

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Megan Luce
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell

Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: April 22, 2009
Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Bldg North, Room 16

LPC 62/09

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ross Buffington
Ken House
Kathryn Longwell
Megan Luce
Mark McIntire
Pamela Sundell
Ha Pham

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook

Commission Members Excused:

Imad Al Janabi
Fred King

Others Present:

Brett Santhuff, Sharon Winters, Richard C. Toth, Andrea Tull, Mar-le Wendt, Mitch Moore

Commission Members Absent:

N/A

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusals

Commissioners Al Janabi and King were excused.

B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 25, 2009 were approved.

1. PUBLIC HEARING – NOMINATION TO THE TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Chair McIntire opened the public hearing and Mr. Reuben McKnight delivered notes on general order for nominations to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

The Tacoma Register listing will follow procedures defined in 13.07.050, and will consist of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. The initial meeting for this nomination was on March 11, 2009, and the Commission determined that the property met the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity and scheduled a public hearing and comment period; at which, the public may enter comments for the record. Following the comment period, the Commission may deliberate on the nomination for up to 45 days before recommending to City Council listing on the register, or denying the nomination.

The Tacoma Municipal Code lists six criteria for designation in Chapter 13.07.040.

A. 539 Broadway (University Union Club)

Mr. McKnight continued with the Staff Report and background information:

Constructed between the years 1888 and 1890, The Union Club, is being nominated under Criteria A, B, C, E, and F. The building is an early example of Colonial Revival architecture in Washington State, and of the work of architects Whidden and Lewis. The building retains its integrity conveying its association with the boom period in Tacoma in the late 1880s. The Union Club was a social and business club with the most influential men as members. The site is an important location for visibility and near other landmarks including The Old City Hall Historic District and The Elks Temple. The building's exterior addition was constructed in 1906; alterations were made in 1924 and in 1936 the University and Union Clubs joined and remained in the building until 1985. Modifications have been made to the bay side and the unique massing and architectural details remain intact on the Broadway elevation.

He also provided notification and correspondence information: The nomination was submitted by Historic Tacoma. He explained that the owner was not the sponsor of the nomination, however, Mr. McKnight was recently notified in a letter dated April 17, 2009, that the owner withdrew his opposition. A copy of the letter from the owner's attorney, Mr. Douglas Kiger, was circulated to the Commission.

The notice of the hearing was sent to the owner and the owner's representative on April 3, 2009 via certified and first class mail. Comments and related correspondence received to date were included in the Board Packets.

The Commission voted to forward this property for public comment and additional consideration on March 11, 2009, finding that it appeared to meet the Landmarks designation criteria in 13.07.040.

The property was nominated under the following Tacoma Register 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
- 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;
- 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; or
- F. Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or City.

This is a nomination for the exterior of the existing principal structure.

Staff recommended that the public comment period be extended for an additional two weeks to May 13, 2009, to allow for additional public input, prior to making findings or conclusions.

Mr. Santhuff reminded the Commission that the application presented at the preliminary meeting met the criteria for nomination, emphasizing a recent visit to Portland, Oregon, to visit other buildings designed by the University Union Club's architect. He also mentioned working with the property owner's real estate representative to create marketing materials that included information on financial incentives, and submitted a marketing flyer for the record.

Chair McIntire invited the public to present public testimony.

Ms. Sharon Winters read a letter of support for the nomination from Historic Tacoma, which acknowledged the importance of working with a property owner as early in the nomination process as possible, in order to provide education and support to owners on the benefits to the nomination. She

stated it was the Commission's responsibility to review nominations using the criteria to support their decision.

Mr. Richard Toth stated that he was the immediate neighbor on the north side of the University Union Club building, and read a letter of support into the record, submitted by him and his wife.

Ms. Mar-le Wendt reported to the Commission that she had her 1945 University Union Club of Tacoma membership card, which displayed her name, Mrs Edward W Wendt. She said that she was probably one of the first members of the University Union Club.

Chair McIntire closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Buffington asked Mr. McKnight why the staff recommended keeping the nomination comment period open for an additional two weeks.

Mr. McKnight explained that at the time of preparing the staff report, staff had not heard from the owners of the building. Therefore, because of the significance of the building and the nomination, staff recommended an additional two weeks for thorough opportunity for public comment. He said that it would be the Commission's decision to wait an additional two weeks.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, find that the University Union Club at 539 Broadway, meets the nomination criteria A, B, C, E, and F of Tacoma Municipal Code 13.07.040, and recommend to City Council that the University Union Club be listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places".

MOTION: Buffington

SECOND: Hill

MOTION: Carried (1-recusal, Commissioner House)

2. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 819 North Sheridan Street

Ms. Cook read the Staff Report: Built in 1922, the bungalow at 819 North Sheridan Avenue is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The house is currently undergoing an interior remodel of the existing second story. The proposal on the exterior involves the replacement of four existing second story original wood windows with Marvin wood replacements. The purpose for replacement of the four windows (two front and two side dormer elevation) is to increase thermal efficiency. For egress compliance, the rear alley windows will be replaced with a French style door with two side lites. A faux deck rail will be installed along the width of the rear second level elevation. New trim on the windows and doors will match the existing trim in design and materials.

She continued with the Staff Report: The applicant met with staff regarding the proposal including thermal efficiency options; the remodel includes installation of such items as insulation; the applicant will be available at the Commission meeting to discuss the window replacement proposal. The applicant's elevation plans will be submitted at the meeting on April 22, 2009.

North Slope Historic District Guidelines and Secretary of Interior's Standards to be considered:

NSHD Guideline Number 6. Exterior Materials. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope Neighborhood 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. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.

NSHD Guideline Number 8. Additional Construction. Goal: Sensitively locate additions, penthouses, buildings systems equipment, or roof-mounted structures to allow the architectural and historical qualities of the contributing building to be dominant. While additions to contributing buildings in historic districts are not discouraged, they should be located to conceal them from view from the public right-of-way. Some new additions, such as the reconstruction of missing porches or the addition of dormers in the roof, may need to be located on the front facade of the building. When an addition is proposed for the front of the building, appropriate and sensitive designs for such modifications should follow the guidelines for scale, massing, rhythm, and materials.

SOIS Number 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

SOIS Number 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

SOIS Number 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. The home on the property is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it was constructed in 1922. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building including new construction per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark
3. The removal of the original wood windows may not meet Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 5, which states, "*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved*", because the windows and trim are original features on the house. However, the Commission may consider whether certain windows, especially those on the side and rear elevations, constitute "distinctive materials" that "characterize the property."
4. The application did not include information on alternatives to increase thermal efficiency other than the removal of windows. The interior remodel will include thermal efficiency techniques, such as insulation. The applicant will be available to speak with the Commission regarding the proposed window replacements with Marvin wood windows.
5. The use of Marvin wood windows for replacement windows has been approved by the Commission. In these cases, there has been a condition of deterioration or an upgrade from vinyl or aluminum window materials.
6. The proposal meets Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 9, for, "*The new work...will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*", because the construction will use compatible materials that match the existing windows and trim in design, materials, and design.

7. The use of wood windows and trim that matches the existing windows meets North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 6, for Exterior Materials, specifically, for, *“Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically observed in the neighborhood”*.

8. Egress is required by Tacoma Municipal Code because the interior remodel proposes a second story bedroom to increase livable space within the existing footprint. A proposed French wood door with side lights will be installed as a replacement of the windows; the elevation drawings were submitted at the meeting for further review by the Commission.

Staff recommended adoption of the above analysis as findings and deferred approval recommendation to the Commission based upon additional consideration of Item 3 and the elevation drawings presented at the meeting.

Mr. Moore made a correction to the staff report that the interior remodel on the home was not a current project, but was in the proposal stages. He added that Mr. Kuntz in the Building and Land Services Division advised him that egress would be a good idea because the upstairs level existing bedroom will serve as a master bedroom; he said that there was a previous approval for a bedroom with the existing 30 inch stairwell. Mr. Moore said that a secondary egress option was official. He circulated a copy of the specification sheet for the Marvin wood windows.

Commissioner Hill asked if the door glass was plain and not decorative. Mr. Moore confirmed that it was a plain glass.

Mr. Moore added that a window with a mullion on the street side window could be returned if the Commission requested it.

Commissioner Buffington asked if Mr. Moore had discussed with the City building department that the rear door with a fake deck would meet and be an improvement for egress over the existing windows. Mr. Moore responded with “yes.”

Commissioner Luce asked if the window replacement proposal included mullions. Mr. Moore said that he preferred plain glass but he would use what was recommended by the Commission.

Commissioner Sundell asked about the different window styles on the house and if the proposed replacement windows would be in the same openings; she asked about the consideration of storm windows; as well as the use of casement window rather than the proposed rear French door.

Mr. Moore responded that the new windows would be in the same openings; the repair to the windows would be added maintenance rather than new windows; and agreed with the casement window proposal.

Commissioner Longwell said that she would support the rear casement window proposal but would not support the rear door and false deck, because it does not match the character of the house and does not meet Secretary of Interior’s Standard number 2, for, “The historic property will be retained and preserved...” She continued by stating her opposition to the replacement windows on the side and front elevations because the windows could be repaired and storm windows could be added for thermal efficiency.

Commissioner Longwell asked the Commission to deny the application for replacement of the existing wood windows and to deny the faux deck and French door proposal. She said that a casement window would be more appropriate to the character of the house and the view from the street. She added that the view of the rear would be readily apparent to passerbyers and that the Commission denied a French

style door on the rear of the house at 1111 North 4th Street because it was inappropriate to the style of the house.

Mr. Moore circulated a photo of the neighboring homes with various inappropriate elements on the homes. (The picture was submitted to the Commission as part of the application.) Commissioner Longwell stated that projects were done without obtaining permits and design review as well as prior to the designation of the North Slope Historic District.

Mr. McKnight encouraged the Commission to consider Staff Report Item 3, specifically, if the existing windows were distinct materials that affect the character of the house.

Commissioner Buffington stated that the front and rear windows were distinctive features that distinguish the character of the house and the surrounding community. He stated that he had concern with the rear existing window not meeting egress requirements on the second level.

Commissioner Luce stated that there was no evidence presented supporting the removal of original wood windows, including the condition of the existing windows, and use of or consideration of other options such as storm windows to increase thermal efficiency.

Commissioner Sundell suggested the use of the front elevation windows' dimensions to design the proportion for a rear casement style rear window adding that the casement style would be in more character with the house.

Mr. McKnight suggested that staff could request clarification in writing on the current egress requirement from the Building department.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, move to deny the application as presented for replacement windows at 819 North Sheridan Avenue, and the Commission adopt as findings, the Staff Analysis Items numbers 1 and 2; adopt Staff Analysis Item number 3, changing it to state that the window removal does not meet SOIS Number 2 and SOIS Number 5; delete Staff Analysis Item number 4; adopt Staff Analysis Item number 5, by adding, "No such deterioration is evident on the existing windows proposed for removal; delete Staff Analysis Item numbers 6 and 7; adopt Staff Analysis Item number 8, changing, "...the proposed French door does not meet SOIS Number 9, specifically, for, "The new work...will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment"; furthermore, the Commission recommended that alternatives to the French door, such as a larger window to meet egress requirements, be submitted for review; additionally, the applicant shall look at repair and the use of storm windows on the front and side elevations of the building".

Commissioner Sundell requested clarification on the motion for the use of storm windows on both the front and side elevations' windows. Commissioner Buffington responded the motion included both the side elevation and front elevation windows.

Mr. McKnight asked for clarification on the motion to deny the rear French door proposal. Commissioner Buffington responded that the recommendation was to return with a rear window proposal dependent upon egress requirements.

The clarifications to the motion were accepted by Commissioner Buffington.

MOTION: Buffington
SECOND: Luce
MOTION: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that a written decision would be forthcoming within a few days and an appeal could

be filed within 10 days upon receipt of the decision.

3. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments.

4. STAFF COMMENTS

There were no comments.

5. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. Design Guidelines and Preferred Alternative – Wedge Neighborhood

Mr. McKnight reviewed the April 22, 2009 Staff Report regarding the “Wedge” Neighborhood proposal submitted in June 2008 for consideration of the neighborhood as a historic special review district overlay zone.

He presented the background and items reviewed by the Commission to date, which included the proposed working set of the boundaries. He stated that the current scheduled item that evening was to discuss design guidelines and district regulations, adding that the Commission is required to adopt design guidelines for the district once it (district) is adopted. He reported that the most comparable example of district guidelines are the North Slope Historic District guidelines established in 1994.

Mr. McKnight continued with the Staff Report presenting the purpose of design guidelines, which would serve several functions; he provided examples of design-based or project-type approaches to guidelines; he described several compatibility elements with the neighboring North Slope Historic District and covered the regulations and exemptions of the North Slope and requests for exemption for the Wedge Neighborhood. He also reviewed proposed Conservation Districts and Non Residential Areas regarding guidelines.

Staff recommended the Commission’s consideration of adapting the North Slope Historic District guidelines for the Wedge District, including amendments for nonresidential buildings and other exemptions, with the recommendation that these guidelines be reviewed at a later date for both districts.

Staff also recommended specific language should be incorporated to better address new construction for nonresidential uses and structures within the district and proposed conservation areas.

Mr. McKnight stated that the proposed design guidelines, as the other items previously adopted by the Commission would be considered a working set, and not an approved final set of proposals.

Commissioner Buffington asked for clarification on the original Wedge Neighborhood request that excluded non-residential and commercial properties from designation, but a number of apartment buildings would be considered contributing structures within the proposed district. He asked if the guidelines would apply to the apartment complexes.

Mr. McKnight stated that non-residential and commercial properties included multi-family buildings or historic multi-family uses in the residential category. He said that there could be clarification on the language to specifically address multi-family buildings.

Mr. McKnight stated that at the next meeting, these recommendations would be prepared as a package, including the description, boundaries, map, and other elements of the proposal. He also stated that the design guidelines did not have to be included at that time.

Commissioner Sundell asked if there was a plan to review the North Slope Historic District Guidelines. Mr. McKnight stated that this was not on the current work program, although there was interest. Commissioner Longwell reported that the North Slope Historic District Neighborhood Board was interested in consistency with the Wedge's guidelines.

Commissioner Buffington asked if there were persons in the audience interested in speaking to the agenda item.

Ms. Tull recommended that MultiCare was interested in knowing of any written code regulations especially for the commercial and non-residential property, and that this information be included and prepared for the public hearing schedule.

Mr. McKnight said that any input or guidance regarding commercial property for consideration by the Commission could be submitted to Staff. He said that Wedge information will be prepared in a packet for review at the next meeting on May 13, 2009. He added that the Planning Commission would be working on the regulations, however, any advice from the Landmarks Preservation Commission can be offered to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Tull asked consideration of the working district where there were MultiCare properties with underlying zoning and purpose of that zoning such as for daycare and parking uses, at South 4th and 5th Streets.

Commissioner Buffington offered that other property owners make comment with their concerns on the proposal's working set, such as on the proposed exemptions for commercial property and exterior changes that were not visible from the right of way.

Commissioner Buffington summarized the next meeting dates with the Wedge scheduled as an agenda item, which included May 13 and 27, 2009, and the public hearing was scheduled on June 24, 2009.

B. Other Business

Ms. Cook requested available Architectural Review Committee members to schedule a site visit with Staff on Friday, April 24, 2009, at 5:00 p.m. in order to review the condition of the windows on a deferred application from 2008. She stated that the ARC site visit at 1130 North K Street was an outstanding item from 2008, as the application was deferred to conduct a site visit and prepare a proposal for consideration by the full Commission. Commissioners McIntire and Sundell offered to meet at the property.

Commissioner Longwell asked about the appointment status of the vacant Commission position due to the resignation of Commissioner Swope. Mr. McKnight stated that an announcement will be issued to the public requesting applications to serve until the end of the term, which will be December 31, 2009.

The meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer