

Members

Chris Granfield, *Chair*
 Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*
 Duke York
 Jonah Jensen
 Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Jeff Williams
 Eugene Thorne
 Laureen Skrivan
 Lauren Flemister
 Ross Buffington, *Wedge Neighborhood Ex-Officio*
 Marshall McClintock, *North Slope Ex-Officio*



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Staff

Reuben McKnight, *Historic Preservation Officer*
 Lauren Hoogkamer, *Historic Preservation Coordinator*

Date: May 27, 2015, 2015

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Chris Granfield, *Chair*
 Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*
 Duke York
 Eugene Thorne
 Laureen Skrivan
 Jonah Jensen
 Jeff Williams
 Ross Buffington
 Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
 Lauren Hoogkamer
 John Griffith

Others Present:

Caroline Swope
 Jeff Dunning
 Jordan Kiel
 Ranleigh Starling
 Roger Edwards
 John De Loma
 Keith Watts

Commission Members Absent:

Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Lauren Flemister

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

1. ROLL CALL**2. CONSENT AGENDA****A. Excusal of Absences**

Mr. James Steel and Ms. Lysa Schloesser were excused.

B. Approval of Minutes: 5/6/15, 5/13/15

The minutes of 5/6/15 and 5/13/15 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

C. Administrative Review: 2109 South C Street—Painting**3. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS****A. Events and Activities Updates**

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer provided an update on events and activities for Historic Preservation month.

4. PUBLIC HEARING – NOMINATIONS TO THE TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES**A. 224 N Yakima Avenue (Born-Lindstrom House)**

Caroline Swope, Kingstree Studios

Chair Chris Granfield called the public hearing to order and reviewed the procedures. Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Located at 224 North Yakima Avenue, this two-story Queen Anne house, was built in 1889 by Leopold Born and designed by architect Rollin J. Roath.

On March 25, 2015, the Landmarks Preservation Commission found that the property meets the threshold criteria for nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

STANDARDS

The buildings are nominated under the following criteria:

- B. *Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past* - for its association with Leopold Born, Eugene Ricksecker and Emil Lindstrom, who were influential in shaping Tacoma and the surrounding region.
- 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* - as an example of a Rollin Roath Queen Anne Victorian residence that was altered at the start of the 20th century.
- 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 historic, cultural, or architectural motif* - for its location within the Stadium-Seminary National Register Historic District.

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.

ANALYSIS

1. At 126-years-old the structure meets the age and integrity threshold criteria. Other than the 1950s crown molding and the reconfigured entry, the interior hasn't been touched for approximately 100 years. Records indicate that the second floor and Craftsman interior were added between 1905 and 1912, during the proposed period of significance. The exterior has maintained its Queen Anne character, although the mansard roof is not original.
2. The Born-Lindstrom House meets Criterion B for its association with Leopold Born, Eugene Ricksecker and Emil Lindstrom, who were influential in shaping Tacoma and the surrounding region. The Born family lived in the home from 1890 until 1900. Leopold Born was a builder and contractor, as well as a "Master Mason" in the Free and Accepted Masons. Eugene and Mary Ricksecker occupied the house from 1903 until 1904. Eugene was an engineer who worked with the Army Engineering Corp to construct the road to Paradise Valley on Mount Rainier. Mount Rainer Ricksecker Point is named after him. The proposed period of significance is 1905 to 1907, during which Emil and Henrietta Lindstrom lived in the home. Emil was the co-founder and president of the Lindstrom-Handforth Lumber Company, which built more than 10 miles of railroad to connect the Rainier sawmill with the Northern Pacific Railroad's Prairie Line.
3. The house meets Criterion C as an example of a Rollin Roath Queen Anne Victorian residence that was altered at the start of the 20th century. Architect Rollin J. Roath designed more than a dozen Tacoma buildings, one of which is on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places (the 1890 Parker-Reith Building, also

known as Fraternity Hall). Most of his other buildings have been remodeled beyond recognition. 224 North Yakima is unique due to the quality and sensitivity of the work done. The interior has been remodeled in the Craftsman style. Other than the 1950s crown molding and the reconfigured entry, the interior hasn't been touched for approximately 100 years.

4. The house meets Criterion E for its location within the Stadium-Seminary National Register Historic District.

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, if no further public comments are received, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for designation.

Ms. Caroline Swope provided a presentation with photos of the home from its construction in 1889 compared to a recent photo from 2012. Victorian and Craftsman character defining details were highlighted. Interior photos showing the remodel in progress were discussed and original details were noted. Ms. Swope discussed how the home fulfilled the criteria for nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places including the historically significant owners, character defining exterior features representative of broad 20th Century changes in domestic architecture, and the location within the Stadium-Seminary historic district.

Mr. Marshall McClintock noted that the home sits just outside of the North Slope and commented that he felt that the home met the criteria.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to City Council that the Born-Lindstrom House be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, finding that it does meet the criteria of TMC 13.07.040."

Motion: Jensen

Second: York

The motion was approved.

5. DESIGN REVIEW

- A. 5010 Pacific Avenue (Stewart Middle School)
Rehabilitation

Greg Hepp, Bassetti Architects

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The James P. Stewart Intermediate School was built in 1924 and designed by architect Roland E. Borhek, who also designed Jason Lee Middle School. Only the main 1924 structure was included in the landmark nomination, which described the building as having "excellent integrity." The applicant is now planning a full rehabilitation which includes: replicating the original terrace stairs and balustrade; restoring the terrace walls and adding handrails; reusing the original balustrade cap; creating ADA accessible doors and an enlarged ramp from the windows flanking the terrace; restoring the original entrance and replicating the historic door; removing paint from the cast stone; filling the doors underneath the terrace and at the northeast kitchen entry; removing and enlarging the kitchen windows; replacing a door with aluminum-clad windows; removing the non-original ramp at the northwest entry and restoring the stairs; removing the covered walkway to the annex; filling in the doors at the southeast entry; removing the remainder of the smokestack; removing the one-story rooms on the west side; replacing the second story windows with louvers; replacing non-original hardware; removing the 1963 annex and the 1974 gym and bridge; restoring the newly exposed wall; creating new service doors on the north end; cleaning and repairing brick; and replacing all wood windows with aluminum-clad, single-hung, windows.

The applicant is also proposing a new gymnasium building with CMU facades that vary in color and texture to echo the design of the main structure. The use of CMU would extend to the patched portions of the main structure.

The project team briefed the Landmarks Preservation Commission on June 11, 2014, other design options were presented at earlier meetings. In June 2014, three options were presented. Option one was to remove and rebuild the terrace to create useable space below. Option two was to eliminate the terrace and rebuild the stairs. Option three was to raise the terrace and retain the stairs. The Commission indicated that they preferred the third option.

On May 13, 2015, the Commission was presented with an updated briefing. At this time the Commission requested that the masonry balustrade be replicated, which is reflected in the new proposal. There was also a discussion on how the CMU was being used on the new and original building. The Commission also requested further evidence as to why the project team was proposing replacing all of the original windows.

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.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
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.
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. The building is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, as such, it is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior changes.
2. This property was originally used as a school and it will continue to be used for this purpose.
3. Character defining features such as the balustrade will be retained. However, the Commission has requested that further evidence be provided to support replacing the original windows, which are also a character defining feature.
4. The replicated entrance, stairs and balustrade are based on existing material and historic photographs. The applicant has not proven that all of the windows are deteriorated beyond repair.
5. The new gymnasium does not destroy historic material. The new work is differentiated from the old, but compatible in massing, size, and architectural features.

6. The new work and building could be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application with the stipulation that consideration be given to restoring and upgrading the original windows that ranked in good and fair condition.

Mr. Jeff Dunning provided a review of the previous discussion of the project and the feedback received from the Commission. He noted that the terrace and stair would be upgraded replaced, ADA entrances would be added to lower level of the east side. The entrance on the left would be restored to the previous design, but interior details would not be replicated. Doors on the side of the terrace would be filled. On the north elevation unused doors would be filled and small windows would be replaced with matching larger windows. An existing ramp would be removed since it does not comply with ADA. On the south side, a covered walkway would be removed and unused doors would be blocked.

Mr. Jordan Kiel discussed the massing of the new building, and how it would reference some of the details of the existing building. The structure connecting the new gym to the old buildings was discussed. Illustrations and renders of the proposed structure were shown.

Mr. Dunning reviewed the changes to the west elevation where the classroom annex building, the gymnasium building, the smoke stack, and plaster one story additions would be all be removed.

Mr. Kiel discussed how they would be replacing the plaster base treatment of the existing building. Photos were shown of the current condition, with the plaster was deteriorating along the base and in need of repair work. They were proposing a more durable surface material to replace the plaster.

Ms. Ranleigh Starling discussed the balustrade, noting how the original balusters had been replaced with simple cylindrical balusters. She reviewed that the previous discussion had expressed interest in preserving the cap. She noted that challenges posed by the current rail not meeting code as the rail was too short. After a discussion with the district, the decision had been made to replicate the original baluster. A 36" steel rail would sit behind the original balustrade to meet code requirements. Images of the new proposed guardrail were shown. Discussion ensued. Commissioners had comments and questions about configuration and appearance of the steel rail. There was a question about the need for two steel railings above the cap, and the necessity for having the rail behind the balustrade. The idea of raising the balustrade to a code compliant height was explored. There was support for the balustrade as proposed with a single metal handrail design behind.

The condition of the windows was discussed. A color coded elevation of the windows was shown, demonstrating whether windows were in poor, fair, or good condition. Photos of the windows demonstrating the typical conditions were shown. Mr. Rob Sawatzky described the windows as a thermal comfort issue, a daylighting issue, and a distraction. He noted that working and learning in an environment more connected to nature is more effective. Fiscal responsibility in terms of energy and long term maintenance costs, as well as aesthetics were also considered. Mr. Dunning discussed photos of replacement windows from another district noting that maintenance of restored features was still an issue when compared to replacement with newer windows. Ms. Starling discussed the proposed replacement windows and compared to the existing windows. The replacement windows would be aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided light. The proposal was to replace all of the windows. Mr. Kiel added that the sashes would be removed, but the original frame would be retained.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase expressed concern about the wholesale replacement of all of the windows. Mr. Ross Buffington commented that the windows in fair condition did not look like they warranted being replaced according to Secretary of Interiors Standards (SOIS) number 6. Ms. Starling responded that they were focused on SOIS number 1 by seeking to retain the historic use and that replacement of the windows would be vital to a the operation of the school. The SOIS standards were discussed. Mr. Jeff Williams suggested that they explore storm windows as an option. Mr. Sawatzky responded that using storm windows would add additional cost. Chair Granfield asked if there was any data that could be presented on the importance of the windows to the learning environment. Mr. Sawatzky

responded that there were studies that it has an impact through thermal comfort and acoustics. Vice-Chair Chase commented that being able to see the numbers on cost would help them in the effort of balancing the competing needs. Mr. McKnight suggested that they could consider different strategies for different components of the building. Vice-Chair Katie added that they typically could have more leniency with components other than the front façade. Mr. McKnight, noting that the Commission was being asked to consider the proposal for final design approval, suggested that the Commission could approve the design partially with the additional information requested for the windows.

Mr. Jonah Jensen noted that he had recused himself as the Tacoma School District was a client.

Ms. Lauren Skrivan thanked the presenters for their effort and hard work and did not want them to be discouraged.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application with the stipulation that consideration be given to the restoration and upgrading of original windows that ranked in good and fair condition."

Motion: York

Second: Chase

The motion was approved.

Commissioners provided guidance that the design team return with cost/benefit analysis of total replacement versus rehabilitation, thermal savings, addition of storm windows, and exploration of partial restoration with only front façade windows being repaired. The motion passed allows for replacement of windows found to be in poor condition.

B. 1101 N I (North Slope Historic District)
Dormer & windows

John De Loma, MD Designs

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1923, this property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal includes a 15'x28' shed roof dormer on the northeast side of the second story, which will not exceed the maximum height allowed in the view-sensitive overlay zone. This remodel is to accommodate larger bedrooms on the second floor. The height of the dormer roof does not exceed the height of the main roof ridge. The remodel will also include replacing the existing vinyl windows, on the northwest side, with matching vinyl windows. The addition on the northwest side will be replaced with a new 9'x13' addition, with fascia boards that match the existing structure. The addition is located in the side yard, which is not visible from the right-of-way. The roof on both new projections will have a minimum slope of 2.5/12. The siding on the additions will match the existing cedar siding and the windows will be single-hung vinyl, with trim that matches the existing. A picture window will be replaced with two single-hung, vinyl windows to accommodate a kitchen remodel. The existing front door will be refinished and the existing garage door will be replaced.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this project on March 25, 2015. The commission's preference was for option A with one wide dormer, which is reflected in this application. All of the original windows were already replaced with vinyl before the current owner purchased the property. During the briefing, the applicant proposed using vinyl windows for the current proposal.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

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

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. **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.
3. **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.

Guidelines for Doors

1. **Retain historic entry doors whenever feasible.** Replacement doors should, where possible, match the original door in design and other details, and materials. In many cases, for security or cost reasons, a non-custom door in alternative materials may be proposed; in these cases, the door should appear to be wood (painted fiberglass doors molded with panel indents may be acceptable; faux wood finishes tend to be inappropriate) and should be compatible with the architecture of the house (Craftsman doors should not be proposed for Victorian era houses, for example).

Guidelines for Additions

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

ANALYSIS

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications to the structure.
2. All historic windows had already been replaced with vinyl at the time of purchase.

3. There is no requirement to upgrade non-historic windows; vinyl replacements may be acceptable in these situations.
4. Changes to windows on secondary elevations to allow for interior remodels are not discouraged. The window changes proposed are on secondary elevations.
5. The existing front door is being restored.
6. The architectural style of the new additions is compatible with the existing structure.
7. The additions could be removed without harming character defining features.
8. The additions are subservient to the main structure.
9. There is a clear visual break between the old and new structures.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. John De Loma commented that the overall intent was to bring back some of the original character of the building. He reviewed the changes that they were proposing to the existing home including the addition of bedrooms to the existing house. They would attempt to match new features including trim, windows, and siding to the existing features of the home.

Mr. Marshall McClintock asked if the new windows were going to replicate the grid in the upper sash of the existing windows on the structure. Mr. De Loma responded that they could match them, but the original plan was to put in picture windows. He added that the bump out was in a fenced in area. The intended configuration and appearance of the windows was discussed. Mr. McClintock recommended adding the matching grid to the upper part of the windows on all three sides of the bump out.

Mr. James Steel asked if the stop work order was for the bump out on the northwest side. Mr. De Loma responded that the bump out had been opened up with the intent of tearing down and rebuilding the bump out and a stop work order had been placed as they currently only had a demolition permit. Ms. Hoogkamer clarified that the stop work order was due to the demolition permit being for interior work only.

Mr. McClintock asked if about the door. Mr. De Loma responded that it would be a glass door.

The posts in the front of the house were discussed. Mr. De Loma commented that an engineer had recommended that the posts not be disturbed.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase suggested that the Commission should recommend, but not require, that the windows be matched to the rest of the house.

There was a motion.

"I move that that the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application at 1101 N I Street with the recommendation that the headers on the new windows in the bump out match the headers on the main portion of the building and that single hung windows with a grid be used in the upper sash."

Motion: Chase

Second: Jensen

The motion was approved.

C. 1001 N L (North Slope Historic District)
Windows

Keith Watts, C.C. & Company, Inc.

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District, however, its build date of 1950 falls outside of the district's period of significance which is between 1888 and 1940, according to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places nomination forms. Currently, the building has a mix of vinyl, wood, and aluminum windows. This proposal is to replace all of the existing windows with the Ply Gem vinyl windows from the Pro and Builder series. The replacements will include single-hung and horizontal sliding windows.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: 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. **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 North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications to the structure.
2. This property, although listed as a contributing structure, falls outside of the period of significance for the North Slope Historic District.
3. This building currently has a mix of vinyl, wood, and aluminum windows.
4. There will be no change to the window configuration.
5. There is no requirement to upgrade a non-historic window.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Keith Watts commented that since that they were seeking to make improvements for the tenants including increasing energy efficiency and improving the appearance from the street. He reported that they had received complaints from the tenants over the winter due to the poor energy performance of the windows. He noted that they were looking to match the windows with what had already been replaced to have a more consistent appearance.

Images of the exterior of the building were shown. Mr. McKnight noted that the images were taken by staff and the analysis of the windows was based on that visual assessment.

Mr. McKnight commented that it was stated in the staff report that the building was outside of the period of significance and that there was some ambiguity as the national register listing went up to 1955. Mr. Marshall McClintock noted that the dates of significance mentioned in the first and second expansion related more to the periods when the most building occurred, and not the contributing structures. The second expansion had identified significant dates, but also houses that had been built up to 1955. Mr. McClintock added that the building was a contributing structure and was listed as such.

Mr. McClintock asked if the original windows were repairable. Mr. Watts responded that all of the windows were repairable to a degree, but that replacement of the all of the windows would benefit the building in terms of consistency, aesthetics, and value. He added that the tenants of units where the windows had been replaced had significantly lower utility bills. Replacing with double paned wood windows had not been explored

Mr. Jeff Williams asked about the window configuration with some windows being sliding and some being single hung and if originally the sliding windows had been side by side double windows. Mr. Watts responded that the original windows had likely been a single large double hung window. Mr. Williams commented that he was more concerned about consistency than repair versus replacement. He recommended double paned picture windows where they were originally in the larger configuration with single hung windows used everywhere else.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase asked if the proposal was to replace all of the windows. Mr. Watts responded that they were not replacing the existing vinyl windows. Vice-Chair Chase commented that they would need further documentation on the deterioration of the wood windows. It was noted that many of the wood windows were painted shut. Mr. Ross Buffington responded that removing the paint to restore operability would cost less than replacing it. Mr. Watts commented on wanting to install new windows for the benefit of the tenants. Mr. McClintock commented that there was nothing stopping them from replacing with double paned wood windows and receiving the same advantages. Mr. Watts reiterated his preference to replace with the vinyl windows for cost effectiveness reasons. Discussion ensued on the need for additional documentation of the existing windows. Chair Chris Granfield reviewed the typical level of research and documentation expected of a proposal to replace windows in a historic district..

Mr. McClintock recommended that the Commission approve replacing the aluminum windows and defer approval of replacement of the wood windows until further information had been provided.

Mr. Williams commented that there was not enough intact character in the building with the three different types of windows present. He expressed support for allowing the applicant to replicate the windows that had been there originally with vinyl. He added that only a third of the windows were original and that the building would benefit from consistency. Mr. Jonah Jensen concurred.

Mr. Buffington commented that allowing replacement would not be consistent with what they had told the school district or with SOIS number 6. Mr. Williams responded that in the case of the school district all of the original windows were still present.

There was a motion

"I make a motion that we approve this as staff recommended "

Motion: Williams
Second: Jensen

The motion was approved with 5 commissioners voting aye and 1 voting nay.

6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Narrowmoor Addition Conservation District

Staff

The proposed finding for the Narrowmoor Conservation district were discussed. Mr. Reuben McKnight noted that some amendments had been added to the document and that there were new letters that had been submitted to the Commission. Mr. McKnight reviewed the new amendments. Under finding two, item B had been added to demonstrate to the Planning Commission how the proposal had evolved over the process. Under item number 8, a recommendation had been added to amend the Land Use code to include consideration of design guidelines and historic preservation standards for any variance involving a property that is listed on the historic register or located in a historic or conservation zone. The action being requested was for the Commission to adopt the guidelines as findings to be submitted to the Planning Commission.

Residents of the Narrowmoor area provided comments and questions. There was a comment that finding 3, item C had conflicting statements regarding the height of accessory structures. Mr. McKnight responded that while there had been extensive discussion and feedback on accessory building height, there had been no recommendation from the commission at the time. Discussion ensued. There was a concern about the maximum combined lot coverage in recommendation number 4 possibly being interpreted to conflict with the Growth Management Act. There was a concern about the minimum frontage recommendation. There was a recommendation to amend recommendation 6, regarding vegetation, to be specific to view sensitive overlay areas. A typo in the second sentence of page 4 was noted.

There was a motion.

"I make a motion to approve this with two minor changes, the fixing of a typo and exploring the regulation of trees on a city wide basis in view sensitive overlay areas, to be forwarded to the Planning Commission."

Motion: Williams
Second: Chase

The motion was approved.

B. Historic Preservation Awards Nominations

Staff


Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer facilitated a discussion of nominations for Historic Preservation Awards. The 2015 Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission Awards Ceremony would be held on May 31st.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer