

From: [Greg Kuraspediani](#)
To: [Johnson, Susan](#)
Cc: [Susanne Dow](#)
Subject: RE: Design review for 1109 N. 7th
Date: Friday, September 23, 2022 5:33:43 PM

Hi Susan,

This response is by Greg Kuraspediani. See my notes below in red font.

From: Johnson, Susan <SJohnson7@cityoftacoma.org>
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2022 3:34 PM
To: Greg Kuraspediani <gregk@eazy.com>; Susanne Dow <SusanneD@fgctacoma.com>
Cc: McKnight, Reuben <RMCKNIGH@cityoftacoma.org>; Rooney, Paige <PROoney@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: Design review for 1109 N. 7th

Hello Greg and Susanne –

We are getting ready to send out the meetings materials for next week's Landmarks Commission, including your project at 1109 N. 7th. I wanted to reconfirm one of you will be able to attend (Wednesday 9/28, 5:30pm on Zoom, meeting link and agenda coming soon), and also bring a few points to your attention. So you're prepared, the Commission may have the following questions or concerns: **Greg Kuraspediani will be attending the web meeting. Susanne will not.**

- The 2 sidelight windows – could these be retained? What is the reason for removing them? Removal of historic material where avoidable (sidelights, door trim) is discouraged by the design guidelines for the district. Since they are original and also on the front elevation, their removal may not meet the guidelines. Please see the guidelines for doors and windows.

<https://cms.cityoftacoma.org/planning/historic-preservation/districts/Design-guidelines-NSW-2020.pdf>

First of all the sidelight windows could be retained with a single door option. However, it would be wrong to do so. There are two main objectives I have regarding the request for replacing these existing doors. The first objective is to provide an energy efficient front door. The entire structure will be dramatically improved to ideal green construction technologies that we feel is an important contribution to global warming no matter how small it may be. If everyone did their part and was properly conscientious the world becomes a better place. No one is requiring me to spend the additional money to super insulate this building in its remodeling but I am trying to adhere to higher objectives. Frankly the historical objectives have so far been counter to this type of goal in more than one instance. I want to do both but do have limitations, so I feel a compromise towards green is appropriate. I come that direction with my checkbook and it seems to me it is not too much to ask for a little compromise from the Historical objectives for such a small issue. Second, I do not believe the sidelights are original construction for this Historical building. So it seems strange to me that they be retained when they were added some time after this building was originally constructed. Third, my second objective is to improve the looks or aesthetics of this building. Prior owners for whatever reason installed the double door on one side and then installed the single door with sidelights on the other side. Bear in mind this is the left and right side of the street facing wall. It looks bad the way it is and yet that is an option I am allowed to take which is to leave it as is which is

ugly. I don't think Historical objectives should include ugly. So I am willing to improve ugly with symmetric pleasing to the eye insulated doors. I hope the committee sees my intent and can find a solution that cures ugly and improves the carbon foot print while still having the historical look about it without a cost that is unreasonable.

- For review purposes, we would advise that you present your preferred alternative. Is the original proposal of two double doors still your preferred approach? I've done my analysis based on that, with two new alternatives (the two single doors). Please correct me if your preferred approach has changed.

My preferred approach would be the single doors with the square windows. This will bring the look of the building back the closest to the original historical look and improve the energy efficiency of the building.

- One of the new alternatives drawings shows 4 panel doors but I don't see any material info or spec sheets for those

I believe Susanne has sent those specs to you and if not, she can get them out before the meeting.

- Changing the original door casings and moulding will also likely raise questions – could the existing crown moulding just be replicated with moulding of a matching profile from a lumberyard, for example?

This is reasonable and possible. I am not 100% sure of what you mean specifically, but getting door casings and moulding more suited to a certain look is very viable and not overtly expensive to obtain.

- Changing the size and location of door openings on the front elevation generally is not consistent with the guidelines – keeping the existing openings and replacing only the doors themselves would be the easiest path

There must be some sort of miscommunication on this one because we are not proposing to change any door locations or openings other than making both doors the same which they currently are not. So the only changes of location or opening would have to do with making that correction.

- If door openings change and sidelights are removed, that will necessitate filling the gaps in the existing lap siding, which is likely fairly brittle – how will that be done? For example, would you plan to source matching material/profile siding from a lumberyard?

We share this same concern. However, we already face that issue with the existing siding in several areas of the building just due to all the dry rot we have had to repair. Once we have approval on door replacement that we both can agree upon, we would carefully remove much of the siding on that entire wall. We would then match the existing framing and enclose or expand depending on what option is allowed. Then we would re-install the existing siding that survived its removal and purchase matching cedar lap siding (very expensive) to complete the wall. I told you in the earlier question/response that the single doors were my preference, but I am actually on the fence as to my preference for single doors vs double doors. Because the double doors eliminates the risk I have on reworking the siding because it would take up the same space on the existing double door and cover the single door space as well as the side light space without siding problems. This is the biggest reason to install both new double doors.

Thanks,

Susan

Susan Johnson

(she/her/hers)

Historic Preservation Coordinator

City of Tacoma Planning and Development Services Department

747 Market Street Room 345

Tacoma, WA 98402

Mobile: 253.281.7445

www.cityoftacoma.org/historicpreservation