

Members

Duke York, *Chair*
 Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*
 Chris Granfield
 Jonah Jensen
 Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Jeff Williams
 Eugene Thorne
 Laureen Skrivan
 Ross Buffington, *Wedge Neighborhood Ex-Officio*
 Marshall McClintock, *North Slope Ex-Officio*



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Staff

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

Date: January 14, 2015

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Duke York, *Chair*
 Eugene Thorne
 Laureen Skrivan
 James Steel
 Chris Granfield
 Lysa Schloesser
 Ross Buffington
 Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
 Lauren Hoogkamer
 John Griffith

Others Present:

Brandon Montesi
 Robert Stickel

Commission Members Absent:

Katie Chase, *Vice Chair*
 Jonah Jensen
 Jeff Williams

Chair Duke York called the meeting to order at 5:29 p.m.

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

- A. Excusal of Absences. Jonah Jensen and Katie Chase were excused.
- B. Minutes of 12/10/14

The minutes were approved as submitted.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

- A. 411 N I Street (North Slope Historic District)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

411 North I Street, built in 1905, is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District. The exterior siding on the upper floors is wood shingle and the ground floor, between the second floor and the basement, is stucco, which is now deteriorated. The applicant is proposing replacing the stucco with 5" reveal smooth textured Hardie Lap Siding with cedar corner boards. The whole exterior will be repainted to match; the applicant has provided a sample of the color. Project also includes a new composite shingle roof and the replacement of broken window panes; no windows are being altered.

The applicant has indicated that the stucco was poorly installed originally and would be cost prohibitive to repair.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Design Guidelines for the Wedge Neighborhood and North Slope Historic Special Review Districts 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 building is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications to the structure.
2. Applicant is proposing removing original stucco. The majority of the siding, which is wood shingle, will remain.
3. Staff recommends that the applicant explore repairing the stucco. Proposed siding is not a visual match to the original stucco, but the whole exterior would be repainted to match.
4. New siding could be removed and stucco could be replaced.
5. Proposal would change the appearance, although the ground floor siding is not very visible due to the front porch.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that applicant explore repairing the stucco.

Mr. Brandon Montesi requested clarification that staff was recommending repair of the stucco. Mr. McKnight confirmed that was the recommendation of staff. Mr. Montesi responded that the stucco was too far gone to be patchable and the cost of replacing it would be at least three times greater than the cost of using a hardie lap siding.

Chair York asked if the plan was to remove the stucco entirely. Mr. Montesi responded that it was necessary because there was rotten shiplap on the side walls where water has been penetrating.

Eugene Thorne asked if he had explored what was under the stucco. Mr. Montesi commented that it was shiplap that is coming off in sections. He clarified that the shiplap was the sheathing that would go underneath the siding.

Mr. Buffington asked if the stucco was installed when the house was constructed in 1905. Mr. Montesi commented that it was difficult to tell what was original.

Mr. McClintock reported that there were other examples of stucco on buildings in that area and his recommendation was that an effort should be made to preserve it as much had already been lost on other homes in the area. He noted that other commissioners would need to weigh in on cost.

Chair York asked if there had been any outside bids to replace the stucco. Mr. Montesi said that his company could do it so he was aware of the higher cost. He provided detail as to the difficulty of repairing the stucco compared to installing a hardie siding. Mr. Montesi then used as example photos of the neighboring homes, which had used lap

siding. Mr. McClintock noted that one of the examples was a new structure that was not contributing to the historic district.

Ms. Lysa Schloesser asked about the photos showing where the wall near conduit was pulled away and if there had been any investigation of what was underneath it. Mr. Montesi responded that he had instruction to not touch anything on the house without further feedback.

Mr. McKnight commented that the stucco was very far gone, but appeared to be original to the lower story of the house. Ms. Schloesser asked if the stucco was in bad shape on all sides of the house. Mr. Montesi said it was and added that houses on the other side of the street were brick so he didn't think the lap siding would impact the character of the neighborhood. Chair York commented on the house being within a historic district and that the new homes nearby would not be considered in a discussion of changing the historical significance of the home.

Mr. McKnight commented on the history of the discussion with the applicant. When the applicant began the discussion about replacing the siding, the recommendation had been to select a smooth based hardie siding and a smaller reveal than is typical on new construction. On further review they realized that the house had been intended to be stucco on the lower story.

Mr. Steel commented that he was not convinced that the stucco was original based on the panelized look of where it's cracking and the depth of the siding material. He added that it was a common retrofit in the 50s and 70s. He called attention to the window trim in the area of the stucco where it did not appear intentional and also noted that there would not typically be a wood belly band below the stucco. Ms. Schloesser called attention to the substrate near the conduit and asked if it would have been ripped back to put the stucco on. Mr. Steel said it was likely just shear. Ms. Schloesser asked what the original material could have been. Mr. Steel suggested that it was probably shingle or another wood siding material Chair York added that the diagonal shiplap was fairly universal and typical in the northwest. Ms. Schloesser commented that she was inclined to agree with Mr. Steel that the stucco did not appear original. Chair York commented that the belly band is significant and that anyone experienced with stucco would not include a band because it creates more openings for water intrusion.

Mr. Steel commented that while more documentation would be preferred, he was inclined to believe that the stucco was not original and that a lap siding might be more appropriate. He went over some options for materials that might be used instead. He noted that the Commission might take issue with the proposed cedar corner boards as the home likely had mitered corner edges.

Ms. Schloesser asked if Mr. Montesi had priced out the cedar shingle. Mr. Montesi answered that he would have to do the exact calculations, but the costs would be higher. Ms. Schloesser said she would like to see the proposal for the corner elements. Mr. Montesi commented that he could do mitered edges with aluminum and also discussed some other alternatives.

Mr. Steel asked Mr. McKnight to clarify if on the North Slope, when the element is not intact, would the homeowner be restricted to replacing a non-historic element with the exact product as was there originally. Mr. McKnight pointed to the precedent with windows where it is difficult to replace with original materials and a similar visual match is acceptable. He also noted that in the case of hardie plank there have been cases in the past where so much of the original siding was gone that the Commission had allowed hardie siding to be put on.

Mr. Thorne asked if there had been any effort made to research historic photos of the house. Mr. McClintock commented that they are typically from the front and the area being discussed is in the back. Mr. McKnight responded that staff had looked into it and couldn't find any.

Mr. Steel asked Mr. Montesi what kind of material was used for the siding on the second floor. Mr. Montesi answered that it was cedar shake siding with mitered corners. The front façade was cedar shingles as well.

There was a motion.

"I move to approve the application for 411 N I Street with the stipulation that the outside corners need to be mitered

whether that be with cedar lap siding or hardie lap siding with an aluminum channel trim that covers the corners of the siding."

Motion: Steel

Second: Granfield

The motion passed. There was additional discussion with Mr. Montesi to recommend appropriate materials to be used for the corner of the siding.

4. BOARD BRIEFING

A. 1121 N 7th St (North Slope Historic District)

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

A Stop Work Order was issued for work being done on an existing carport, shed and a new deck. The carport has existed for many years, but was never permitted and is built too close to the property line. To remain, the carport will require both a setback variance and a fire rated wall along the property line.

The City will require that the carport be removed from the home unless the code issues are remedied, which will include 1) a fire rated wall, enclosing the north side of the carport, 2) approval of a setback variance, and 3) approval from the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Because of the cost of applying for a variance, the owner is requesting early guidance from the Commission regarding approval by the Commission should a variance be granted.

ACTION REQUESTED

Board feedback.

Mr. McKnight commented that the property was not currently code compliant and would require a fire wall along the property line and would function more like a garage, while being open in the back.

Mr. Robert Stickel commented that he was using similar materials and was only seeking to make the 1950s constructed carport structurally sound. He added that due to the concrete slab tilting towards the house, he was worried about the integrity of the building being affected by water. He added that the shed in the back did not need a permit. Mr. McKnight clarified that if the shed was going to be built inside of the carport, it would be part of the carport discussion. Mr. Stickel commented that he didn't want to cut a line from the eave to the carport because the water would leak into the carport and eventually the basement.

Commissioners had additional questions about where the property line was in relation to the retaining wall. Mr. Stickel confirmed that the retaining wall marked the property line.

Mr. Stickel reiterated that that he was trying to save the structure by making it structurally sound and wasn't making any changes to it. Mr. James Steel commented that he sympathized with the unfortunate hand Mr. Stickel had been dealt, having both a carport and possibly a slab that had not been built properly. The challenge they had to deal with was that there was a nonconforming structure that he wanted to make improvements on that would not benefit the historic district. Mr. Stickel responded that tearing down the carport would lead to water damage to his home.

Mr. Ross Buffington asked if Mr. Stickel had explored any ways to address the foundation. Mr. Stickel responded that any of the alternatives would be expensive. Mr. Steel asked if a structural engineer had been consulted. Mr. Stickel responded that he hadn't yet as he wanted to get more information from the Commission and see if he could move forward with getting a variance. Mr. Steel explained that he wasn't a structural engineer himself, but suspected that the level of upgrade needed to bring the carport up to code would be higher than expected. Ultimately, tearing down the carport and building a single car garage may be a better solution. Mr. Steel listed some of the visible deficiencies that he could identify from the photos and recommended that a contractor or structural engineer be consulted before

further effort was made to bring the structure up to code.

Mr. Eugene Thorne observed that the current slope of the carport could be directing water towards the retaining wall and possibly eroding it.

Chair York clarified for the Commission that they were getting outside of the purview of Landmarks Preservation with discussion of the structure. Mr. McKnight commented that the plan reviewers would likely provide a lot feedback and the code issues would likely be resolved by the time the project made its way back to the Commission. The main question for the Landmarks Preservation Commission is whether or not the project would ultimately be approved due to the design guidelines in the district.

Mr. Buffington reported that to his knowledge the North Slope did not allow carports, though there was a section allowing detached garages. Mr. McKnight noted that there was some ambiguity created by how long the structure had been there and the purpose of bringing it to the Commission was to provide feedback that could be useful to Mr. Stickel in making a decision on how to proceed. Mr. Buffington clarified that if Mr. Stickel were to come before the Commission with a permit to rebuild the car port, he did not see them approving it.

Chair York noted that if the carport was greater than six feet from the house it would have been considered a temporary structure. The fact that it was attached to the house added additional challenges to the process of getting it permitted. He did not see Commission guidelines allowing the approval.

Mr. Stickel expressed frustration that the only options he had available would involve additional expense, restating is desire to keep the carport as is with minor repairs. Some discussion ensued between Commissioners and Mr. Stickel as to his options moving forward and the restrictions created by the historic district.

Mr. McKnight reported that the Commission did not need to make a decision, but the Commission was being clear that design guidelines did not allow a carport. He reviewed that the Commission was not likely to approve the existing structure with the proposed improvements, but if a new structure was proposed that conformed to guidelines the commission would be will to consider it. Mr. McKnight discussed the next steps with Mr. Stickel.

5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Hoogkamer provided an update on events and activities. There were no events for January, but there were a number of events planned for February including the #IHeartTacoma campaign, the Heritage Mixer, and the Landmarks Preservation Commission retreat. Mr. McClintock asked if the training event had been fully booked. Ms. Hoogkamer commented that they still had space available.

B. Officer Nominations

Mr. McKnight reported that the bylaws indicate that the nomination of new officers should take place in December and elections should follow in January. Since the Commission typically prefers to do the nominations in January after appointments have been completed he suggested that they might amend the bylaws. He noted that there were no formal rules for officer nominations and that the Commission could proceed however they wished.

Chair York nominated Chris Granfield as chair.
The Commission voted unanimously to approve the nomination.

James Steel nominated Katie Chase as vice chair.
The Commission voted unanimously to approve the nomination.

6. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

Mr. McClintock commented on a series of lectures "Conversations re: Tacoma" and they were looking for people to assist the planning process.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:48: p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer