

Members

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



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

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

Date: October 11, 2017

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 243

Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Pratt, *Chair*
Ken House, *Vice-Chair*
Roger Johnson
Lysa Schloesser
James Steel
Jeff Williams
Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
John Griffith

Others Present:

Lynda Shepherd
Steve Shaub
Matt Larson
Dale Johnson
Scott Cameron
Peter Levy

Commission Members Absent:

Kevin Bartoy
Eugene Thorne

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. He

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 be 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 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 than replicating historic forms and historic materials. He commented that the brick wrapping the deck would be inappropriate and steel would be more appropriate. Commissioner Steel added that heavy timber would also be 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 reviewed 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 it 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 at replicate the other cornice on the west side. Chair Pratt clarified that that it would not be a requirement.

Commissioner Steel commented that the proposal was very well drawn and clearly laid out. He asked that 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 the 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.