

## Members

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Brittani Flowers  
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, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
John Griffith, Office Assistant

Date: April 26, 2017

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

### Commission Members in Attendance:

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

### Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith

### Others Present:

Cynthia Padilla  
Emily Refi  
Ben Gleason  
Bret Drager  
John De Loma

### Commission Members Absent:

Marshall McClintock  
Brittani Flowers

Chair Katie Pratt called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

### 1. ROLL CALL

### 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 3/22/17
- C. Administrative Review
  - 2015 South C Street – new door
  - 812 North 11th Street – exterior restoration

The consent agenda was approved.

### 3. DESIGN REVIEW

- A. Theater District Station Relocation (Old City Hall Historic District)

The item was moved to after 3.B. and 3.C.

Item 5.A. concerning the LINK artist selection was combined with item 3.A.

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

Sound Transit is currently in Final Design phase for the expansion of the Tacoma Link Light Rail, which will add 2.4 miles of track from downtown to Hilltop. This expansion will include seven new station platforms stops and the relocation of the Theater District Station to two blocks north along Commerce Street just south of the existing Spanish Steps and the I-705 on- and off-ramps. The project team is seeking approval for the design of the new

Theater District Station, which will consist of a center-platform from which patrons can access trains in both directions. Pedestrian access will be from the location of an existing mid-block crosswalk, and the platform will have a single entry at the north end of the platform.

The platform will extend south of the crosswalk with a sloped walkway up to the 60' long boarding area. Two 17' x 7' canopies with windscreens will be located at either end of the boarding area. Amenities located within the platform will include a ticket vending machine, ORCA card readers, benches, waste & recycling receptacles, and signage, including "next train" digital display and rider information. The platform ground plane will be scored concrete with the required yellow tactile platform edge pavers located on either side of the boarding area. The canopy structural steel members will be painted dark green to compliment the canopy structures at existing stations. Clear glass windscreens and translucent glass canopy roof panels will be supported by aluminum mullions. Stainless steel railings will separate the platform facility from the roadway along the sloped walkway and at the end of the boarding area.

The Commission was briefed on this item on January 11, 2017. Minutes from that meeting may be viewed at [www.cityoftacoma.org/lpc-agenda](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/lpc-agenda).

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

### **STANDARDS**

#### **Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings**

9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

### **ANALYSIS**

1. This construction project is located within in the Old City Hall Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.
2. No historic material is being destroyed. The new platform is compatible, but differentiated from the district's historic material.
3. The platform could be removed without harming the district's character defining features.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Cynthia Padilla, Sound Transit, provided an overview of the project that would add a two mile extension and seven station platforms. The first new platform would be the 7th and Commerce Street station which would replace the existing Theater District Station. She noted that they were currently at 60% design on the schedule and would enter into construction in mid-2018 with service anticipated to begin several years later.

Emily Refi, Waterleaf Architecture, reviewed the location of the new station between Old City Hall and the Spanish Steps. She discussed the proposed site plan that would leave the existing cross walk in place and maintain the existing bike lanes. She reviewed images of the proposed platform and noted how it would be accessed by pedestrians. Ms. Refi noted minor changes to the platform since the last briefing to make sure glass panels could be easily replaced if broken. She noted that they had moved to an aluminum storefront glazing system to avoid the look of a window and were floating the edge of the glass. Infrastructure associated with the project included three overhead contact system (OCS) poles.

Materials and furnishings were discussed. Ms. Refi reported that they were trying to maintain the look of the system

with the existing stations and would have painted structural steel similar to the other stations, steel railings, glass canopies, windscreens, steel outriggers, light fixtures, and modular benches. Images of station signage were reviewed.

Commissioner House asked if the portions of the vertical column above the canopy served a purpose. Ms. Raffe responded that they wanted to provide opportunities for artwork to be incorporated into the canopies that would be safe from vandalism and damage. She noted that there was a tube steel beam between the columns that supported the steel outriggers. Commissioner Steel commented that it was appropriate for the scale and anchored the station.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if the station name was a placeholder. Ms. Padilla confirmed that it was and that they were having a vote on station names.

It was noted that the OCS poles would be similar in color to the structural steel on the platforms.

Item 5.A., the LINK Artist Selection Update, was discussed. Ms. Padilla reported that they had selected artist Kenji Stoll as result of a process working closely with Tacoma's Art Commission. She reviewed that the selection panel had interviewed 3 candidates. She noted Mr. Stoll is very active in the community, works with youth, and would be tasked with community engagement. She reviewed other artwork that he had worked on including a painting on the side of Rialto Theater and planters on Hilltop. She commented that they would hire also a technical advisor to help Mr. Stoll create artwork that connects to the station.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if they would focus the palette on the beams. Ms. Padilla confirmed that they were trying to focus the design and wanted to make sure that there was an easy way to attach the artwork and maintain the sightlines on the roadway. Commissioner Schloesser commented that the community engagement process would drive how each art opportunity looks.

Ms. Padilla commented that the traction powered substations (TPSS) could also provide art opportunities if they provide screening.

There was a motion.

"I move that we approve the design for the Theater District station relocation as submitted."

Motion: Jensen

Second: Steel

The motion was approved unanimously.

#### B. 616 North K Street (North Slope Historic District)

##### *Rehabilitation*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1913, this property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. This home was badly damaged by fire, a few years ago, and subsequently water intrusion. On March 22, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the proposed rehabilitation. Due to the degree of fire and water damage, the entire roof and part of the rear façade will have to be rebuilt. The rehabilitation will also include extensive interior remodeling. The proposal includes replacing the shed roofed side dormers with hipped dormers, squaring the addition in the back, and adding a hipped roof to the back of the home, as requested by the Commission. Land Use staff has identified a potential setback issue with the rear bump out, on the north side. The applicant is currently working with staff to resolve the issue. The condition of the original doors and siding, underneath the vinyl, are not yet known. The owner would like to salvage as much original material as possible. The existing vinyl windows will be replaced with matching single-hung vinyl windows.

#### **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. **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.
3. **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.
  4. **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.

#### **Guidelines for Doors**

1. **Avoid enlarging or moving an original entry opening,** unless you can provide documentary evidence to demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with typical designs for houses of the time period, or that the change will restore a previously altered condition.

2. **Retain historic entry doors whenever feasible.** Replacement doors should, where possible, match the original door in design and other details, and materials. In many cases, for security or cost reasons, a non-custom door in alternative materials may be proposed; in these cases, the door should appear to be wood (painted fiberglass doors molded with panel indents may be acceptable; faux wood finishes tend to be inappropriate) and should be compatible with the architecture of the house (Craftsman doors should not be proposed for Victorian era houses, for example).
3. **Avoid nonhistoric configurations.** Double entry doors were not common in the historic district, and are discouraged unless it can be demonstrated that this was an original feature to the building.

#### **Guidelines for Porches**

1. **Retain existing porches and porch details.** The original design elements of existing historic porches, when present, should be maintained. Major changes to configuration or ornamentation should be avoided. Missing or deteriorated details, such as columns and railings, should be repaired or replaced in kind.
2. **Avoid adding architecturally inappropriate details.** Items such as porch columns reflect the architecture of the home. Tapered columns atop piers are emblematic of Craftsman homes, but are not appropriate on Victorian era houses. Likewise, scrollwork, turned posts, or gingerbread are not appropriate on a Craftsman home. Replacement elements that have no historic design relationship with the architecture diminish the historic character of the building.
3. **Replace missing porches with designs and details that reflect the original design, if known. Avoid adding conjectural elements.** Photographic or other documentary evidence should guide the design of replacement porches. Where this is unavailable, a new design should be based on existing original porches from houses of similar type and age.

#### **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).
4. **Materials and colors.** Composition roofs are an acceptable substitute for shingles, and have been in use on homes since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Composite and engineered materials that mimic the visual qualities of shingles vary widely in quality and appearance. If an engineered material is proposed that is not common in the district, material samples and product specification sheets should be furnished to the Commission. Metal roofs are not acceptable for historic homes. Clay tile roofs are appropriate only on the few examples of Mission or Spanish influenced architecture seen in the districts.

#### **Guidelines for Additions**

1. **Architectural style should be compatible** with the era and style of the principal structure, including massing, window patterning, scale of individual elements, cladding, roof form, and exterior materials.

2. **Additions should be removable** in the future without harming the character defining elements on the principal structure.
3. **Additions should be sensitively located** in a manner that minimizes visibility from primary rights of way. Where this is not possible, the design should respect the style, scale, massing, rhythm, and materials or the original building.
4. **An addition should be subservient** in size, scale and location to the principal structure.
5. **Seamless additions are discouraged.** There should be a clear visual break between the old structure and the new, such as a reduced size or footprint or a break in the wall plane, to avoid creating a falsely historic appearance (such that the original, historic portion of the house can be distinguished from the new, non-historic addition).

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The rehabilitation work is replacing lost historic features and in keeping with the home's original design.
3. Original doors and siding will be repaired, if feasible.
4. The existing front porch is being retained and repaired.
5. There is no requirement to upgrade existing vinyl windows. The existing vinyl windows are being changed to single-hung vinyl.
6. Rebuilding the existing roof is necessary, due to fire damage, the new roof and dormers are sensitively designed and match the architectural style of the home.
7. The existing addition is being expanded for the interior remodel. It is sensitively located and compatible in style; however, it will be seamless.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Ben Gleason, the owner, commented that they didn't know what the condition of the siding was or whether it could be repaired. He noted that there was either Hardie board or cedar siding available for the replacement, but they would prefer not to use cedar as it was triple the cost. He commented that the architect had left an existing round window and they wanted the back to look like the front, with the exception of the master closet where there would be a window on the right side of the back of the house.

Commissioner Steel asked that they use the same style of corner trim when they replace the siding underneath the vinyl if it is not repairable. Mr. Gleason responded that there isn't any corner trim and that it wraps the corner. Commissioner Steel suggested that if they use Hardie Plank that they have aluminum mitered corners which have been allowed by the Commission in the past. Commissioner Williams requested that if they use Hardie Plank that they mimic the existing pattern of the shingles.

Mr. Gleason asked if they had any preferences on the lights on the front. Commissioner Steel responded that there might be code requirements about how close to the door the lights can be placed. Mr. McKnight noted that electrical fixtures were district exempt.

Mr. McKnight asked if the Commission would want to provide guidance on how to proceed if the siding was not repairable. Commissioner Williams suggested that they could allow an administrative review with the Commissioners suggestions. Chair Pratt requested that they take pictures of the siding if it could not be repaired.

Commissioner Johnson asked if any of the original windows had been covered over. Mr. Gleason responded that when he finished gutting the home he would know more.

There was a motion.

"I move that we approve the application as per the staff report standards and guidelines outlined with the provision that the siding would go through administrative review."

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Jensen

The motion was approved unanimously.

C. 608 North Ainsworth Street (North Slope Historic District)

*Rear porch remodel*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

## **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1901, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. To accommodate an interior kitchen remodel, the owner is proposing to replace the existing back porch with a new 12x15 back porch, which will be attached to an enclosed mudroom. Part of the original mudroom is being incorporated into the new kitchen. The siding of this enclosure will match the existing siding. The new wood windows on the enclosure will also match the existing windows. The rear porch posts and beams will match the existing posts and beams on the front porch. The existing shed roof will be replaced with a new hip roof with composite roofing, and the total height will be 15' 3". The aluminum windows will be replaced with two new wood windows, and the doors will be replaced with wood French doors. The owners are also proposing to replace the wood windows on the southwest elevation with new double-pane wood windows.

Other proposed work includes in-kind repair of the wood railing and steps on the front porch. There will be no other alterations to the front façade.

## **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

## **STANDARDS**

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

#### **Windows**

5. **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.
6. **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.

7. **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.

8. **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.

9. **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.

**Guidelines for Doors**

4. **Avoid enlarging or moving an original entry opening,** unless you can provide documentary evidence to demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with typical designs for houses of the time period, or that the change will restore a previously altered condition.
5. **Retain historic entry doors whenever feasible.** Replacement doors should, where possible, match the original door in design and other details, and materials. In many cases, for security or cost reasons, a non-custom door in alternative materials may be proposed; in these cases, the door should appear to be wood (painted fiberglass doors molded with panel indents may be acceptable; faux wood finishes tend to be inappropriate) and should be compatible with the architecture of the house (Craftsman doors should not be proposed for Victorian era houses, for example).

6. **Avoid non-historic configurations.** Double entry doors were not common in the historic district, and are discouraged unless it can be demonstrated that this was an original feature to the building.

#### **Guidelines for Porches**

4. **Retain existing porches and porch details.** The original design elements of existing historic porches, when present, should be maintained. Major changes to configuration or ornamentation should be avoided. Missing or deteriorated details, such as columns and railings, should be repaired or replaced in kind.
5. **Avoid adding architecturally inappropriate details.** Items such as porch columns reflect the architecture of the home. Tapered columns atop piers are emblematic of Craftsman homes, but are not appropriate on Victorian era houses. Likewise, scrollwork, turned posts, or gingerbread are not appropriate on a Craftsman home. Replacement elements that have no historic design relationship with the architecture diminish the historic character of the building.
6. **Replace missing porches with designs and details that reflect the original design, if known. Avoid adding conjectural elements.** Photographic or other documentary evidence should guide the design of replacement porches. Where this is unavailable, a new design should be based on existing original porches from houses of similar type and age.

#### **Guidelines for Roofs**

5. **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.
6. **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.
7. **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).
8. **Materials and colors.** Composition roofs are an acceptable substitute for shingles, and have been in use on homes since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Composite and engineered materials that mimic the visual qualities of shingles vary widely in quality and appearance. If an engineered material is proposed that is not common in the district, material samples and product specification sheets should be furnished to the Commission. Metal roofs are not acceptable for historic homes. Clay tile roofs are appropriate only on the few examples of Mission or Spanish influenced architecture seen in the districts.

#### **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 front porch railing and steps will be repaired in-kind and match the existing features.
3. Non-historic aluminum windows (on southwest elevation) are being upgraded to wood double-pane windows.
4. Changes to windows to accommodate interior remodels are not discouraged by the design guidelines.

5. Wood windows (on southwest elevation) are being replaced with double-pane wood windows. These windows are not visible from the public right-of-way.
6. The wood siding on the proposed mud room enclosure will match existing siding.
7. The trim on the new French doors and windows will match the existing wood trim.
8. The new back porch will match the existing front porch.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Bret Drager, Drager Architecture, commented that the home was a nice example of American Foursquare architecture and that it was in very good shape except for the back porch which had deteriorated. He commented that they wanted to expand the kitchen into that area and update the sun room area by opening it into the dining room area. He noted that the back porch area had stacked brick foundations and they wanted to pour a complete foundation around. He commented that they would replace the windows with the same pattern and use wood.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the porch was originally enclosed. Mr. Drager responded that they didn't know if it was originally, but it was possibly partially enclosed.

Mr. Drager reported that a flat sloped metal roof had been added to cover up the deck and they wanted to bring some of the detailing on the front onto the back to make it more substantial.

There was a motion

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 608 North Ainsworth Street as submitted."

Motion: Williams

Second: Schloesser.

The motion was approved unanimously.

## **4. BOARD BRIEFINGS**

### **A. 723 North M Street (North Slope Historic District)**

#### *Roof*

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

## **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1919, this property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. On March 22, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the owners' desire to increase the roof height, which is generally discouraged by the district design guidelines. The design team has prepared a new option in response to the Commission's feedback, as well as takes into account the various lot size and land use challenges surrounding this property. Most notably, the overall height has been reduced significantly and the front dormer proposed earlier has been removed from the proposed design.

## **ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Ms. Hoogkamer noted that the applicant had determined that building an addition on the back would not be feasible due to the lot size.

John De Loma, MD Architects, reviewed that for the proposed option they had followed the existing roof line and raised the ridge 3'10" from the existing ridge line. He noted that the Commission had expressed concern that the previous design would change the look of the front of the house. He commented that achieving a 3<sup>rd</sup> bedroom was the ultimate goal and that the proposal created a 3rd bedroom that met the minimum size and ceiling height requirements.

Commissioner Williams asked for clarification on the roofline. Mr. De Loma commented that it would continue the ridgeline from the back and would be a left and right gable.

Commissioner Schloesser asked what the extent of the room would be. Mr. De Loma noted where the room would be located between two brackets, noting that it would be 8 feet wide and have a 7 foot ceiling clearance.

Commissioner Steel asked to review the design review guidelines for the district on roofs and additions, noting that changes to the primary ridgeline in height were generally discouraged. He commented that there could be an argument that it wasn't significantly changing the appearance from the street. He noted the guidelines for additions stated that additions should be subservient to the principle structure and that seamless additions were discouraged to avoid creating a falsely historic appearance. He commented that the design was very seamless and the guidelines discouraged that. He commented that there were challenges with the proposal relative to the guidelines.

Mr. De Loma commented that he was trying to maintain the era of the house. He commented that he was trying to achieve the needs of his clients, who were trying to stay in the house. Commissioner Bartoy commented that it was a difficult decision, but the guidelines were for homeowners and the Commission because the historic districts lived beyond the people interpreting them and they needed to have continuity.

Commissioner House commented that after reviewing the design guidelines he felt that the view from the street would be changed considerably with change the roof. He commented that they could potentially argue for a compromise on one of the guidelines, but doing it four or five times would make it difficult for him to vote in support of the proposal.

Chair Pratt commented that she felt that it would be difficult to visualize the end result from the side view.

Commissioner Williams clarified that it would be a flat roof continuing back. Mr. De Loma commented on what features would be removed and which would remain.

Commissioner Steel commented that the proposed addition would be good outside of the district, but inside the district they were bound by the guidelines and it did not meet them.

## 5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### A. LINK Artist Selection Update

The LINK artist selection update was discussed as part of item 3.A.

### B. Historic Preservation Awards

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed that nominees and the award categories. After deliberation, Commissioners concurred with including the following categories for awards: leadership, organization, commercial renovation, landmark nomination, community engagement, events, residential renovation, and collaboration. The nominees were discussed and Commissioners agreed that it would be appropriate to postpone consideration for nominations that have not yet been approved by the City Council. Following discussion, Commissioners agreed on winning nominees for each category. The awards ceremony would be held on May 20th.

### C. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Hoogkamer provided an update on events and activities.

#### 2017 Events

1. Buying an Old House Workshop Recap
2. **Historic Preservation Month** (May)
  - i) City Council Proclamation (5pm @ City Council Chambers, May 2<sup>nd</sup>)
  - ii) Historic Tacoma's Kick-Off Event (7pm-9pm @ Feast Art Center, May 5<sup>th</sup>)
  - iii) Tacoma Historical Society's Historic Homes Tour (May 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup>)
  - iv) Amazing Preservation Race (11am @ UWT Stairs, May 7<sup>th</sup>)
  - v) Puyallup Tribe Reservation Tour (9:30am @ 9<sup>th</sup> Street/Market Street, May 18<sup>th</sup>)
  - vi) Historic Preservation Awards and Maritime History Walking Tour(1pm @ Slavonian Hall, May 20<sup>th</sup>)
  - vii) Cycles on the Foss: Environmental History Bike Tour (5pm @ Foss Waterway Seaport, May 26<sup>th</sup>)
3. Northeast Tacoma Tour (12pm @ Dash Point Elementary, June 3<sup>rd</sup>)

4. Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Youth Heritage Program: Maritime Heritage (July 11<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup>)
5. South Tacoma Walking Tour (10am TBD, August 12<sup>th</sup>)
6. Walking Tour (10am TBD, September 9<sup>th</sup>)
7. Social Justice Bus Tour (TBD September 30<sup>th</sup>)
8. Prairie Line Trail Arts Symposium (October 19<sup>th</sup> TBD)
9. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance (Tour: 5pm; Dance: 6-9pm @ Browns Point Improvement Club, November 3<sup>rd</sup>)

## 6. CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. McKnight reported on the Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability meeting where the landmark recommendation for Cushman Substation was discussed. He reviewed that there had been public testimony from the North End in support of the nomination of the interior space and discussion of possible uses. The Committee forwarded the nomination with the Commission's recommendation to Council with the expectation that there would be amendments later on in the process. Mr. McKnight commented that they might want to go to the Council Study Session prior to it going to Council, adding that they would be drafting a resolution of the Commission's nomination. Discussion ensued on concerns related to how future uses of site were discussed relative to the nomination. Chair Pratt commented that she would edit the Historic Preservation Month proclamation to emphasize the economic benefits of historic preservation.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.