

## Members

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



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

## Staff

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

Date: June 28, 2017

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

### Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Ken House, *Vice-Chair*  
Brittani Flowers  
James Steel  
Eugene Thorne  
Marshall McClintock

### *Staff Present:*

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith

### *Others Present:*

Kathy Ursich  
Eckart Klee  
Lynn DiNino  
Ray Martin  
Michael Brown  
Jared Baehmer

### Commission Members Absent:

Roger Johnson  
Lysa Schloesser  
Jeff Williams  
Kevin Bartoy

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

### 1. ROLL CALL

### 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 6/14/17
- C. Administrative Review
  - 1004 North K Street—non-historic windows
  - 1506 South 5th Street—siding
  - 913 Pacific Avenue—louvers

The consent agenda was approved

### 3. TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES – PUBLIC HEARING

- A. 2312 North 29th Street
- B. 2804-2806 McCarver Street, Beals House Duplex

Chair Pratt called the public hearing to order and reviewed the hearing procedures.

Mr. McKnight read the staff reports for 2312 North 29<sup>th</sup> Street and 2804-2806 McCarver Street.

### AGENDA ITEM 3A: 2312 North 29<sup>th</sup> Street

#### BACKGROUND

The house, at 2312 North 29<sup>th</sup> Street, is built in the National Folk style, a vernacular style popular from about 1850 until 1930. Although, the exact build date is unknown, the house appears on maps starting in 1884. It served as working-class housing during the early development of Old Town. Significant dates include 1884-1916, when it was occupied by Croatian tenants. The building is nominated under Criterion A as a remaining territorial residence from the earliest period of Old Town's development and its Croatian community; Criterion B for its association with Janet E. Steele, who built the first lumber building in Tacoma as well as gave birth to the first two European American children in Tacoma. It is also associated with John N. Fuller, who served as a member of the city council of Old Tacoma and of the consolidated city council of Old and New Tacoma. The nomination also includes Criterion E as this house sits within the same city block as Seamen's Rest (2802 N. Carr), within one block of the Slavonian Hall (2306 N. 30th) and two blocks from St. Peters Episcopal Church (2910 N. Starr), all listed city landmarks.

#### REQUESTED ACTION

The purpose of this hearing is to hear public comment and determine whether the nominated property meets the criteria for designation and should be scheduled for City Council.

#### EFFECTS OF NOMINATION

- Future changes to the exterior will require approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to those changes being made, to ensure historical and architectural appropriateness.
- Unnecessary demolition of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places is strongly discouraged by the municipal code, and requires approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
- Future renovations of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places may qualify for the Special Tax Valuation property tax incentive.
- The property will become eligible for the Historic Conditional Use Permit.

#### STANDARDS

The property is nominated under the following criteria:

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- B. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- E. Is part of, adjacent to, or related to an existing or proposed historic district, square, park, or other distinctive area which should be redeveloped or preserved according to a plan based on a historic, cultural, or architectural motif*

#### ANALYSIS

1. At over 133-years-old the property meets the age threshold criterion.
2. The property retains its integrity, including its original massing, scale, feeling, and most materials; the front façade is intact, although the porch and siding were altered in the 1990s when the turned posts, balustrade, and shingles were added to the front. The west and east facades retain their original siding and some original windows. The rear addition was added between 1888 and 1896; changes older than 50 years may be significant in their own right. In the 1990s, the roof style of the rear addition was changed and a small rear porch was added. The chimney was also removed and a foundation was added.
3. The building meets Criterion A for its association with the development of Old Town and its Croatian community; Criterion B for its association with Janet E. Steele, who built the first lumber building in Tacoma as well as gave birth to the first two European American children in Tacoma; and Criterion E for its proximity to other listed city landmarks.

#### RECOMMENDATION

The Commission may recommend designation to the City Council, deny the nomination, or defer if additional information is needed. Based upon the criteria listed in TMC 13.07.040, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for designation.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3B: 2804-2806 McCarver Street, Beals House Duplex**

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Beals House Duplex, at 2804-2806 McCarver Street, was built in 1888. The house was built by Curtis A. Beals, a contractor and real estate salesman who also served two terms on the Tacoma City Council. Beals lost the house in the 1890s; for the next five decades the house was occupied by members of Old Town's Croatian immigrant community. In 1984, Eckart Klee, the home's current owner and resident, purchased the building. The building is nominated under Criterion A for its association with the development of Old Town and its Croatian community; and Criterion C as an example of the West Coast stick style, representing a transition between the Italianate style and emerging Queen-Anne, Stick, Shingle, and Neo-Colonial styles.

#### **REQUESTED ACTION**

The purpose of this hearing is to hear public comment and determine whether the nominated property meets the criteria for designation and should be scheduled for City Council.

#### **EFFECTS OF NOMINATION**

- Future changes to the exterior will require approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to those changes being made, to ensure historical and architectural appropriateness.
- Unnecessary demolition of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places is strongly discouraged by the municipal code, and requires approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
- Future renovations of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places may qualify for the Special Tax Valuation property tax incentive.
- The property will become eligible for the Historic Conditional Use Permit.

#### **STANDARDS**

The property is nominated under the following criteria:

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;*

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. At 129-years-old the property meets the age threshold criterion.
2. The property retains its integrity, including its original massing, scale, design and most materials; however, in 1984, a small addition was added to the south side of the house and all of the original windows were replaced with aluminum sashes, although the framing is still intact. The cast iron balustrade that was on the roof has also been lost.
3. The building meets Criterion A for its association with the development of Old Town and its Croatian community; and Criterion C as an example of the West Coast stick style.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission may recommend designation to the City Council, deny the nomination, or defer if additional information is needed. Based upon the criteria listed in TMC 13.07.040, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for designation.

Chair Pratt invited members of the public to provide comment regarding the nominations.

Marshall McClintock, Historic Tacoma, commented that 2312 North 29th Street was a unique property for their register, being the only small working class housing that they had on the register. It was also unique in that it was built some time before 1884. He noted that it was associated with several of the founders of what would become Old Tacoma as well as the working class residents of Old Town who resided in the house.

Kathy Ursich commented that 2804-2806 McCarver Street should be on the historic listing because it was a territorial home, it was built in 1877, and the architect was also a City Council Member. She noted that the duplex had many

Croatian residents, which were associated with the Slavonian Hall. It was also one of the oldest buildings in Old Town.

Eckart Klee commented that he had resided in the home since 1984 when they started restoring it. He discussed work that he had been done to the home and work that was still planned.

Lynn DiNino expressed support for the nomination of 2312 North 29<sup>th</sup>, commenting that the home was maintained beautifully and that it was a pleasure to have the house in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Thorne commented that the Beals House Duplex was an interesting example of a duplex that was built as one originally, which they did not have many examples of on the register. He commented that it sounded like a well-built structure.

Commissioner Steel, regarding the applicability of Criterion E for 2312 North 29<sup>th</sup> Street, asked what proximity is usually applied. Mr. McKnight responded that it was a loosely defined criterion, but if there was a shared history with a number of landmarks in proximity that benefited from that context, then the Commission could apply that criterion.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to City Council that 2312 North 29th Street be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places including the following elements: the exterior of the building, finding that it meets the criteria A,B, and E."

Motion: Steel

Second: Thorne

The motion was approved.

Commissioner Steel recommended including criterion E for 2804-2806 McCarver Street.

There was a motion

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to City Council that the Beals House Duplex be included in the Tacoma Register of Historic Places finding that it meets criteria A, C, and E of TMC 13.07.040."

Motion: Steel

Second: Flowers

The motion was approved.

#### 4. DESIGN REVIEW

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

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

##### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1893, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing to raise and extend the rear gambrel roof across the back façade, so that the height and pitch matches the front gambrel, and add a deck in place of the current rear addition. The materials for the siding, trim, and windows will match the existing original materials. The rear of the home has been altered in the past; no work will be done to the front façade. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this proposal on July 27, 2016, and provided positive feedback.

##### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

##### **STANDARDS**

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

###### **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.

#### **Guidelines for Roofs**

1. **Preserve and retain existing roof form and appearance.** Major changes to the overall roof plan/type are discouraged. For example, changing a hipped roof to a gabled roof is generally inappropriate.
2. **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.
3. **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. New siding will match the original materials and design.
3. The existing roof form and appearance of the front façade will not be altered.
4. The new dormer will match the existing roof in style, height and pitch. It is sensitively located at the rear of the home and will be minimally visible from the main right-of-way.
5. The primary ridgeline of the house will not be changed.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Ray Martin, York Enterprises, commented that the owner had been working to improve the house and the rear dormer would help him significantly in his plans for the home. He added that the dormer would take the home closer to its historic look and they were going to try to create a design that would exemplify that. With the approval of the Commission for the dormer concept, they would move forward and create additional details and plans.

Michael Brown, the owner, commented that the dormer would improve the aesthetic of the back of the house.

Mr. Martin noted that there was some T1-11 siding that they wanted to restore back to shingles. They had already received verbal approval from the Planning Department to extend the dormer from the existing exterior wall, though it was encroaching on the setback, because it was going straight up and not making the encroachment worse.

Commissioner Steel observed that the dormer was offset from the primary roof of the house. Mr. Martin responded that the planes were closer that they appeared in pictures and it was actually offset by only several inches. Commissioner Steel suggested that it be mirrored on the other side, in terms of being stepped back from the primary roof, if possible. Reviewing the conceptual elevations, Commissioner Steel noted that shifting the addition off to the left caused the roof to not align with the roof of the existing gambrel dormer. He recommended that they center the ridge of the addition so it aligns with the existing one. Mr. Martin commented that they couldn't maintain the pitch of the roof, because they were trying to match the pitch of the front dormer of the house. They were following the pitch line on the original drawing. The whole gambrel section would actually be torn off.

Commissioner Steel commented that it appeared in the photos that the front dormer didn't go to the edge of the roof either. Mr. Martin responded that it does to the right, but on the left side it did not. He noted that the house jogs on both sides, so they were trying to match the style, pitch, and the height while recognizing that the back was wider than the front elevation.

Mr. McClintock noted that they had no drawings showing the deck, the door, or additional windows. Mr. Martin indicated on the pictures where those elements would go.

Chair Pratt clarified that they would be returning with design details if the concept was approved.

Commissioner Steel stated that the dormer addition would be fine if they were mirroring the form on the front of the house, as long as they were coming back with better architectural drawings.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for the scale, form, and shape of the new addition at 720 North I Street as submitted with the understanding that the applicant will be submitting final plans for our review before approval."

Motion: Steel

Second: Flowers

The motion was approved.

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

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1901, 619 North K Street is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The Landmarks Preservation Commission conducted a site visit on June 23, 2017. This proposal is regarding the second dwelling towards the rear of the property, which is a legal nonconforming structure. Although it is located on the property of 619 North K Street, there is no build date for this structure and it is not included in the district inventory.

Commissioner McClintock has provided research that indicates the structure was built in 1925 and altered at an unknown date. Pursuant to TMC 13.07.070, *B. Historic District Inventories. The Commission shall adopt and maintain historic building inventories for buildings within Historic Special Review Districts that identify "Contributing" and "Non Contributing" properties. Architectural integrity, as it relates to materials, space, and composition in various periods of architecture, shall be respected and, to the extent possible, maintained in contributing properties. Historic. The absence of a property on a historic inventory shall not preclude the Landmarks Preservation Commission's authority to review changes to such a property. If a property is not listed on the historic inventory for the district, the property shall be assumed to be contributing.* Inventories may be formally amended annually. Staff recommends that

if the Commission finds this structure to be noncontributing, then the Commission may recommend this be reflected in the inventory during the annual amendment.

The applicant is proposing replacing some windows to meet egress requirements, as well as altering the roofline to a hipped roof with dormers. The chimney would also be removed. These changes are to accommodate an interior remodel. There are no changes proposed for the main house. The applicant will be providing updated materials that reflect the Landmarks Preservation Commission's comments.

### **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.



### **Guidelines for Roofs**

1. **Preserve and retain existing roof form and appearance.** Major changes to the overall roof plan/type are discouraged. For example, changing a hipped roof to a gabled roof is generally inappropriate.
2. **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.
3. **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 within the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.07.070 for exterior modifications.
2. The structure is lacking architectural integrity, as it relates to materials and composition relative to a period of architecture and does not fit the character of the overall district. The structure is also not individually significant and has been altered over time.
3. Historic windows are being removed, which conflicts with the design guidelines for contributing properties.
4. Windows are being removed/altered to accommodate an interior remodel which is not discouraged by the design guidelines.
5. Existing siding will be matched.
6. Although the roof form and appearance would change, this structure faces the alley and is to the rear of the primary structure and not visible from the primary right-of-way.
7. The proposed architectural style is compatible with the district.
8. The alteration does not harm character defining elements on the principal structure.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Commission find this structure noncontributing and approve of the application.

Ms. Hoogkamer reported that following the site visit, she was altering the staff report to note that the building did have architectural integrity as it relates to materials and composition relative to a period of architecture, although it still did not fit the character of the overall district, was not individually significant, and had been altered over time.

Jared Baehmer, Cornerstone Home Designs, reported that he had done several variations of the design: the original design with the dormers on top, a straight hip roof raised to provide a 8 foot ceiling height, and a gambrel roof concept. The windows had been changes from sliders to casement windows for egress.

Commissioner Steel asked how review of an accessory structure was different in the North Slope. Mr. McKnight

responded that the Commission did a lighter review noting that garages were a typical example. He noted that with accessory structures they were usually talking about garages and they did not get many applications to modify existing garages. He noted that the North Slope inventory did not include garages separately.

Commissioner Thorne asked if there had been any reviews in that area of a carriage house, which would be similar to the accessory structure being discussed. Mr. McKnight reviewed that on North 5<sup>th</sup> Street there was a garage built with a breezeway that was functionally an attached structure with living space. It was a completely new structure and went through the full design review process. He recommended that the Commission treat the accessory structure at 619 North K as a design review of a structure in the district according to the guidelines for the district.

Commissioner Thorne asked if the roof of the accessory structure would need to match the main house. Mr. McKnight responded that there was no requirement that an accessory structure match the main structure on the lot.

Commissioner Steel noted the lack of visibility from the street, and the significant level of modification to the structure. He commented that similar to the carriage house they had looked at, if there was a way for the new structure to reflect the detailing, roof style, and massing of the main house so it had a more congruent relationship he would welcome that over other styles of roofs that were not keeping with the style of the main house.

Photos of the main house were reviewed.

Mr. Steel noted two of the design options had a flattened roof peak, but the main house had a traditional ridge.

Mr. McClintock commented that he didn't have a problem with making the roof uniform across or having a hipped roof. His preference was to keep the same style that they had presently, establishing the eave line all the way across. Commissioner Steel commented that making the roof uniform across would preserve the existing ridge but might not achieve the goals of the applicant. Discussion ensued on the possibility of increasing the roof height. Chair Pratt commented that her only concern was it going up to a full 2 story height, rather than being a 1 ½ story building. Vice-Chair House concurred that keeping it at 1 ½ stories would be preferable, but he was not concerned about the outline of the roof. Commissioner Flowers commented that she was comfortable with the raising the two portions of the roof that were below the line of the house. Commissioner Steel suggest that the height of the ridge as it was currently should not be exceeded.

Commissioner Steel suggested that the applicant return with the completed application, and that approving the ridge height, existing eave style, and existing gable style roof was enough direction to provide.

Commissioners discussed possibly allowing dormers. Mr. McClintock suggested skylights as an alternative option that might be acceptable. Mr. McKnight noted that it would be difficult with dormers not to end up with a flat roof, given the pitch of the roof.

Mr. McClintock requested that with the final application they provide detail on what windows and doors they would be putting in.

There was a motion

"I motion to defer approval of the application pending revision to the plans to preserve the existing ridge line height and pitch; bring the lower parts of the roof to match the higher eave line; and cursory review of land use and building code issues that may arise in the project prior to coming back to the Commission for full consideration."

Motion: Steel

Second: House

The motion was approved.

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

### **A. Events and Activities Update**

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

1. Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Youth Heritage Program: Maritime Heritage (July 11<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup>)
2. South Tacoma Walking Tour (10am TBD, August 12<sup>th</sup>)
3. Walking Tour (10am TBD, September 9<sup>th</sup>)
4. Social Justice Tour (TBD September 30<sup>th</sup>)

5. Prairie Line Trail Arts Symposium (October 19<sup>th</sup> TBD)
6. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance (6-9pm @ Browns Point Improvement Club, November 3<sup>rd</sup>)

**6. CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Pratt requested that Commissioners respond to quorum checks to make sure that they have a quorum. Mr. McKnight commented that ideally they would like to know by the day before the meeting if they have quorum, so that they can cancel if they need to.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.