope Historic District
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed:	\$73,615
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation:	\$133,900
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value:	55%
Project Period:	April 2014 to January 2016 (1 years and 9 months)
Appropriateness of Rehabilitation:	Whole house renovation including replacement of siding, new electric and plumbing, new lighting fixtures, bathroom and kitchen remodel, finishes, cabinetry, painting, flooring, drywall, framing, insulation, window replacement, new doors, new furnace, chimney cap, new gutters, and deck repair. Exterior work was administratively approved in January 2015 and approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission in February 2014.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application in the amount of \$73,615.

Mr. Marshall McClintock commented that the home had clearly been a challenge and recommended that the Commission accept the analysis and approve the special tax valuation.

There was a motion.

"I move to approve the special tax valuation as written and as recommended by staff."

Motion: Williams

Second: York

The motion was approved unanimously.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1119 North L Street (North Slope Historic District)

Garage

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1943, this property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing a new 24'x24,' alley-accessed garage, to the rear of the lot. The garage will be 12.5' high with a 4/12 slope roof and 30-year architectural composite roofing. The applicant is proposing T1-11 siding. The south elevation will have two 5'x3' Milgard vinyl windows and a smooth-faced, paneled, fiberglass side door facing the home. The garage door will be a 16'x7,' paneled, steel door. The garage will be painted to match the house. No work is being proposed for the main house.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Garages & Parking and New Construction

1. **Alley accessed parking is the typical and predominant residential parking configuration in the district.** Residential driveways and garages facing the street are typically only appropriate when there is no alley access, or other site constraints prevent alley accessed parking (such as a corner lot).
2. **Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way.** Parking areas and garages should be set toward the rear of the lot to minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Where it is not possible to locate a parking structure to conceal it from view, it should be set well back from the front plane of the primary structure on the property. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in the residential areas of the neighborhoods and should be located behind the building and away from the street.
3. **Goal:** Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. **Guideline:** New buildings should be comparable in height to adjacent structures. Buildings that are substantially taller or shorter than the adjacent historic buildings should be avoided.
4. **Goal:** Relate the size and proportions of new buildings and their architectural elements to those of the neighborhood. **Guideline:** Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations.
5. **Goal:** Break up the facades of buildings into smaller varied masses comparable to those contributing buildings in the residential historic districts. **Guideline:** Variety of forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the North Slope and Wedge residential communities. Smaller massing—the arrangement of facade details, such as projections and recesses—and porches all help to articulate the exterior of the structure and help the structure fit into the neighborhood. Avoid large, blank planar surfaces.
6. **Goal:** Emphasize entrances to structures. **Guideline:** Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details, such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.
7. **Goal:** Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing contributing buildings where such elements are visible from the street.
Guideline:
 1. **Shape and Pitch:** Typically, the existing historic buildings in the districts either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower.
 2. **Architectural Elements:** Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or "widow's walks" to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.
 3. **Materials:** Roofs that are shingle or appear to be shingle, or composition roofs, are the typical historic material compatible with the district. Seam metal may be an acceptable material for simple roof structures. Slate, faux slate and terra cotta tiles are not appropriate for the districts.
8. **Goals:** Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhoods were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.
Guideline:
 1. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar in type, pattern, configuration and appearance to those typically found in the neighborhood.
 2. Stucco, especially commercial EIFS systems like Dryvit, is not acceptable for the historic district.
 3. Faux materials, such as vinyl or metal siding, are not acceptable for the historic district.
 4. Certain siding patterns, including board and batten and panel, are not historically common in the district and should not be used.
 5. Cementitious products, such as Hardiplank, may be acceptable in the district if installed in a historically correct pattern (for example, horizontal lapped siding or shingle). In such cases, the product used shall be smooth in texture (faux wood grain finish is NOT acceptable).

6. Engineered products for trim and molding, if demonstrated to be similar in appearance to painted wood, may be an environmentally responsible substitute for wood on new structures. In such cases, the applicant should demonstrate to the Commission, via product literature and material samples, that the product is compatible.
9. **Goals:** Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings, as represented in the neighboring buildings. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.

Guideline:

1. Placement. Typically, older buildings have doors and transoms that matched the head height of the adjacent windows. New structures should utilize this pattern.
2. Doors. Doors should be or appear to be paneled and/or contain glazed openings.
3. Windows. New structures should utilize existing historic window patterns in their design. Windows should be vertically oriented. Large horizontal expanses of glass may be created by ganging two or more windows into a series. Historically, the typical window in the district was a double hung sash window. Casement windows were commonly used for closets, nooks, and less commonly, as a principal window type in a structure. Many double hung sash windows had the upper sash articulated into smaller panels, either with muntin bars, leaded glazing, or arches. Commonly, windows were also surrounded with substantial trim pieces or window head trim.

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 garage is alley-accessed and sited towards the rear of the lot.
3. The garage will not be visible from the right of way.
4. The garage height and size is compatible with the district.
5. The garage design is compatible with the district and comparable to neighboring garages.
6. The guidelines for garages do not address materials. Vinyl windows have been approved for garages and new construction. T1-11 siding is not listed as a recommended material for new construction.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application, but defers recommendation on the proposed siding material. Staff has recommended to the applicant consideration of Hardiplank or wood horizontal siding.

The contractor from Garages Etc. was present to represent the applicant. He commented that he did not think the owner would be opposed to cementitious wood grain siding. He noted that the garage was in the alley and only one or two sides will be visible, but it was likely that the owner would clad the entire structure in cementitious siding.

Mr. McClintock asked if the windows were sliding windows. The contractor responded that they were half vent windows, which were represented on the home and throughout the surrounding neighborhood. He added that the windows would not be visible from the street. Mr. McClintock recommended that the Commission ask for single hung vertical windows instead of sliding.

Commissioner York expressed support for the modification of the windows from half vent to single hung and requiring cementitious lap siding instead of T1-11. Commissioners concurred. Vice-Chair Jensen asked that smooth siding be used instead of faux grain.

There was a motion

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 1119 North L Street with the modification of a single hung window on either side of the door and a smooth cementitious siding."

Motion: Schloesser

Second: Jensen

The motion was approved unanimously.

B. 715 Pacific Avenue (Old City Hall Historic District)

Sign

As the applicant was not present the item was discussed after item 5.A. Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1890, the North Pacific Bank Note Company building is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District. The applicant is proposing a routed Dibond sign with dimensional black acrylic letters and a brushed chrome vinyl overlay. The sign would be 22.5" on the smaller end and 24.4" high on the larger end, the sign length would be 104" and would read "subCulture SALON." The larger letters would be 10.3" and the smaller letters would be 4.7" The sign would be mounted to the brick above the storefront, at the mortar joints; there would be no drilling into the masonry. A previous design showed the sign mounted on the header of the storefront, which would obscure the transom windows. Staff recommended reducing the dimensions of the sign and relocating it to the wall area above the storefront, which would avoid obscuring the building's architectural features. The applicant revised the application according to this recommendation.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

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 is being destroyed or altered. The sign is differentiated from the historic material and compatible in size and scale.
3. The sign can be removed without harming the integrity of the historic property; there will be no drilling into the masonry.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. McKnight discussed the location, noting that the storefronts were relatively new. He reviewed that the applicant had revised the application to make the sign smaller and relocate it from the window header below the transom.

Commissioner Flemister asked if they were planning on removing gooseneck lamp above the store front near where the sign was to be located. Mr. McKnight commented that the Commission should assume that the lamp was going to be removed.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 715 Pacific Avenue as submitted."

Motion: Steel

Second: York

The motion was approved unanimously.

5. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 811 North Ainsworth (North Slope Historic District)

Addition

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1890, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is seeking feedback on a proposed new addition. The Landmarks Preservation Commission conducted a site visit on April 5, 2016. Based on that feedback and discussions with staff, the applicant has submitted updated plans. The primary change from the previous proposal is that the wing addition has been moved to the rear of the house, to reduce the visual impact from the front of the property. The exterior materials have changed, as has the window configuration, to better reflect the historic character of the home and surrounding district.

ACTION REQUESTED

This is a board briefing. No action requested.

