Agenda

Landmarks Preservation Commission
Planning and Development Services Department

Date: October 25, 2017
Location: 747 Market, Tacoma Municipal Bldg, Conference Room 243
Time: 5:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Excusal of Absences
   B. Approval of Minutes: 10/11/17
   C. Administrative Review:
      • 913 Pacific Avenue—sign face change

3. DESIGN REVIEW
   A. 417 N Sheridan Avenue (North Slope Historic District) Addition
      Laura Jensen and Matt Larson, Owners
   B. 412 South M Street, (Wedge Neighborhood Historic District) Addition
      Reid Carr, Owner

4. BOARD BRIEFINGS
   A. 919 North L Street (North Slope Historic District)
      Caroline Hedin, Studio Point253
   B. LED Streetlights
      Leigh Starr, Public Works

5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS
   A. Commissioner Term Expirations
      Staff
   B. Amendments to Guidelines, Bylaws, and Inventory
      Staff
   C. Events and Activities Updates
      Staff

6. CHAIR COMMENTS

Next Regular Meeting: November 8, 2017, 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Bldg., Rm. 243 5:30 p.m.

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

The City of Tacoma does not discriminate on the basis of handicap in any of its programs or services. To request this information in an alternative format or to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at (253) 591-5056 (voice) or (253) 591-5820 (TTY).
Chair Katie Pratt called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   A. Excusal of Absences
   B. Approval of Minutes: 9/27/17
   C. Administrative Review
      - 4604 N 38th Street – heat pump
      The consent agenda was approved.

3. **SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**
   A. 321 North J Street
   Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

OVERVIEW
WAC 254-20 enables local governments adopt local legislation to provide special valuation of historic properties that have been rehabilitated. With regard to the application review process, state law authorizes local historic review boards to determine:

1. Whether the property is included within a class of historic property determined eligible for special valuation by the local legislative authority under an ordinance or administrative rule (in Tacoma, this means properties defined as City Landmarks);
2. Whether the property has been rehabilitated at a cost equal to or exceeding 25% of the assessed improvement value at the beginning of the project within twenty-four months prior to the date of application; and
3. Whether the property has not been altered in any way which adversely affects those elements which qualify it as historically significant.

If the local review board finds that the property satisfies all three of the above requirements, then it shall, on behalf of the local jurisdiction, enter into an agreement with the owner which, at a minimum, includes the provisions set forth in WAC 254-20-120. Upon execution of said agreement between the owner and the local review board, the local review board shall approve the application.

Per TMC 1.42, the Tacoma Landmarks Commission is the local body that approves applications for Special Tax Valuation.

ANALYSIS
Property Eligibility: Contributing property in the North Slope Historic District
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed: $111,376.47
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation: $287,100
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value: 39%
Project Period: 1/18/2016 – 8/14/2017 (19 months)
Appropriateness of Rehabilitation: Exterior work in kind and approved by LPC.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application in the adjusted amount of $111,376.47.

Lynda Shepherd, the owner, noted that they were able to uncover the outline of the original pattern in the gable after removing several layers of siding.

Mr. McClintock commented that it was a great renovation project for the district, the gable work was extraordinary, and the work to restore the porch balustrade was very nice as well.

There was a motion.
"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 321 North J Street, in the amount of $111,376.47."
Motion: Johnson
Second: Williams
The motion was approved unanimously.

B. 616 Saint Helens Avenue, Wagner Motors Building

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

ANALYSIS
Property Eligibility: Tacoma Register of Historic Places
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed: $1,608,201
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation: $925,500
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value: 173%
Project Period: 10/1/2015 – 5/25/2017 (19 months)
Appropriateness of Rehabilitation: Exterior reviewed and approved by LPC

RECOMMENDATION
Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application in the adjusted amount of $1,608,201.

Steve Shaub commented that they were happy to have revitalized the building and brought some life back into it.
commented that they had put a lot of work into upgrading utilities and life safety features. He added that they were happy with how it had turned out.

There was a motion.

“I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 616 St Helens, in the amount of $1,608,201.”

Motion: Williams
Second: Steel
The motion was approved unanimously.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1115 North L Street (North Slope Historic District)

Mr. McKnight reviewed that the item had been deferred from a previous meeting and noted a letter from Dale Johnson that responded to some of the questions from that meeting. He read the staff report.

BACKGROUND
This item was deferred from the 9/27 Commission meeting.

Built in 1890, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant, who recently purchased the home, is seeking retroactive approval for the siding replacement and front stairs. The front stairs were highly deteriorated and the replacement involved very minimal visual change. Additionally, non-historic siding was replaced with 6” HardiePlank siding and trim. No other windows or doors were changed, except for the non-historic windows in the front gable. It also appears that a lower cornice on the pediment may have been removed.

On September 27, 2017, the Commission forwarded comments and questions to the applicant.

ACTION REQUESTED
Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS
North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines for Exterior Siding and Materials
1. Avoid removal of large amounts of original siding.

2. Repair small areas of failure before replacing all siding. It is rarely advisable to replace all of the existing siding on a home, both for conservation reasons and for cost reasons. Where there are areas of siding failure, it is most appropriate to spot repair as needed with small amounts of matching material. Where extensive damage, including rot or other failure, has occurred, siding should be replaced with as close a material and visual match as is feasible, including matching reveals, widths, configuration, patterns and detailing.

3. Other materials/configurations. It is not historically appropriate to replace deteriorated siding with substitute materials, unless it can be demonstrated that:
   - The replacement material is a close visual match to the historic material and can be installed in a manner in which the historically character defining details may be reproduced (mitered corners, dentil molding, etc); and
   - Replacement of the existing historic material is necessary, or the original material is no longer present; and
   - There is no feasible alternative to using a substitute material due to cost or availability.

4. Avoid changing the appearance, pattern or configuration of original siding. The siding type, configuration, reveal, and shingle pattern all are important elements of a home’s historic character.
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.

2. The condition of the original siding is not known.

3. Non-historic siding was removed and replaced.

4. HardiPlank siding has been approved in this district when other options have been determined infeasible (such as large areas of siding loss).

RECOMMENDATION
Staff defers recommendation.

Dale Johnson, JRA Architecture and Planning, commented that the original windows had been put in by previous owners including the small window in the gable. He reported that they were trying to get a cornice made to replace the old piece that was lost. He added that they had not been aware until recently that it was a historic building and had not been aware that they needed to get permits for siding. He discussed the siding, noting that it had been deteriorated significantly on the east and the west side. He reported that the house had been purchased about a year ago. He reported that the braces were being custom made and the ones shown in the photo were temporary. The braces that were there before had rotted. The roof above the porch had not been modified.

Mr. McClintock reviewed that at the previous meeting there had been concerns about how the corners were handled. Commissioner Johnson asked if there had been any original siding remaining. Mr. Johnson responded that there had been an old ship lap siding underneath the cedar siding, but it was impossible to match. He added that it had not had mitered corners.

Commissioner Steel asked if any photos had been taken of the original siding. Mr. Johnson responded that the contractors had not taken any pictures.

Commissioner Steel noted that they were in a difficult position because people were supposed to get permits for siding, which is when they would be notified that they were in a historic district. If they had known, the Commission would have asked about the proposed format of the trim and what siding would be used. Now they were in a position where they needed to determine what may have been there and they were struggling with how to process.

Commissioner Steel reported that in similar homes when Hardie was approved due to deterioration, they would recommend trimming it in a similar way to the original trim, but they did not know how it was originally trimmed. He commented that if they could not miter the corners, they typically would recommend painting the trim to match the siding so the trim was not as pronounced. He commented that they would recommend painting the body the same as the trim. He added that if the knee braces had been removed, they needed to replaced in kind. The top window should be replaced to look like the original two windows that were there and it should be a wood window.

Mr. Johnson asked if the trim around the windows should all be the same color. Commissioner Schloesser commented that the tiny reveal around the windows should remain white to match the original.

Commissioner Steel asked if the siding was wood grained. Mr. Johnson confirmed that it was. Commissioner Steel noted that they typically only allowed smooth siding.

Mr. McClintock asked if it would make sense to reduce the size of the large trim pieces on the bay window. Mr. Johnson commented that the issue it created is how to finish the siding that goes up that corner. Commissioner Steel discussed how the original trim would have been typically for a home of that style.

Commissioner Williams commented that it might not be necessary to paint the belly band to match the body. He suggested that there could be another piece of Hardie there instead of a visual break.

Commissioner Steel commented that he agreed with the listed recommendations, but he would also support a punitive measure because it was frustrating to work backwards, noting that if they had brought in the discussed items as a proposal they would be have been rejected. He commented that it was troubling that they were getting a more
favorable outcome then they would have if they had followed the process.

Commissioner Schloesser noted that there were two single hung sash windows in the photo, asking if they were original wood windows that had been left there. Mr. Johnson responded that they appeared to have been matched with what had been there. It was noted that the Commission had received letters stating that the windows had not been replaced.

Mr. McKnight noted that the Commission could condition the approval and the owner could report back to staff when the work was completed. He commented that if the Commission included conditions it would not have to come before the Commission again.

Vice-Chair House asked if the cornice that would be clipped on would be mounted onto the Hardie plank. Mr. Johnson confirmed that it would be.

Mr. McKnight reviewed the conditions that the Commissioners had determined. The conditions of approval included restoring the knee braces at the entrance, reducing the corner board size on the ground level bay window, restoring the cornice, painting out the corner boards, and restoring the small window in the gable end.

There was a motion

"So moved."
Motion: Steel
Second: Williams
The motion was approved unanimously.

5. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 2101 South C Street (Union Station Conservation District)

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND
The building at 2101 S C Street is a cement block building that was originally constructed in 1939 as a café (it has been occupied by other businesses as well, including the Old Time Woodworking cabinet company). The building is located within the Union Station Conservation District, meaning that additions to existing buildings are reviewed by the Landmarks Preservation Commission using the Union Station-Warehouse Design Guidelines. Generally speaking, alterations that do not require additional square feet are exempt from Commission review in the conservation district.

The proposal is to rehabilitate and expand the existing building to house two new restaurants, which will consist of expanding the C Street façade with a similar wall and window treatment toward Commerce Street. The Commerce Street façade will be constructed of brick and have outside plaza and deck seating.

ACTION REQUESTED
This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Scott Cameron reviewed that they were looking to expand the length of the building down 21st Street for the addition. They were doing the façade on Commerce Street in a different style to be more like the buildings on that street and to be the entrance for a restaurant. He noted that they were talking with different agencies including the Commission to review their plans. It was noted that the addition would be downhill from the existing building. It was noted that the Union Depot-Warehouse Historic District design guidelines would apply, but the Secretary of Interior’s Standards would not.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there was a reason for the small arch on the brick facade. Mr. Levy responded that it was for more visual interest. They had gone through a number of design iterations of the storefront. Commissioner Williams noted that there was a nearby garage that had a similar façade before it burned down.

Commissioner Steel commented that there appeared to be two additions happening, the addition to the original and
the Commerce Street façade. He recommended that they go more strongly in one direction in the other, making the addition more compatible with the original building or not having an addition that looks similar to the original building. Mr. Levy responded that they wanted it to look like a continuous building from 21st Street. On Commerce Street, they wanted something inviting and that matched the brick that fronted most of Commerce Street.

Commissioner Williams asked if they had considered continuing the poured concrete look through the new addition as opposed to the brick, so it doesn’t look like an addition on the Commerce side. He commented that it might be an interesting contrast, though he liked shape and agreed that the buildings on Commerce had more brick.

Commissioner Steel commented that the brick wrapping the deck looked strange, since brick was typically a heavy, monumental material. He commented that compatibility was more important that replicating historic forms and historic materials. He commented that the brick wrapping the deck would be inappropriate and steel would be more appropriate. Commissioner Schloesser concurred adding, that she would prefer to see the continuity of the original café wrapping around instead of the brick.

Chair Pratt review the district guidelines, noting that for storefront design the guidelines suggested storefronts be compatible in size, scale, and material. She commented it needed to be more compatible with the original material of the building. Otherwise, the addition was great to activate that side of the building and tied in with the loading docks along the area.

Commissioner Williams commented that the Commerce Street façade could look very good without the brick if done right. He expressed support for the mirroring of the windows along the 21st Street side.

Mr. Levy asked if they would prefer textured stucco instead of brick. Commissioner Steel suggested the two visually different additions could take on a more similar character, with a clear delineation on the 21st Street side of where the addition starts. Mr. McKnight noted that the guidelines for the district lacked anything requiring differentiating old from new. Mr. Levy asked if the Commission would accept stucco on the Commerce Street side. Commissioners agreed that they would accept a stucco front instead of brick.

Commissioner Steel asked if the brick wall plane of the building on upper floor of the Commerce Street side could continue down to the ground level. Mr. Levy responded that it might be a better due to potential noise from the 21st Street side to shield customers from sound.

B. 417 N Sheridan (North Slope Historic District)

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND
Built in 1905, 417 N Sheridan Ave is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. This proposal is regarding the demolition of a non-historic addition on the rear (north side) of the house and replacement with a larger addition, and a partial demolition of the NE corner of the second floor to accommodate new dormer. The proposed two-story addition would include two floors of living space and an unconditioned attic space, with a dormer on the east side that matches that of the historic structure. It would require an expansion of the foundation footprint to match the historic building width, and increase the height of the addition to match the existing structure. Proposed windows and trim would match existing, and a deck would be added to the north side of the new addition. The applicant is also proposing to remove the asphalt siding and trim and repair historic siding underneath. If siding is too damaged, siding would be removed and replaced with cement board siding to match historic detailing.

ACTION REQUESTED
This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Matt Larson, the owner, noted that the design had been revised from a previous version. He reported that there were good sized bedrooms under the front gable and the west gable. There was a third bedroom in the back. They were trying to gain some clearance by continuing the ridge line straight back.

Chair Pratt asked which of the dormers in the drawings was part of the proposed addition. Mr. Larson confirmed that it would be the rear dormer. The location of the addition was noted and Mr. Larson added that they were replicating
one of the existing dormers.

Commissioner Williams asked why the new dormer was bigger than the existing dormer. Mr. Larson responded that the new dormer was to allow appropriate clearance for the restroom. Commissioner Williams commented that if the new dormer could be the same size as the existing dormers, he would be fine with it. Mr. Larson noted that one of the original dormers had been lost.

Mr. Larson commented that they could replicate the other cornice on the west side. Chair Pratt clarified that it would not be a requirement.

Commissioner Steel commented that the proposal was very well drawn and clearly laid out. He asked when the application returns to the Commission, that it include before elevations and proposed elevations so they can see what is new on the exterior of the building.

Commissioner Williams asked that they document the condition of the siding underneath if they are going to replace the siding and take lots of pictures to document its condition.

Mr. McClintock asked if it would be an issue that there was no differentiation between the original building and the addition. Commissioner Steel responded that it would not be an issue because it was not visible from the street, it maintained the same ridge height, and there had already been modifications to the back side of the home.

Chair Pratt commented that it was okay if the dormer was a little bit broader, because it set it apart from the original. She added that they didn't need to add the return underneath the pediment, because it would better differentiate the original dormer from the addition.

Mr. Larson noted that the front gable looks like it will have shingles underneath the existing siding. Discussion ensued. Chair Pratt suggested that he be cautious removing the siding at the gable as there might be something decorative underneath.

Mr. McKnight noted that the property might be eligible for special tax valuation program.

6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Events and Activities Update

Mr. McKnight provided an update on the following events and activities:

2017 Events
1. South Tacoma Way Walking Tour Recap
2. History Happy Hour Trivia Night Recap
3. Wood Windows Workshop Recap
4. Prairie Line Trail Celebration and Artists Forum (4:30pm @ TAM, October 19th)
5. Lincoln District Tour (11am, October 21st)
6. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance: Browns Point Bop (Tour: 5pm; Dance: 6-9pm @ Browns Point Improvement Club, November 3rd)

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.
AGENDA ITEM 3A: 417 North Sheridan Avenue (North Slope Historic District)

Laura Jensen and Matt Larson, Owners

BACKGROUND
Built in 1905, 417 N. Sheridan Ave. is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. This proposal includes demolishing the 28sf non-historic addition on the rear (north side) of the house, as well as the partial demolition of the NE corner of the second floor to accommodate a new gable dormer. This area would be replaced with an approximately 6'x12', two-story addition that would include two floors of living space and attic space, with a dormer on the east side that matches the historic structure. It would require an expansion of the foundation footprint to match the historic building width, and increase the height of the addition to match the existing structure. Proposed windows and trim would match existing, and a 192sf deck would be added to the north side of the new addition. The applicant is also proposing to remove the asphalt siding and trim and repair historic siding underneath. If the historic siding is too damaged, it would be removed and replaced with cement board siding to match the historic detailing.

On October 11, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this project; the current proposal reflects the Commission’s comments.

ACTION REQUESTED
Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS
North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines
Guidelines for Roofs
1. **Rooftop Additions should be sensitively located.** Additions that affect roof appearance may include the addition of elements such as dormers, skylights and chimneys. Additions are not discouraged, but should seek to minimize the visual impact to the overall roof form, as follows:
   - Changes to the roof form should be located to the rear and less visible sides of a home.
   - In certain cases, it may not be possible to conceal new elements such as additional dormers from view.
     In such cases, using examples of historic additions (location, scale, design, materials) to guide new design is appropriate.

2. **Existing roof heights should be maintained.** Changes to the primary ridgeline height of a house are generally discouraged, such as “bump ups,” with the exception that: in certain cases it may be demonstrated that an overall ridgeline height increase will dramatically increase useful attic space in a house WITHOUT significantly changing the appearance of the home from the street (rare).

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 or 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.

2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission provided positive feedback on this proposal on October 11, 2017.

3. The addition will include a new dormer on a secondary façade. The addition is located at the rear of the property and will match the ridge height and materials of the existing structure.

4. The architectural style, including massing, windows, roof form, and exterior materials, is compatible with the existing structure.

5. Although seamless and not subservient in size or removable, the Commission commented that the addition is sited at the rear of the property, which is minimally visible from the right-of-way. It is also replacing an existing non-historic addition.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Recommended language for approval:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 417 North Sheridan Avenue, as submitted.*

---

**AGENDA ITEM 3C: 412 South M Street (Wedge Neighborhood Historic District)**

Reid Carr, Owner

**BACKGROUND**

Built in 1916, this property is a contributing structure in the Wedge Neighborhood Historic District. The applicant is proposing a 7'x20'-10," one-story addition to the kitchen at the rear of the house. New siding and trim will match the existing materials and Marvin or Anderson double-hung wood windows will be used, as well as a three-paneled wood door. The addition will include a rear staircase that leads to the attached mudroom.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

**STANDARDS**

Wedge Neighborhood Historic District Design Guidelines

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 or 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 Wedge Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.

2. The architectural style, including massing, windows, roof form, and exterior materials, is compatible with the existing structure.

3. The addition is removable and sensitively located towards the rear of the home, which is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

4. The addition is subservient in size, scale, and location.

5. The addition is not completely seamless, it is only one story and includes a break for the stairs.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

*Recommended language for approval:*

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 412 South M Street, as submitted.*

**BOARD BRIEFINGS**

**AGENDA ITEM 5A: 919 North L Street (North Slope Historic District)**

*Caroline Hedin, Studio Point253*

**BACKGROUND**

Completed between 1888 and 1908, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant would like feedback on options for increasing the living space in their existing 998sf home. Their preferred option is to raise the home two feet and dig out the basement.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

**AGENDA ITEM 5B: LED Streetlights**

*Leigh Starr, Public Works*

**BACKGROUND**

The City’s Public Works Department and Tacoma Public Utilities have launched a joint initiative to replace 16,000 overhead light fixtures (approximately 75%) of Tacoma’s aging streetlights with new, energy efficient LED fixtures by the end of 2018. The existing fixtures, which are high-pressure, sodium currently account for 83% of the total energy used by all streetlights in the city. Additional information, including schedule and an interactive map can be found on the City’s website [http://www.cityoftacoma.org/LEDStreetlights](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/LEDStreetlights) and are included in the packet.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.
AGENDA ITEM 6A: Commissioner Term Expirations

Staff

The following appointments are expiring/vacant on December 31, 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lysa Schloesser</td>
<td>(Architect 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kevin Bartoy</td>
<td>(At-Large 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>(Professional 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>(Architect 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City Clerk's Office will be issuing a recruitment announcement and scheduling interviews in the upcoming months.

AGENDA ITEM 6B: Amendments to Guidelines, Bylaws, and Inventory

Staff

Once annually, the Commission may review and amend inventories, guidelines, and Commission Bylaws.

For 2017, there are no scheduled amendments to bylaws, inventories or guidelines.

AGENDA ITEM 6C: Events & Activities Update

Staff

2017 Events
1. Prairie Line Trail Celebration and Artists Forum Recap
2. Lincoln District Tour Recap
3. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance: Browns Point Bop (Tour: 5pm; Dance: 6-9pm @ Browns Point Improvement Club, November 3rd)
APPLICATION FOR DESIGN REVIEW
FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

Please include ALL of the following information with your application. Insufficient application materials will result in a delay in processing of your application. If you have any question regarding application requirements, or regulations and standards for historic homes and neighborhoods, please call the Historic Preservation Office at 263.591.5254.

PART 1: APPLICANT INFORMATION

House Address: 417 N Sheridan Ave
Landmark/Conservation District (if applicable): NSHD

OWNER INFORMATION

Name (printed): Laura Jensen / Matthew Larson
Email: mgj.arch@gmail.com
Address (if different than above): 814 S Sprague Ave, Tacoma Wa 98405
Phone: 360-480-6615

Homeowner's Signature:

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

CONTRACTOR INFORMATION

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

Representative's Name: ____________________________
Company: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________
Phone: ____________________________

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

PRELIMINARY PLAN CHECK

CHECKED FOR BUILDING CODE:*

LAND USE/ZONING:
VARIANCE REQUIRED? CUP REQUIRED?

*PRELIMINARY PLAN CHECK IS NOT AN APPROVAL OF A PROJECT. A SEPARATE PERMIT APPLICATION MAY BE REQUIRED.

APPLICATION FEE (please see page 2)

Estimated Project Cost, rounded to nearest $1000

$100,000

Application Fee Enclosed: $500

Revision 12/18/12
PART 2: INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

*NEW* FEE SCHEDULE

Fee Schedule

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

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

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

HOW TO USE THIS FORM

STEPS FOR APPLICANTS

1. Begin the application consultation process with [www.tacomapermits.org](http://www.tacomapermits.org) to identify code-compliance issues and required permits. Presubmittal conferences with Commercial Plan Review may be required for major projects and should occur prior to Landmarks Commission review of your project. If variances are required for your project, contact the Historic Preservation Office before submitting your application. Variances or conditional use approvals that may affect the exterior design of the project must be resolved prior to Landmarks Commission review.

2. Review the Standards and Guidelines for Historic Buildings. Many homeowners want to know whether their project will be approved by the Commission ahead of the meeting. The Landmarks Commission reviews projects according to design guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation. This information is available online at [www.cityoftacoma.org/HistoricPreservation](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/HistoricPreservation).

3. Fill out this form in its ENTIRETY.

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

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

WHERE TO GO:

OR email form to: [landmarks@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:landmarks@cityoftacoma.org)

[Permit Intake Center](#)
City of Tacoma, Planning and Development Services Department
747 Market Street, 3rd Floor
253-591-5030
PART 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Please describe below the overall scope of work, including all proposed new construction, changes to existing buildings, and any elements to be removed and replaced. *(For complex remodeling projects, it may be beneficial to divide the description into different areas [north façade, west façade] or by type of work [windows, doors, siding]).* 

Attach additional pages if needed.

Proposed changes are to the primary residential structure only.

Demolition

Fully demolish 28 sf of non-historic 1st floor addition at the back (north) end of the home.
Demolish to foundation 72 sf of non-historic 1st & 2nd floor addition at the back (north) end of the home.
Demolish remaining back (north) wall of building from 1st floor through attic.
Demolish NE corner of 2nd floor, attic space & roof to accommodate new gable dormer.

Remove non-historic asphalt shingle siding and trim (see pictures). This siding was tested and is non-hazardous. Assess underlying siding condition. From sample demo historic siding appears to be present under asphalt shingle siding. There was good amount of damaged siding above skirt board, but this appears to be from an interior plumbing leak. The drip trim above skirt board was trimmed to install asphalt siding. If the siding is in overall good viable condition then we will retain the existing siding. Siding damaged beyond reuse will be removed down to the sheathing layer as part of demolition.

Demo existing knob and tube (K & T) electrical.
Remove interior lighting fixtures.
Demo existing galvanized plumbing.
Remove all plumbing fixtures.
Demo existing plumbing drain line from 2nd floor that is on East exterior of building.
Demo existing asphalt shingle roofing.

Construction

Build 24 lineal feet of foundation on north side to square out the remaining addition footprint to the historic building footprint. Proposed new windows will match existing in style and material (wood).

Build new interior addition space 72 sq ft on the first and second floors including new roof and unconditioned attic space. New windows with trim and detailing to match existing.

Repair/replace/add siding to match existing as required. Some historic siding is present on the interior of the current 2nd floor sunroom addition and a sample demo of exterior asphalt sheathing revealed additional detailing and siding condition. New siding and trim will match existing detailing:

- siding is 4 ¼” reveal lap wood siding, ends with a 1 ½” drip at base which was trimmed to install flush asphalt shingle sheathing and 7” skirt board below, trim at outside corners is 4-5”
- 4.5” trim on sides and top of windows/doors with milled 2” cornice trim top above, window sills are sloped 1.5” with 1 inch extension front and side,

Retain/refurbish/recreate any other trim and architectural detailing found under existing asphalt shingle siding.

Reroof with architectural asphalt shingle roofing.

Build new 192 sq ft exterior deck off north end of house.
Building systems
Install new upgraded electrical panel on first floor to replace existing outdoor electrical panel.
Install new wiring to replace demolished K & T and for new electrical lighting and outlet locations in addition.
Replace and add interior lighting fixtures.
Relocate existing electric forced air furnace. Duct from existing location to new location.
Relocate existing hot water heater.
Install new plumbing supply and drain lines for relocated/new plumbing fixtures.

PART 4: SUPPLEMENTS

How to Use This Table

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

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

If you have any questions regarding what information should be included in your application, please call the Historic Preservation Office at 253-591-5254.

NOTE: ONLY USE ONE CHECKLIST

- Use Checklist A for: Detached garages
  New porches
  Decks
  Additions
  Foundations
  Other Major Work (call the Historic Preservation Officer with questions)  p. 5

- Use Checklist B for: Siding
  Roofing
  New window or door openings
  Other Minor (For example, chimney restoration)  p. 6

- Use Checklist C for: Windows (replacement or restoration of existing)
  Doors (replacement or restoration of existing)  p. 7
RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION CHECKLIST A
(For Garages, Porches, Decks, Additions, Foundations and other Major Projects)

CHECKLIST to include the following:*

- Accurate Measured Site Plan (which shows ridgelines and dormers of existing and new buildings)
- Accurate Measured Elevation Drawings (all sides, with dimensions, siding materials, windows, and doors indicated)
- Clear and labeled photograph(s) of Site and surrounding area
- Detail illustrations of trim, casing, balusters, posts and railings (if applicable)
- Material samples (ie. stained glass, or if proposing uncommon material)
- Paint samples (from hardware store)

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

| Size of new construction (footprint, i.e. 22 X 30’): | Approx. 6’ x 12’ |
| Overall height and pitch of roof (for new buildings): | Existing approx. 26’ & 10:11 |
| Exterior cladding material(s): | (e) asphalt shingle, proposed – wd siding to match existing |
| Window types and materials: | Various wood – picture and double hung |
| Door types and materials: | Wood |
| Window trim (attach drawings, catalog sheets, etc. if necessary): | Wood |
| Roof Material: | Comp asphalt shingles |

*ADDITIONAL TIPS

- Drawings required for building permits can often be used for Landmarks Review, as long as information regarding finish detail, exterior materials, and windows and doors are indicated.
- For information about drawing site plans, please refer to BLUS Publication B1, Site Plan
- Elevations should be scale drawings and should include dimensions, heights, window and door locations, eave overhangs, trim details, and the locations of materials and other elements.
- Please include a photograph of existing house (for new garages if the new garage is to match any existing features of the house)
- For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Office for more information.
**RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION SUPPLEMENT CHECKLIST B**
(For New Siding, Roofing, and Window and Door Openings)

CHECKLIST to include the following:*

|☐| Elevation drawings (if new windows or doors are to be added where there no existing ones) |
|☐| Clear and labeled photograph(s) of work area(s) |
|☐| Detail illustrations of trim and casing |
|☐| Material samples (if proposing uncommon or new to market material) |
|☐| Paint samples (from hardware store if applicable) |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Material(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Window types and locations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior cladding material(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ADDITIONAL TIPS*

- **Drawings required for building permits can often be used for Landmarks Review, as long as information regarding finish detail, exterior materials, and windows and doors are indicated.**
- **Elevations should be scale drawings and should include dimensions, heights, window and door locations and trim details.**
- **Please include a photograph of existing examples (if the new features are to match any existing features of the house)**
- **For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Officer for more information.**
**RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION SUPPLEMENT CHECKLIST C**
(for Window and Door Replacement and Restoration)

CHECKLIST include the following:*

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

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

Narrative list of window and door types and locations:

**ADDITIONAL TIPS**

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

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

- For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Officer for more information.
Window sill at asphalt siding

Door head at asphalt siding

Historic siding & corner trim below asphalt shingle siding

Damaged historic siding below asphalt shingle siding
Interior of 2nd story addition looking north.

Historic siding inside 2nd floor addition

Interior of 2nd floor addition looking east

Interior/floor of 2nd floor addition NW
Demo Plans
427 N. SHERIDAN, TACOMA, WA  98406
JENSEN - LARSON FAMILY

1/4" = 1'-0"

1  1st floor Demo
2  2nd floor Demo
3  Roof Demo

NOTE - FOR FOUNDATION DEMO PLAN SEE 1/A2.10
APPLICATION FOR DESIGN REVIEW
FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

Please include ALL of the following information with your application. Insufficient application materials will result in a delay in processing of your application. If you have any question regarding application requirements, or regulations and standards for historic homes and neighborhoods, please call the Historic Preservation Office at 253.591.5254.

PART 1: APPLICANT INFORMATION
House Address 412 S 5th  Landmark/Conservation District (if applicable) WEDGE

OWNER INFORMATION
Name (printed) Reid Carr  Email reidscar@gmail.com
Address (if different than above) Phone 253 376 9948

Homeowner’s Signature*
*Application must be signed by the property owner to be processed.

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

Representative’s Name  Company
Address
Email  Phone

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
PRELIMINARY PLAN CHECK
CHECKED FOR BUILDING CODE:*  

LAND USE/ZONING:
VARIANCE REQUIRED?  CUP REQUIRED?

*PRELIMINARY PLAN CHECK IS NOT AN APPROVAL OF A PROJECT. A SEPARATE PERMIT APPLICATION MAY BE REQUIRED.

APPLICATION FEE (please see page 2)
Estimated Project Cost, rounded to nearest $1000
$100,000
Application Fee Enclosed

Revision 12/18/12
PART 2: INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

*NEW* FEE SCHEDULE

Fee Schedule

On December 18, 2012 City Council approved a new general services fee schedule that includes new fees for design review and demolition review of historic buildings (Res. No. 38568). The new fees are as follows:

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

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

HOW TO USE THIS FORM

STEPS FOR APPLICANTS

1. Begin the application consultation process with www.tacomapermits.org to identify code-compliance issues and required permits. Presubmittal conferences with Commercial Plan Review may be required for major projects and should occur prior to Landmarks Commission review of your project. If variances are required for your project, contact the Historic Preservation Office before submitting your application. Variances or conditional use approvals that may affect the exterior design of the project must be resolved prior to Landmarks Commission review.

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

3. Fill out this form in its ENTIRETY.

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

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

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

OR email form to:
landmarks@cityoftacoma.org
PART 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Please describe below the overall scope of work, including all proposed new construction, changes to existing buildings, and any elements to be removed and replaced. *(For complex remodeling projects, it may be beneficial to divide the description into different areas [north façade, west façade] or by type of work [windows, doors, siding]).*

Attach additional pages if needed.

The scope of this project is a 7’ x 20'-10" addition to kitchen at rear of the house. The addition will be sided to match the existing bevel siding. The new kitchen windows will be Marvin or Anderson double hung wood windows to match the original existing wood windows. Roofing and fascia on addition will also match existing.
### PART 4: SUPPLEMENTS

**How to Use This Table**

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

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

If you have any questions regarding what information should be included in your application, please call the Historic Preservation Office at 253-591-5254.

**NOTE: ONLY USE ONE CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Checklist A for:</th>
<th>Detached garages</th>
<th>p. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New porches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Major Work</td>
<td>(call the Historic Preservation Officer with questions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Checklist B for:</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New window or door openings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Minor (For example, chimney restoration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Checklist C for:</th>
<th>Windows (replacement or restoration of existing)</th>
<th>p. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doors (replacement or restoration of existing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION CHECKLIST A
(For Garages, Porches, Decks, Additions, Foundations and other Major Projects)

CHECKLIST to include the following:*

- Accurate Measured Site Plan (which shows ridgelines and dormers of existing and new buildings)
- Accurate Measured Elevation Drawings (all sides, with dimensions, siding materials, windows, and doors indicated)
- Clear and labeled photograph(s) of Site and surrounding area
- Detail illustrations of trim, casing, balusters, posts and railings (if applicable)
- Material samples (i.e. stained glass, or if proposing uncommon material)
- Paint samples (from hardware store)

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

Size of new construction (footprint, i.e. 22 X 30):

7' x 20' 10"

Overall height and pitch of roof (for new buildings):

14' 4"

Exterior cladding material(s):

Cedar bevel siding do match existing

Window types and materials:

Marvin DBL hung

Door types and materials:

Wood 3 panel w/ window do match existing

Window trim (attach drawings, catalog sheets, etc. if necessary):

Trim do match existing

Roof Material:

3 tab black do match existing

*ADDITIONAL TIPS

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

- For information about drawing site plans, please refer to BLUS Publication B1, Site Plan

- Elevations should be scale drawings and should include dimensions, heights, window and door locations, eave overhangs, trim details, and the locations of materials and other elements.

- Please include a photograph of existing house (for new garages if the new garage is to match any existing features of the house)

- For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Office for more information.
RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION SUPPLEMENT CHECKLIST B
(For New Siding, Roofing, and Window and Door Openings)

CHECKLIST to include the following:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Elevation drawings (if new windows or doors are to be added where there are no existing ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Clear and labeled photograph(s) of work area(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Detail illustrations of trim and casing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Material samples (if proposing uncommon or new to market material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Paint samples (from hardware store if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Proposed Material(s):
- Window types and locations:
- Exterior cladding material(s):

*ADDITIONAL TIPS

- Drawings required for building permits can often be used for Landmarks Review, as long as information regarding finish details, exterior materials, and windows and doors are indicated.
- Elevations should be scale drawings and should include dimensions, heights, window and door locations and trim details.
- Please include a photograph of existing examples (if the new features are to match any existing features of the house).
- For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Officer for more information.
RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION SUPPLEMENT CHECKLIST C
(for Window and Door Replacement and Restoration)

CHECKLIST include the following:*  
☐ Clear and labeled photograph(s) of work area(s) with locations of work indicated (i.e. in pen)  
☐ Detail illustrations of trim and casing and window profiles  
☐ Catalog cut sheets or product samples  

In addition to the above, please provide the following information:  
Narrative list of window and door types and locations:  

*ADDITIONAL TIPS  
• Drawings required for building permits can often be used for Landmarks Review, as long as information regarding finish detail, exterior materials, and windows and doors are indicated.  
• Please include a photograph of example elements (if new windows or doors are to match any existing features of the house)  
• For structures within the North Slope Historic District, refer to the North Slope Design Guidelines for more information about design. Contact the Historic Preservation Officer for more information.
October 2, 2017

Landmarks Preservation Commission  
c/o Reuben McKnight  
Tacoma Municipal Building  
747 Market Street  
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: Proposed Modifications to 919 North L Street, North Slope

Dear Reuben, et. all,

My clients reside at the above address and are looking to renovate the existing crawlspace/basement so they may add two bedrooms, a laundry room, and a family room, in addition to addressing current water intrusion issues. To make the basement legally occupiable, they must increase the head height from the existing +3’-6” 1/2” to a minimum of 7’ clear, per current building code. In order to accommodate this desire, and to allow for a potential increase in floor/ceiling structure above and/or HVAC duct work, we are proposing raising the home approximately 2’ and request your approval.

**History**

This home is considered a contributing home in the North Slope Historic District. It seems to have been designed for Charles H. King and/or Henry Young, by Darmer & Cutting and was potentially constructed between 1888-1889 by an unknown contractor, or by F.C. Collins in 1892. The home may have originally been located at 923 North L Street; OR, the original home was demolished and the current structure was built in the 1930’s. The available data is a bit conflicting. (See attached)

**Existing**

The existing home is approximately 998 sf on a single level. It contains two small bedrooms, a living room, dining room, kitchen, and bathroom. The kitchen, bathroom and stairs to the existing basement are contained in an addition at the back of the home.

**Proposed**

The clients are a growing family with two children who hope to add one or two more children to their family. Alastair, the husband, grew up in this home and would like to raise his family here also. To accomplish this, they hope to add approximately 940 sf by digging out the basement and/or raising the home. While an addition at the rear of the house is in theory possible, it is the least desirable option due to the size of the rear yard and wanting to maintain an outdoor space for the children to play. We have begun precursory conversations with a structural engineer (Exodus Engineering) and a general contractor (Ritzman Construction) and both have made it abundantly clear that raising the home would provide significant cost savings for my client. (See attached)

We request the Landmarks Preservation Commission consider our request to raise the 1st floor finish height two feet, which would raise the roof two feet above its current height. To mitigate the impact, the property could be landscaped at the street facade to assist in keeping the appearance of the existing height. This approach is not unprecedented in the North Slope Historic District and in fact there are such examples directly across the street. (See attached)

We thank you for your time and look forward to our discussion.

Sincerely,

Caroline N. Hedin, Architect  
studio point253, LLC
Click on the address above to see if there are other images related to this address

2 images.
Approximate address.
Built circa 1888
Charles H. King / Henry Young
The house may have originally been built at 923 No. L St., later moved on site and remodeled/rebuilt
City Directory (1889)
Sanborn Map 1896,1912
979.778 K524K Vol.II (listed under 923 No. L St.)
-----
R.E. McKenzie
TDL 6/2/1907 p.17 (repairs by Byron & McDonald, contr.)

Built: 1888
Decade built: 1880s
City: TACOMA
Block: 900 N L ST, TACOMA
Subject: 919 N L ST, TACOMA

More information: About the Tacoma-Pierce County Buildings Index

Description

Address: 919 N L ST, TACOMA BU-887 date 10-24-1977
Identifier: BU-887
Source: Cultural Resource Survey
Image Date: 10-24-1977
Image decade: 1970s
More information: About the Tacoma-Pierce County Buildings Index
Archive: L\000919_NO_L_ST__Tacoma_19771024.jpg
**Bird's Eye Photo (Microsoft Virtual Earth)**

**Street View Photo (Google Maps)**

**Scan#:** 986  
**Historic Name:** Charles H. King Home  
**Property Address:** 919 N L St, Tacoma, WA 98403  
**Tax No./Parcel No.:** 2039230040

**Date Recorded:** 2002  
**Style:** Vernacular  
**Form/Type:** Single Family  
**Date of Construction:** 1892  
**Architect:** Darmer & Cutting, architects  
**Builder:** F.C. Collins, contractor  
**Significance:** Home of Mrs. R.E. McKenzie, widow. Plans were completed for the McKenzie home by C. A. Darmer, who described the home as "...a six room affair of the old English half-timber type, and will cost $3,000..." Darmer & Cutting, architects F.C. Collins, contractor. 1908

**Appearance:** The original house at this location has been demolished and was probably replaced in the late 1930's. This is a one story, single family residence designed in the Vernacular Style. The roof is a pyramidal-hip, with shallow eaves that have decorative brackets at the far edges. A hipped porch roof is centered on the facade. To the right and left of the entrance porch are picture windows protected by shed-roofs. The structure is clad in wide, horizontal siding.

**Driving Directions**  
**Photos (Tacoma Public Library)**  
**Pierce County Assessor Data**
Streetlight Replacement Project

The City's Public Works Department and Tacoma Public Utilities have launched a joint initiative to replace approximately 75% of Tacoma's aging streetlights with new, energy efficient LED fixtures by the end of 2018.

Nearly 75 Percent of Tacoma's Streetlights to be Replaced with LEDs

As part of this project, approximately 75% (16,000 light fixtures) of all Tacoma area overhead streetlights will be upgraded to energy-efficient LED lights by the end of 2018. The existing fixtures, which are high-pressure, sodium currently account for 83% of the total energy used by all streetlights in the city.

Not every streetlight in the city will be upgraded at this time. The majority of the fixtures scheduled for replacement are either "cobra head" or "shoe-box" style (pictured below). Ornamental, flood and wall pack lights will not be converted to LEDs at this time.

Lights to be Replaced
New Lights

Project Timeline

- Request for Bid (RFB) for materials – issued in June 2017. Contract for materials was awarded to Leotek in August 2017.
- Request for Bid for installation services – expect to issue RFB in August and award contract early fall 2017
- Installation and replacement implementation– dates to be determined once the installation contract has been awarded. The goal is to begin the project in late 2017 and complete by the end of 2018.

Public Meeting Schedule

Below is a list of public meetings relating to this project that are currently on the schedule.

- Contracts and Awards Board: Approved as a part of the Consent Agenda on September 29, 2017.
- Tacoma Public Utility Board Meeting: Contract approved by the Utility Board on September 29, 2017.
- Neighborhood Community Council: Met August 24, 2017. For more information contact Carol Wolfe at (253) 591-5384.
- Cross District Association: Met September 19, 2017. For more information including time and location contact Shari Hart at (253) 591-5208.

Implementation Schedule and Interactive Map

View an interactive map that allows searching by address to find when (or if) streetlights are scheduled for replacement. Once installation begins, this map will be updated in real-time.

[Streetlight Replacement Schedule Map by Neighborhood](#)
Preliminary versions of the project schedule and maps are available below for anyone unable to access the interactive map above. Once installation begins, these documents will be updated on a weekly basis.

- [Project Schedule](#) (PDF)
- [Neighborhood Zones Map](#) (PDF)

### Frequently Asked Questions

**General**

**Cost**

**Schedule**

**Safety**

**Are LED lights harmful to my health or the environment?**

Replacing old, high-pressure sodium lights with new LED fixtures should have no negative impact on health or the environment. In fact, LED lights offer significant benefits including reduced energy use and less light-trespass.

I read that the American Medical Association (AMA) issued a report that excessive blue light emitted by LEDs is harmful to health and the environment.

In June 2016, the American Medical Association (AMA) published an article on the potential environmental and health hazards associated with LED streetlights.

The AMA article’s focus evaluated early LED installations with respect to glare and light trespass (light spreading to unintended areas), the potential impacts on human health and the environment and how best to minimize those impacts. The AMA commended the energy efficiency and effectiveness of LED technology, but also urged cities to minimize the amount of blue-rich outside lighting and recommended the use of LEDs with a color temperature equal to or less than 3000K to minimize the amount of glare.

The report failed to consider some of the significant benefits associated with various higher temperature lights in certain situations. A study in Seattle documented how light color temperature can affect how far in advance drivers can detect objects. That study found the best color temperature for night time object detection is around 4000K, approximately the same color temperature as moonlight.

- **Glare reduction** – LED technology has significantly improved since the early installations used in the AMA study. New LED technology provides much greater control over glare and lighting than early installations including how much, where and when light is dispersed.
- **Night vision** – For high speed traffic areas, industry research suggests 3000K is insufficient to support optimal safety for drivers and pedestrians. For higher speed areas, 4000K LED lighting
improves object detection by 1.5 times that of 3000K fixtures.

- **Quantity of blue light** – every streetlight emits some degree of blue light. While the percentage of blue light emitted is higher in the new LED fixtures, the intensity is less than existing fixtures. Normalized by intensity, the 4000K arterial LEDs will emit 12 – 17% less blue light than our existing high-pressure sodium fixtures.

LEDs provide the greatest ability to control where and when light is dispersed, how much is dispersed and at the optimal spectrum—more than any other technology available on the market.

**Will the City be installing any LEDs that go against the AMA recommendations?**

3000K LEDs will be installed in all residential and local areas, which comply with the AMA recommendations. In higher speed arterial streets, Public Works will be installing 4000K fixtures to ensure adequate safety. After extensive research, Public Works found that 3000K lighting in high traffic areas did not meet minimal safety requirements for traffic and pedestrians. It was determined that 4000K LED lights provide optimal safety in high speed arterials. This will allow the City to:

- Minimize glare through design and fixture
- Increase night visibility and object detection at a distance
- Provide lighting that emits less “blue light” than existing high-pressure sodium fixtures

**Benefits of LED Lighting**

**Less light pollution:**

- The dim-ability of LED technology allows us to control streetlight systems to only provide the level of illumination needed at any given time, which is nearly impossible with conventional streetlighting.
- LEDs allow for a high degree of control over where the light is directed, as opposed to conventional street lamps that shine light in all directions.
- Many of our current lights broadcast light into the sky. This type of light, called up-lighting, provides no benefit for streetlights that are 30 – 40 feet high and, in fact, actually creates visual problems for nocturnal animals.

**Improved visibility:**

- LEDs provide greater control over the light distribution, creating more consistent light levels where needed. This minimizes the amount of blue light emitted reducing glare.
- LED lighting allows greater visibility at a distance for drivers, creating an extra safety margin by providing between 1.5 – 2 times further coverage than existing streetlights.
- Because the new fixtures produce less total light, the new LED lights will actually emit less “blue light” than our existing high-pressure sodium light fixtures.

**Less energy:**

- LEDs use 50 – 65% less energy than the fixtures to be replaced (high-pressure, sodium lights)

**Lower costs:**

- Lower materials costs - LEDs are more efficient and last much longer than conventional streetlight lamps.
- Lower utility costs- LEDs require less energy, thereby lowering monthly electricity costs
- Lower maintenance costs - Fewer replacements means lower overall maintenance costs.

**Improved safety and security:**

- Fewer outages - longer life equipment means fewer streetlight outages, improving both safety and security.

**Additional Resources**

- Department of Energy - [Street Lighting and Blue Light – Frequently Asked Questions](#)
- [Seattle Lighting Study](#)

**Questions and Comments**

For questions and comments visit the [Streetlight Replacement Project TPU Site](#) and fill out the form at the bottom of the page.

**Contact Us**

City Project Manager
Leigh Starr
(253) 591-5031
[Email](#)

TPU Project Manager
Roger Peery
(253) 502-8138
[Email](#)
The Landmarks Preservation Commission Presents

The Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Swing Dance

Browns Point BOP

Friday, November 3rd • 5-9PM

Browns Point Clubhouse - 201 Ton A Wan Da Ave NE

Tour the historic Browns Point Lighthouse Keeper’s Cottage from 5-6pm. Dance from 6-9pm.

Featuring the Pierce County Big Band and dance demos by Studio 6 Ballroom. No-host bar and free appetizers. Suggested donation for entry goes to support heritage events and programming in 2018. Co-sponsored by Points Northeast Historical Society.

An RSVP is required on the Tacoma Historic Preservation Facebook, by phone at (253)-591-5254, or by email at landmarks@cityoftacoma.org.