Agenda

Landmarks Preservation Commission
Planning and Development Services Department

Date: March 12, 2014
Location: 747 Market, Tacoma Municipal Bldg, Conference 248
Time: 5:30 p.m.

Please note assigned times are approximate. The Chair reserves the right to alter the order of the agenda.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Excusal of Absences
   B. Meeting Minutes 9/25/13, 10/9/13

3. DESIGN REVIEW
   A. 1110-12 and 1114-16 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way (Kellogg-Sicker/ Pochert) Kevin Grossman 15m
      Façade restoration
   B. 820 N Ainsworth (North Slope Historic District) Staff 10m
      Exterior renovations

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING
   A. Media Outreach and Development Carrie McCausland 25m
   B. Marketing and Events Committee Update – Preservation Month JD Elquist 15m
   C. 1705 N Steele Street – inventory status Staff 5m

5. CHAIR COMMENTS

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer

Next Regular Meeting: March 26, 2014, 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Bldg., Rm. 248 5:30 p.m.

This agenda is for public notice purposes only. Complete applications are included in the Landmarks Preservation Commission records available to the public BY APPOINTMENT at 747 Market Street, Floor 3, or online at http://tacomaculture.org/historic/resources.asp. All meetings of the Landmarks Preservation Commission are open to the public. Oral and/or written comments are welcome.

The City of Tacoma does not discriminate on the basis of handicap in any of its programs or services. To request this information in an alternative format or to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at (253) 591-5056 (voice) or (253) 591-5820 (TTY).
Vice Chair Echtle called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

1. **ROLL CALL**
   Vice Chair Echtle, Elquist, Rahe, Steele, York present as well as ex-officios Buffington and McClintock.

2. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   A. Excusal of Absences: House, Chase and Jensen were excused.
   B. Minutes: there were no minutes.

   Consent agenda approved.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW**
   A. Tacoma Totem Pole (Fireman’s Park)

   Mr. McKnight read the staff report into the record:

   **Background**
The Tacoma Totem Pole was commissioned by Tacoma civic boosters and curio shop owners Chester Thorne and William Sheard in 1903, and installed at a location near its present location the day before President Theodore Roosevelt arrived in Tacoma. Reported to have been carved at a cost of $3000, the pole was intended to rival Seattle’s infamous Pioneer Square Totem Pole and is symbolic of a broader historical narrative surrounding the role of the Puget Sound in the Alaskan Gold Rush and the internationally significant Alaska Yukon Exposition that was being planned for 1909. The symbols and carvings on the pole are of unknown origin but are suggestive of Haida style of northwestern British Columbia. The pole is not of Coast Salish origin or design.
The pole has been undergoing a structural and condition analysis by the City this year. On April 12, 2013, during this analysis, structural engineers under contract with the City determined that there was a significant risk of structural failure due to rot and deterioration. The Public Works Director ordered the immediate temporary bracing of the pole, while city engineers began working on a strategy for long term external bracing.

This is an application to install a single bracing pole behind the Totem Pole, with brackets attached to two points of the pole, to stabilize in place. Three options for bracket design are being presented to the Commission.

PRIOR MEETINGS

April 24, 2013: Staff briefed the Commission on the status of the pole and tentative plans to stabilize the pole. During this briefing, several Commissioners questioned the cultural appropriateness of the plan, due to several cultural factors, and requested that staff further research traditional practices related to declining totem poles, the history and meaning of the Tacoma Totem Pole (including the significance of the symbolism), and whether the pole was legitimately carved.

May 7: Staff convened a working group to discuss and further research these questions. The outcome of this discussion was that the most appropriate course of action for cultural and safety reasons was that the pole should be removed and relocated to a place where it could decompose, and that every interpretive opportunity to educate the public about the history and context of the pole, and totem poles generally, be explored.

May 8: The Landmarks Preservation Commission directed staff to gather additional information regarding the safety issues and costs associated with stabilization, and additional analysis should be done regarding the history of the pole.

June 4: The Tacoma Arts Commission convened a De-Accession Review Panel to consider the removal of the Totem Pole from the Municipal Art Collection, per the Municipal Art Collection De-Accession Policy. The panel voted unanimously to retain the pole in the Municipal Art Collection. The panel did not arrive at a consensus regarding the best approach to deal with the pole, other than to conclude that it should be preserved either standing, or stored protected in an indoor location.

June 12: The Commission was briefed on options regarding the preservation of the pole. Staff provided a briefing on the structural bracing options and costs.

STANDARDS

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation apply to this project. Note that these standards are different than the Standards for Rehabilitation. The four Secretary of the Interior’s Standard approaches are Rehabilitation, Preservation, Restoration, and Reconstruction.

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
ANALYSIS

1. The Tacoma Totem Pole is a City Landmark, and any alterations to it that affect its appearance requires the approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to those changes being made, per TMC 13.05.046.
2. The pole is primarily significant for its association with the early development of Tacoma, the Alaska-Yukon Gold Rush and its effects on the development of commercial activity in the Puget Sound region.
3. The pole is not of Coastal Salish origin or design. Although the style of the pole has been described as being suggestive of Haida, the identities and cultural backgrounds of the carvers is unknown, and the carved elements themselves are atypical in dimension and design.
4. According to an engineer’s report issued on April 12, 2013, examination of the pole indicated that there was a significant risk of sudden structural failure due to deterioration. The pole was temporarily braced as a result, and remains this way currently.
5. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has received status updates and requests for feedback at meetings on April 24, May 8, and June 12.
6. The proposed bracing design will support the pole in place, avoiding the risks associated with removal and reinstallation of the pole and costs associated with transport and storage, thus meeting Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Preservation #1.
7. The single support pole will be placed behind the Totem Pole and will be painted black, to both be distinguishable from the historic pole as well as be visually subservient, thus meeting Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Preservation #3.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. McKnight introduced Darius Thompson from the Public Works Department, the project manager. He said that the updated cost estimates have been distributed to the Commission.

He said that staff does not recommend a specific bracing method from the options put forth, but that the commission can discuss and make a recommendation. Mr. Thompson said he is seeking direction on which way the Commission wants to go with the bracing so that staff can move forward with design, bracing and get rolling with this project.

There was discussion.

- Option 1 shows a ring around the back side, a pole up the back with two through-bolts showing in front
- Option 2 shows a ring all around the pole, 9” tall, but no through-bolts
- Option 3 same as option 1 with continuous through-bolts, but rather than a pipe brace, there is a flat steel plate up the back

The Commission discussed which method would cause the least additional damage to the pole and also wood treatments to stop additional rotting.

Mr. McKnight noted that, as was discussed in June, the City has the ability and the need to stabilize the pole right now if it stays where it is, just for safety reasons alone. Any steps after that would be part of a discussion with the Arts Commission on the plan for dealing with ongoing maintenance. The City will need to have that discussion if a plan to stabilize the pole is approved by the Commission.

Discussion then turned to the cost estimate along with continued discussion of which option would be best centering around the issue of ring brace vs. through-bolts. Also discussion about the pole being treated as an art object vs. archaeological object.
Mr. Thompson said that the timeline to build the bracing would be something like 2.5 to 3 months to get someone in to advertise, bid the job, award the job, and then get the contractor going. Design would take about 2 weeks once we know which option the Commission approves.

Commissioner Steel asked summarized concerns and observations related to Option 1:
- If through-bolts can be plugged with wood on the face of the pole
- Resolving any moisture infiltration concerns resulting from the through-bolts going through the totem pole
- Would expansion and contraction cause issues?
- Use a noncorrosive material

There was a motion:
“I move that we approve the Fireman’s Park Totem Pole design at 801 A Street as submitted with Option 1 as the brace type that is preferred by the Landmarks Commission with an additional request that the applicant consider the through-bolts being plugged on the face side of the totem pole with wood plugs, the through-bolts be sealed in a way that does not allow moisture infiltration into the pole, and that the expansion and contraction of the totem pole be considered in the bracing design, and that noncorrosive material be used where penetrating the totem pole.”

Motion: Steele
Second: York
Motion approved

Mr. McKnight said that the outcome is that the Commission has voted to approve the bracing with attachment Option 1. He said that the issues named in the motion can be clarified by staff. If these conditions are met, the Commission doesn’t need to see the design again.

4. BOARD BRIEFING

A. Old City Hall (625 Commerce – Old City Hall Historic District)

Mr. McKnight briefed the Commission.

He said that on September 11 staff reported to the Commission that we would have a tentative design briefing on the roof repair project for Old City Hall. He said that since then the City has reached a stipulated agreement with the building owner for them to prepare their own plan to repair the roof. Mr. McKnight said that the plan is due to his office next week.

The agreement is that the owners will address the roof repairs themselves. They will present a proposal, a plan for documentation and salvage materials, and so forth, and bring that to the Commission. Mr. McKnight said that will be scheduled for the October 9 agenda. As a result, at this time the City is not presenting a repair plan to the Commission because the owners have signed an agreement to take care of the roof, in addition to some other outstanding issues with the building. Staff will be working with them over the next couple of weeks to get the design package ready for Commission review on October 9.

5. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

Term Expirations
Mr. McKnight noted that several Commissioners have their Commission terms coming up soon. The Commission will be seeing a general recruitment notice. There will be four potential appointments, one vacancy. He said the City is required to announce and recruit whenever there is a term expiration. There is an application on the City’s Boards and Commission website

Architectural Review Committee
Mr. McKnight said that he planned to schedule an Architectural Review Committee for October 2. There are two agenda items. The first is at 715 N Grant St. there is a project in the planning stages right now. It’s a single-family residential house. The lot is a tight flatiron-shape lot. They are going through setback review now. They will need some variances and they have some critical early stage questions about garages, attached or not attached, regarding the design guidelines in the historic district and we want to give them some early feedback. They are in the variance process now, which comes before the LPC process, but what they do now will be critical to their design. Secondly is the Bostwick Building. You may have noticed some paint on the storefronts. They will be in next week to talk about that. These are the mahogany storefronts.

Mr. McKnight said that he also wanted guidance from the Commission on 811 N M Street. This a residential remodel that included an addition to the back of the house, window replacement on the sides and back and hopefully restoration on the front. The Commission at a meeting in April directed that the front windows be retained and restored if possible. Mr. McKnight said that he had just recently conducted a site visit and needed some guidance from the Commission. There are double-hung windows in the front bay on either side of the bay, flanking a Victorian fixed-paned window with a multi-colored light window above it. In the process of working on the house, they discovered a couple of things. When they removed the sashes to start working on the restoration, they discovered that the window frames and sashes are actually falling apart, the joinery is rotted. And what were thought to be double hung windows are not actually double hung. The top sash was fixed at a very early period. There are no weight pockets and there are no pullies in these windows. The owner would like to go with the Andersen Woodright 400 series windows that they are using all throughout the house, which have already been approved, with the exception of the center window in the bay which has the ornamentation—they are having that milled in kind. The issue is that the sill, the frame, the guides, and the sashes, especially in the corners, are all in fairly bad shape. They were never weighted windows. Mr. McKnight said he looked at the frames inside, and there is nothing there at all. Windows are held up by camlocks that put pressure on the sides which is all that is holding the window up. For operability, for sheer practicality, these are 1 over 1 single light windows (picture example shown). Right now they are sawing and putting in a primed board for the sills and they’ve done the outside trim casing work. Mr. McKnight asked if the Commission wanted the owner to come back to amend the approval, or if the Commission wanted to do a site visit, or if the change to the project could be reviewed administratively for the Woodright wood-clad window in the double-hung configuration.

Commissioner consensus was that this can be left to staff discretion.

Reuben will schedule ARC meeting for October 2.

6. CHAIR COMMENTS
None.

Meeting adjourned at 6:28 pm.

Submitted as True and Correct:

____________________________________________
Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer
Commission Members in Attendance: Ken House, Katie Chase, Jonah Jensen, James Steel, Duke York, Ross Buffington, Marshall McClintock

Commission Members Absent: Edward Echtle, Megan Luce, Daniel Rahe

Commission Members Excused:

Staff Present: Reuben McKnight, Lisa Spielmann

Others Present:

Date: October 9, 2013
Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Chair Ken House called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

1. ROLL CALL
   Commissioner Echtle, Luce, and Rahe and present are the ex-officio Commissioners.

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Excusal of absences: no excusals requested.
   B. Meeting minutes: no minutes to approve

   Consent agenda approved.

3. DESIGN REVIEW
   A. 625 Commerce Street (Old City Hall, Old City Hall Historic District)

   Mr. McKnight read the staff report into the record.

   BACKGROUND
   Old City Hall, constructed in 1892, was the first property added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places in 1974. Since 2006, the property has been vacant while the ownership has attempted to obtain financing for a rehabilitation project.

   In 2010, during a severe cold snap, the sprinkler main froze and burst, flooding the interior of the building. Although the damage from the water was cleaned up and abated, several other areas of concern have emerged, including a leaking roof on the northeast tower, potentially failing masonry on the west side of the building, lack of fire protection, and other substandard conditions.

   Since 2010, the building has been under a “derelict” status under the Minimum Buildings and Structures Code (TMC 2.01); recently the City elevated this to a “dangerous” status. As a result of this action,
owner and the City negotiated a stipulated agreement to address the substandard conditions in the building (attached to the Staff Report).

The first action stipulated in the agreement is roof replacement on the northeast tower of the building, which has failed and is allowing water to enter the building, raising significant concerns about long term decline. The owner has submitted the attached proposal in keeping with the agreement, in which the following is proposed:

1. Remove and store existing barrel rolled copper roof.
2. Inspect and anchor existing copper cornice/soffit ornamental elements.
3. Inspect and repair/replace as needed existing roof decking material.
4. Install Tri-Built self-sealing underlayment
5. Install metal standing-seam roof in a finish to be determined
6. Install new gutters within the existing gutter system
7. Close open soffits where material is missing with temporary measures

This work is to be executed by November 4 and completed by December 20, 2013. Within the Stipulated Agreement, the owner agrees also to present a permanent restoration plan, including repair of cornice elements, to the Landmarks Preservation Commission within three years.

The City has consulted with roof repair and building envelope specialists regarding recommendations for addressing the roof issue. There is general agreement that the existing roof, which appears to be original to the building, must be removed to address both water incursion and wind.

Additional Items

Staff has requested that the following information be furnished to the Commission at the October 9, 2013 meeting:

1. Profile information for the metal roof, including width between roof seams.
2. Detail drawings showing the roof/gutter junction and gutter details.
3. Drawn details of the proposed treatment for the soffit where the cornice materials are missing (how will the soffit be enclosed, including materials, profile and attachments).
4. Material samples of the proposed metal finish.
5. Additional information for documentation of the existing roof if additional pieces of the cornice must be removed.

Mr. McKnight distributed material samples.

ACTION REQUESTED
Approval of the proposal to replace the existing roof and secure the cornice materials to the building, as indicated above.

STANDARDS
The Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation apply. The standards “are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.”

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
ANALYSIS

1. Built in 1892-3, Old City Hall is an iconic historic building in Tacoma, listed on the National, State and Local Registers of Historic Places, in addition to being the namesake of the Old City Hall Historic District. Old City Hall was the City of Tacoma’s first designated landmark.

2. As a City Landmark, exterior changes to the building require the review and approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to the work being performed or permits being issued, per TMC 13.05.047.

3. The proposed action is being undertaken under a Stipulated Agreement between the City and the property owner, as a result of an enforcement action by the City to address multiple substandard conditions present on the property, including a failed roof.

4. According to building envelop consultants, repair of the roof is not feasible, because there are multiple areas of failure, and the tiles currently on the roof are not securely attached (meaning that more loss would be anticipated in high wind events). Repair from the underside will not address water penetration through the roof and underlayment.

5. According to a report prepared for the City by Wetherholt and Associates, previously presented to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, the original roof tiles could be custom reproduced but tooling may have to be made. The cost would be estimated at 2-3 times the cost of a standing seam assembly, thus

6. The proposed seam metal roof will attempt a color match to the remaining copper. In general, faux finishes should be avoided. A color such as “weathered copper” or “dark bronze” is preferable over an artificially patinated surface.

7. Removal of the copper will be documented and the material will be stored, to allow for future restoration.

8. The ownership will address the long term design of the roof and missing cornice elements within three years as a part of the stipulated agreement.

9. The existing (remaining) copper cornice elements will be retained and secured in place.

10. The proposed action will address the water incursion into the building.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted, noting that 1) this approach is designed to address the ongoing issue of serious water incursion into the building, 2) based upon the input received, this represents the most economically and technically feasible approach to address the issue, and 3) materials will be salvaged and the owner has committed to returning to the Commission to discuss future restoration.

There was discussion regarding stipulation that a permanent plan will be brought forward by owners within three years ensued. Also discussion about applying a special tax valuation on this effort and the Commission’s options. Also concerns about the wording of the motion. A recommendation was made that there be a condition that no future permits or LPC approvals be issued until a permanent replacement and restoration has gone through. Mr. McKnight indicated that he’d have to check to see if that is legal. Lisa Wojtanowicz also noted that in the stipulated order there are requirements that need to be met within three years and all other violations (as outlined in the dangerous building code) be brought into compliance within five years.

There was discussion of an appropriate motion.

Motion:
Approve a temporary solution as presented, conditioned upon meeting the requirements outlined in the stipulated agreement Item 12 regarding return to the LPC with a plan for the restoration of the missing gutter and cornice elements with an architecturally appropriate roof material and design within the timelines that are indicated in item 9 of the stipulated agreement; that the future proposal shall comply with Secretary of the Interior standards. A permanent roof solution may be required for the purposes of a special tax valuation for the Commission to approve such an application.
Motion seconded by Commissioner York.

Commissioner Chase proposed that the motion be amended to not use the shiny copper material.

Amendment seconded by Steel. Amendment accepted.

Commissioner Steel requested that in future if legal agreements are being reviewed that a rep from the City Attorney’s Office be present.

Motion: House  
Second: York  
Motion approved.

4. Board Briefing  
A. 764 Broadway (Bostwick Building)—storefront painting

Mr. McKnight stated that Rex Nikula from Reeder Management Company was not present.

BACKGROUND
Originally built in 1889, the Bostwick Building is a City Landmark. The building was added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places in 1999 and received a Special Tax Valuation incentive for a substantial remodel that concluded in 2000. The building achieved its current visual appearance following a significant remodel in 1924, at which time the ornate Victorian exterior was stuccoed, and the existing Philippine mahogany storefronts were added.

On September 24, staff received numerous complaints that the storefronts on the building, which were stained and varnished, were being primed and painted. Staff contacted the ownership and property management company, Reeder Management, which was unaware that there was a requirement for approval for this exterior change.

Approximately 75% of the wood storefronts on the Saint Helens side of the building have been primed and painted with an oil-based penetrating primer and acrylic paint. The color of the paint is a brown selected to match the tone and hue of the unpainted wood. According to the property manager, the ongoing maintenance (and severely weather condition) of the existing exposed wood prompted this action. While stain and clear sealant was considered, the management was advised by the painting representative that this would not address long term maintenance and that suitable products would not produce a desirable “sheen.”

At the request of staff, Mr. Nickula of Reeder Management attended the Architectural Review Committee on October 2. During this meeting he explained the rationale behind the painting and expressed concern that the removal of the paint would be very difficult.

The Committee made the following observations and recommendations:

- The mahogany wood is a character defining element of the building and was not meant to be painted
- Expert advice should be sought regarding both the feasibility of removal of the paint as well as potential sealants that would still allow the wood grain to be seen
- Potential resources might include window restoration experts or furniture refinishing experts
- The commission would like to see cost comparisons and pros/cons of different approaches to determine if painting is truly the best option
- For the primed storefronts, the owner may want to finish the painting due to the seasonal changes occurring, but if the owner elects to pursue that course of action, they should do so with the knowledge that it may have to be removed in the future
- Exploration of chemical stripping prior to mechanical stripping is recommended.
Mr. Nickula requested to be on the October 9, 2013 Landmarks meeting to continue the discussion and present additional information. Mr. McKnight said he would follow up to see why they did not attend this meeting and when the LPC may see a proposal from them. If they don’t respond, he may pursue this as violation.

Commissioner York discussed remarks by a Sherman Williams chemist regarding paint vs. varnish. Clear varnish (one coat) doesn’t last nearly as long as the paint with its expansion-contraction characteristics, but it has been proven that a multicoat buildup of varnish (four coats) you can achieve the same result as paint in terms of durability. So there is a way to make the varnish last as long as paint.

Chair House noted that they have created the condition by priming so near to the end of the weather window.

5. CHAIR COMMENTS
The Chair had no comments.

6. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING:

Mr. McKnight noted that there are a few special tax valuations coming up at the next meeting, and minutes will completed.

Commissioner Jensen said that few months ago he gave an update on Washington and stated he could arrange a tour. It’s getting toward the end of selective demolition for anyone who would may be interested. One challenge with that may be with the time since it is getting darker sooner, we would need to do it earlier in the day instead of at this meeting time. The contractor is not on site after dark. He talked with the school district today and sometime in the next 3 or 4 weeks would be a good time. There are a lot of interesting things going on in the inside, and you can start to see the shape of the additions and the spaces they are going to create around the historic building. There are a lot of things happening concurrently. He said he could set something up with Mr. McKnight if people are interested.

There was brief discussion of work currently occurring on the roof.

Mr. McKnight reminded the Commissioners of the tour of McCarver Elementary on October 16, 5:30pm. This is an introductory walk through of current state in advance of project work.

Adjourned.

Chair Ken House adjourned the meeting at 6:28 pm.

Submitted as True and Correct:

____________________________________________
Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer
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DESIGN REVIEW

AGENDA ITEM 3A:  1114 and 1116 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way

Kevin Grossman, owner

BACKGROUND
The H.C. Pochert Building was constructed in 1904 and the Kellogg-Sicker Building in 1906. Both were designed by notable Tacoma architect Carl August Darmer, and were added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places in 2013. The buildings are located in the Hilltop Neighborhood of Tacoma, which was one of the first residential neighborhoods to develop outside of the downtown area.

The buildings have been vacant since 2005, when the City of Tacoma acquired both buildings and adjacent parcels as a potential redevelopment site. Over the past several years, there has been a broad discussion about the historic significance of the buildings and their importance to the Hilltop Neighborhood and MLK Corridor.

Most recently, in 2013, the present owners of the buildings purchased them with the intention of rehabilitating them as a mixed use development.

This is a proposal to restore the primary facades of both buildings, including:
1. Removal of non-historic storefronts and plywood boarding, and installing an anodized aluminum and wood storefront based upon the original design drawings (included in application materials)
2. Replace broken and deteriorated windows in Kellogg-Sicker Building second story (in existing openings) with aluminum clad wood windows to match historic configurations
3. Clean, repair and restore masonry
4. Remove non-historic awning on Kellogg-Sicker Building
5. Restore existing original windows on second floor of Pochert Building

REQUESTED ACTION
Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings:

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

ANALYSIS
1. Both buildings are historically significant and were added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Properties in 2013.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to both buildings per TMC 13.05.047, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of their status as a City Landmarks.
3. Both buildings have been vacant for several years and prior to that suffered from many years of deferred maintenance. Until 2013 it was unclear if either building would be saved through adaptive reuse.
4. Both storefronts have been removed and are no longer in their original configuration. The plan to rebuild the storefronts is a close visual match to the original Darmer plans and will restore much of the original street level character of the buildings in a feasible manner, thus meeting SOI Standard #6.
5. The second story windows in the Kellogg-Sicker Buildings are currently boarded up and are significantly deteriorated. The windows in the Pochert Building are intact and can be restored to serviceable condition. The proposal to replace the existing Kellogg-Sicker windows with a close visual approximation and restore the Pochert windows meets SOI Standard #6.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

Agenda Item 3B: 820 N Ainsworth (North Slope Historic District)

Staff

Background
Built in 1919, the house at 820 N Ainsworth is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. It recently was in foreclosure and now will be extensively rehabilitated. The scope of work includes:

Front (east) elevation:
- Removal of vinyl siding and repair of missing and damaged original siding beneath, including trim and casing
- Replacement of the (5) existing non-historic vinyl sliding windows in the front dormer with (4) hinged wood casement windows. The current configuration is asymmetrical. The new window openings will be centered in the dormer and overall glazed area will be narrower; the new wall space at either end will be sided with matching wood siding as is on the rest of the house.

Side (north) elevation:
- Remove deteriorated side porch and relocate side door as shown in drawings. The existing side porch roof elements, including barge board and supports, will be salvaged and reused in the new side door location. Stairs will be rebuilt in kind.
- The existing window in the location where the new side door will be placed will be salvaged and relocated to the upstairs bathroom, to replace an existing vinyl window.
- Removal of oil tank
- Replace garage door with reproduction carriage door (not visible from right of way).

Rear (west) elevation (not visible from right of way)
- Remove non-historic plate glass window in bay addition with counter height wood double hung sash windows
- Replace vinyl windows on second story with wood double hung windows

Side (south) elevation (not visible from right of way):
- Replace vinyl windows with wood double hung windows
- Install window in new bath using salvaged window
- Side over existing non-historic casement window opening

Requested Action
Approval of the above scope of work.

Standards
North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines:

Windows
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.
5. New Window Openings/Changing Window Openings. 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 a 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.
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.

ANALYSIS

1. This house is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it was built in 1919. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building per TMC 13.05.047, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. Removal of non-historic vinyl windows and replacement with historically appropriate windows in a historically appropriate configuration meets the applicable NSHD guidelines for windows.
4. The relocation of the side porch is required for interior configuration. The reconstruction of a new side entry will have a minimal visual impact and by salvaging original materials, will ensure a visual match for scale and architectural elements.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

AGENDA ITEM 4A: Media and Outreach Development
Carrie McCausland, Media and Communications Office

Carrie McCausland from the Media and Communications Office of the City will present an overview of a proposed media and outreach strategy for the Landmarks Preservation Commission for the coming year and next biennium. The briefing will include specific task items and potential areas of participation for individual Commissioners.

AGENDA ITEM 4B: Marketing and Events Committee update
JD Elquist, Committee Chair

The Marketing and Events Committee will discuss planning for Preservation Month in May, as well as the annual preservation awards.

AGENDA ITEM 4C: 1705 N Steele Street – inventory status
Staff

BACKGROUND

Recently the owner of the building at 1705 N Steele contacted the historic preservation office to discuss replacement of existing non-historic aluminum slider windows. Per the LPC bylaws, this would be treated as an administrative review. However, additional work may be proposed for the house to enhance the entry to the second unit.

The building is listed as “noncontributing” in the National Register nomination from 2003 due to modifications, including removal of all original windows, removal of primary entrance to the building, and a non-historic addition. It was not named in the 1996 North Slope Historic District expansion nomination (local designation) but was included as a secondary structure in the ordinance prior to 2005. When building addresses were removed from the Tacoma Municipal Code in 2005, the Commission adopted an administratively managed building inventory.

The new inventory ended the practice of classifying buildings as Pivotal, Primary, Secondary and Non-contributing. Instead all buildings became either “contributing” or “non-contributing.” This building was included in the “contributing” category.
Staff wishes to solicit feedback from the Commission on whether this property should remain as a “contributing structure” due to the loss of character. Changes to the inventory for the North Slope are reviewed once per year.

Pictures below for discussion.
APPLICATION FOR DESIGN REVIEW
COMMERCIAL AND MULTIFAMILY

Please include ALL of the following information with your application. Insufficient application materials will result in a delay in processing of your application. If you have any question regarding application requirements, or regulations and standards for historic buildings and districts, please call the Historic Preservation Officer at 253.591.5220.

PART 1: PROPERTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Property Name</th>
<th>Kellogg/Sicker &amp; Pochert Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building/Property Address</td>
<td>1110-12 &amp; 1114-16 MLK Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark or Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Name</td>
<td>Ryan Rhodes Designs, Inc (Ryan Rhodes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Address (if different than above)</td>
<td>303 Nickerson Street, Seattle, WA 98109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Phone</td>
<td>206 632-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan@ryanrhodesdesigns.com">ryan@ryanrhodesdesigns.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner's Name (printed)</td>
<td>Kellogg Sicker Pochert, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner's Address</td>
<td>31620 23rd Avenue South, Suite 200, Federal Way, WA 98003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner's Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Application must be signed by the property owner to be processed. By signing this application, owner confirms that the application has been reviewed and determined satisfactory by the owner.

APPLICATION FEE
Please see the fee schedule on page 2.

Estimated project cost: 100,000.00
Application fee enclosed (please make payable to City of Tacoma): 2,000.00

The Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) is the designated review board to approve or deny proposed changes to designated historic buildings and districts. Review criteria are available at the Planning and Development Services Department (253) 591-5220 and on the city website. Information on standards and guidelines can be found in Tacoma Municipal Code 1.42 (Landmarks Preservation Commission) and 13.07 (Special Review Districts).
PART 2: INSTRUCTIONS

New Fee Schedule for 2013

On December 18, 2012, City Council approved a new general services fee schedule that includes new fees for design review and demolition review of historic buildings (Res. No. 38588). The new fees are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated project cost</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 – 5000</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTS UNDER $1 MILLION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Each additional $1000</th>
<th>$30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum fee per review</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Demolition</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTS OVER $1 MILLION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum fee</th>
<th>$3000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each additional $10,000</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum fee</td>
<td>$4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Tips for Modifications to Historic Buildings

1. **First contact the proper permitting office to ensure your project is code compliant.** Presubmittal conferences with Commercial Plan Review may be required for major projects and should occur prior to Landmarks Commission review of your project. **If variances are required for your project, contact the Historic Preservation Officer before submitting your application.** Variances or conditional use approvals that may affect the exterior design of the project must be resolved prior to Landmarks Commission review.

2. **For complex projects, several design briefings to the Landmarks Commission may be necessary.** Contact the Historic Preservation Officer to discuss scheduling options. The Landmarks Commission generally meets twice per month. Sign applications and other simple design reviews generally do not require multiple visits.

3. **Projects are evaluated using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, and any applicable Historic District Design Guidelines (if the project occurs within a historic district).** Design Guidelines cover areas such as massing, scale, streetscape, signage, awnings and other design elements. Copies of Tacoma's guidelines are available at the Historic Preservation Office, or online at [www.tacomaculture.org](http://www.tacomaculture.org).

General Steps for Submitting Applications

1. **Begin the application consultation process with Buildings and Land Use (BLUS) to identify code-compliance issues and required permits.**

2. **For large projects, contact the Historic Preservation Office to determine an appropriate schedule for review.**

3. **Submit completed application and APPLICATION FEE to:**

   Historic Preservation Officer
   747 Market Street, Room 1036
   Tacoma, WA 98402-3793

   OR Email form to:
   landmarks@cityoftacoma.org

**PLEASE NOTE:** The Landmarks Commission meets on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month. Applications are due a MINIMUM of 2 weeks prior to the meeting date you are targeting, so please plan accordingly. Incomplete or missing information will delay consideration of your application.
PART 3: PROJECT SCOPE AND DESCRIPTION
Please use the space below to describe the project. Attach additional pages if necessary. All proposed changes must be included in this description. Please see NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION CHECKLIST (next page).

Proposed East Façade Restoration to Existing Brick Buildings:

Remove non-historic glazing and plywood cover, install new street-level storefront to match historic/original design as nearly as practicable.

Replace broken/missing wood double-hung windows on upper floor of Kellogg/Sicker Building (in existing openings) with new aluminum clad wood windows – to match historic/original windows in size, profile, and operation as nearly as practicable.

Clean and restore existing brick façade, including terracotta and stone details per plans.

Remove non-historic awning from Kellogg-Sicker Building
**PART 4: APPLICATION CHECKLIST** (For sign or awning applications, please go to PART 5).

### General Requirements

- [ ] Twenty copies of the application and all supporting documents for distribution
- [ ] Property owner/manager consent

- [ ] Check here to certify that you have contacted the Permit Counter to resolve any potential code or zoning issues with your project.

- [ ] Check here to certify that there are NO PENDING APPLICATIONS FOR A VARIANCE related to this application. If there are any pending variances related to this application, you MUST notify the Historic Preservation Office.

### Narrative Description Checklist

- [ ] General overview of project, including quantities and dimensions of elements such as signs (i.e. “one proposed 24 X 60” sign, with 12” extruded plastic letters, to be located on the south façade sign band…)
- [ ] LIST of features to be removed, replaced or added (*if application includes removal or replacement of material*)
- [ ] Specification or product sheets for materials and finishes, if applicable
- [ ] Program of work for large-scale or complex projects, if applicable (i.e. scope of work for masonry restoration and cleaning)

### Attachments

- [ ] Plans and graphics submitted for permitting may be used for Landmarks Review if materials, products and finishes are clearly indicated on the plans.

- [ ] Site plan/locational map INCLUDING adjacent buildings and streets (for any additions or new construction). *Note that Building and Land Use Services also often requires a site plan for a Building Permit. See Information Sheet B1 Site Plans (available at the Permit Counter).*

- [ ] MEASURED floor plans, CLEARLY identifying new and existing features (if applicable)

- [ ] MEASURED elevations, CLEARLY identifying new and existing features

- [ ] Details of method(s) of attachment for signs, awnings and canopies (if applicable)

- [ ] COLOR photographs of existing conditions (digital is fine as long as it is clear)

### Other Requirements

- [ ] Material and hardware samples (in some cases specification or cut sheets may suffice)
- [ ] True color paint and/or finish samples, where required by ordinance
Part 5: SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SIGNS AND AWNINGS

Instructions for Signs and Awning Applicants

Please include the following with your application:

- Twenty copies of the application cover sheet and narrative description (pages 1 and 2 of this form)
- Twenty copies of supporting attachments
- Graphic rendering of proposed sign (to scale with dimensions indicated, and including any conduits)
- Photograph of existing building
- Details of attachment
- Single set of material samples (if necessary)

Please answer the following questions (if applicable):

1. Are there existing signs on the building? _______________________________________________________________________

2. If so, will they be removed or relocated? _______________________________________________________________________

3. Sign Material _______________________________________________________________________

4. Sign Dimensions _______________________________________________________________________

5. Logo or typeface and letter size _______________________________________________________________________

6. Lighting Specifications _______________________________________________________________________

7. Describe the method of attachment and underlying material _______________________________________________________________________
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FAUX COPPER CAP FLASHING
CLEAN ORIGINAL TERRA COTTA FREIZE
RESTORE ORIGINAL BRICK (TYP.)
CLEAN TERRA COTTA HEAD TRIM (TYP.)
NEW ALUMINUM CLAD WOOD DBL HUNG WINDOWS IN EXIST. OPENINGS
COLOR: DARK BRONZE ALUM. (TYP.)
CLEAN EXIST. STONE SILL
WOOD CROWN MOULDING (PTD.)
4'-8" TRANSOM (MATCHES ORIGINAL)
ANODIZED BRONZE ALUM. STOREFRONT SYSTEM
8'-6" STOREFRONT
ANODIZED BRONZE ALUM. STOREFRONT SYSTEM
11-1/4" PANELED TRANSOM (PTD.)
STRIP AND RESTORE ORIGINAL STONE PLINTH (BOTH SIDES)
PAINTED WOOD PANEL SILL
PAINTED WOOD TRIM
6'-0" X 7'-6" ANODIZED ALUM. STOREFRONT DOOR
3'-0" X 7'-6" PAINTED WOOD DOOR
MATCH ORIGINAL DETAILING

RESTORE AND REPAINT EXIST. DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS
RESTORE EXIST. BRICK
3'-6" TRANSOM (MATCHES ORIGINAL)
ANODIZED BRONZE ALUM. STOREFRONT SYSTEM
5-1/2" TRANSOM TRIM (PTD. WOOD)
8'-0" STOREFRONT
ANODIZED BRONZE ALUM. STOREFRONT SYSTEM
PAINTED WOOD SILL PANEL
SILL HEIGHT MATCHES HISTORIC
5'-8"X7'-6" ALUMINUM STOREFRONT DOOR
PANELED TO MATCH HISTORIC

PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION - KELLOGG/SICKER + POCHERT BUILDINGS
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0" when printed on 24X36

HISTORIC EAST ELEVATION - KELLOGG/SICKER BUILDING
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0" when printed on 24X36

HISTORIC EAST ELEVATION - POCHERT BUILDING

Ryan Rhodes Designs, Inc.
1936 First Avenue South
Seattle, Washington 98134
206 632-1818 fax 206 632-7870

project number

13-30

1110-12 & 1114-16 MLK JR. WAY, TACOMA, WA
KELLOGG/SICKER + POCHERT
Rehabilitation For:
2/27/2014
PRELIMINARY
PROPOSED EXT. ELEVATIONS @ 1/4" = 1'-0"
HISTORIC EXT. ELEVATIONS
APPLICATION FOR DESIGN REVIEW
FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

Please include ALL of the following information with your application. Insufficient application materials will result in a delay in processing of your application. If you have any question regarding application requirements, or regulations and standards for historic homes and neighborhoods please call the Historic Preservation Officer at 253.591.5220.

PART 1: APPLICANT INFORMATION

House Address 820 N. Ainsworth

Landmark/Conservation District (if applicable) North Slope

OWNER INFORMATION

Name (printed) Jeff Williams Renovations LLC Email Jeffwilliams@windermere.com

Address (if different than above) 3419 N. 27th St

Phone 253.363.1135

Homeowner's Signature*

*Application must be signed by the property owner to be processed.

CONTRACTOR INFORMATION

If application will be presented by a representative or contractor, please fill in the following:

Representative's Name Jeff Williams

Company Jeff Williams Renovations LLC

Address above

Phone

APPLICATION FEE (please see page 2)

Estimated Project Cost, rounded to nearest $1000 $7,000

Application Fee Enclosed $225.00

Revision 12/10/12
PART 2: INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

*NEW* FEE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated project cost (determined by applicant)</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 – 5000</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each additional $1000</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum fee</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE NOTE:
1. Fees are required only once per application.
2. If an application is denied by the Landmarks Commission, and a new application is submitted for the same project, new fees may apply.
3. Demolition fees are applied to cover the cost of public hearings, but may not be required for the removal of certain accessory structures.

HOW TO USE THIS FORM

STEPS FOR APPLICANTS

1. Review the Standards and Guidelines for Historic Buildings. Many homeowners want to know whether their project will be approved by the Commission ahead of the meeting. The Landmarks Commission reviews projects according to design guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation. This information is available online at www.tacomaculture.org.

2. Fill out this form in its ENTIRETY.

3. Find the correct checklist for your project, and submit the required supporting documentation. Part 4 of this form outlines which checklist to use for your project. There are three checklists, but you only need to use one.

4. Submit your application for preliminary review to the Permit Intake Center of Planning and Development Services. The Plans Reviewer will initial and date the cover sheet of this application. This ensures your application meets applicable codes and will avoid delays down the road. Your application will NOT be processed without this step.

5. Submit it to the Historic Preservation Office with the APPLICATION FEE. The Landmarks Commission meets on the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of each month, and applications are due to this office TWO WEEKS in advance. When your application has been scheduled for review, you will be notified.

WHERE TO GO:
Permit Intake Center
City of Tacoma, Planning and Development
Services Department
747 Market Street, 3rd Floor
253-591-5030
PART 3: Project Description

Exterior:
Remove existing vinyl siding to uncover original horizontal wood siding below (appears to be in good condition) and repair missing or damaged siding, trim and casement with wood materials matching original.

East (front) façade:
Replace sliding vinyl windows in the dormer with hinged wood casement windows (see attachment), recreating casement and trim from the existing original windows. The current configuration will go from five non-centered irregularly spaced sliders to 4 casement swing-out windows centered and evenly spaced with matched wood siding, casement and trim on either side.

North façade (side partially visible from right of way):
Remove non-original deteriorated side porch and supports and relocate existing door.
Remove oil tank below porch.
Relocate original window to bathroom above install existing original side door
Relocate and resize existing side porch roof, facia and supports above new door location
Rebuild stairs to match existing wood stairs
Replace deteriorated plywood garage door with reproduction carriage door (see attachment).
Replace vinyl double hung second story window with original window below (mentioned above).
Replace sliding vinyl windows in the dormer to match windows above.

West façade (rear no visible from right of way):
Remove non-original plate glass window
Remove original kitchen window (to be used as a new bath window on the south façade), replacing with the adjacent original wood window currently on the north façade
Replace non-original plate glass windows with wood double hung (cabinet height) windows
Replace second story vinyl windows with wood double hung windows (see attachment)

South façade (not visible from right of way):
Replace second story vinyl windows with wood double hung windows (see attachment)
Install second story window in new bath (removed from existing kitchen)
Remove and reside non-original casement window
PART 4: SUPPLEMENTS

How to Use This Table

The following is a table of common projects divided into Categories. For each Category of work there is a corresponding checklist designed to help you include the information required for your application.

Find the type of work you are proposing, and download the corresponding checklist to attach to your application.

Checklists are available from the Historic Preservation Office, and on our website at [www.tacomaculture.org/historic.asp](http://www.tacomaculture.org/historic.asp)

If you have any questions regarding what information should be included in your application, please call the Historic Preservation Office at 253-591-5220.

NOTE: ONLY USE ONE CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Checklist A for:</th>
<th>Detached garages</th>
<th>p. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New porches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Major Work (call the Historic Preservation Officer with questions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Checklist B for:</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>p. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New window or door openings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Minor (For example, chimney restoration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Checklist C for:</th>
<th>Windows (replacement or restoration of existing)</th>
<th>p. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doors (replacement or restoration of existing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION SUPPLEMENT CHECKLIST C
(for Window and Door Replacement and Restoration)

**CHECKLIST** include the following:*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Photograph(s) of work area(s) with locations of work indicated (i.e. in pen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Detail illustrations of trim and casing and window profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Catalog cut sheets or product samples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above, please provide the following information:

**Narrative list of window and door types and locations:**

---

**ADDITIONAL TIPS**

- **Drawings required for building permits can often be used for Landmarks Review, as long as information regarding finish detail, exterior materials, and windows and doors are indicated.**

- **Please include a photograph of example elements (if new windows or doors are to match any existing features of the house)**

- **For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Officer for more information.**
vinyl sliding window detail
Rebuild railing as original. Remove raised bed.
Rear elevation. Replace non-historic picture windows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Product Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-1</td>
<td>SPDHSPWoodSitelineEXSashPack Double Hung Sash Kit 36 x 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$299.68</td>
<td>$599.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram**

- Standard Sash Opening Width = 36
- Standard Sash Opening Height = 50
- Sash Split = Even
- Assembly = Sash Replacement Kit
- Jambliner Color = White Jambliners
- Jambliner Options = No
- Radius Top Rail = None
- Exterior Color = Primed
- Interior Finish = Primed
- Customer Elevation = 0 - 4000 feet
- Energy Rating = Other Glass Options
- Glazing Type = Insulated
- Low-E Option = Low-E
- Tinted Glass = No Tint (Clear)
- Glass Style = Clear
- Tempered Glass = Not Tempered
- California Fire Code Label = No
- Neat Glass = No
- Preserve Glass = Preserve
- IG Options = Argon
- Hardware Finish = Imitation Oil Rubbed Bronze
- Sash Limiter = No Sash Limiter
- Finger Plows = With Finger Plow(s)
- Room Location = Custom Location
- Custom (Enter Room Name) = 36
- Is this a Re-Order P.O. = No
- Check Info Link = Acoustic Ratings Info link
- Customer Service = 1-800-246-9131 Option 2
- Manufacturer = JELD-WEN Wood Windows & Patio Doors
- Catalog Version Date = 01/24/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Product Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200-1</td>
<td>SPDHSPWoodSitelineEXSashPack Double Hung Sash Kit 24 x 54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$251.31</td>
<td>$753.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Standard Sash Opening Width = 24
- Standard Sash Opening Height = 54
- Sash Split = Even
- Assembly = Sash Replacement Kit
- Jambliner Color = White Jambliners
- Jambliner Options = No
- Radius Top Rail = None
- Exterior Color = Primed
- Interior Finish = Primed
- Customer Elevation = 0 - 4000 feet
- Energy Rating = Other Glass Options
- Glazing Type = Insulated
- Low-E Option = Low-E
- Tinted Glass = No Tint (Clear)
- Glass Style = Clear
- Tempered Glass = Not Tempered
- California Fire Code Label = No
- Neat Glass = No
- Preserve Glass = Preserve
- IG Options = Argon
- Hardware Finish = Imitation Oil Rubbed Bronze
- Sash Limiter = No Sash Limiter
- Finger Plows = With Finger Plow(s)
- Room Location = Custom Location
- Custom (Enter Room Name) = 36
- Is this a Re-Order P.O. = No
- Check Info Link = Acoustic Ratings Info link
- Customer Service = 1-800-246-9131 Option 2
- Manufacturer = JELD-WEN Wood Windows & Patio
- Doors
- Catalog Version Date = 01/24/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Product Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300-1</td>
<td>WoodTraditionPlus-Premium Fixed Casement Stationary 28 x 28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$139.59</td>
<td>$977.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width = 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height = 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|           | Operation (Outside View) = Stationary Direct Set or Insash = Insash Assembly = Sash Only Exterior Color = Primed Interior Finish = Primed Certification = Sustainable Forestry Initiative Customer Elevation = 0 - 4000 feet Energy Rating = Other Glass Options Glazing Type = Insulated Low-E Option = Low-E Tinted Glass = No Tint (Clear) Glass Style = Clear Tempered Glass = Not Tempered California Fire Code Label = No Neat Glass = No Preserve Glass = Preserve IG Options = Argon Product ID Number = No, I do not have the Product ID # Room Location = Attic Is this a Re-Order P.O. = No Check Info Link = Acoustic Ratings Info link Customer Service = 1-800-246-9131 Option 2 Manufacturer = JELD-WEN Wood Windows & Patio Doors Catalog Version Date = 01/24/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product #</th>
<th>Product Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400-1</td>
<td>WDHWoodSitelineEX Single Hung Operating 25.375 x 48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$331.42</td>
<td>$662.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Width = 25.375  
Height = 48  
Sash Split = Even  
Operation (Outside View) = Operating  
Assembly = Unit  
DP Rating = DP35  
Jambliner Color = White Jambliners  
Radius Top Rail = None  
Exterior Color = Primed  
Species = Pine  
Interior Finish = Primed  
Certification = Sustainable Forestry Initiative  
Sash to Match Exterior Color = Yes  
Customer Elevation = 0 - 4000 feet  
Energy Rating = Other Glass Options  
Glazing Type = Insulated  
Low-E Option = Low-E  
Tinted Glass = No Tint (Clear)  
Glass Style = Clear  
Tempered Glass = Not Tempered  
California Fire Code Label = No  
Neat Glass = No  
Preserve Glass = Preserve  
IG Options = Argon  
Hardware Type = Cam Lock(s)  
Hardware Finish = Imitation Oil Rubbed Bronze  
Sash Limiter = No Sash Limiter  
Finger Plows = With Finger Plow(s)  
Screen Option = No Screen  
Room Location = Attic  
Is this a Re-Order P.O. = No  
Check Info Link = Acoustic Ratings Info link  
Customer Service = 1-800-246-9131 Option 2  
Manufacturer = JELD-WEN Wood Windows & Patio Doors  
Catalog Version Date = 01/24/2014  
Jamb Width = 5.5625  
Exterior Trim = No Exterior Trim  
Sill Nosing = No Sill Nosing  
Jamb Thickness = 4/4 JE  
Prep for Stool = No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>500-1</th>
<th>WDHWoodSitelineEX Single Hung Operating 37.375 x 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width = 37.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height = 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sash Split = Even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation (Outside View) = Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly = Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DP Rating = DP35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jambliner Color = White Jambliners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radius Top Rail = None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Color = Primed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Species = Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Finish = Primed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification = Sustainable Forestry Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sash to Match Exterior Color = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Elevation = 0 - 4000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Rating = Other Glass Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glazing Type = Insulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-E Option = Low-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tinted Glass = No Tint (Clear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass Style = Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempered Glass = Not Tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Fire Code Label = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neat Glass = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve Glass = Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG Options = Argon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware Type = Cam Lock(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware Finish = Imitation Oil Rubbed Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sash Limiter = No Sash Limiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finger Plows = With Finger Plow(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screen Option = No Screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Location = Attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is this a Re-Order P.O. = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check Info Link = Acoustic Ratings Info link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Service = 1-800-246-9131 Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturer = JELD-WEN Wood Windows &amp; Patio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalog Version Date = 01/24/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamb Width = 5.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Trim = No Exterior Trim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sill Nosing = No Sill Nosing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamb Thickness = 4/4 JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for Stool = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product #</td>
<td>Product Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-1</td>
<td>WDH/woodSitelineEX Single Hung Operating 25.375 x 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width = 25.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height = 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sash Split = Even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation (Outside View) = Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly = Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DP Rating = DP35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamb Liner Color = White Jambiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radius Top Rail = None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Color = Primed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Species = Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Finish = Primed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification = Sustainable Forestry Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sash to Match Exterior Color = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Elevation = 0 - 4000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Rating = Other Glass Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glazing Type = Insulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-E Option = Low-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tinted Glass = No Tint (Clear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass Style = Obscure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempered Glass = Not Tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Fire Code Label = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neat Glass = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve Glass = Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG Options = Argon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware Type = Cam Lock(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware Finish = Imitation Oil Rubbed Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sash Limiter = No Sash Limiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finger Plows = With Finger Plow(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screen Option = No Screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Location = Attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is this a Re-Order P.O = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check Info Link = Acoustic Ratings Info link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Service = 1-800-246-9131 Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturer = JELD-WEN Wood Windows &amp; Patio Doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalog Version Date = 01/24/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamb Width = 5.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Trim = No Exterior Trim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sill Nosing = No Sill Nosing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamb Thickness = 4/4 JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for Stool = No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Quote Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Item Summary</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-1</td>
<td>SPDHSPWood Siteline EXSash Pack Double Hung Sash Kit 36 x 50 Primed</td>
<td>$299.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$599.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-1</td>
<td>SPDHSPWood Siteline EXSash Pack Double Hung Sash Kit 24 x 54 Primed</td>
<td>$251.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$753.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-1</td>
<td>Wood Tradition Plus-Premium Fixed Casement Stationary 28 x 28 Primed</td>
<td>$139.69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$977.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-1</td>
<td>WDHWood Siteline EX Single Hung Operating 25.375 x 48 Primed</td>
<td>$331.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$662.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1</td>
<td>WDHWood Siteline EX Single Hung Operating 37.375 x 48 Primed</td>
<td>$407.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$814.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-1</td>
<td>WDHWood Siteline EX Single Hung Operating 25.375 x 36 Primed</td>
<td>$315.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$315.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretax Total Price: $4,123.12
**CASH INVOICE**

**Bill-To-Party**
JEFF WILLIAMS RENOVATIONS LLC  
3419 N 27TH ST  
TACOMA WA 98407-6242

**Information**
- Invoice #: 90546990  
- Date: 02/24/2014  
- Payment Terms: Due  
- Customer #: 400986722  
- Account #: 400035702  
- Service Order #: 40000207039  
- Sales Doc #: 398147

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
<th>Net Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>LPC Application Fee</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0/AU</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document Subtotal:** $225.00  
**Taxes:** $0.00  
**Other:** $0.00  
**Amount Due:** $225.00
Building & Land Use

RECEIPT NO: 400756770 02/24/14 11:52 AM BLUBR00000C22

JEFF WILLIAMS RENOVATIONS LLC A/C: 400035702 $225.00
3419 N 27TH ST
TACOMA

VC XXXXXXXXXXXX8243
Auth. No: 024-0227445138

Payment Total: $225.00
Card $225.00

Signature

X

I agree to pay the above total per the issuer agreement.