STANDARDS

North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines

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.

Guidelines for Additions

1. **Architectural style should be compatible** with the era and style of the principal structure, including massing, window patterning, scale of individual elements, cladding, roof form, and exterior materials.
2. **Additions should be removable** in the future without harming the character defining elements on the principal structure.
3. **Additions should be sensitively located** in a manner that minimizes visibility from primary rights of way. Where this is not possible, the design should respect the style, scale, massing, rhythm, and materials of the original building.
4. **An addition should be subservient** in size, scale and location to the principal structure.
5. **Seamless additions are discouraged.** There should be a clear visual break between the old structure and the new, such as a reduced size or footprint or a break in the wall plane, to avoid creating a falsely historic appearance (such that the original, historic portion of the house can be distinguished from the new, non-historic addition).

Guidelines for Parking and Garages

1. **Alley accessed parking is the typical and predominant residential parking configuration in the district.** Residential driveways and garages facing the street are typically only appropriate when there is no alley access, or other site constraints prevent alley accessed parking (such as a corner lot).
2. **Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way.** Parking areas and garages should be set toward the rear of the lot to minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Where it is not possible to locate a parking structure to conceal it from view, it should be set well back from the front plane of the primary structure on the property. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in the residential areas of the neighborhoods and should be located behind the building and away from the street.
3. **Attached garages and carports are inappropriate.**

4. New curb cuts are discouraged. Residential driveways requiring curb cuts from a street or arterial are generally prohibited, unless the applicant can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that because of special circumstances not applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of this standard prevents alley-accessed parking. If approved, such curb cuts and approaches shall be consistent with the standards approved for the historic districts and on file in the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Steel noted that the original application aligned the L addition off the back of the primary structure and not the additional gable on the rear of the building. He commented that in order to move the L addition further back, they had extended the primary gable form back. As a result, the gable on the north elevation was now the size of the primary structure of the house. He reviewed that this had been done to slide the wing addition further back in response to feedback from Commissioners. Commissioner Steel commented that what they had submitted before was the most logical location for a wing addition because moving it further back required extending the primary structure which was not keeping with the scale of the original house.

Commissioner Williams asked if the original smaller gabled roof would be retained if they did not slide the addition back. Mr. Anthony Guido, Red Pyramid LLC, responded that there was a deficiency with the ceiling height in the current addition, so it would probably not be retained. He added that they weren't planning on demolishing the whole back of the structure.

Chair Chase asked Commissioner Steel to clarify if the change did not meet the guidelines for the North Slope. Commissioner Steel commented that he believed, based on evidence that the rear addition was original to the structure. Mr. McClintock commented that it showed up on maps from 1896, but it was only single story. It was noted that the space above was likely converted from an original attic. Mr. Guido shared photos that demonstrated that the addition was not original to the house. Mr. Steel commented that if they are trying to maintain the primary house structure and not build an addition that confuses that. He commented that extending the gable further would be worse for the original structure than the original application.

Mr. McKnight reviewed that during the site visit there had been concern about whether the wing addition was too dominant to the historic structure as it was placed close to the front wall plane of the house. There was also concern about how much it interrupted the original fabric of the structure. The response to that was to reconfigure the addition and move it farther from the front of the lot to reduce its impact. There had also been a recommendation to make the window pattern plainer. It was noted that one of the considerations had also been the proximity of the home next door.

Chair Chase commented that she felt moving the addition further back was more in line with the standards. She added that the addition was quite large compared to the size and scale of the original structure and that it did not meet the standard of being subservient.

Commissioner Steel noted that there were examples of similar homes with additions that were the same proportion as the primary structure. He noted an example from Friday Harbor of similar structures that had additions proportionate to the primary structure.

Commissioner Williams commented that applicant was on the right path and had responded to what the Commission had asked him to do. He commented that given the examples shown he felt that it was satisfactory as it had been moved back towards the back of the lot. Commissioner Williams commented that he'd like to see the original plate glass window on the front be addressed in keeping with the original windows.

Commissioner Steel commented that there were different ways that an addition could be subservient and that the roof peak is not the only way that an addition can be subservient. He commented that they had adequate site to achieve making the addition subservient by moving the addition back and had met those goals.

Commissioner Williams asked about the fence shown in front of the building on the elevation drawings commenting that he would prefer that the fence not cover up the front of the house.

Commissioner Thorne noted that there was a distinctive window on the upper story of the front of the building that would be a way to bring back some character to the addition. Mr. Guido responded that it was their intent to preserve features like that.

Commissioner Williams recommended using the original window on the side of the house as a guide for the windows of the addition for size and scale. Commissioner Steel recommended aligning the upstairs and downstairs windows of the front façade by stacking or grouping them together.

Mr. McClintock reported that neighbors had express preference for pitched roof dormers over shed roof dormers. Commissioner Williams commented that he had felt that shed dormers were more appropriate for the style of roof. Commissioner Steel commented that the home had a simple farmhouse style aesthetic and that an addition to it should maintain that plain and simple vernacular. Mr. McClintock responded that he had looked at folk Victorian homes with dormers and that the roof shape of the dormer matched the larger roof shape. He added that he did not find any with shed dormers. Commissioner Steel commented that the way the shed dormer was drawn it looked like it complemented and was subservient to the primary structure. Commissioner Williams commented that he preferred the simpler form of the shed dormer. Vice-Chair Jensen reviewed the guidelines and commented that when he looked at the original roof form, he didn't see a shed, he saw a gable. Chair Chase concurred that the shed adds a different roofline and that a gabled dormer would be more in keeping the vernacular style. She added that she didn't have an issue with the with the back as it was not the primary façade, but a gabled dormer for the front façade would be better. Discussion ensued. Chair Chase commented that having no dormer on the front would be better for meeting the standards and would not draw the eye as much to the L addition. Mr. Guido commented on removing the front dormer, that he could do a smaller gable with a window to provide light.

Chair Chase reviewed the guidelines for additions. For whether the architectural style was compatible with the era, Commissioners Chase and Jensen concurred that a shed dormer would not be compatible. For whether the addition was removable without harming character defining elements of the principle structure, Commissioners agreed. Commissioners agreed that the addition was sensitively located. For whether the addition was subservient in size, scale, and location to the principle structure, Commissioners were in agreement that it was subservient in location. Chair Chase and Vice-Chair Jensen commented that it was not subservient in size and scale. Commissioners agreed that there was enough differentiation.

6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Events and Activities Updates

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

1. Historic Preservation Month, May 2016
 - a) Historic Homes Tour with Tacoma Historical Society(April 30th –May 1st)
 - b) Proclamation (5pm @ City Council, May 3rd)
 - c) Historic Preservation Month Kick Off: Historic Tacoma's Coloring Contest of Tacoma Iconic Buildings (7pm @ 1120 Creative House, May 6th)
 - d) Amazing Preservation Race (11am @ UWT, May 14th)
 - e) City of Destiny Poetry Slam: Lincoln District Edition (6pm @ Lincoln High School, May 20th)
 - f) Awards Ceremony (1pm-3pm @ The Swiss, May 22nd)
 - g) Midcentury Modern Ride—Formerly Known as the Tweed Ride (10:30am @ Point Defiance Park, May 28st)
 - h) History Speaks: "Eyes of the Totem Rediscovered" (12pm @ WSHM, May 31st)
 - i) Film Screening: Eyes of the Totem (3pm @ WSHM, June 4th)

2. Neighborhood History Walks with the Councilmembers, June-July 2016 TBD

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. McKnight reported that the City would be doing paving and stormwater work in the Wedge Neighborhood. He reviewed a map of where the City would be doing curb replacements. He noted that there were some granite curbs in the areas and that the City typically salvages and stores them to be reused in other projects.

Mr. McKnight discussed a proposal to provide notification of major projects in the North Slope Historic District and the Wedge Neighborhood to owners of surrounding properties. He suggested setting a standard for notification when there is a visible addition to the footprint of a house or new construction. Commissioners discussed the appropriate notification radius. There was concurrence for either matching the City standard of a 400 foot notification radius or only notifying adjoining properties. There was agreement to draft language for notifying adjoining properties only.

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer