

**Members**

Roger Johnson, *Chair*  
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*  
Greg Benton  
Phillip Hill  
Ken House  
Imad Al Janabi, PhD  
Fred King  
Megan Luce  
Mark McIntire  
Caroline Swope, PhD

Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio

**Staff**

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: August 13, 2008

LPC157/08

Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Bldg North, Room 16

***Commission Members in Attendance:***

Ross Buffington  
Phillip Hill (arrived at 5:06)  
Ken House  
Imad Al Janabi  
Roger Johnson  
Fred King  
Megan Luce  
Mark McIntire  
Caroline Swope

***Staff Present:***

Tonie Cook  
Donna Bosinski

***Commission Members Excused:***

Greg Benton  
Kathryn Longwell

***Others Present:***

Bruce Buskirk; Joe Buskirk; John Valentine; Kevin Lukinbill; Annette Lukinbill; Connie Guffey; Gene Grulich

Chair Roger Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

### 1. CONSENT AGENDA

#### A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioners Benton and Longwell were excused.

#### B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of June 11 and June 26, 2008, were approved as submitted.

### 2. NOMINATIONS TO THE TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Ms. Tonie Cook outlined the general procedures for nominating properties to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, as defined in 13.07.050, consisting of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. This was the initial meeting for the property and the Commission will determine whether the property meets the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity. If the Commission finds that the age and integrity standards are met, then the Commission may move to have the nomination scheduled for a public hearing and comment period, at which the public may enter comments into the record for consideration.

#### A. Ansonia Apartments

Constructed in 1914, the Ansonia Apartments is located in the National Register Stadium-Seminary Historic District at 215-219 North Tacoma Avenue and was being nominated under criteria A, C, and D for its association with the City's North End. Luxury apartments were developed by contractors and funded

through finance companies such as the building's architectural firm of Heath and Gove. The building represents a time when there was a major shift to the use of streetcars from automobile transportation and City codes requiring the use of masonry on larger construction projects.

The threshold criteria for Tacoma Register listing are listed at TMC 13.07.040B(1), and include:

1. Property is at least 50 years old at the time of nomination; and
2. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association such that it is able to convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

The building was constructed in 1914. In 1950, a four-unit addition was constructed, which are currently condominiums. The original windows have been replaced, but the building retained much of the original detailing, cladding, and other architectural design features.

Staff recommended scheduling the nomination for public testimony at a hearing on September 10, 2008.

Mr. Gene Grulich reported that, in addition to being developed by famous architects (Heath and Gove), the real estate on which the Ansonia Apartments was built had been owned at one time by McCarver, one of the founders of Tacoma. Furthermore, Henry Rhodes spent his final years in the Ansonia Apartments tending to his roof garden until his death in 1954.

Mr. Grulich stated that it was unfortunate that a previous owner had replaced all of the original windows, probably due to a previous energy crisis.

Commissioner Fred King inquired if the annex would be included in the nomination. Mr. Grulich replied that the annex was not designed by Frederick Heath, but the structure was over 50 years old and an integral part of the original building; although it does not mimic the original building, which was in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Vice-Chair Ross Buffington remarked that the staff report and application indicated that the apartments were built at a time when the streetcar was replacing automobiles. He further indicated that he had thought it was the other way around – that the automobiles replaced the streetcars. Mr. Grulich replied that he had questioned the historian who prepared the narrative of the application. He said that there were automobiles before streetcars. The streetcar came in after the first burst of activity of automobiles, because the automobiles were so unreliable and so few, that the streetcars were the main introduction of transportation throughout the North End. Mr. Grulich wanted to add one more element, in that the intention in 1914 was to bring quality residences closer in to the inter-city, rather than continuing further out to the hinterlands.

There was a motion:

*"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, find that the Ansonia Apartments, at 215-219 North Tacoma Avenue, meet the threshold criteria and recommend scheduling the nomination for public testimony at a hearing on September 10, 2008".*

Motion: McIntire  
Second: King  
Motion: Carried

### **3. DESIGN REVIEW**

#### **Old Business**

##### **A. 1130 North L Street**

This item was rescheduled, per the applicant.

## New Business

### A. 901 North K Street

Ms. Cook delivered the staff report: The house at 901 North K Street was built in 1892, designed in the Queen Anne style, and is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The proposal was to add a rear second story, 10' x 19' 9" (approximate dimensions), consisting of deck and stairway over a concrete pad. Dimensions for the proposed stair, posts, handrails, and landing were shown on the design plan. It appeared that previously there had been a second story exit and stairway on the rear; the existing rear second story door was boarded over, and was not proposed for replacement. Materials include Trex or treated redwood on the upper deck; Trex decking on the landing; treads will be treated material or Trex; 4-inch bevel siding over plywood sheeting to match existing main house siding; and smooth cedar top rail and top corner cap, as was shown in the design plan.

At the time of preparing the staff report, the applicant confirmed that the top deck railing would be 38 inches in height, and the North elevation setback was three to four feet. The code requirement for the setback is 5 feet for a 25-foot lot.

North Slope Design Guidelines to be considered are number 2 for scale, and number 6 for exterior materials.

Also, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation to be considered:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
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.

The proposed deck, stair, and concrete pad are on the rear of the house, which is located on a corner lot. It appeared that there had been a stairway for the second story door; the deck and stairway design was most likely new. The proposal will be visible, but it did not appear to adversely affect the character of the historic structure, thereby meeting the North Slope Historic District guidelines for massing, size, scale, and materials.

Mr. and Mrs. Lukinbill were available to provide information on the setback. Mr. Lukinbill stated that the setback was 3.5 feet. Previously, the Commission had recommended a waiver request of the Tacoma Municipal Code of a 5-foot setback.

Staff recommended approval of the application and waiver request pending information on the setback dimensions.

Mr. Lukinbill wanted to clarify that he would not be using Trex on the deck. Instead, he would use a high quality wood.

Chair Johnson solicited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner King asked for clarification of the homeowners' intentions, relative to what previously was the back door. Ms. Lukinbill replied that there still was a back door that needed to be boarded up for safety reasons and because the insurance company required that it be done. She explained that when the new deck and railing was finished they would re-open the door.

There was a motion:

*"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, recommend approval for the deck and stair at 901 North K Street, accepting the owner's comments that Trex will not be used, and agree to waive the setback requirement".*

Motion: McIntire  
Second: Hill  
Motion: Carried

## **B. 1117 Broadway**

The New York and Ted Brown Buildings were designated City Landmarks in 2003 and are under the Special Tax Valuation program through 2014. The proposal was to install one (internally illuminated) 5-foot oval shaped sign attached with 3/8" x 3" bolts to the non-historic front elevation canopy.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for consideration were number 9, new additions, exterior alterations; and number 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.

The proposed storefront sign will not be in the traditional style with external lighting or individually illuminated letters and will not be installed onto original historic fabric. The sign will advertise the commercial use of the building and will be able to be removed. Staff recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

Ms. Guffey, of Plumb Signs, added that the sign would be rather small and subdued. She added that it would fit well with the architecture; furthermore, it will be attached to the metal canopy in order to avoid destruction to the façade.

Chair Johnson asked if there were any similar signs on the building. Ms. Guffey replied that she was unaware of any similar signs on or near the building. Chair Johnson stated that he would not like to see such a beautiful building being overwhelmed with backlit, white signage if the other tenants decided that they wanted to have similar signs for their businesses. Commissioner Phillip Hill indicated that "this was a very, very special building" and a lot of money had been put into it. He continued to state that a sign needed to be customized to the building, not one that distracts from it. The proposed signage would be "overwhelming", he added.

Ms. Guffey inquired as to what type of signage the Commission would prefer over the proposed plan. Commissioner Hill replied that the Commission was unable to provide design ideas. He added that possibly it could be the color (white) that was distracting; however, the three things he would be looking for were massing, color, and detail.

Chair Johnson further explained his opposition to the proposed sign as depicted in a photograph. He said he was "struck" by the rich colors of the building and nicely-matching street trees, but the sign showed up as "big white oval, with a little bit of color from the green filigree". Commissioner Caroline Swope stated her agreement with Chair Johnson and her concern about "a big chunk of white" being lighted at night. She continued to state that she also had concern about the eventual dirt gathering on the white sign; and that she did not have a concern about the design of the sign, but rather the lighting and the color of it. Commissioner Mark McIntire offered the opinion that "traditional" would be either a shingle or a blade sign.

Ms. Guffey said that the design was provided by her customer. She asked for more clarity relative to what the Commissioners wanted, such as whether or not the oval shape of the sign was okay, should it be more incorporated with the colors of the building, should it be a different font, etc. Commissioner King stated that the introduction of the new shape of the sign on the front of the building was "disturbing", and not appropriate.

There was a motion:

*"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, reject the application for a sign, as presented, at 1117 Broadway, finding that the signage proposed fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, number 9; specifically, that this work is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features enough to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment and;*

*furthermore, we encourage the applicant to redesign the sign and resubmit, taking into consideration the comments presented by the Commissioners this evening; specifically, consideration of a blade sign, consideration of re-doing the massing and color of the sign, and detail of the sign”.*

Motion: Buffington

Second: McIntire

Motion: Carried

### **C. 1406 North 7<sup>th</sup> Street**

Constructed in 1932, this side gable house is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The proposal was a retroactive application for replacement of 19 original windows/trim with vinyl windows/trim in the same openings; the opening sizes were not changed.

For consideration are the North Slope Historic District design standards, number 3 – scale, number 7 – exterior materials, as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

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.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
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.

The historic windows have been replaced with vinyl windows. Previously, the Commission has not approved the replacement of original historic windows with vinyl, based on the North Slope Historic District design guidelines and Secretary of Interior's Standards. The installation of non-historic windows was not consistent with the style that had been a part of the historic character for the North Slope Historic District. The applicant has indicated that the replacement was due to thermal efficiency. Staff deferred recommendation to the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Mr. Bruce Buskirk stated that his son, who resided in the house, asked several contractors if he needed a permit to install new windows and was told that he did not. He said that, at the time when a neighbor asked his son if he had a permit to install the windows, there was only one window left to install. He further stated that installing new windows was “a fuel issue”, as the original windows were not energy efficient. He said that they had the new windows specifically designed to maintain how the house looked and to look like the windows that were removed – the only difference being they were vinyl, rather than wood. He said that the cost of installing wood windows would have been approximately \$30,000 to \$50,000 versus \$10,000 for the vinyl, which did not include any casing for the inside. In addition, there would be an energy savings in the Milgard Tuscany windows, with the appropriate R ratings, which would save approximately 40 percent on the energy bill, Mr. Buskirk said. He said he felt that the newly installed windows were consistent with the structure's appearance and the only difference was the material. He added that the cost of removing the windows and replacing them with wood windows would be \$40,000 to \$60,000. He asked the Commission for its approval of the vinyl windows.

Commissioner Swope inquired if the applicant had considered installing storm windows rather than replacing the windows with vinyl. She added that storm windows on an historic window give a higher R value than brand new windows. Mr. Buskirk said that they had not looked into storm windows.

Commissioner McIntire asked which contractor installed the vinyl windows. He stated that this contractor had often given false advice to North Slope Historic District customers and wondered if there was a way to revoke the company's business license for completing work that they knew was wrong. He said that the existing windows could have been rebuilt with thermal pane for less than was paid for the vinyl windows. Furthermore, the Commission had never approved the installation of vinyl windows and will probably reject this application, he said. He said that he faults the contractor because they did not do their due diligence to find out if vinyl windows were acceptable in that neighborhood.

Commissioner Swope indicated that The Trolley Times (a North Slope Historic District newsletter) was sent to every homeowner in the district, quarterly. The publication has a standard feature regarding permitting for windows. Commissioner McIntire added that "at the time of the permit, it should have been caught". Mr. Buskirk stated that they tried to do everything they were supposed to do at every point. "I just don't want to be made an example for what this contractor has done over the years", Mr. Buskirk said. He further stated that he had checked their reputation with the Better Business Bureau and there were no problems with the contractor. "We are just doing the best we can to make the house look right and didn't change the structure of any of the windows", he said.

Commissioner Swope stated that the applicant's house was a perfect example of a late Tudor Transitional. She continued to say that it was right before houses changed from the ornamented, more elaborate homes, down to post World War II, where they got really stripped down because everyone was trying to save money. "You had a house with leaded glass windows. You have the chimney stack in the front of the house, which is the reference to Tudor, England. You have the arched window above, and the leaded grille glass is one of the most integral parts of that design. That is what made your house what it was. When those got pulled out, and what's been put in their place, is a faux Craftsman style window that's been trimmed down and it changes the entire character of the building", she said.

Vice-Chair Buffington said that the house was built in 1932, so it would be appropriate to assume that the windows that were replaced were the original windows to the house. Mr. Buskirk stated that he did not know if they were the original windows. Vice-Chair Buffington said that if the windows were replaced simply because they were single pane, as opposed to having the wood deteriorated and beyond repair, that would be a violation of another Secretary of the Interior's Standards, where it calls for reusing original materials whenever possible. Mr. Buskirk maintained that the windows were not "in that good of shape. There was draftiness next to the windows and coming through the windows; so it was not just the single pane, it was the structural integrity of the window". Vice-Chair Buffington said that there are companies in Tacoma that can refurbish old original wood windows and make them energy efficient, as well as by using storm windows. He said that it was unfortunately "after the fact" and; had the applicant been told that he was required to get a permit, he would have been referred to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for design review and guidance. Mr. Buskirk stated that he had no idea that any of that (refurbishment) was possible.

Commissioner Swope inquired if the Commission could send the contractor a letter and remind them that they are violating the North Slope Historic District standards by installing vinyl windows. Ms. Cook stated that she was in the process of tabulating addresses in a database on all the window repair companies in the area.

Commissioner Megan Luce then inquired if the applicants could sue the contractor for their part. Mr. Buskirk said, "Maybe it's a compromise that I could get a statement from them that they will give to you that, if our application's approved, they will commit in writing, that they will advise everyone in this district of the historic requirements. So that they would commit in writing that, from now on, they would do that".

Commissioner McIntire said that the contractor was well aware of the guidelines; furthermore, there was a newsletter that was sent to everyone in the district to state that fact. Chair Johnson told the applicant that the Commission cannot bargain with an applicant. "We have our regulations", he said.

Commissioner Swope reiterated that it was unfortunate this occurred, but ignorance of the North Slope Historic District guidelines does not make it any less painful. Vice-Chair Buffington said that in the past three years, the Landmarks Preservation Commission has had six or eight retro-active applications for window replacement, where original wood windows were replaced with vinyl windows – and all of those have been disapproved by the Commission; therefore, the Commission had a fairly well-established precedent.

Commissioner Swope inquired if installing windows in any part of Tacoma, not just the North Slope Historic District, required obtaining a permit. Several Commissioners stated that was true. Commissioner McIntire said that it was part of a contractor's license that they must perform due diligence, which this contractor did not.

Commissioner King inquired if the applicant would not be able to occupy the house if the application was denied. Commissioner Hill said that the applicant would need to work with the North Slope Historic District requirements and present a solution back to the Commission. Vice-Chair Buffington stated that the applicant had the right to appeal the decision to the City's Hearings Examiner within ten days. Ms. Cook added that if an appeal was not made, then there would be a citation and penalty process to occur. Commissioner King asked if the Commission had any authority to punish the contractor that was involved or would it be the applicant's responsibility to find recourse from the contractor. Chair Johnson said that the latter was correct.

There was a motion:

*"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, reject the application for retro-active installation of windows at 1406 North 7<sup>th</sup> Street, finding that the applicant has failed to meet Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 5, 9, and especially standard number 6, which reads that deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced, as well as the North Slope Historic District guidelines, numbers 3 and 7".*

Motion: Buffington

Second: House

Commissioner Swope asked that North Slope Historic District guidelines numbers 3 and 7 be included in the motion.

The amendment was accepted, as stated.

Motion: Carried

Ms. Cook said that a written decision would be forthcoming, after which the applicant would have ten days to appeal the denial.

Commissioner Swope asked Chair Johnson to draft a letter to the installation company, and possibly to the City's permitting and/or licensing departments, to apprise them of what has been occurring in the district. Chair Johnson stated that staff had noted that the installer's truck was no longer parked in front of the home following notification of the design review requirements, but had been moved to the rear of the property, diminishing its visibility.

#### **D. 811 North I Street**

Ms. Cook stated that the house at 811 North I Street was a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. In November 2006, Mr. Valentine came before the Commission, and the Commission denied the same application to install blown-in insulation into the walls, which were not insulated. The procedure would involve drilling approximately 1-inch holes into existing siding, which is original cedar horizontal lap-siding, along a horizontal line, spaced at approximately 16-inch intervals between the studs. Once the insulation was blown in from the exterior, the holes would be patched and sanded, and the siding repainted to its original color (white). The application was for the first floor only; the owner would maintain the existing siding and repair any damaged or deteriorated siding.

In 2006, the Commission denied the proposal, finding that it did not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standard, number 10, regarding that the new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and the integrity of historic property and its environment be unimpaired, as the process was not removable.

During a discussion with staff, the owner stated that installing the insulation through the interior would be cost prohibitive. The owner was asking for reconsideration based on information which the owner wanted to discuss with the Commission. Photos were included with the application, as well as a copy of the 2006 denial.

Staff recommended Secretary of the Interior's Standards, number 10 to be considered, as previously stated in the record.

**The following was excerpted from the November 2006 staff report's analysis:**

Staff requested the applicant to research several alternatives to this approach, as follows (responses in italics):

1. The feasibility of removing siding and drilling into the sheathing to install the insulation, and then reinstalling the siding when complete.  
*The contractors that the applicant contacted did not believe the siding would survive removal and were unwilling to do so, for this scope of project. In addition, the siding removal would also necessitate removal of custom bracing for the downspouts, also increasing the scope of the project. He received an estimate of \$1,000 for siding restoration, if the siding was removed, not including painting.*
2. The feasibility of drilling from the inside of the house:  
*The interior walls are hand-laid plaster over wire mesh, which was nailed to lath. Applicant did not want to drill through interior wall surfaces. None of the contractors would bid on this specification. Staff note: the potential to break the keys or cause stress damage to the plaster was also a concern.*

Ultimately, the repair was intended to produce no visual effect and increase the thermal efficiency of the house. The degree, to which the patches would be visible, would depend on the quality of the work. In the worst case scenario; eventually, the siding could be replaced.

In 2006, staff recommended approval. Staff deferred recommendation on this application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Mr. Valentine stated that he worked with Mr. Reuben McKnight following the 2006 denial. According to the applicant, Mr. McKnight had indicated to him that the fact that Mr. Valentine was not present for the last design review to explain his position was not helpful.

Mr. Valentine said that he had attended energy conservation classes at Tacoma Water and Power and obtained a list of weatherization contractors. He said that he had contacted every contractor on the list in order to obtain estimates. Mr. Valentine referenced the 2006 denial document, which stated that drilling on the inside was feasible and preferred, but added: "None of those guys would touch it". Furthermore, the contractors offered no guarantee on the appearance or integrity of the walls if the work was done from the inside. In fact, one contractor cautioned him not to do it, stating 'It's gonna wreck your wall'. Mr. Valentine stated that simply hanging a picture on his walls was an ordeal, as chunks of plaster fall off. Because of the hand-texture of the wall, "restoring it to appearance is impossible", he said. He said that one contractor told him that he would need to replace the lath and plaster with drywall. He said that what the 2006 denial letter proposed as a solution was impossible, because he was unable to find a contractor to undertake the project. He said, "There is nothing really lofty going on here, I'm just trying to do my duty to cut back on global emissions. We're really not willing to go to the ends of the earth. This is about doing the right thing for us".

Regarding his siding, Mr. Valentine stated that it was non-standard and very thin and old, and was no longer available. Relative to B in the denial document, which stated that 'the longevity of the repair to the siding once drilled is questionable, because the patch/putty will age differently than the original siding and will eventually fail, potentially causing significant damage to the remaining siding as well as the insulation

itself from moisture incursion'. Mr. Valentine offered his friend's opinion, which was that the siding would eventually fail and would not last forever. He said that Mr. McKnight explained that the problem with wooden plugs was the expansion and contraction on the sunny façade of the house, which destroys the paint, as well as the glazing. Mr. Valentine's friend also told him that the modern, synthetic putties and spackle, etc. are much less susceptible than the old ones, and he said it was not a big concern. He said that when something happens to the siding, something will need to be done.

Commissioner Swope asked the applicant for a copy of the contractor list. She asked the applicant if he had been given any sense of time before the plugs might be an issue. Mr. Valentine stated that he was told 15 to 20 years, depending on the quality of work performed. Commissioner Swope then asked if Mr. Valentine had been told how many holes would be required to be drilled in each bay. Mr. Valentine replied that he did not know. Commissioner Hill stated that if there was blocking in the walls, he would only get one-half to one-third of the wall insulated. Commissioner McIntire offered that even the modern materials (insulation) would shrink, although it may take a longer period of time and; therefore, would lose density. He said that the gain would be one-half of an R over what was currently in place. Commissioner Swope said that the other issue was that the cellulose would float down and settle. Mr. Valentine stated that he had been taking energy classes for the past two years, and Bruce Carter, who is renowned for his expertise, told him it was an excellent solution for insulating.

Mr. Valentine then asked for clarification of the Commission's guidance and whether or not it was advocating not insulating. Commissioner Hill stated that the point of the conversation was that any insulation loses its R value over time, and there would be a certain point where the R value was very minimal. Mr. Valentine asked, "So the Commission is telling me to not bother?" Several Commissioners stated that that was not the case. Chair Johnson stated that the Commission was not in a position to recommend what type of insulation – to insulate, or not to insulate.

Commissioner Swope stated that she was personally faced with a similar problem with a 1906 home, without any insulation in the walls. She said that one of the contractors from Mr. Valentine's list had given her a bid to drill from the inside on 100-year-old plaster walls. She stated that one of their approaches was to remove the picture rail and install the insulation. Re-installing the picture rail should cover the patching. She continued to explain that during her quest, she contacted numerous contractors. Among the comments from those contractors were that the plug's average lifespan was 7 to 10 years; however, all of the contractors advised her to drill from the inside, even though it was messy and difficult and; in any event, do not drill from the outside. She told the applicant that, because his house had so many windows, he would need to drill even more holes – above, as well as below the windows.

Commissioner Hill drew a diagram to depict a window, and tried to explain how the applicant would be paying for insulation of a full wall, but because of the windows, only half of the wall would end up being insulated. Mr. Valentine stated that whether 20 or 40 holes are drilled, the plugs needed to be maintained. He said that all the contractors he contacted were willing to drill, but would not guarantee the appearance or the integrity of the wall. Commissioner McIntire stated that there are contractors in the area that could drill and insulate from the inside and the results would be professionally finished.

Commissioner Swope said that her concern was that a tremendous amount of historic siding that would be drilled multiple times to look like "Swiss cheese" and then be plugged. Then the issue would be what sort of integrity would be left on the siding and how long would the plugs last. She added that several of the contractors suggested, rather than "Swiss-holing" the building, to figure out where the access would be needed and pull the top piece of siding off and install a new piece of siding – which would look much better than the plugs.

Mr. Valentine: "Who's gonna pay for this? I'm sorry. I don't buy the budget's not our problem, it is. For ordinary citizens, the future is about insulating and conserving energy. You're gonna have – in ten years – everybody in the City..." Commissioner Hill reminded the applicant that the Commission's purview was to follow the regulations of a specific district and Secretary of the Interior's Standards and that they are Federal standards.

Commissioner Swope added that there was also a Secretary of the Interior's Standard that states that "distinctive features and construction techniques and examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved". And siding is one of those, she said. Commissioner McIntire stated that that was why the suggestion of insulating from the interior came about, because the applicant would not

need to deal with the exterior whatsoever. “That’s out of the question!”, Mr. Valentine said. Commissioner Hill again reminded the applicant that the Commission was bound to uphold the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Commissioner McIntire added, “They are not negotiable”.

Mr. Valentine said that he would try to find a contractor who would undertake the project.

Chair Johnson called for a motion.

There was a motion:

*“I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, re-affirm its decision of November 2006, in regard to the application for insulation at 811 North I Street”.*

Motion: Buffington  
Second: McIntire  
Motion: Carried (King opposed)

The applicant asked if he needed to re-apply for design review, in the event he found a contractor to do the exterior siding. Commissioner McIntire suggested that the applicant contact Mr. McKnight and discuss any further action relative to the siding. Ms. Cook explained that if the applicant’s new proposal deviated from what had been discussed, he would need to come back before the Commission. She said that she would provide a written decision via mail and he could discuss any further steps with Mr. McKnight.

#### 4. CHAIR/COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner House requested that staff present a briefing regarding proposed changes to the residential development regulations and the Comprehensive Plan for 2008. He said that the proposed changes could impact historic districts and historic preservation, in general. The first hearing was slated for September 3, 2008. Chair Johnson inquired as to what specific concerns Commissioner House had regarding the proposed changes. Commissioner House stated that the proposed changes could have an impact on height regulations, dwelling units (ADUs), and possibly contradict some of the North Slope guidelines. He asked for further edification of the proposed changes from staff.

\*~\*~\*~\*~\*~\*~\*

Commissioner King wanted to explain why he opposed the denial of the insulation issue for 811 North I Street. He stated that he did not understand why the applicant was denied to carry out his proposal. Vice-Chair Buffington explained that the applicant proposed to drill holes into the exterior original materials of his house, which was against the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards – that original materials should remain undisturbed, if at all possible. He further explained that there are several contractors that are able to successfully insulate a historic home from the interior. The Commission was trying to protect the integrity of the exterior envelope of the building. Commissioner King failed to understand the limits of the Commission. He asked, “If the electric company wants to put in a power head, and they need to put brackets to hold a pipe to the wall, are they prohibited from doing that – from drilling the wall?” Commissioner Swope replied that there was a difference between six screws being installed to hold a bracket, compared to 2 to 4, 1 ½ inch holes being drilled every few inches. Once the material has been drilled, the original material has been destroyed, Vice-Chair Buffington said. Chair Johnson said that energy conservation versus historic fabric had become more and more of an issue in recent years. He said that this discussion would continue during the upcoming retreat.

\*~\*~\*~\*~\*~\*~\*

Commissioner Hill reported that the Arts Commission would be working on Art at Work month, coming in November 2008. He said that the Commission had selected the AMOCAT award winners. He also said that he was part of an art selection committee for the Center for Urban Waters, along the Foss Waterway.

#### 5. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Cook reported that she had attended a Pierce County Landmarks Commission meeting on August 12, 2008, where she went over the letter that had been sent from the Landmarks Preservation Commission with suggestions on the grant process. She reported the possibility of Tacoma having its own contract for the use of the money for historic surveys. She stated that she was in receipt of recent communication, which stated that the Landmarks Preservation Commission preferred to have its money directly allocated to the City, and not as one large RFP for the entire County. The distribution of the \$366,000 was suggested to be allocated three different ways including using the number of structures and properties within the different jurisdictions that were 50 years, or older. She said that Tacoma had approximately 36,000 older structures, compared to other jurisdictions of 200 to 500 structures. Based on that distribution, the allocation could be from \$40,000 to \$93,000. She said that the Commission had asked her what percentage of the City had been surveyed since 1981. She told the Commission that she would research the question and follow up at a later date. She stated that staff would attend any future Pierce County Landmarks Commission meetings when they address recommendations to the Pierce County Council.

Commissioner House asked for clarification regarding monies being allocated to the City. Ms. Cook explained that whatever amount was awarded, the City of Tacoma should have a separate contract with the County to get that money and then the City would hire its own consultants for conducting surveys.

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

Ms. Cook reminded the Commission that the retreat would be held on August 16, 2008. Chair Johnson suggested that the Commissioners bring their own lunches.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer