

Members

Duke York, *Chair*
 Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*
 JD Elquist
 Chris Granfield
 Jonah Jensen
 Daniel Rahe
 Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Jeff Williams

Ross Buffington, *Wedge Neighborhood Ex-Officio*
 Marshall McClintock, *North Slope Ex-Officio*

Staff

Reuben McKnight, *Historic Preservation Officer*



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: May 14, 2014

Location: 747 Market, Tacoma Municipal Bldg, Conference 248

Commission Members in Attendance:

Duke York *Chair*
 Katie Chase, *Vice Chair*
 Chris Granfield
 James Steel
 Jonah Jensen
 JD Elquist
 Ross Buffington
 Marsall McClintock
 Daniel Rahe
 Lysa Schloesser

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight

Others Present:

Jeff Simmons
 Jeff Dunning
 Greg Hepp
 Matt Robbins

Commission Members Absent:

Jeff Williams

Chair Duke York Called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

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

- A. Excusal of Absences
 Commissioner Williams was excused.
- B. Administrative Review
 - i. Albers Mill (emergency removal of canopy beam) 5/2/14

Mr. Reuben McKnight provided an image of a beam from the metal canopy that had fallen to the deck below. The building owners planned to replace the fallen beam as well as others that showed similar signs of degradation. The replacement would use similar material. There were no comments or questions from the Commission.

3. DESIGN REVIEW**A. 605 N K Street (North Slope Historic District)**

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The house at 605 N K Street was built in 1889 and is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. This is an application for the enclosure of the rear porch to make a mudroom. The enclosure was installed during the spring as a part of a previously permitted deck remodel (2011) and received a stop work order for the enclosure. The enclosure is clad with salvaged historic drop siding to match the existing on the house, with a new pre-hung entry door and a salvaged double hung window on the side elevation for light.

There is a question regarding the proximity to the property line of the window – if it is within 3 feet it may have to be removed and infilled. The existing home and porch have not been significantly altered by the porch enclosure, and it is not visible from the front.

REQUESTED ACTION

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Wedge-North Slope Design 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 of the original building.

ANALYSIS

1. The home at 605 N K Street is a contributing structure within the North Slope Historic District, which is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. By virtue of its status as a City Landmark, changes to the exterior of the building that require a permit require the review of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to the issuance of a permit.
3. The exterior material, salvaged wood drop siding, is compatible with the existing siding on the home.
4. The enclosure could be removed in the future without significant adverse effect to the home.
5. The enclosure is not visible from the front, and is minimally intrusive from North 6th Street (it is visible from 6th due to topography and the configuration of the corner property).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

Mr. Jeff Simmons commented that the addition had been examined by Mr. John Kendall and Mr. McKnight and both said it was structurally sound. He commented that he had planned to finish the enclosure of the porch to match the rest of the house. To that end he had salvage local materials over time as nearby garages were demolished.

One Commissioner asked if original permit for the deck had not included the mudroom at the time. Mr. McKnight confirmed that was what had happened.

There was a motion.

"I recommend approval of the application for 605 North K street as submitted."

Motion: Jensen

Second: Granfield.

The motion was approved.

B. 719 N Grant Street (North Slope Historic District)

In light of the applicant not being present, Mr. Reuben McKnight reviewed the plan and reported a change from the previous application where divided light windows would no longer be used. Mr. McKnight then read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

This is a proposed new construction of a single family home in the North Slope Historic District. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was presented with the design concept on October 2, 2013 at an Architectural Review Committee meeting.

At the time, the applicant was seeking feedback on the overall design proposal, in addition to the possible locations for the garage (attached with door facing away from the main façade of the house, or detached). The design required variances for setback due to the unique configuration of the lot. The Commissioners present preferred the detached garage, per the design guidelines, as well as provided feedback regarding material palette, window configurations, and details such as adequate eave overhangs.

The proposed design consists of a Craftsman influenced design, as follows:

- Main siding will be smooth faced Hardie Plank lap siding with a 5" reveal
- Gable ends will have painted cedar shingles with a 7" reveal
- Window trim will be 4" legs with 6" header
- Knee braces in eaves will be 6X6" and eaves will have a 2' overhang
- All windows will be either casement or double hung vinyl windows with a 4 light grid in the upper sash

REQUESTED ACTION

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Wedge-North Slope Design Guidelines for New Construction:

1. Height:
 - a. Goal: Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures.
 - b. Guideline: New buildings should be comparable in height to adjacent structures. Buildings that are substantially taller or shorter than the adjacent historic buildings should be avoided.
2. Scale:
 - a. Goal: Relate the size and proportions of new buildings and their architectural elements to those of the neighborhood.
 - b. Guideline: Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations.
3. Massing:
 - a. Goal: Break up the facades of buildings into smaller varied masses comparable to those contributing buildings in the residential historic districts.
 - b. Guideline: Variety of forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the North Slope and Wedge residential communities. Smaller massing—the arrangement of facade details, such as projections and recesses—and porches all help to articulate the exterior of the structure and help the structure fit into the neighborhood.
 - c. Avoid large, blank planar surfaces.
4. Sense of Entry
 - a. Goal: Emphasize entrances to structures.
 - b. Guideline: Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details, such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.
5. Roof Shapes and Materials
 - a. Goal: Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing contributing buildings where such elements are visible from the street.
 - b. Guideline:
 - i. Shape and Pitch: Typically, the existing historic buildings in the districts either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower.
 - ii. Architectural Elements: Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or "widow's walks" to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.
 - iii. Materials: Roofs that are shingle or appear to be shingle, or composition roofs, are the typical historic material compatible with the district. Seam metal may be an acceptable material for simple roof structures. Slate, faux slate and terra cotta tiles are not appropriate for the districts.
6. Exterior Materials
 - a. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhoods were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. Guideline:
 - i. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar in type, pattern, configuration and appearance to those typically found in the neighborhood.

- ii. Stucco, especially commercial EIFS systems like Dryvit, is not acceptable for the historic district.
 - iii. Faux materials, such as vinyl or metal siding, are not acceptable for the historic district.
 - iv. Certain siding patterns, including board and batten and panel, are not historically common in the district and should not be used.
 - v. Cementitious products, such as Hardiplank, may be acceptable in the district if installed in a historically correct pattern (for example, horizontal lapped siding or shingle). In such cases, the product used shall be smooth in texture (faux wood grain finish is NOT acceptable).
 - vi. Engineered products for trim and molding, if demonstrated to be similar in appearance to painted wood, may be an environmentally responsible substitute for wood on new structures. In such cases, the applicant should demonstrate to the Commission, via product literature and material samples, that the product is compatible.
7. **Rhythm of Openings**
- a. **Goals:** Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings, as represented in the neighboring buildings. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.
 - b. **Guideline:**
 - i. **Placement.** Typically, older buildings have doors and transoms that matched the head height of the adjacent windows. New structures should utilize this pattern.
 - ii. **Doors.** Doors should be or appear to be paneled and/or contain glazed openings.
 - iii. **Windows.** New structures should utilize existing historic window patterns in their design. Windows should be vertically oriented. Large horizontal expanses of glass may be created by ganging two or more windows into a series. Historically, the typical window in the district was a double hung sash window. Casement windows were commonly used for closets, nooks, and less commonly, as a principal window type in a structure. Many double hung sash windows had the upper sash articulated into smaller panels, either with muntin bars, leaded glazing, or arches. Commonly, windows were also surrounded with substantial trim pieces or window head trim.
8. **Garages and Parking:** Some early houses provided space for storing various means of transportation, from carriages to automobiles; however, these structures were traditionally separate from the main building and were nearly always entered from the alley rather than from the street.
9. **Guidelines for Parking and Garages**
10. Alley accessed parking is the typical and predominant residential parking configuration in the district. Residential driveways and garages facing the street are typically only appropriate when there is no alley access, or other site constraints prevent alley accessed parking (such as a corner lot).
11. Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Parking areas and garages should be set toward the rear of the lot to minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Where it is not possible to locate a parking structure to conceal it from view, it should be set well back from the front plane of the primary structure on the property. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in the residential areas of the neighborhoods and should be located behind the building and away from the street.
12. Attached garages and carports are inappropriate.
13. New curb cuts are discouraged. Residential driveways requiring curb cuts from a street or arterial are generally prohibited, unless the applicant can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that because of special circumstances not applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of this standard prevents alley- accessed parking. If approved, such curb cuts and approaches shall be consistent with the standards approved for the historic districts and on file in the Public Works Department.

ANALYSIS

1. The lot at 719 N Grant Street is within the North Slope Historic District, which is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. By virtue of its location within the district, new construction requires the review of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to the issuance of a permit.
3. The owner previously received feedback on the design guidelines and site configuration from the Architectural Review Committee on October 2, 2013.
4. The City has approved a setback variance based in part on the feedback from the Commission for the configuration of the new construction.

5. The proposed design meets the guidelines for height. As a 2.5 story residential structure, it will not be significantly taller than the adjacent home to the east, which is also a recent construction. The home to the west is a contributing bungalow, which will be adjacent to the proposed garage.
6. The home meets the guidelines for scale for the individual architectural elements, such as the porch, window openings, and details. The placement of the building on the lot is dictated by the variance and underlying zoning requirements.
7. The proposed design meets the criteria for massing, using elements such as projecting bays, windows, trim detailing and contrasting siding to avoid the creation of large planar surfaces.
8. The porch design and location of the front door satisfies the sense of entry guideline.
9. The design meets the guidelines for roof shape and design. The primary roof is a 9:12 pitch, and employs cross gables to break up the massing. The design also incorporates large overhangs. Composition 3 tab roofing is typical.
10. Smooth sided Hardie Plank with cornerboards and cedar shingle siding is consistent with the guidelines for exterior materials.
11. The window patterning of paired double hung and casement window, with a consistent header height, is consistent with the guidelines for Rhythm of Openings. The divided lights should be external grids or omitted.
12. The location of the garage is dictated by the requirement to have a detached garage. It is set back from the main façade of the house and is consistent in scale and massing with the district guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

Mr. McKnight reiterated that windows shown in the plan set were single or double hung windows with four over one divided light. Having the upper sash divided into smaller lights is consistent with the design guidelines and the district patterns however the Commission had been clear that the fake metal grids that are sandwiched between glass panes is not something that is desirable in the historic district.

Chair York commented that the applicant had made good progress to accommodate some of the feedback from the Commission at an earlier meeting. He added that it was going to be one of the few houses in the North Slope that doesn't square with the street. A Commissioner commented that there was historic precedent for houses not being square with the street like when the street runs diagonal but the houses don't change grid. Another Commissioner commented that most of the problems from the original plan had been improved with the some reservations remaining on the windows. There was some discussion on the appropriateness of the windows with some agreement among the Commissioners that they were acceptable.

There was a motion.

"I move that we approve the application as submitted for 719 N Grant Street"

Motion: Rahe
 Second: Schloesser
 The motion was approved.

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. Stewart Middle School

BACKGROUND

The design team for Stewart Middle School will present further refined options for the main entry to the building, seeking consensus from the Commission.

Mr. Jeff Dunning reported that he had been working with the school committee on the direction of the plan and had finished design advisory group meetings in the schematic phase, having landed on a schematic design that is preferred by the school and the district. Mr. Dunning displayed an image that demonstrated they would be using all three floors and called attention the proposed locations for the learning communities and administration on the first and second floors. They would continue to use the lower floor entrance for accessibility and would have the opportunity to use the upper floor as well. The center area that is currently the auditorium was being redesigned as a multi-purpose commons that would include a set of seats that could be pulled out. He continued, discussing the intended flow of foot traffic through the building where people would be directed from the upper areas into the central space. Early sketches of the interiors demonstrated that they were maintaining the historic arched windows in the performance space. The light well shown in the tour would be topped over with a large skylight. The stairs would be in what had been the light gallery. The arches would be kept, but the windows that had been in them were gone. Mr.

Dunning also noted that the existing rear of the building was being removed and expanded because the gym and auxiliary gym don't fit in the space and having them as separate buildings would create educational and security issues. The section intended for demolition was highlighted on an image. Exact plans for the gym were ongoing, but they wanted to share with the Commission what the impact on the building would likely be. More archive photos of the building and original plans were shown to demonstrate that the terrace would need to be lifted because the doors were at a substandard height. They discussed the variety of options that were being considered for how they would be altering the terrace entry to keep with historic precedent. The options for the terrace and the entry were presented to the Commission including rebuilding the terrace, no terrace with stairs, and schemes with more significant alterations.

A Commissioner asked if a parent coming to visit a classroom would enter the main entrance on the lower level between the two columns. Mr. Dunning answered that it was likely but that the entry at the top of the stairs would lead to the admin section as well. The plan would be to have either of the entrances function as the main entry.

A Commissioner asked if the left door on the upper level was going to be blocked. Mr. Dunning responded that the door was blocked currently, but they were planning to restore the door and make it operational. There was additional discussion as to which entry was likely to be left unlocked during the day.

A Commissioner asked which entry would be the handicapped entrance. Mr. Dunning responded that the lower front entry would be the handicapped entrance in every scheme considered.

A Commissioner asked how much space they would gain in Scheme A1. Mr. Dunning responded that they would gain 1500 square feet, which is effectively a classroom and a half internally. Some discussion ensued on how they would gain the space somewhere else if they weren't using that scheme. It was also noted that windows could be added that would give the admin better supervision of the front of the building.

A Commissioner asked if B3 would result in a similar gain to internal space as A1. Mr. Dunning answered that it would be a similar gain, but a little less. There was further discussion comparing the different schemes.

A Commissioner commented that the C schematics remove the entry stairs completely, which is a defining characteristic of the primary façade. Mr. Dunning asked to clarify that all of the C schemes would be non-starters. There was some agreement from other Commissioners that the C schemes would not be agreeable.

A Commissioner commented that the A schemes, while looking similar to the existing elements, makes changes that make the landscape appear to be washing into the building. Jeffersonian style architecture typically rises from the landscape rather than being part of it. The B options are less impactful to the character of the building, specifically B1. There's the most potential to preserve the stairs that were there with B1. Some discussion ensued about changes to the A schemes that would make them more appealing.

There was concern that anything going beyond the A1 scheme would be something that could not be considered by the Commission as A1 was the main façade of the building. If the Commission were to approved the other ideas the community would react negatively. Mr. Dunning responded that there would be a public outreach phase to gauge community opinion.

A Commissioner commented that B1 was appealing because it resulted in the least amount of alteration removing only the plaza to allow handicapped access. It was clarified that the stair would not be left as they were, but pushed back into the building and B2 would keep the stairs in their current configuration. The Commissioner stated that their reason for supporting the B scheme would be to preserve the existing stairs in their current configuration. Some discussion ensued working out a possible compromise solution within the B schemes.

Mr. McKnight asked how much elevation would need to be made up to acquire an entrance below the plaza. Mr. Dunning responded that there was around 8 feet between the grass and the first level. Mr. McKnight how much of a tradeoff there is in terms of the plaza flooding the building. Mr. Dunning answered that they were raising the plaza 18-24 inches.

A Commissioner asked if they had ordered a stability study of the existing stairs. Mr. Dunning responded that they had and it was in progress.

A Commissioner commented that in their view A1 did the most to preserve the historic character of the building and that it was important to retain the terrace area as it was an important component historically. It was commented that the A series strikes the best balance between maintaining character and meeting the needs of the district with 1500 feet of extra usable space.

There was a concern that the bus drop off which would not change from its location on the other side which might be an issue for people in wheelchairs. Mr. Dunning responded that they have two points of access including a possible new option for the special buses. Some discussion ensued about which of the handicapped accessible entrances would receive the heaviest use.

There was a question as to whether the parking lot would remain. The response was that the parking lot was being reconfigured and would likely be reduced.

A Commissioner asked if it was deemed economically unfeasible to leave the plaza at its current level and excavate down. The response was that the first level did not provide adequate head height and excavating the entire ground level would be cost prohibitive.

A Commissioner expressed concern that the alterations were to make the side being altered the new front entrance and that things like the large plaza were deemphasizing the main entrance. Mr. Dunning responded that it was still their intention, but they had to be mindful that in the morning students come from all directions and after school starts other entrances are locked down and access is limited to the main entry. Commissioners provided some feedback on some of the schemes could be eliminated with B3, B4 and all of the C schemes eliminated.

A Commissioner asked if the gym additions were being done so that they were isolated from the main body of the building after hours. Mr. Dunning responded that was correct and there was a rear hallway that could be closed off to limit public access.

Mr. McKnight noted that one of the objectives for the discussion was to gain some level of consensus on the treatment of the front. The Commission had provided some consensus generally supporting a more conservative approach to the front. There remains some question about the effect of building a taller plaza on the hierarchy of the building. A Commissioner added that what was needed at this time was perspectives to see what the different proposed schemes would look like compared to the current appearance

Mr. Dunning commented that they would need to do a risk analysis of the program space and a cost analysis of what the front looks like. Their ongoing collaboration with the general contractor and the architectural team that would hopefully provide some understanding of what the cost differential is should the program space not be available. Mr. Dunning also commented on the plans to add trees to the outside of the building that could block views of the building. Some discussion ensued on whether additional information would be needed on the trees with Mr. McKnight offering to look into it further if needed. There were no additional questions from the Commission.

5. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no chair comments.

Mr. McKnight briefed the Commission on the Historic Tacoma's postcard project that he would be attending.

There were no comments from the chair.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:06 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer

