

## Members

Kevin Bartoy, Chair  
Ken House, Vice-Chair  
Roger Johnson  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Jeff Williams  
Jennifer Mortensen  
Alex Morganroth  
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  
Amylena Figueroa, Office Assistant

Date: June 13, 2018

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 243

### Commission Members in Attendance:

Kevin Bartoy, Chair  
Ken House, *Vice-Chair*  
Roger Johnson  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Jeff Williams  
Marshall McClintock

### *Staff Present:*

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
Amylena Figueroa

### *Others Present:*

Susan Johnson  
Marshall McClintock  
Norm Gollub  
Kristi Evens & Peter Hummel  
Scott Painter  
Ahmad Rabi  
Larry Corkins  
Nore Winter & Brad Jonson

### Commission Members Absent:

Jennifer Mortenson  
Alex Morganroth

Chair Kevin Bartoy called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

## 1. ROLL CALL

## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 5/2/18; 5/9/18

The notation that Commissioner Steel's name has been misspelled, and to remove the E from his last name.

- C. Administrative Review
  - 1017 N. Cushman—windows
  - 1214 N. 8<sup>th</sup> St.—heat pump
  - 522 N. J St. – chimney removal
  - 605 S. G. St. - windows

The consent agenda was approved.

## 3. NOMINATIONS TO THE TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES – PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Bartoy introduced the Public Hearing with stating that there is a public hearing, and a sign-up sheet for citizens to sign up to speak on the two items for the nominations.

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

General Procedural Notes:

The Landmarks Preservation Commission will hear public comments today regarding a nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

Tacoma Register listing follows procedures defined in 13.07.050, and consists of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. The initial meeting determines whether the property meets the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity. If the Commission finds that the age and integrity standards are met, then the Commission may move to have the nomination scheduled for a public hearing and comment period, at which the public may enter comments into the record for consideration. Following the comment period, the Commission may deliberate on the nomination for up to 45 days before recommending to City Council listing on the register, or denying the nomination.

*The purpose of this hearing is to hear public comment to help the Commission determine whether the nominated property meets the criteria for designation and should be scheduled for City Council.*

Chair Bartoy introduced the Public Hearing. The three citizens that signed on the sheet have attended for a different topic. Chair closes the public hearing section. He opens the floor to the commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson asked if staff had hear any negative comments regarding the public hearing. Mr. McKnight said no.

**2101 Jefferson Avenue, Heidelberg Brewing Co. Warehouse and Shipping Depot/7 Seas Brewery**

**BACKGROUND**

Built in 1949 and expanded in 1953, the building currently houses the 7 Seas Brewing Company. The building was constructed by Heidelberg Brewing Co. (formerly known as Columbia Breweries, Inc.) as a warehouse and shipping depot for the former brewery across the railroad tracks to the east at a time of rapid growth for the company. Designed by architects/engineers George Wellington Stoddard and Associates of Seattle and built by Woodworth Co., contractors, the building has had a brewery related use for most of its history. It retains a high degree of integrity and is nominated under Criterion A as the building reflects a period of expansion for the brewing industry in Tacoma between 1949 and 1968. It is also nominated under Criterion C as the building exhibits a clear association with the industrial history of Tacoma's warehouse (or brewery) district. The building features some important engineering and design aspects, including large volume spaces and a direct, interior connection to the adjacent railroad (Prairie Line). Within the last 50 years, the building also gained an association with glass artist Dale Chihuly, but that connection is separate from the eligibility analysis.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

The purpose of this hearing is to hear public comment and determine whether the nominated property meets the criteria for designation and should be scheduled for City Council.

**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 property is nominated under the following criteria:

- A. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;*
- 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;*

The building may also be eligible under Criterion E. *Is part of, adjacent to, or related to an existing or proposed historic district, square, park, or other distinctive area which should be redeveloped or preserved according to a plan based on a historic, cultural, or architectural motif.*

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. At 69 years-old the property meets the age threshold criterion.
2. Changes older than 50 years may be significant in their own right; the property retains its integrity from its 1949 build date and 1953 expansion. In 1961, another addition was constructed.
3. As the building is within the Union Station Conservation District, and is also an element within the historic area informally known as the "Brewery District," the Commission staff recommends consideration of the nomination under Criterion E: *Is part of, adjacent to, or related to an existing or proposed historic district, square, park, or other distinctive area which should be redeveloped or preserved according to a plan based on a historic, cultural, or architectural motif.*

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission may recommend designation to the City Council, deny the nomination, or defer if additional information is needed. Based upon the criteria listed in TMC 13.07.040, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for designation.

Chair Bartoy noted that because there's no comment or discussion, the quorum can move to motions.

Commissioner Johnson began making a motion, however, Commissioner Williams commented that criteria E should be added into this motion as well.

Mr. McKnight stated that criteria E probably referred to the historic context of the brewery.

Chair Bartoy offered new motion that included Commissioner Johnson's original motion along with Commissioner William's addition to include criteria E as well.

Mr. Johnson made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to City Council that the Heidelberg Brewing Co. Warehouse and Shipping Depot/7 Seas Brewery be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including the following elements [Principal Structure, and Additions to the Building] finding that it does meet Criteria [A, C, and E] of TMC 13.07.040."*

Commissioner House seconded the motion.

Motion was approved.

#### **301, 309, 311 & 323 Puyallup Avenue, The Trecento Block**

##### **BACKGROUND**

The four buildings that comprise the north side of the 300 block of Puyallup Avenue are representative of the commercial and light industry, especially the automotive industry, found along this section of Puyallup Avenue and across the Dome District from the end of World War I to the start of World War II. Three of the buildings were designed by noted Tacoma architects. All are examples of the commercial buildings found in the American interwar years. The period of significance for the block is 1919 to 1953 (original construction and addition). The block and its buildings are nominated under the following criteria: Criterion A as indicative of the development of the commercial, automotive and light industrial character of Puyallup Avenue and the Dome District during the interwar period; Criterion C as indicative of various types of utilitarian, commercial architecture of the interwar period from the elaborate service stations of the 1920s (301) to modest service-bay businesses (309 and 311) to

a retail store (323). Major Tacoma architects, C.F. W. Lundberg (301), E. J. Bresemann (311) and Russell, Lance, & Muri (323) designed three of the buildings, providing examples of their work on more prosaic buildings; and Criterion F owning especially to the restoration of 301 and 323 Puyallup in the context of the continuing neighborhood development and loss of other historic buildings, the block now stands out as an intact example of what was once common there. The pattern of businesses over the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and now into the 21<sup>st</sup> reflects the broad pattern of development of low rise, low density retail businesses and light industry across the country.

### **REQUESTED ACTION**

The purpose of this hearing is to hear public comment and determine whether the nominated property meets the criteria for designation and should be scheduled for City Council.

### **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 property is nominated under the following criteria:

- A. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;*
- B. *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.*

### **ANALYSIS**

1. At a range between 81 and 99 years-old the properties meets the age threshold criterion.
2. Although the buildings have been altered over time, they individually and collectively retain a substantial integrity of location, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.
3. As of June 5, 2018, eight letters of support (included in the packet) have been received.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission may recommend designation to the City Council, deny the nomination, or defer if additional information is needed. Based upon the criteria listed in TMC 13.07.040, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for designation.

Chair asked if there is a motion for the Trecento block.

Mr. McKnight noted that the same motion carries as the principal structures and historic additions.

Commissioner Williams made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to City Council that the Trecento Block be included in the Tacoma register of Historic Places, including the following elements: The later additions that are considered historic, and be forwarded to City Council for recommendation for designation based on criteria A, B, and F."*

Commissioner Schloesser seconded the motion.

Motion was approved.

#### **4. NAMING – PUBLIC HEARING**

##### **1147 Dock Street, The Melanie Jan LaPlant Dressel Park**

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

##### **BACKGROUND**

The Foss Waterway Development Authority is requesting to name the future park at 1147 Dock Street, the Melanie Jan LaPlant Dressel Park. Construction on the ¾ acre park is set to be completed in 2020 and will include commemorative signage on Ms. Dressel's lifetime of service on the boards of Tacoma's non-profits and her role in the redevelopment of the Thea Foss Waterway. She also served as the president and CEO of Columbia Bank for 17 years. Melanie Dressel passed away in 2017.

On May 9, 2018, the Landmarks Preservation Commission voted to schedule the request for a public hearing.

##### **CRITERIA**

**The City of Tacoma Policy on Place Names and Name Changes** is included in the packet, specifically "Initial Procedures for Considering Name Change Requests," Section 3.1.

##### **ACTION REQUESTED**

There is no action required. The comment period will remain open for 30 days following the close of this hearing.

Chair Bartoy noted that the naming review is optional for the Commission, because the park is owned by the Foss Waterway Development Authority. FWDA is going through the process as a courtesy to the City. Chair Bartoy and Mr. McKnight noted that because of this, the Commission has discretion to make its recommend to City Council regarding the naming of the park immediately.

Commissioner Steel made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to City Council that 1147 Dock Street be named The Melanie Jan LaPlant Dressel Park".*

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

#### **5. DESIGN REVIEW**

##### **A. Dickman Mill Park Expansion and Head Saw (Individual Landmarks)**

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

This is a donor funded Metro Parks Tacoma project to return the historic Dickman Mill Headsaw to its original location in Dickman Mill Park. The headsaw is a City of Tacoma Landmark. The headsaw, carriage, and two smaller associated artifacts will be returned to the site within the project area. These pieces have been in storage since the early 1980's offsite. The project also includes park improvements such as a new deck, overwater walkway, interpretive signage, artwork, lighting of the headsaw and carriage, and seating. All improvements are for park visitor enjoyment and for interpretation of the headsaw and mill's history and significance.

On February 28, 2018, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the project.

##### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

##### **STANDARDS**

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

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

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.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

### **ANALYSIS**

1. The artifacts are individually listed City Landmarks, and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for modifications.
2. The park property is not on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, only the Dickman Mill Headsaw is an individual landmark.
3. The headsaw and corresponding artifacts will be prepared for public display, which requires minimal changes.
4. The historic property is being retained and preserved and relocated to its original location in the Dickman Mill Park.
5. The property is being recognized as a physical record of its time interpretive signage, artwork, lighting and site-specific salvaged materials will be utilized to convey the history.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Hummel began by commenting about the lower portion of the wheel. He stated that the best location is where the public can see it up close. The small part of the wheel will be part of the assembly. He stated that was their way of addressing the questions that the commission had from last meeting. Commissioner Johnson asked exactly where the lower wheel would be located. Mr. Hummel responded that would be in the "plan view", and commences to bring a slide show up to show a model view of what the proposed project would look like. Mr. Hummel showed the top part of the mill. He stated they are treating it as an artifact. Commissioner Johnson stated that there must be a way for the public to realize the wheel was beneath the larger wheel. Mr. Hummel answered that there will be two additional interpretive signs that can explain that level of the operation and development. He felt it's important to keep this on site as its 10 feet in diameter. Commissioner Johnson continued to ask if the band saw drops down through the base of the upper part. Mr. Hummel answered that yes it will be fixed and welded in place. Further discussion ensued regarding the blade of the saw.

Commissioner House asked how it's protected from the elements. Mr. Hummel answered that the type of protection paint used is what's also used on bridges and steel structures. The saw is in remarkable condition itself for being in storage for 40 years. Commissioner House noted that bridge paint sounded like an excellent idea, and it should be important to conduct maintenance as well. Chair Bartoy asked what the maintenance plan is. Mr. Hummel and Ms. Evans explained that the maintenance plan is not fully set in place yet.

Commissioner Schloesser commented she is intrigued by the ghost log and would like more explanation on that. Mr. Hummel showed a slide that had a picture of the proposed log. The ghost log would have lighting inside of it and wire metal writing for texture in the form of words from actual mill workers of that time. The log would taper into a canoe to show the different cultures that were brought together at the mill. Commissioner Schloesser asked if any words from the Puyallup tribe would be included. The Mr. Hummel stated that the artist has talked with the tribe and plans to talk with more of the elders that have worked at the mill.

Further discussion ensued regarding the design of the saw.

Commissioner Steel commented that putting the lower wheel out as a wagon wheel be changed. Because this is an artifact, he would like it placed back onto the deck, and incorporated into the signage and aligning it in a way where it's understandably connected to the rest of the piece.

Commissioner Williams agreed with Commissioner Steel's comment.

Commissioner House commented that he is happy to see the saw be put together again, and really appreciated

the time and care they were putting into the preservation of the saw.

Chair Bartoy commented that he isn't quite keen on the log turning a canoe.

Further discussion ensued regarding the wheel.

Mr. McKnight summarized what he was hearing from the Commissioner's. He asked if maybe the Commissioner's would consider approving the project with the condition that alternatives be considered and presented to the commission for the second wheel, as well as the commission would like to see additional documentation regarding the inventory of the artifacts associated with the saw. Commissioner Williams agreed that documentation is important.

Commissioner Steel made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmark's Preservation Commission approve the application for the Dickman Mill Park Expansion Head Saw with the additional requirements that the applicant document or otherwise provide some type of preservation plan for any artifacts associated with the mill that are not included in the application design – and the second requirement that the lower wheel of the mill is not included in our current approval and the applicant present alternatives for how the lower wheel can either be discarded, stored, or presented in the current design in a different way."*

Commissioner Schloesser seconded the motion.

Motion approved unanimously.

### **B. 901 Broadway, Jones Building/Pantages Theater (Individual Landmarks) Signage**

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

The Broadway Center for the Performing Arts is seeking approval to replace the signs on the Pantages and Rialto Theaters with LED screens. The current signs are difficult for staff to maintain and update, limited in space, and causing damage to the Pantages lobby roof. Neither sign is historic--the Pantages sign was installed in 2006, during the lobby renovation, and the Rialto sign was installed in 1991 when the city took over the building. The proposed screens would be capable of advanced graphics and moving images, but the intention is to have monochromatic displays, with a black background and white lettering at all times, with only text and minimal logos. Logos will never occupy more than 20% of the screen. The Broadway Center will never use more than two fonts on the screen at any given time. Animation of any kind will not be used. Events will alternate by fading out and in every 15 to 20 seconds. The reader boards will have the same aesthetic look as they do now, with the exception of when the screens switch between events.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this proposal on March 28, 2018. The proposal reflects the Commission's requests.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

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

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is an individually listed City Landmark, 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 removed or destroyed. The signs are compatible with the building and can be removed without harming any character defining materials.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Painter wanted to show the Commission how the logos would look on the sign. He showed some pictures on his slide show of how the sign will look. He discussed that there would be no more than two fonts per sign, as he wants to keep it historic looking.

Commissioner Williams made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Planning Commission move the application as submitted for the Broadway Center."*

Commissioner Schloesser seconded it.

Motion was approved unanimously.

### **C. 1014 Division Avenue (Wedge Historic District) Window Replacement**

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1926, this is a contributing property in the Wedge Historic District. The owner is requesting approval to remove and replace all 33 wood windows, which appear to be original to the house, with Lindsay vinyl windows. The exterior trim would be retained. The owner has already purchased the vinyl windows and has provided photos of the windows as well as letters from window contractors stating that 12 windows are broken; all the seals are not working; many are painted shut. In their opinion, replacement is necessary. Staff recommended that someone who specializes in carpentry or historic wood windows be consulted. The applicant has also provided images of all of the windows. A cost analysis of repair versus replacement has not been provided.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

##### **Wedge Neighborhood Historic District Design Guidelines**

##### **Windows**

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.

## ANALYSIS

1. This property is a contributing structure in the Wedge Neighborhood Historic District and, as such, exterior modifications are subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.
2. The existing 33 windows proposed to be replaced appear to be original to the home.
3. The proposal does not appear to meet the design guideline to preserve existing historic windows, which states: *“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.”*
4. The proposal states that all 33 windows must be replaced due to deterioration and thermal performance, both of which are addressed in the design guidelines. The guidelines encourage the repair of existing historic windows, and state in part: *“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.”*
5. The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that the windows meet the requirement for replacement. There has been no cost analysis for repair versus replacement. According to the design guidelines, condition issues such as failed glazing compound, broken glass panes, windows painted shut, deteriorated paint surface (interior or exterior) and loose joinery do not necessarily warrant replacement. The professionals quoted do not specialize in the repair of historic wood windows.
6. The application also states that replacement is necessary for thermal performance. The guidelines state: *“If thermal retrofitting is proposed as a rationale for window replacement, the owner should also furnish information that shows:*
  - *[That] ... 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.”*The above information has not been provided, and thus this guideline does not appear to be met.
7. The application proposes vinyl windows as a replacement. The guidelines state: *“Replace windows with a close visual and material match. When repairing original windows is not feasible, replacement may be considered.”* In addition, the guidelines state, *“Vinyl windows are not an acceptable replacement for existing historic windows.”* The replacement windows proposed thus do not meet the design guideline.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not recommend approval of the application. Although several of the windows appear to be deteriorated, the application has not provided sufficient evidence that all windows must be replaced, and the proposed replacement window does not meet the design guidelines for the historic district.

Mr. Rabi began by stating that he would like to replace the windows, and he had five company's appear for a quote. He mentioned that the exterior look of the window would not change, only the inside track would change. He stated the goal is to update the home and switch to double paned windows and a new efficient furnace. He said that in the pictures the Commission can see where some windows don't open or are broken. Currently because more than half the windows are broken, he cannot run the furnace. He's had squatters come in his home because the windows are already broken and the house is on Division Avenue. He said all the windows are being replaced "like for like."

Commissioner McClintock noted that none of the replacement windows have divided lights like the existing, which is a significant visual change.

Commissioner Schloesser asked staff for a timeline when the property first came to their attention. Mr. McKnight answered that at the end of May the applicant came in for a building permit and was referred to the historic preservation office. Mr. McKnight said that he explained the design guidelines at that point, and the issues Mr. Rabi would need to work through in order to obtain his building permit. He said that the applicant informed them that the project was on a compressed timeline, so staff advised them that the administrative path forward was to begin the application process to the Commission. Mr. McKnight also stated that staff informed the applicant at that time that the proposed replacement windows did not appear to meet the design guidelines. The historic application was submitted on June 4<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Schloesser noted that the windows appeared to have been ordered on May 10. Mr. Rabi responded that he had applied for a right of way permit a month prior, to get a dumpster out on the main road. When they applied for the permit, he took his window order to the permit office and asked if there were any issues with replacing windows "like for like." He said the staff may have not noticed it was in the historic district and told Mr. Rabi that it would be okay to order the windows.

Mr. McKnight said there is a permit record for a Right of Way permit for this property, but that these are not reviewed by or routed to historic preservation staff. He said that the first time historic preservation staff was aware of the project was when calls started coming in from concerned residents.

Commissioner's Schloesser, Williams, and Steel commented that the guidelines for windows do not allow vinyl windows. Mr. Rabi said that there are many examples of vinyl windows in the area on different homes, some recently installed. Commissioner Steel stated that some houses had replacement windows prior to the area becoming a district, but that his house still has historic windows.

Mr. Rabi asked if the vinyl windows had grids would be acceptable. Commissioner Steel said that vinyl windows have grids sandwiched between the glass panes, which are not appropriate. Commissioner Steel discussed alternatives to vinyl windows.

Commissioner Steel commented a house visit could be a good idea to view the windows. Commissioner Williams noted that the vinyl window replacements are still not acceptable, even if the windows need to be replaced. Commissioner Williams said that from the pictures, the windows appear to be repairable based on his experience rehabilitating houses.

There was discussion about the qualifications of the companies who provided opinions on the feasibility of window repair.

Vice-Chair House stated that his experience as an owner of a historic house who has repaired similar windows, they appear to be repairable. He said a site visit might be helpful.

Mr. McKnight stated that there are two issues for the Commission to consider. First, whether the windows need to be replaced, and second, if so, then with what type of replacement.

Mr. McKnight commented that an action on the application would not be taken at a site visit. It would still require

consideration at a formal Commission meeting. He said that the soonest the Commission could schedule a site visit would be the following week. Mr. McKnight outlined the potential decisions of the Commission, to approve the application, deny, or defer consideration and schedule a site visit.

Commissioner McClintock said that a site visit would take additional time but would probably not be helpful. Mr. Rabi concurred.

Commissioner Steel made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission deny the application for 1410 Division Avenue (Wedge Historic District)."*

Seconded by Commissioner Schloesser.

Commissioner Steel tabled his motion after Mr. Rabi indicated he had additional questions. There was discussion about review requirements for minor alterations.

Mr. McKnight asked if the Commission could revise the motion to include the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Steel made a new motion.

*"I move that the Landmark's Preservation Commission deny the application for 1410 Division Avenue (Wedge Historic District), having the Commission agreed with the findings of City staff."*

Motion was seconded by Commissioner Schloesser. The motion approved unanimously.

## **5. BOARD BRIEFINGS**

### **A. 805 North J Street (North Slope Historic District) *New Construction***

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

The property at 805 North J Street was built in 1965 and is noncontributing to the North Slope Historic District. The owner is proposing to demolish the existing structure and replace it with 2000 square foot, two-story, Victorian-style, duplex with a 5/12 roof. The new building would have Andersen Fibrex doors and windows and cementitious lap siding.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Feedback on the proposal.

Mr. Corkins began stating that he'd like to tear down this building that is in poor shape and not historic.

Commissioner McClintock stated that if this structure were by itself he wouldn't have many qualms, but because it's surrounded by an existing flat roof he wonders if doing the Victorian style would disrupt the aesthetics of the surrounding area. By taking a complex and modifying only one of the buildings into Victorian although the rest of the complex looks more modern would be too large of a contrast. He noted that one of the guidelines the Commission adheres by is to not fake history.

Commissioner Williams noted that the commission doesn't have the authority to determine a stylistic view for Mr. Corkins.

Commissioner Steel added that because of the context of the surrounding buildings, what Commissioner McClintock was suggesting is great, but it could muddy the waters by taking a modern approach.

Commissioner House commented that under the design guidelines you could do either Modern or Victorian.

Mr. Corkins stated the structure that he is proposing to put up, would screen the view of the other buildings.

Mr. McKnight noted that this is a fairly complete design and the outcome is a response given to the Commission with the recommendation of staff.

Commissioner Steel commented that he's enjoying the hand drawn design and made a recommendation that the slider windows would not work, and that Mr. Corkins could think about a single hung window.

Mr. Corkins answered that he encouraged this because of security.

Commissioner Williams commented that other than the sliders, he agreed with the design.

Further discussion ensued regarding the design of the complex.

Mr. McKnight offered his interpretation of the Commissioner's thoughts. He noted that the only real concern is the use of sliding windows, which he could discuss with Mr. Corkins the alternatives that he heard the Commission mention. He also mentioned that the minor amendments can be made and submitted with revised drawings within the design package and presented to the Commission on the next available agenda. Mr. Corkins agreed.

Chair Bartoy thanked the Mr. Corkins.

#### **4. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS**

##### **A. Old City Hall Historic District Design Guidelines**

Winter & Company, the City's consultant hired to prepare design guidelines for the Old City Hall Historic District, will provide an overview of the project, share visual examples of preservation guidelines that they have prepared for other communities and engage LPC members in a discussion of the Old City Hall District. This may include a discussion of the key character defining features of the district, key issues that may need to be addressed in the guidelines and other topics related to the district and future guidelines. The firm's founder Nore' Winter will be in attendance along with Brad Johnson, who is a Senior Planner/Designer for the firm.

##### **ACTION REQUESTED**

No action requested.

Mr. McKnight gave an introduction for Winter and Company. They have worked with the City of Tacoma before when they worked with the city to create the Preservation Plan in 2011.

Mr. Jonson from Winter and Company gave an overview and general approach of what they are planning to do. He reviewed the meaning of historic preservation specifically in Tacoma. He stated that the focus would be on the local district.

Mr. Jonson stated the main thing right now is for his team to just learn about Tacoma and try to understand the district the best they can in a short amount of time, and bring back user friendly graphic oriented design guidelines that can be used by the Commission. They will do an initial draft and have the Commission review the second draft in the fall in preparing for adoption by the Commission.

Regarding City Hall there were many building owners that were participating with the input for this project.

He reviewed the Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Schloesser commented that the team should include Wireless Communication Masts. Brad agreed, as he had heard that comment earlier that day from someone else

Mr. Jonson showed examples of design guidelines format and the importance of using a consistent order from his presentation.

Commissioner Steel commented that some of the feedback that the Commission has heard from business owners, property owners, and politicians, is that preservation might be a barrier to economic development. So if there was a way to talk about adaptive re-use, and frame the guidelines in such a way that it's understood that accommodations for adaptive re-use can be made. He believed it would be important to include in there.

Commissioner Williams commented that because of their background, that company should have data on adaptive reuse and restoration is actually more green and it's economically a driver for a historic district. It would be great if they could add that information into these guidelines.

Chair Bartoy appreciated the customer focus on this, as many people are beginners when it comes to addressing these guidelines.

Further discussion ensued regarding design guidelines.

Mr. McKnight commented that every Historic District has a set of guidelines as is required by code. Once the guidelines are in place, that it's perfectly reasonable to take a look at all of them and see how internally consistent they are with how the Commission handles business.

#### B. Events & Activities Update

##### **2018 Events**

1. Trivia Night (6pm @ The Swiss, June 20th)
2. Fern Hill Walking Tour (1pm @ Corner of S. 84th/S. Park Ave., July 14th)
3. Stadium Historic District Walking Tour (3pm @ Stadium High School, August 18th)
4. LPC Training ( September TBD)
5. Trivia Night (6pm @ The Swiss, September 19th)
6. Historic Churches Tour (TBD, October)
7. Fifth Annual Holiday Heritage Swing Dance (6-9pm @ Tin Can Alley, Nov. 4<sup>th</sup>)
- 8.

The Commission and Staff waived the activities and events update due to time.

#### **5. CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Bartoy wanted to point out that staff did a phenomenal job with Historic Preservation Month

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

***These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit: <http://www.cityoftacoma.org/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=67980>***