

**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*

**Staff**

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



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: June 24, 2015

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

**Commission Members in Attendance:**

Chris Granfield, *Chair*  
Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*  
Eugene Thorne  
Laureen Skrivan  
Jeff Williams  
James Steel  
Lysa Schloesser  
Lauren Flemister  
Ross Buffington  
Marshall McClintock

**Staff Present:**

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith  
Elliott Barnett

**Others Present:**

Jeff Dunning  
Ranleigh Starling  
Lorne McConachie  
Chris Smith  
John Gibson  
Jim Dugan  
Paul Papovich  
Rob Sawatzky  
Rick Harmon  
Jackie Turner  
Kathryn Longwell  
Jean Hoard  
Jim Hoard

**Commission Members Absent:**

Duke York  
Jonah Jensen

Chair Chris Granfield called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL****2. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 5/27/15

The minutes of 5/27/15 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

- C. Administrative Review: 1015 A Street-Sign face change

**3. DESIGN REVIEW**

- A. Old Business
  - i. 5010 Pacific Avenue (Stewart Middle School)

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. The project team briefed the Landmarks Preservation Commission on June 11, 2014, and May 13, 2015. On May 13<sup>th</sup>, the Commission requested further evidence to support the replacement of all of the original windows. On May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2015, the Commission approved the proposed rehabilitation, including the replacement of the windows that ranked in poor condition. The Commission deferred action on the replacement of the windows in good and fair condition and requested that additional analysis be done on restoring and upgrading all or some of the existing fair to good condition windows.

The project team is proposing an alternative approach that includes restoration of 18 of the existing wood windows in the center of the primary façade that are in the administrative spaces of the building, and replacing the remaining windows with an aluminum clad wood double hung window in the classroom areas in a matching divided light pattern. This approach is based upon thermal performance factors, feedback from faculty regarding noise reduction in the classroom spaces, and maintaining the historical appearance of the building. The interior would be painted wood and the glass would be double-paned with a low-E coating. The original wood frame would be restored. All of the windows would be painted a dark green color that matches the historic color scrapings found during the evaluation.

#### **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.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. The building is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, and 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. The proposal is based on student comfort and performance.
3. The Commission requested that further evidence be provided to support replacing the original windows, which are a character defining feature. The applicant has provided an analysis of five approaches to the window replacement or restoration, and following this analysis, is proposing an alternate strategy of replacement for classroom spaces, and retention for the primary elevation in the administrative spaces.
4. The applicant is basing the proposal on a series of factors, including noise reduction, thermal performance, and cost (operable storm windows, combined with restored windows, represents a higher cost than restoration alone or replacement alone). Taken as a whole project, including the decision to restore the cast stone balustrade at the main entrance, this is presented as a balanced approach to the rehabilitation of the whole building.
5. The proposed windows are compatible with the historic character of the building, while meeting the financial and technical needs of the project. It is not asserted that the existing windows are beyond repair.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the alternative approach.

Mr. Rob Sawatzky reviewed that the team had gathered more information based on Commission feedback. He stated that their intent was to present a solution that enhances the school, maintains the aesthetic, brings it up to code, and supports new programs. He felt that the approach being presented was balanced and supported by the data.

Mr. Jeff Dunning reviewed a table of the window options compared across multiple criteria including cost, maintenance, historic aesthetic and usability. Based on the information from the table, the conclusion they had reached was that the aluminum clad windows were the best option in all criteria except historic aesthetic. Mr. Jeff Williams requested further details comparing the restoration of windows against the preferred option across all of the criteria. Mr. Dunning reviewed that for cost, the original windows were only slightly cheaper than the new windows. For maintenance, the original windows would need maintenance after 15 years, compared to 50 years for the replacement windows. For the historic aesthetic, the aluminum clad would have the original look, but would have aluminum facing and Low-E glass. For usability both types of windows would function and operate the same. For air filtration the replacement windows would perform significantly better. The heat transfer U value of the original windows was 3 times over the state allowance in the code for new buildings. Sound performance was slightly better with storm windows than the proposed replacements but the difference was negligible. For visible light transmittance, there would be less glare with the Low-E glass of the replacement windows. Mr. Dunning noted that a score was totaled for each of the explored options with the top four categories of criteria given a higher numeric value. Mr. Williams requested more information regarding the quoted cost for repair of the existing windows. Mr. Dunning responded that the quoted costs were based on actual bids.

Mr. Eugene Thorne noted that at the previous meeting they had mentioned studies on the impact of heat and visible light on the students. He asked if there was any information from those studies that they wished to share. Mr. Sawatzky responded there was a lot of literature and that he could provide references that would support the importance of daylighting and thermal comfort and the impact on learning, focus, and attention.

Mr. Ross Buffington asked what would happen to the wood windows if replacement was to proceed. Mr. Dunning later noted that they would be only removing the sash, bagging it, and storing it in an unused boiler room on site.

Ms. Ranleigh Starling discussed the efforts to balance cost, the needs of the school district, and the needs of the Landmarks criteria. Based on the needs assessment they were able to determine two viable options: a restored single pane historic window with an interior sash or a new window. For the center section of the front façade, there were no class rooms, which would give them the flexibility to restore the original windows. The maintenance issues for the original windows were discussed. Ms. Starling noted that there was no maintenance plan for wood windows in the school district. Mr. Sawatzky noted that the proposal to replace the center windows on the front façade was an effort to compromise with the preference to restore all of the existing windows. Ms. Lysa Schloesser asked for a breakdown of the costs. Mr. Dunning didn't have specific details, but commented that adding storm windows to the original windows would be a significant cost. Ranleigh discussed the issues with storm windows relating to challenges of maintenance. She noted that repair of the original windows would remain a possibility for the future as the windows were being stored on site.

Paint color was discussed. Paint scraping had uncovered four coats of paint, of which they would be using the darker green color.

Mr. Lorne McConachie discussed his background, having worked on twelve major restorations including Stadium High School and having served on the Seattle Landmarks board. He discussed how they were framing the discussion relative to the Commission's ordinance. He cited TMC 1.42.20 specifically noting the word "enhancement" in the declaration of purpose. Mr. McConachie cited TMC 1.42.090 which noted that the Commission would serve as the local review board for the special tax valuation program and verify that the improvements are consistent with the Washington State Advisory Council's Standards for Rehabilitation and Maintenance. He discussed the challenge between the restoring the building and enhancing it. He discussed their hopes for the compromise option striking a balance between the competing needs. Mr. Williams reviewed that the standards of the Commission were the Secretary of Interior's Standards (SOIS) which require repair rather than replacement. He agreed that there were windows that clearly needed to be replaced, but there were also many more that could be repaired. Mr. McConachie responded that the maintenance guidelines were based on the Washington State Advisory Council's Standards. Mr.

McKnight noted that the State Advisory Council pertained the special tax valuation and read TMC 13.07.095 into the record, which stated that the SOIS is the primary resource for evaluating the appropriateness of rehabilitation projects.

Mr. James Steel felt that clear choices had been presented and the question was to decide what values they prioritize. He commented that while some of the windows were in fair condition, others were in poor condition. He questioned whether they would want buildings with a checkerboard approach to restoration or to look at buildings systemically and do a replacement system wide. The other issue was maintenance and environmental concerns. He commented that requiring a school with limited budget to have a maintenance schedule that they could not afford did not make sense. He added that if the windows were of a character that could not be replicated with an aluminum clad wood window and there wasn't a plan to store the windows for a possible future restoration he might have a different opinion.

Mr. Eugene Thorne noted the acceptability of aluminum clad windows at the UWT and asked if there was something unusual that in their situation that allowed that. Vice-Chair Katie Chase commented that the issue with Stewart Middle School was that many of windows were repairable, which was why they had opposed wholesale replacement in the previous discussion.

The windows for the main façade were discussed. Vice-Chair Chase stated that she would prefer repairing the windows on the entire east façade. Ms. Starling commented that part the challenge was that Main façade had as many windows as both the north and south sides. Mr. Williams noted that he had been one of the people opposed to replacement of windows in fair and good condition in the previous discussion, adding that he had been shocked at the cost of repaint and weather-strip the windows. He added that piecemeal replacement did not make sense. Vice-Chair Chase commented that she would rather see public money spent on the labor to restore the windows than to purchase something that had been manufactured somewhere else. Mr. Williams asked if Bassetti actually preferred to repair the center windows of the main façade or if their preference would be to replace all of the windows. Mr. Dunning responded that they chose the windows for repair based on them not being classroom space, but they would prefer to replace those windows as well. Ms. Laureen Skrivan expressed concern that aesthetically the original windows on the main façade would not match the replacements. Mr. Steel noted that the main reason they would not match would be that in ten years the paint on the original windows would have deteriorated. Discussion ensued on whether to replace or restore the center windows on the main façade.

There was a motion.

*"I move to approve the window replacement for 5010 Pacific Avenue, Stewart Middle School, as submitted, replacing all of the wood windows identified by the applicant that will be replaced with an aluminum clad wood window to match the existing profiles of the windows."*

Mr. Steel clarified that his motion was to allow the replacement of all of the windows, including the windows of the primary façade. Mr. Buffington asked that the motion be amended to note that the school district was storing the windows on site for possible restoration in the future. Mr. Steel agreed to amend the motion.

Mr. Buffington commented that he felt it was a bad idea to allow anyone to remove material that could be repaired. He commented that it was a clear violation of the Secretary of Interior's Standards and that it would be setting a bad precedent. Vice-Chair Chase also expressed concern about the precedent being set by approving the replacement of all the windows.

Motion: Steel  
Second: Williams

The motion was approved with four Commissioners voting in favor and three voting against.

- B. New Business
  - i. 818 N Ainsworth

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1925, this building is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal is for a 15'x26', detached, alley accessed, garage at the rear of the property. The garage would be minimally visible from the right-of-way. The slope of the roof will be 8/12 and the roof height, at approximately 15', will be under that of the original structure which ranges from approximately 21' to 29'. The exterior will be Hardiplank siding with a reveal that matches the original house. The roof details and trim will also match the existing home. Cedar boards and smooth plywood will be used for the soffits. The roof will have Dutch hips at the gable ends, to match the house. The doors will be metal with a wood frame and trim. The windows will be vinyl with wood trim that matches the existing house.

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

### **STANDARDS**

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

1. Alley accessed parking is the typical and predominant residential parking configuration in the district. Residential driveways and garages facing the street are typically only appropriate when there is no alley access, or other site constraints prevent alley accessed parking (such as a corner lot).
2. Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Parking areas and garages should be set toward the rear of the lot to minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Where it is not possible to locate a parking structure to conceal it from view, it should be set well back from the front plane of the primary structure on the property. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in the residential areas of the neighborhoods and should be located behind the building and away from the street.
3. **Goal:** Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. **Guideline:** New buildings should be comparable in height to adjacent structures. Buildings that are substantially taller or shorter than the adjacent historic buildings should be avoided.
4. **Goal:** Relate the size and proportions of new buildings and their architectural elements to those of the neighborhood. **Guideline:** Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations.
5. **Goal:** Break up the facades of buildings into smaller varied masses comparable to those contributing buildings in the residential historic districts. **Guideline:** Variety of forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the North Slope and Wedge residential communities. Smaller massing—the arrangement of facade details, such as projections and recesses—and porches all help to articulate the exterior of the structure and help the structure fit into the neighborhood. Avoid large, blank planar surfaces.
6. **Goal:** Emphasize entrances to structures. **Guideline:** Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details, such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.
7. **Goal:** Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing contributing buildings where such elements are visible from the street.

#### **Guideline:**

1. **Shape and Pitch:** Typically, the existing historic buildings in the districts either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower.

2. **Architectural Elements:** Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or "widow's walks" to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.

3. **Materials:** Roofs that are shingle or appear to be shingle, or composition roofs, are the typical historic material compatible with the district. Seam metal may be an acceptable material for simple roof structures. Slate, faux slate and terra cotta tiles are not appropriate for the districts.

8. **Goals:** Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhoods were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco-covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.

**Guideline:**

1. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar in type, pattern, configuration and appearance to those typically found in the neighborhood.
  2. Stucco, especially commercial EIFS systems like Dryvit, is not acceptable for the historic district.
  3. Faux materials, such as vinyl or metal siding, are not acceptable for the historic district.
  4. Certain siding patterns, including board and batten and panel, are not historically common in the district and should not be used.
  5. Cementitious products, such as Hardiplank, may be acceptable in the district if installed in a historically correct pattern (for example, horizontal lapped siding or shingle). In such cases, the product used shall be smooth in texture (faux wood grain finish is NOT acceptable).
  6. Engineered products for trim and molding, if demonstrated to be similar in appearance to painted wood, may be an environmentally responsible substitute for wood on new structures. In such cases, the applicant should demonstrate to the Commission, via product literature and material samples, that the product is compatible.
9. **Goals:** Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings, as represented in the neighboring buildings. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.

**Guideline:**

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

### ANALYSIS

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications and new construction.
2. Driveway is accessed via the alley, meeting the guidelines for location of parking structures.
3. Garage is set to the rear of the lot, and will only be visible from the alley.
4. Roof height is lower than the main house. The 8/12 slope is within the range prescribed in the guidelines.
5. Overall scale is compatible with that of the existing building.
6. Façade, massing and design are comparable to neighboring garages; it is also compatible with the existing structure.
7. Garage materials and design visually match that of the existing building.
8. Windows and doors open to the yard and are not visible from right-of-way.

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Marshall McClintock asked for specifications on the door and windows. Mr. Smith responded that it was going to be a six panel metal door and the windows would be vinyl framed, single hung windows that would match the kitchen windows. The upper divided lighted would be sandwiched between the glass. It was noted that the Commission typically preferred no grids or exterior grids with a spacer.

Mr. McClintock recommended approval with the clarifications.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 818 North Ainsworth for the garage with the stipulation that the windows and lights in the garage either have no grids or have the grids on the outside with a spacer."*

Motion: Chase

Second: Flemister

The motion was approved unanimously.

- a. 912 North J Street

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

912 North J Street is a vacant lot in the North Slope Historic District. This proposal is to build a new 71'x15' home and a 15'x20' detached garage on the 25'x130' lot. The applicant has provided photographs of another home he built using the same design. The new structures will have smooth-faced, LAP cement board siding with approximately 6"-7" reveals. The front gable on the house will be shake cement siding. The windows will be single-hung and fixed vinyl. The front single-hung windows will have grids in the upper half and bronze handles. The 10/12 roof will be black architectural laminate and the doors will be fir craftsman-style doors. The roof ridge will reach 24'-8". The front porch will have 5/4"x6" cedar decking with knotty pine used for the soffit. The posts and railing will be wrapped in white wood. The gutters will be white aluminum. The alley-accessed garage is orientated towards the rear of the lot

and will not be very visible from North J Street. The garage doors and windows open to the backyard. The house and garage will be painted Deep Taupe with Brown-Black accents and white trim, as shown in the photographs.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

##### **Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Garages and New Construction**

##### **Garages and Parking**

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

##### **Height**

**Goal:** Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. **Guideline:** New buildings should be comparable in height to adjacent structures. Buildings that are substantially taller or shorter than the adjacent historic buildings should be avoided.

##### **Scale**

**Goal:** Relate the size and proportions of new buildings and their architectural elements to those of the neighborhood. **Guideline:** Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations.

##### **Massing**

**Goal:** Break up the facades of buildings into smaller varied masses comparable to those contributing buildings in the residential historic districts. **Guideline:** Variety of forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the North Slope and Wedge residential communities. Smaller massing—the arrangement of facade details, such as projections and recesses—and porches all help to articulate the exterior of the structure and help the structure fit into the neighborhood. Avoid large, blank planar surfaces.

##### **Sense of Entry**

**Goal:** Emphasize entrances to structures. **Guideline:** Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details, such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.

##### **Roof Shapes and Materials**

**Goal:** Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing contributing buildings where such elements are visible from the street.

##### **Guideline:**

1. Shape and Pitch: Typically, the existing historic buildings in the districts either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower.
2. Architectural Elements: Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or "widow's walks" to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.



3. Materials: Roofs that are shingle or appear to be shingle, or composition roofs, are the typical historic material compatible with the district. Seam metal may be an acceptable material for simple roof structures. Slate, faux slate and terra cotta tiles are not appropriate for the districts.

#### **Exterior Materials**

**Goals:** Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhoods were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco-covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.

#### **Guideline:**

1. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar in type, pattern, configuration and appearance to those typically found in the neighborhood.
2. Stucco, especially commercial EIFS systems like Dryvit, is not acceptable for the historic district.
3. Faux materials, such as vinyl or metal siding, are not acceptable for the historic district.
4. Certain siding patterns, including board and batten and panel, are not historically common in the district and should not be used.
5. Cementitious products, such as Hardiplank, may be acceptable in the district if installed in a historically correct pattern (for example, horizontal lapped siding or shingle). In such cases, the product used shall be smooth in texture (faux wood grain finish is NOT acceptable).
6. Engineered products for trim and molding, if demonstrated to be similar in appearance to painted wood, may be an environmentally responsible substitute for wood on new structures. In such cases, the applicant should demonstrate to the Commission, via product literature and material samples, that the product is compatible.

#### **Rhythm of Openings**

**Goals:** Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings, as represented in the neighboring buildings. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.

#### **Guideline:**

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

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is in the North Slope Historic Special Review District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for new construction.
2. The building size, massing, and height are comparable to the neighboring structures.
3. The front entrance is emphasized with the porch details.
4. The garage is alley-accessed. The garage door is off-centered to meet the Small Lot Development Standards.

5. The garage faces the rear of the lot and is not visible from the right of way.
6. The façade is appropriately broken up with architectural details.
7. The roof is gabled and has a 10:12 slope, which falls within the range prescribed by the district's guidelines.
8. The exterior materials align what with those recommended by the guidelines.
9. The windows and doors match the configuration and design recommended by the guidelines.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. John Gibson noted earlier comments from the Commission expressing preference not to have sandwiched grids and commented that he would remove the sandwiched grids. Mr. Marshall McClintock commented that he would prefer some kind of gridding in the upper part of the front façade of the house. It was suggested that it could be simulated divided light with a spacer.

Mr. McClintock asked about the egress window on the front façade. Mr. Gibson reported the dimensions of the upper windows and commented that minimum egress would be met. Responding to concerns about the casement windows on a similar house, he commented that the casements would not be used and that the windows would be the same height but wider.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase asked how the height of the home would compare to the adjacent houses. Mr. McClintock reported that he had heard that the adjacent homes were 23 and 19 feet tall. The proposed home would be 24.8 feet tall.

The garage was discussed. Mr. James Steel asked about centering the garage. Mr. Gibson responded that since there was no room to build a storage space and the lot, he wanted there to be 2 to 3 feet on one side of the garage for storage. Mr. Steel commented that they would prefer a centered garage. Mr. McClintock asked about the man door for the garage and if would match the other door. Mr Gibson commented that he didn't have any pictures, but would prefer a steel door.

Mr. McClintock requested opinions from the Commissioners on the lack of crown molding on the windows. Mr. Steel commented that there were subtle things that could be done to contextualize the home within the neighborhood, but embellishments weren't necessary.

The balustrade height above the lower sill was discussed. Mr. Gibson noted that he would prefer a lower balustrade, but was bound by building code. Mr. McKnight reported that if the Commission felt strongly, staff could discuss lowering the railing height with the plans examiner. Discussion ensued. Mr. McClintock expressed support for seeking to lower the balustrade height.

Commissioners discussed comments that would be included in the motion language.

Mr. Steel asked if there were any concerns related to the privacy of the adjacent back yards. Mr. McClintock responded that it was an issue that had been raised specifically in regards to accessory dwelling units. Mr. Steel expressed concern that they were interrupting the continuity of the existing backyards with narrow homes that are nearly the full length of the lot.

There was a motion.

*"I move to approve the application for 912 North J Street as submitted with the following additional comments: 1. The garage door should be centered on the garage. 2. The front door should be of a shaker, mission, or craftsman style*

*as shown in pictures provided by the applicant. 3. The second floor windows on the front elevation will be changed to an egress window per the applicants comments today: 36 by 46 for both windows. 4. On the front elevation of the house, the windows should have divides as shown but the divides should be of a simulated true divided nature with muntins on the outside and inside and a spacer bar within the glazing. 5. An additional recommendation by the Commission to reduce the front railing height pending the applicants conversation with a code official."*

Motion: Steel  
Second: Chase

The motion was approved unanimously.

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

##### **A. Residential Zoning Amendments**

Mr. McKnight noted that a number of comments relating to the issue had been included in the packet. Additional letters had been distributed to the Commissioners at the meeting. He noted that it was a briefing to advise and solicit information from the Commission.

Mr. Elliott Barnett provided a presentation on the Affordable Housing Planning Work Program Phase 3. He noted that it had been in the works for five years starting in 2010 with a report from the Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group. He reviewed that there were six different proposals to allow more density and greater housing choice: lot size flexibility and small lot standards; proposals for Special Review Districts including R2-SRD and HMR-SRD; a pilot residential infill program; a significant overhaul to the existing Planned Residential Districts code; affordable housing incentives and bonuses; and City process enhancements. He reviewed that the zoning and lot sizes had changed very little since 1953 and that prior to the establishment of the zoning regulations there was a greater mix of housing types in neighborhood. A zoning map was discussed, Mr. Barnett noting that most of the residential zoning in the City was R-2. He discussed the need for "missing middle housing" to create the densities that would support transit, aging in place, and affordable housing. Mr. Barnett noted that as they created new flexibilities they would also seek to create a greater review process with additional oversight from the City to make sure that infill housing fits in with the neighborhood.

The infill strategies would include Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADUs), Smaller lots, denser housing in single family zone, cottage housing, and planned residential districts. The small lots standards changes included a 0.6 floor area ratio, requiring only one parking space, roof pitch and eaves, windows and doors trimmed, and special considerations made for historic districts to ensure cooperation between the Landmarks Preservation Commission and Land Use.

He discussed lot size flexibility options including lot size averaging and a proposal to provide flexibility near critical areas. Changes to the special review district included proposals to lower lot sizes to 3500 square feet, which was based on the existing and historic lot development patterns in the district. They would also allow duplex and triplex infill in Special Review Districts if the design requirements were being met. He discussed a map of the North Slope that showed which of the existing lots would not be allowed to be created today.

For the pilot residential infill program they would be seeking to create some good examples through an administrative design review of DADUs, Corner 2-family, R-3 multi-family, and cottage housing. Planned Residential Districts would allow a higher density in exchange for sustainability and affordable housing. Incentives and upzones would take some steps to improve incentives for affordability. City Process enhancements would include creation of a good examples library to illustrate design standards.

Specific issues for Historic Districts were discussed. Issues related mostly to land uses allowed and protecting historic character. Feedback included comments that they were already doing their share for density and that it would not generate much affordable housing. Protecting and enhancing historic character was discussed, Mr. Barnett noting some of issues associated with the proposals including concerns that it could incentivize demolition through neglect; historic districts not being an appropriate place to test new ideas; and issues with trusting the city review process in achieving the objectives.

Mr. Barnett discussed the efforts being made to ensure that the proposals would work for historic districts such as making sure the land use code handles height, bulk, and allowed uses; making it clear that demolition of historic features is not allowed; discretion to look at DADUs in the context of neighborhood patterns; and limiting exterior changes of contributing structures.

It was noted that for the residential pilot program, they were seeking the expertise of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. An invitation was extended for a member to serve on the advisory body to help review residential infill pilot proposals.

Mr. James Steel asked if all of the proposals were for affordable housing. Mr. Barnett responded that housing choice in different neighborhoods was also a component. Chair Chris Granfield asked that if the program was for increasing density in general or for a specific demographic. Mr. Barnett responded that it was general density.

Mr. Marshall McClintock noted that the North Slope had a number of concerns and had met with Mr. Barnett. He commented that they did not want any additional spec houses or to open up the zoning to allow more of them unless they would do something to promote quality building. He noted concerns about additional triplexes and duplexes, feeling that they already had enough of them in the area and that adding more would destroy the interiors of contributing structures that they would like to see restored. He commented that DADUs would not be much of a problem at a maximum height of 15 feet, but there would be issues for larger ones that might be looking into a neighbor's yard. He felt that the issues were important enough that he would like to see the Landmarks Preservation Commission express the concerns to the Planning Commission. Mr. Ross Buffington commented that the Wedge Historic District would have similar concerns with the prospect of additional duplexes and triplexes being converted from existing homes. He added that they already have a substantial number of existing multifamily and affordable homes in their neighborhood. They also would be concerned about the prospect of additional DADUs. He commented that implementing some of the ideas would be a step back from the efforts to preserve the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Eugene Thorne suggested that they should also consider how they would protect historic character in areas that were not designated as historic districts.

Ms. Lauren Flemister commented that there were bigger issues would need to be considered such as who the homes would be affordable to and who would be excluded. She felt that they were at the point where they couldn't continue in the same patterns that they were currently developing in. She commented that the texture and the compositions of the neighborhoods in the past was different than what exists now. She felt that they could not look at it purely through a preservation lens. Ms. Flemister felt that they needed more examples of good development. Mr. McClintock responded that the North Slope and Wedge Historic Districts had already met the density goal and if the rest of the R2 areas met the density goals and more density was needed, they would be open to considering more. Discussion ensued. Mr. Jeff Williams suggested that a higher design standard was needed in historic districts for infill. He suggested that the pilot programs should be developed first outside of the district. He added that triplex and duplex conversions should not be allowed in historic districts.

Vice-Chair Chase agreed with Ms. Flemister's defense of renters in historic districts and noted that she lived in a converted triplex. She agreed that a one-size fits all approach would not work and hoped that if the pilot program was allowed in the historic district that the Landmarks Preservation Commission would have power to say no. Discussion ensued on ensuring quality design for infill in the historic districts. Mr. McClintock commented that they needed better infill, noting that the infill that has been seen in North Slope so far had been largely low quality. He agreed that better guidelines and design standards/oversight would be needed before implementation. Mr. Steel commented that they shouldn't throw out the concept, but improve the implementation. He added that people could no longer afford some of the larger homes and that they should not be allowed to languish for lack of demand. He suggested that many of the larger homes and mansions in the North End would need to find new uses. Mr. Williams agreed that selling the large homes was difficult, but that he didn't want to see alteration to the exterior of the homes. He suggested that design review authority would be important in preventing exterior alterations that would be proposed for duplex and triplex conversions.

Mr. McKnight noted that the design review process has evolved since its inception and that the standards in place have not fully met expectations. He felt there was consensus on concern over the quality of building and design.

There were also concerns about triplex conversions resulting in loss of interior character and zoning requirements resulting in changes to the exterior. He reviewed that he had also heard comments that DADUs should not be too large. Mr. Williams added that allowing detached garages on small lots was also an issue. Mr. Steel commented that regulating roof pitch and trim would not be a method for quality and suggested that they might want to remove those kinds of design guidelines.

Mr. Barnett welcomed any additional comments from the Commissioners and noted that the official comment period would be from the middle of July through the middle of August.

#### B. Events and Activities Updates

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

1. Second Annual You Think You Know Tacoma Trivia Night (6pm @ Stonegate Pizza, June 25<sup>th</sup>)
2. All About Log Cabins (5:30pm @ Job Carr Cabin, July 2<sup>nd</sup>)

There was a request for the Commission to support a History Link grant application to Pierce County's Historic Preservation Program. Commissioners voted unanimously to send a letter of support.

#### 5. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer

