

## Members

Katie Chase, *Chair*  
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Duke York  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Jeff Williams  
Eugene Thorne  
Lauren Flemister  
Brittani Flowers  
Roger Johnson

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

## Staff

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



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: July 27, 2016

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

### Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Chase, *Chair*  
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Duke York  
Eugene Thorne  
Lysa Schloesser  
Lauren Flemister  
Marshall McClintock  
Brittani Flowers  
Roger Johnson

### Staff Present:

Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith

### Others Present:

David Spencer  
Michael Brown

### Commission Members Absent:

Jeff Williams  
James Steel

Chair Katie Chase called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

### 1. ROLL CALL

### 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 7/13/16
- C. Administrative Review:
  - Prairie Line Trail Bungalow – relocation
  - 622 N. Cushman Ave. – siding

The consent agenda was approved.

### 3. DESIGN REVIEW

- A. 1410 N. 6<sup>th</sup> Street (North Slope Historic District)  
*Windows and siding*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

Built in 1906, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant's original intent was to remove the existing aluminum siding and repair the underlying siding. Upon removal, it was found that large portions of the original siding are missing and/or damaged beyond repair and the original, double beveled cedar siding would be difficult to source. The applicant is now proposing smooth-faced HardiePlank lap siding, 5 ¼" with a 4" reveal. The cedar shake siding on the front and rear gables would be replaced in-kind. The soffit material was previously replaced with wood that is not exterior grade. This would be replaced with tongue and groove cedar. Belly bands would be included where they currently exist and over large fascia at the porch area, to replicate the original style. The window trim was found to be damaged and altered and the window sashes are decayed and held together with duct tape and L-brackets. The window frames have been replaced with 2"x4" material. The damaged trim will be

replaced with wood trim that is a closer match to the original design and the windows will be replaced with Milgard Composite Ultra series windows. The new windows will include 13 single-hung windows, which will be 24x60, 30x60, and 24x30; one 30x36 and one 24x30. Only three decorative picture windows and the leaded glass in the front window would not be replaced.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

##### **North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines**

##### **Windows**

1. **Preserve Existing Historic Windows.** Existing historic windows in good working order should be maintained on historic homes in the district. The existing wood windows exhibit craftsmanship and carpentry methods in use at the time that the neighborhood was developed. New manufactured windows, even those made of wood, generally do not exhibit these characteristics.
2. **Repair Original Windows Where Possible.** Original wood windows that are in disrepair should be repaired if feasible. The feasibility of different approaches depends on the conditions, estimated cost, and total project scope. Examples of substandard conditions that do not necessarily warrant replacement include: failed glazing compound, broken glass panes, windows painted shut, deteriorated paint surface (interior or exterior) and loose joinery. These conditions alone do not justify window replacement.

Repair of loose or cracked glazing, loose joinery or stuck sashes may be suitable for a carpenter or handyperson. Significant rot, deterioration, or reconstruction of failed joints may require the services of a window restoration company. If information is needed regarding vendors that provide these services, please contact the Historic Preservation Office.

3. **Replace windows with a close visual and material match.** When repairing original windows is not feasible, replacement may be considered.
  - Where replacement is desired, the new windows should match the old windows in design and other details, and, where possible, materials.
  - Certain window products, such as composite clad windows, closely replicate original appearance and therefore may be appropriate. This should be demonstrated to the Commission with material samples and product specification sheets.
  - Changing the configuration, style or pattern of original windows is not encouraged, generally (for example, adding a highly styled divided light window where none existed before, or adding an architecturally incompatible pattern, such as a Prairie style gridded window to a English Cottage house).
  - Vinyl windows are not an acceptable replacement for existing historic windows.

Depending on specific project needs, replacement windows may include:

- Sash replacement kits. These utilize the existing window frame (opening) and trim, but replace the existing sashes and substitute a vinyl or plastic track for the rope and pulley system. Sash replacement kits require that the existing window opening be plumb and square to work properly, but unlike insert windows, do not reduce the size of the glazed area of the window or require shimming and additional trim.
- An insert window is a fully contained window system (frame and sashes) that is "inserted" into an existing opening. Because insert windows must accommodate a new window frame within the existing opening, the sashes and glazed area of an insert window will be slightly smaller than the original window sashes. Additional trim must be added to cover the seams between the insert frame and the original window. However, for window openings that are no longer plumb, the insert frame allows the new sashes to operate smoothly.

4. **Non-historic existing windows do not require "upgrading."** Sometimes the original windows were replaced prior to the formation of the historic district, and now must be replaced again. Although it is highly encouraged,

there is no requirement to "upgrade" a non-historic window to a historically appropriate wood window. For example, a vinyl replacement window may be an acceptable replacement for a non-historic aluminum horizontal slider window, especially if the historic configuration (vertically operated sash) is restored.

**5. New Window Openings/Changing Window Openings**

- Enlargement or changes to the configurations of existing window openings is to be avoided on the primary elevation(s) of a historic building within the district. In specific cases, such as an egress requirement, this may not be avoidable, but steps should be taken to minimize the visual impact.
- Changes to window configurations on secondary (side and rear) elevations in order to accommodate interior remodeling are not discouraged, provided that character defining elements, such as a projecting bay window in the dining room, are not affected. A typical example of this type of change might be to reconfigure a kitchen window on the side of a home to accommodate base cabinets
- In general, openings on buildings in the historic district are vertically oriented and are aligned along the same height as the headers and transoms of other windows and doors, and may engage the fascia or belly band that runs above the window course. This pattern should be maintained for new windows.
- Window size and orientation is a function of architectural style and construction technique. Scale, placement, symmetry or asymmetry, contribute to and reflect the historic and architectural character of a building.

**6. Sustainability and thermal retrofitting.**

- a. Window replacement is often the least cost effective way to improve thermal efficiency. Insulation of walls, sealing of gaps and insulation of switch plates, lights, and windows, as well as upgrades to the heating system all have a higher return on investment and are consistent with preservation of the character of a historic home.
- b. Properly maintained and weather stripped historic windows generally will improve comfort by reducing drafts.
- c. The energy invested in the manufacture of a new window and the cost of its purchase and installation may not be offset by the gains in thermal efficiency for 40 to 80 years, whereas unnecessary removal and disposal of a 100 year old window wastes old growth fir and contributes to the waste stream.
- d. If thermal retrofitting is proposed as a rationale for window replacement, the owner should also furnish information that shows:
  - The above systematic steps have been taken to improve the performance of the whole house.
  - That the original windows, properly weather stripped and with a storm window added, is not a feasible solution to improve thermal efficiency.
  - Minimal retrofit, such as replacing only the sash or glass with thermal paned glass, is not possible.
  - Steps to be taken to salvage the historic windows either on site or to an appropriate architectural salvage company.

**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. Three picture windows and the front leaded glass would be preserved.
3. The majority of the original windows were found to be altered, rotted, and beyond repair.
4. According to the design guidelines, composite windows are an acceptable replacement material. The window trim would be cedar.
5. The wood siding was covered with aluminum siding. The applicant intended to repair the wood siding if it was intact.
6. The siding was found to be beyond repair and difficult to replicate with wood.
7. HardiePlank siding has been approved in this district.
8. The cedar shingle will be replaced in-kind.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

David Spencer, Spencer Construction, noted a change in the design for the dormers, using cedar shake shingles at the top and four inch smooth lap reveal Hardie siding for the rest. Commissioner York asked if he was able to meet egress requirements while keeping the windows the same size. Mr. Spencer confirmed that some of the bedroom windows would meet egress requirements. Commissioner York recommended using double hung casement windows that would open to allow emergency egress for the other windows. Commissioner Johnson commented that the large siding sections that were noted as missing were not shown in the pictures. Mr. Spencer identified in the pictures where siding was missing under the windows and added that bump out for the fire place was also missing. Commissioner Johnson commented that the missing siding was not difficult to find and that it was being used in a project on Steel Street. Mr. Spencer commented that they had looked, but were unable to source it. He added that it could be replicated with beveled cedar, but it was expensive. Commissioner Johnson commented that the guidelines prefer preserving historic materials like the cedar shake shingles instead of stripping them off. Mr. Spencer commented that the cedar shakes had been enclosed by aluminum siding for decades were deteriorated beyond repair. Commissioner Johnson commented that he wished that an effort could be made to preserve the original materials. Commissioner York commented that he did not disagree that the shingles were deteriorated, but that the siding could be replicated. Mr. McClintock commented that the guidelines suggest that if there is historic material that can be saved, they should try to do that. Mr. Spencer noted that there were other issues including bug infestations around the belly band and damage from scraping. Mr. McClintock asked if he could provide more pictures and evidence of the deterioration to make a more thorough case. Commissioner Johnson asked about the report of windows being held together with duct tape and L brackets. Mr. Spencer responded that all of the window sills had been cut into and noted in a photo where a window was held together by duct tape. He added that the only windows that were in good shape were the ones up near the top.

Chair Chase reviewed the staff analysis. Commissioner's concurred that more information would need to be provided on the windows, particularly the sashes, to establish that they were beyond repair. Mr. Spencer commented that only two of the windows that he tested were operable. Mr. Spencer expressed concern that rebuilding the existing windows would damage the interior which had been recently remodeled, which is why he wanted to repair only the exterior portion. Discussion ensued. Commissioners concurred that more information was also needed on the siding.

Mr. McClintock clarified for the applicant that the decision was not a rejection of the proposal, but that they needed more information to approve the proposal. Mr. Spencer asked what would need to be shown to make a determination. Commissioner York recommended reviewing the guidelines and obtaining more photographic evidence demonstrating that the features needed to be replaced. Commissioner Flemister recommended identifying the windows in an elevation picture. Chair Chase recommended also noting in photographs where the siding was missing. Mr. Spencer asked if he should obtain an estimate on repair costs. Chair Chase responded that it would be helpful.

There was a motion.

"I move that we delay a decision on 1410 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street until we have heard back from the contractor with more specific information."

Motion: Johnson

Second: Flemister

The motion was approved.

#### 4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

##### A. 720 North I Street (North Slope Historic District)

###### *Roofline change and new garage*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1893, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant would like the Commission's feedback on a proposed new garage and roofline alteration. The proposal is to add a deck in place of the current rear addition, replace the rear siding with wood or HardiePlank, and raise and extend the rear gambrel roof across the back facade.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Feedback and guidance.

Michael Brown, Owner, noted that he did not know what alterations had been made to the house over time. He commented that he wanted to raise and extend the small gambrel roof, shown on the right side of a photo, over the entire width of the house. Mr. Brown commented that the extended roof would look better and create more usable area on the upper floor of the home. He noted that the siding on the lower portion of the home had been replaced with T1-11 siding that had been installed horizontally and would have to be replaced. He noted the remaining shingles on the upper portion of the back of the house were in poor condition. Mr. Brown also highlighted in the photo where windows had been removed and shingled over. He commented that he wanted to replace the lower siding with Hardie plank that would match the existing reveal. He commented that the upper portion of the siding would be replaced with shingles.

Mr. McClintock discussed the historical background for the home. He reported that there were four houses on the street from 1893 that were developed by Charles Drury and designed by Charles Villard as part of the housing boom of the 1890's. He noted that Mr. Drury was on the school board that created Stadium High School. He commented that it was likely that 720 North I was also developed by Mr. Drury. Mr. McClintock noted that the house was similar in design to the house at 714 North I with a front facing gambrel roof and a small gambrel roof dormer to the side. He commented that the house had not been well taken care of over the years, noting that a previous owner had taken out all of the windows on the rear. He commented that the front was still in reasonably good condition.

Commissioner Schloesser asked to clarify that the rear gambrel would be widened and centered to match the front. Mr. Brown responded that it would match and would meet at the ridge line. Vice-Chair Jensen asked if the gambrel would extend through to the back. Mr. Brown responded that it was broken up by the center gambrel. He added that it would be in the same plane. Mr. McClintock commented on the drawing for the proposed work, expressing concern that he didn't see how a new door was going to fit under the new roofline. Mr. Brown commented that the existing gambrel was below the peak of the roof and that there would be space once it was raised up, adding that the

perspective of the photo made it appear that there was less space than in reality. Mr. Brown commented that the house was close to the 35 foot height limit so he would need to have the height surveyed.

Chair Chase commented that it would be important to match the gambrel on the front and not bump up above or be out of scale. She commented that she would be hesitant to allow Hardie plank on the rear, adding that it would look better better to match and have that continuation. Chair Chase noted that it would be important to document that the existing shingles were unable to be repaired.

Commissioner Flemister asked if he would be restoring any of the windows that had been removed. Mr. Brown commented that there was now a shower behind where one of the windows had been.

Commissioner Johnson commented that new shingles would probably be required for spaces where the windows had been removed. He added that he didn't have any problem with the proposal if it works.

Ms. Hoogkamer asked for the Commission's thoughts on if a more simple roofline was preferred. Commissioners concurred that it should remain a single gambrel.

Mr. McClintock asked about the proposed garage. Mr. Brown noted on a photo of the back of the house where the proposed garage would be located. He added that it would be two garages with a walkway between. He noted that the garages would have their floors at different heights due to the grade, but the roofline would be at the same height on both. Discussion ensued on the configuration of the garages. Mr. McClintock noted that there was an open space requirement for back yards. Chair Chase recommended that Mr. Brown also review the design review guidelines for garages in the district.

Chair Chase reviewed the Commission's recommendations including that for the roofline they wanted to match the height and pitch of the gambrel in the front; that the applicant investigate repairing the siding first, document the existing siding, and replace in kind; and that for the garage he do a site plan and review the design guidelines.

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

### **A. Events and Activities Updates**

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

1. Eastside Neighborhood History Walk Recap
2. Proctor Neighborhood History Walk with Council Member Anders Ibsen (12pm @ Start: Blue Mouse Theatre, August 17<sup>th</sup>)
3. History Happy Hour Trivia Night (7pm @ The Swiss Restaurant & Pub, August 17<sup>th</sup>)
4. Hilltop Neighborhood History Walk with Council Member Keith Blocker (1pm @ Start: People's Park, August 27<sup>th</sup>)
5. Downtown on the Go: UWT/Prairie Line Trail Walk (12pm @ UWT Stairs, October 5<sup>th</sup>)
6. Lighting Restoration Workshop (1:30pm @ Earthwise Tacoma, October 22<sup>nd</sup>)
7. Third Annual Holiday Heritage Swing Dance: Remember the Railroad (6pm @ Freighthouse Square, November 4th)

### **B. Windows Checklist**

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed that staff had created a new version of the window checklist based on Commission feedback and were requesting Commission approval to finalize it. Commissioner York asked if they should include a suggestion to review the building code and consider emergency egress requirements. Commissioners concurred that it was a recurring issue and that some specific language should be added.

There was a motion.

"I move that the windows checklist be approved with the addition of comments by Commissioner York, regarding egress, and that it be available to be issued to applicants."

Motion: Schloesser

Second: Thorne  
The motion was approved.

**6. CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Chase expressed appreciation for the promptness of the City Manager's response to the Commission's letter concerning the Northwest Room in the Tacoma Public Library, adding that it was important that they continue to give the issue their attention.

Commissioner Flemister announced that it would be her last meeting as a Commissioner and that she was going to be joining the Planning and Development Services Department of the City of Tacoma.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer