

Members

Katie Pratt, *Chair*
Ken House, *Vice-Chair*
Kevin Bartoy
Brittani Flowers
Roger Johnson
Lysa Schloesser
James Steel
Eugene Thorne
Jeff Williams



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

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

Date: June 14, 2017

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Pratt, *Chair*
Roger Johnson
James Steel
Eugene Thorne
Jeff Williams
Kevin Bartoy
Ken House
Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer
John Griffith

Others Present:

Melissa McGinnis
Jeff Ryan
Spencer Howard
Mike Bartlett
Michael Sullivan
David Boe
Chanin Escovedo
Jared Baehmer

Commission Members Absent:

Jonah Jensen
Brittani Flowers
Lysa Schloesser

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

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 5/24/17
- C. Administrative Review
 - 520 N. Cushman Ave.—AC
 - 616 N Ainsworth Ave.—AC
 - 811 N I St.—Deck repair
 - 1502 S. 5th St.—Walkway and stairs
 - 1002 Earnest S. Brazill St.—Painting
 - 720 N Sheridan Ave.—Deck and spa enclosure

The consent agenda was approved.

3. NATIONAL REGISTER REVIEW - INTRODUCTION

- A. Point Defiance Lodge, 5717 Roberts Garden Road

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

This is a National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Point Defiance Lodge building, at 5717 North Roberts Garden Road in Point Defiance Park. On March 22, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission

forwarded the Tacoma Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Point Defiance Lodge to City Council with a recommendation for approval.

The lodge was built in 1898 and designed by architect Charles A. Darmer and built by Albert Miller; it is the only original park structure still in existence. The lodge was built as a residence for Ebenezer Rhys Roberts, the landscape gardener hired to work with landscape architect Edward Otto Schwagerl to develop Point Defiance into a park. The building is significant for its association with the development of Point Defiance Park and as the work of prominent architect Charles A. Darmer.

EFFECTS OF NOMINATION

The National Register listing does not restrict future alterations, nor does it affect future use of the property. Projects that occur on or near the site of a listed property or district may be subject to review under SEPA, NEPA, or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and may be required to employ measures to reduce or mitigate impacts to affected historic properties. Listed properties may be eligible for federal historic rehabilitation tax credits if listed or determined eligible for listing.

STANDARDS

To be eligible for National Register, the property(ies) or object must meet the “seven standards of integrity” as well as one of four listing criteria. The seven standards are: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling and Association.

The criteria under which the Point Defiance Lodge is nominated include:

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- C. *Property 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 lack individual distinction.*

ANALYSIS

The Point Defiance Lodge meets the “seven standards of integrity.” The building is associated with the early development of Point Defiance Park. The property also embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction.

ACTION REQUESTED

The purpose of this review is to make a recommendation to the Advisory Council regarding the historic significance of the nominated property.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission recommend inclusion of the Point Defiance Lodge on the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and C, and that comments received be forwarded to the Washington Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for its consideration.

Melissa McGinnis thanked them for moving the building forward to the City Council for local designation.

Commission Johnson commented that excluding Ebenezer Roberts, the first superintendent of Tacoma’s parks, from the nomination was unfortunate.

Chair Pratt commented that she supported the nomination.

There was a motion.

“I motion to support the nomination of the Point Defiance Lodge.”

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Steel

The motion was approved unanimously.

B. College Park Historic District

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

This is a National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the College Park Historic District, which is 125 acres roughly bordered by North Pine Street on the east; North 21 Street on the north; North Alder Street and North Union Avenue on the west; and North 8th & North 18th adjacent to the University of Puget Sound, on the south. It includes 582 primary buildings, 509 of which are contributing properties. Architectural types include Queen Anne; Colonial and Tudor revivals, Minimal Traditional, and Craftsman. The period of significance is 1890 to 1960, during which most of the homes were built. The district represents the broad pattern of social and economic history of Tacoma. The district also embodies the distinctive characteristics of homes from this period and includes the work of master craftsmen and architects.

To ensure that adequate public notice was distributed for this proposal, property owners within the affected area received notice of the pending nominations. Property owners were encouraged to submit comments to the State of Washington.

The nomination form and images have been included in the packet. To view the entire pending National Register nomination, including inventory, visit cityoftacoma.org/HistoricDistricts.

EFFECTS OF NOMINATION

This district is not proposed for the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The National Register listing does not restrict future alterations, nor does it affect future use of the property. Projects that occur on or near the site of a listed property or district may be subject to review under SEPA, NEPA, or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and may be required to employ measures to reduce or mitigate impacts to affected historic properties. Listed properties may be eligible for federal historic rehabilitation tax credits if listed or determined eligible for listing.

STANDARDS

To be eligible for National Register, the property(ies) or object must meet the “seven standards of integrity” as well as one of four listing criteria. The seven standards are: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling and Association.

The criteria under which the Point Defiance Lodge is nominated include:

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- C. *Property 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 lack individual distinction.*

ANALYSIS

The College Park Historic District meets the “seven standards of integrity.” The district is associated with the early development of Tacoma. The properties also embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction as well the work of master craftsmen and architects.

ACTION REQUESTED

The purpose of this review is to make a recommendation to the Advisory Council regarding the historic significance of the nominated district.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission recommend inclusion of the College Park Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and C, and that comments received be forwarded to the Washington Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for its consideration.

Jeff Ryan, Ryan Architecture, commented that the College Park Historic District was something that he had been working on since 2005. He reviewed the geography of the proposed historic district on the east side and north side of the University of Puget Sound. He reported that the University had declined to include any of their buildings in the nomination, but were supportive.

Mr. Ryan commented that the majority of homes were built in the 1920s through the 1940s. He commented that only 4% of the existing homes had been built since 1960. 85% of the homes were in place when the trolley system was

running and 87% of the homes were listed as contributing on the National Register. He reviewed that he had inventoried all of the houses and catalogued them with historic photos when possible. He reviewed that the district had been occupied for 127 years. He discussed the pattern of development over time. He discussed the College Park name, reviewing that University used to be the site of the Tacoma Athletic field, but once the Stadium Bowl had opened, it was mostly unused. He commented that the College District name was used by realtors for selling houses starting at the Jason Lee site and expanding out. It had been named the College District ever since. He had combined the two names to become "College Park". Mr. Ryan discussed how the site had been developed over time, reviewing photos of the development from 1907, 1924, and 1954. He noted that there were a variety of homes in the neighborhood, which gave the neighborhood a unique character. He reported that many of the homes had been built on speculation and sold via a rent to own process. He reviewed a map of the contributing structures, noting the small number of non-contributing structures and houses that had been altered to the point of being ineligible for the register. He commented that, for its age and the variety of homes present, the area was remarkably intact as a 1920s trolley neighborhood.

Chair Pratt thanked Mr. Ryan for his work on the nomination.

Commissioner Johnson commented that it was a very good nomination and that the percentage of contributing homes was surprising.

Commissioner Steel asked if other neighborhoods nominated to the register were typically as nebulous in defining the boundaries. Mr. McKnight responded that the process looked at shared development history and the time period, so the boundaries were primarily drawn through that integrity and that narrative. Mr. Ryan discussed how he had analyzed the boundaries. Commissioner Steel commented that it was interesting that it was a similar development pattern to Portland where the neighborhoods were not as clearly defined

Commissioner Bartoy commented that he appreciated the work put into the nomination and the emphasis on working class, but he was concerned by the boundaries and the name.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission forward to the advisory council approval of the College Park district."

Motion: Johnson

Second: Thorne

The motion was approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1019 Pacific Avenue, the Washington Building/Scandinavian American Bank Building (Pending Landmark)

Chair Pratt recused herself from the item. Commissioner House temporarily served as Chair for the item.

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1925, the Washington Building/Scandinavian American Bank Building is a pending individual landmark. On March 22, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission forwarded the Tacoma Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Washington Building to City Council with a recommendation for approval.

On February 22, 2017, the Commission was briefed on the proposed rehabilitation work, which includes replacing non-original mezzanine level louvers with windows and adding aluminum louvers as needed; repairing cast iron storefronts; repainting existing painted window infill panels; removing canvas awnings; cleaning and repairing the terra cotta cladding; repairing existing windows or replacing in-kind as needed; removing a contemporary sign panel over the mezzanine window on Pacific Avenue; removing contemporary metal ductwork along Court A and repairing the existing louver and painting the metal work to blend with the terra cotta.

The project team is also proposing an illuminated blade sign at the corner of Pacific Avenue and S 11th Street. The sign would be mounted at the same location as a previous corner sign to minimize impacts to the building. The materials, font, dimensions, and illumination have yet to be determined.

The rehabilitation work also includes replacing the non-original entrance doors on Pacific Avenue (originally a storefront) with compatible storefront windows that match the existing contemporary windows. Pursuant to TMC

13.06A.052, within the Downtown, the “primary pedestrian streets” are considered key streets in the intended development and utilization of the area pedestrian use. Feedback from land use planning staff is that the proposal is not consistent with the intent of this section, which promotes pedestrian oriented active uses at the street level. However, the proposal does not appear to directly conflict with this code provision.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

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

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.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

ANALYSIS

1. This property is a pending individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. No historic material is being removed.
3. Distinctive features and finishes, such as the terra cotta, are being repaired and preserved.
4. The original storefront configuration is being restored.
5. The terra cotta cladding will be cleaned and repaired in a manner that will not further damage the historic material.
6. Contemporary modifications are compatible but differentiated from the historic material.
7. New modifications could be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the property.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. McKnight noted that there was variance requirement for the storefronts as the proposal included replacement of non-original entrance doors on Pacific Avenue, which were once a storefront, with compatible storefront windows to match existing contemporary windows. He reported that they had checked on whether there was a conflict in the code that needed to be addressed by the Commission and land use staff had responded that the proposal was not consistent with the intent with the code section on promoting pedestrian use, but a variance was not required and there was no code conflict.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular, commented that the design review had been triggered by a change of use for the ground floor and upper floor offices of the building. The goal of the operation was to make as few changes to the exterior of the building as possible. He reported that they would do a selective repointing for the terra cotta. They would be matching the existing mortar in kind, type, and color. There were areas where existing terra cotta had been broken or cracked and they would be repairing with either use of the Edison system or the mason could make a custom patch.

Mr. Howard reviewed exterior changes that they would be making to the building. Along Pacific Avenue they were proposing removing contemporary features, cleaning up the mechanical, and adding mechanical to accommodate interior uses. Added mechanical elements in the transom windows would be cleaned up and they would return it to glazing at those locations. They would install an aluminum louver in the small upper sash to accommodate residential functions. The new storefront would match existing storefronts on the façade. Commissioner Steel asked

if the bay that was an entrance had historically been an entrance. Mr. Howard responded that the existing assembly was contemporary and it did not look like it had been an entrance historically. On 11th Avenue they would be removing canvas awnings, repairing cast iron storefronts, and translucent panels would be removed. At the entrance on the east end they would remove the contemporary storefront and replace it with one that would match the other one on Pacific Avenue. On the mezzanine level they would install HVAC panels, install an HVAC grill in the original sash, and add a mechanical louver to support interior residential functions. On Court A they would replace and repair the wood storefronts with wood that would be painted to match the existing. They would remove the mechanical unit and replace it with a flat mechanical grill. Plywood panels would be replaced with glazing. They would add a simple metal door for the trash bay that would be painted to match the trim on the facade.

Commissioner Thorne asked if windows on the upper façade were for a second story element. Mr. Howard confirmed that there was a second floor.

Mr. Howard reported that they wanted to have a sign at the corner of 11th and Pacific and would return to the Commission for that since they hadn't finalized the design, but they would be reusing the existing attachment locations.

Commissioner Johnson asked about structural steel being added to the building. Mr. Howard reviewed that there would be seismic braces added to the interior of the building, but the appearance would be minimized.

There was a motion.

"I motion that we approve the packet as presented for the Washington building."

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Steel

The motion was approved.

B. 2114 Pacific Avenue (Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The applicant is proposing a new three-level parking garage on the site which is currently a parking lot. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this project on May 24, 2017. The current redesign reflects the Commission's requests. The project would include adding four windows to the south wall of 2114 Pacific Avenue, which is a noncontributing building in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District. A green roof, decking, and a new metal storefront would also be added to this building. Alterations to noncontributing builds are exempt from design review. The new garage will include 35ft of new retail facades along Pacific Avenue, which will be used for ADA parking. The proposed materials include brick, concrete, and Corten steel mesh and panels. The Commerce side will include ramps to the second and third floor parking decks. A ground floor rain garden and trees are also proposed for the Commerce side. The design team will be presenting three options for the treatment of the concrete beams on the front façade.

The project team will also introduce the Commission to the preliminary design for a proposed Local Improvement District (LID) along Commerce Street, between South 23rd Street and South 21st Street.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work and feedback on the proposed LID.

STANDARDS

Design Guidelines for the Union Depot/Warehouse District & the Union Station Conservation District

Included in the packet.

ANALYSIS

1. This property is in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District and, as such, new construction is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission may, at its discretion, waive mandatory requirements imposed by the design guidelines. In determining whether a waiver is appropriate, the Landmarks Preservation Commission shall require an applicant to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that, because of special circumstances not generally applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography,

location, or surroundings, the strict application of those mandatory requirements would be unnecessary to further the purposes of this chapter.

3. The Commission was briefed on this proposal on March 24, 2017.
4. The proposed building colors and materials complement both the historic and new elements of the district. The proposed materials reflect the prominent materials in the district, which include masonry and metallic finishes.
5. The scale of the proposed garage reflects the warehouse design and massing of the surrounding district.
6. The proposed design does not meet the design guideline's requirement for the inclusion of storefronts and street level retail and services. Although a storefront façade is included in the proposal, that space will also be used for parking. However, the Commission had no specific feedback on this item during the briefing on May 24..
7. The design does incorporate pedestrian-oriented open spaces, which is encouraged by the design guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mike Bartlett, Hunt Mottet Partners LLC, reviewed what they had submitted at the previous meeting. He reviewed that there had been a decorative Corten grill and the x frame painted a bright color. He reported that they had several options that refined the design that they were seeking feedback on. For one option they had incorporated some concrete elements into the top railing, painted the x brace the same color as the frames for the screening, and used a linear railing. For option two, they kept the upper railing open, used a matching color palette, and painted the x frame a dark color. For option 3, they had maximized the wall surfaces as much as they could without losing the open air parking requirement.

Michael Sullivan commented that, in trying to fit into the context of the neighborhood, they had originally tried to reference the Tacoma Steel yard that would have originally been behind the structure, which is why there were so many references to metal. Other options referenced the four story building at 2114, which was poured concrete. He commented that they had couldn't get down to a consensus on what the design was going to be so they explored all three options. Mr. Bartlett commented that they had explored moving the x brace further back, but if it were inside the building it would have to be fireproofed and would have to provide vertical support for other elements. Discussion ensued on the placement of the x brace.

Commissioner Steel commented that he wanted to know more before he would feel comfortable approving a design as it wasn't clear what the detailing would be. He commented that the windows appeared to be jogging up and down from bay to bay. Mr. Bartlett commented that they were trying to work with the existing driveway location and had to move the opening off of the grid line. Commissioner Steel asked why the header heights were different between each bay. Mr. Bartlett responded that it was because they were working with square inches of open area to qualify as an open parking garage. Mr. Steel commented that he was having difficulty understanding the elevation design, which was lacking in detail. He commented that he felt the Commission should be providing feedback regarding priorities for the design, but what they typically approved were architectural drawings. He commented that the level of detail shown in the drawings was not sufficient to provide feedback on what was going on. Discussion ensued. Commissioner Steel suggested that the mesh could be put in front of the structure to make the bays appear more similar in terms of the header height, providing a more uniform appearance for the facade. Mr. Bartlett asked if the preference was to cover the bays with the mesh. Mr. Bartlett commented that the beam in the middle could be moved up, making the top edge uniform.

Mr. Sullivan commented that the unit size in the historic district was for 25 foot lots, noting that they could have made a structure with one long 150 foot bay, which would have obliterated the unit size. He commented that they had broken it up to honor the basic rhythm of the block. He commented that they could get rid of the brick building and make it look like a garage. Commissioner Steel commented that the bays were not the issue, but the different header heights for the garage were and he wanted to see architectural drawings so he could know what was there.

Commissioner Thorne asked if the screens were a structural element. Mr. Bartlett responded that they were there mostly as a safety feature for cars, acting a barrier to prevent cars from accidentally entering the street.

Commissioner House thanked the applicants for returning with multiple options for consideration. Regarding the storefront façade issue, he noted that there was a significant amount of storefront on Pacific Avenue that had been created and preserved by the UWT and that it was okay with him that they were not creating any additional storefront. He commented that he preferred the option that used concrete without the railing, because it continued the strong horizontal elements from the other buildings. He commented that what they had presented was architecturally and visually interesting. He commented that he disagreed with Commissioner Steel, that he could tell

enough from the concept drawings, and that he did not see the need to see additional drawings.

Commissioner Williams commented that he agreed that the level of detail was difficult, that the layout was not symmetrical, and that he had an issue with the x bracing on the outside of the garage.

Commissioner Bartoy commented that he appreciated the changes that had been made. He commented that Elevation C seemed more appropriate out of the three, noting that the stairs of the penthouse would blend in. He commented that he agreed with regards to the screening having issues with its rhythm. Mr. Bartlett asked if having the concrete in the center bay all at the same level would help. Commissioner Williams commented that if it was symmetrical across the three bays, that would be more desirable. Commissioner Williams commented that the x brace was still his biggest issue and that it would be more desirable to have the mesh on the exterior. He commented that having the concrete run across one line would help as well.

Commissioner Thorne suggested that for the frames without the x brace doing some form of minor duplication would give a uniformity that might make it look more symmetrical.

Commissioners concurred with preferring elevation C from the three options presented.

Mr. McKnight suggested that if there was a consensus on option C, they could do a conditional approval and have the architectural drawings come back for a review letter.

There was a motion

"I move that the Commission give conditional approval for elevation C, with condition being that prior to final approval the applicant come back with detail drawings, explanation as to why the x brace needed to be on the outside of the structure, headers more uniform across the structure, more detail on the mesh screen panel design, and some type of design that provides relief in the concrete façade and brick façade before the final approval."

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Williams

The motion was approved with Commissioner House voting against.

The LID was discussed. Mr. Bartlett commented that the main focus of the LID was Commerce Street where they were undergrounding utilities and trying to create a more pedestrian friendly street. He reviewed that historically it was designed to be the back door for the industrial buildings. He reviewed the existing site configuration and reported they were going to a combination of parallel parking with ADA access up to the historic loading docks of the buildings. They would also be creating loading areas for rideshares and taxis. There would be a stamped concrete cobblestone street and they would incorporate train tracks into some areas. They were looking at procuring around 40 Union Pacific Railroad lighting standards. He commented that the idea was that when you leave 21st Street you would feel like you're in a different part of town. Mr. Sullivan discussed how historically, Commerce Street was the utility corridor and was designed with loading docks for the freight cars and wagons that would have made deliveries. Mr. Sullivan noted that some of the things incorporated into the streetscape would be found objects.

Commissioner Steel asked if the rail would be located where it was historically. Mr. Bartlett responded that it would be close, because the street lacked a storm system.

Commissioner House expressed support for that anything that preserved the industrial character.

Commissioner Steel commented that with the Prairie Line Trail they were always encouraging them to avoid creating a false narrative, like with the placement of tracks. He suggested that they keep what they could, but not bring in too many things that would create a false narrative of what was originally there. Mr. Bartlett commented that the tracks would parallel with the street, possibly be 4 feet to the west of where they were currently.

Commissioner Williams commented that he would prefer another treatment than the stamped concrete cobblestone look to avoid creating something designed to look old when it isn't.

5. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 4301 North Stevens Street, Haddaway Hall (Individual Landmark)

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1923, Haddaway Hall is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The grounds, mansion, carriage house, and greenhouse are contributing structures. This proposal is regarding the Education Building, which is noncontributing. The applicant is going through the Conditional Use Permit process to convert the Education Building into the Waldorf School. The only exterior changes proposed are the addition of two play areas. One would be within the Atrium on the north side and the other would be where the tennis court is currently located. The applicant is requesting the Commission's feedback on the compatibility of the new use with the historic property, as well as the proposed play area design and location.

ACTION REQUESTED

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

David Boe, Boe Architects, reviewed that the Weyerhaeuser Mansion was a well-documented property that had had a lot of interest in it over the years. He noted that the proposal concerned the education building, which was a relatively new building on that campus and had a unique architectural style that they were not intending to modify. He reviewed a map of the property noting the education building in the southern part.

Chanin Escovedo, Tacoma Waldorf School, commented that they were the only Waldorf school in Pierce County and needed to expand due to demand for their education. She discussed the Waldorf school which was taught from a nature-based holistic style. They were the fastest growing pedagogical movement that was not run by church or state. Mr. Boe noted that the school focused on outdoor activity in all weather conditions.

Mr. Boe commented that they would use the existing entry gate off of Stevens as the entry point for children being dropped off. No changes to the gates were proposed. They would likely return with detail on signage. No additional impervious pavement was proposed and there was enough parking to satisfy the school's needs. He reviewed photos of the site noting a covered landscape area facing north that would be the first play area proposed. Mr. McClintock asked if the sidewalk on the plan was already there. Mr. Boe confirmed that it was. The second play area location would be east of the entrance. The third play area would utilize a portion of the old tennis courts. That area would be reduced in size to reduce visibility from Haddaway hall. Landscaping had not been designed yet but they were considering something similar to the naturalistic play areas designed by Northwest Trek and Metro Parks.

The compatibility of the educational use was discussed. Mr. Boe noted that the lower floor of the education building had classrooms and a large commercial kitchen. The upper floor had open spaces and many bathrooms from when it was a nunnery and had been used as dorms. He reported that they would do an interior upgrade including fire sprinklers. He noted that they had not provided interior photos as it was unremarkable and was a non-contributing element. He commented that layout would work well for the intended use.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if the tennis court play area was in a recessed landscape, so the historic view would look over and across it. Mr. Boe confirmed that it was and that it was a lower terrace and was not visible.

Commissioner Steel questioned the traffic pattern, asking if the driveway was a single lane so cars would not be passing alongside when someone is dropping off their child. Mr. Boe commented that the area widened, allowing cars to pass, but it was basically one way. Commissioner Steel asked if they had to tailor their plans with potential future uses for Haddaway Hall. Mr. Boe responded that the current thinking was that Haddaway Hall would return to being a private residence. He added that they were considering restoring the greenhouses.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if the intent was to subdivide the lots and separate the school from the house. Mr. Boe responded that it was not the current intent, but was something that would be looked at in the future because the property lines were counterintuitive.

Mr. McClintock asked if the path that goes down to the larger play area would have to be created. Mr. Boe confirmed that it would be constructed. Mr. McKnight noted that the development on the property fell under Landmarks review and was subject to Landmarks approval.

Commissioner Thorne asked if there were any plans for the Chapel. Mr. Boe commented that it was not in their programming and they were focused on everything to the southwest of the historic buildings.

There was general consensus that the proposed use was compatible.

B. 619 North K Street (North Slope Historic District)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1901, 619 North K Street is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. This proposal is regarding the second dwelling towards the rear of the property. There is no build date for this structure and it is not mentioned in the district inventory, although it is located on the property of 619 North K Street. The applicant is proposing replacing some windows to meet egress requirements, as well as altering the roofline to a hipped roof with dormers. The chimney would also be removed. These changes are to accommodate an interior remodel. There are no changes proposed for the main house.

ACTION REQUESTED

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Jared Baehmer, Cornerstone Home Designs, commented that there were currently two different rooflines that made the interior configuration difficult. He commented that they wanted to match the existing roofline by bringing the two lower roofs up to make it a uniform hip roof style. They would flatten the peak of the roof to make it more level and add dormers on the side facing the other house on the property. On the street side they wanted to replace existing windows with windows that would meet egress requirements. He reviewed the proposed floor plan. It was noted that the home was on an alley, not a street.

Commissioner Thorne asked if it was originally a coach house. Mr. Baehmer responded that there had been families living there.

Regarding whether or not the home was contributing, Mr. McClintock reported that the main house was built in 1901, the building in question changed ownership in 1915, and there were \$2000 in permits issued in 1925. A 1926 map showed a smaller version of the existing building. He noted that between 1930 and 1940 the second story element and the additional garage were added. He commented that additional changes fell within the period of significance for the historic district. Though it was not listed as a contributing structure, he felt that it fell within the scope of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Williams asked if the building was only visible from the alley. Mr. McClintock confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Bartoy commented that there were some issues with the historic integrity.

Mr. McClintock commented that there were some interesting details on the internal facing façade like the windows in the upper portion of the house.

The owner commented that she loved the building, but it looked too much like the apartments that she and her husband used to rent. She commented she wanted to use it as her home, but not as it appeared now. She asked what they meant by integrity. Mr. Bartoy discussed seven aspects of integrity used when looking at a historic structure. Ms. Hoogkamer commented that they were predominantly looking at the district guidelines.

Chair Pratt commented that she wanted more information, adding that whether the house was considered contributing or non-contributing would result in very different discussions. Ms. Hoogkamer commented that there was no additional information available for the house and they would have to update the inventory to make the determination on whether or not the home was contributing.

Mr. Baehmer commented that because it hadn't been occupied for some time they only had 12 months to do something with the building.

Commissioner Williams commented that he felt it was non-contributing and they should let the owner do what she wants with it. Mr. McClintock commented that they did find buildings in the district that should be listed and it was a large enough structure that they should take a look at it. Commissioner Williams commented that he would feel different if it was visible from the street. Commissioner House asked what additional information they would need to make a determination on whether it was contributing or not. Chair Pratt commented that for a property to be contributing they looked at the degree of alterations. She noted that the alterations for the home in question had happened during the period of significance, but the additions didn't necessarily gain significance on their own. She commented that she would be hesitant to call it a contributing property in the district.

Commissioner Steel commented that if it was contributing they would have issues with the roof form and raising the roof, which would be changing the height and scale of the structure. It was not contributing they would still need to look at the roof.

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed the code which stated that the absence of a property on the inventory of contributing properties would not preclude the Landmarks Preservation Commission's authority to review changes. Additionally, if the property was not listed on the district they were to assume that it was contributing. Discussion ensued on how to proceed and what could potentially be approved.

Commissioner Bartoy commented that if it was being treated as a contributing structure, he would not be able to accept proposed changes.

Commissioner Steel commented that more information was needed including code interpretation so that they could make a better decision going forward.

Chair Pratt commented that she needed the code in writing and a site visit might also be appropriate.

6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Events and Activities Update

The events and activities update was skipped.

Ms. Hoogkamer was congratulated on her change in title to Assistant Historic Preservation Officer.

It was noted that Commissioner Jonah Jensen had resigned from the Commission and a new Vice-Chair was needed. Commissioner House was nominated by Commissioner Steel. Commissioner Johnson seconded. The motion was approved.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.