ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Consideration of the Minutes for November 17, 2016 and March 16, 2017

November 17, 2016 DRHPB Minutes DRAFT.pdf
March 16, 2017 DRHPB Minutes DRAFT.pdf

WORKSESSION TOPICS

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness - 300 N Meridian
A) KnightBuilding_Staff Report
B) 300 N Meridian Application
C) PMC 21.22.030
D) WAC 254-20-100

OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

The City Council Chambers is wheelchair accessible. Those needing assistance with hearing devices should contact the City Clerk's Office (253-841-5480) the Friday preceding the meeting.
Subject: Consideration of the Minutes for November 17, 2016 and March 16, 2017

Presenter: Michelle Ochs

Recommendation: The Board will review and act upon the minutes from the November 17, 2016 and March 16, 2017 meetings.

Background:

Council Direction:

Fiscal Impacts:

Attachments
- November 17, 2016 DRHPB Minutes DRAFT.pdf
- March 16, 2017 DRHPB Minutes DRAFT.pdf
City of Puyallup  
Design Review & Historic Preservation Board  
City Hall – Room 504  
November 17, 2016  
4:00 PM  

(These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of six years from the date of the meeting and are available upon request.)

DRHPB MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Chair Kris Stamon, Vice-Chair Chris Larson, Andy Anderson, Diane Henke, Jerry Isaksen, Chris Larson,

DRHPB MEMBERS ABSENT:  

STAFF PRESENT:  
Senior Planner – Katie Baker; Senior Planner - Chris Beale; Associate Planner – Kendall Wals; Administrative Assistant – Michelle Ochs

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. A quorum was established.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  
Mr. Anderson moved to approve the agenda, with a second by Mr. Larson. The Board unanimously approved the agenda.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES  
July 28, 2016, September 1, 2016  
Mr. Larson moved to approve the minutes as submitted, with a second by Mr. Anderson. The Board unanimously approved the minutes.

AGENDA ITEMS  

Design Review Adjustment P-16-0122 (Recording start time 01:39)  
Ms. Wals presented the application to review and approve a deviation from the required site plan design principles for buildings on street corners for a proposed fire station, located at 3809 5th St SE.

Mr. Heath recused himself from the discussion, as he is involved in the project.

There was extensive discussion regarding location of entrances and access points. The applicant, Paul Whitehill, with TCA Architecture & Planning, explained that the building is oriented on the property the way it is so that the traffic signal can be controlled, and other
security reasons. Mr. Whitehill stated that the inside of the building can’t be changed because of response, trip hazards, etc.

There was a consensus of the Board that this doesn’t necessarily qualify as a corner terminus building since it is set back from the corner so much, but that the entrance facing the right-of-way does not meet the design requirement. A question was raised about signage, Mr. Whitehill stated that there will be some kind of monument sign. There was some brief discussion about the location of the sign, how it would direct people to access the building, and the type of signage that could be used.

Mr. Larson moved to approve the corner access standards as proposed with these recommendations:

- That there be improvements to the connection of where the entry currently is and the right of way;
- That there be some type of way finding to create a stronger connection to the front entryway.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The Board members voted, and the motion passed 6-0, with an abstention by Mr. Heath.

**Downtown Design Review P-16-0132** (Recording start time 47:40)

Mr. Beale explained that the project being proposed by the applicant is for an exterior addition to the structure at 109 North Meridian. Mr. Beale stated that the applicant would like to speak to the actual design, and to receive some feedback from the Board.

The applicants, Rolf Agather and Tammy Makepeace talked briefly about the history of the building, and the design of the proposed exterior addition. The Board made the following recommendations:

- Using the glass along the entire front length of the area, creating one continued line
- Integrate the material into the existing building, make it more permanent rather than just a tacked-on addition. Make the material go from end to end, merging it into at least one of the columns so it seems like a more permanent space.
- Use materials that fit into the original design. In general, glass doesn’t go all the way to the ground, it is usually filled in with wood or brick. Maybe find some historical photos to work off of.
- Suggestion for future plans in case the coffee stand goes away is to expand the store front all the way out to the street.
- Provide materials, type, color, etc., and good drawings when ready to move forward so the Board has a good idea of what the space will look like.
- There should be a wall, and a panel that sits on top of that. The mullions should come all the way down to the ground.
Mr. Beale explained that staff would create a summary of the suggestions to forward to the applicant, and then start looking at timelines and scheduling time for the applicant to come back before the Board with the item.

**Downtown Design Guidelines** (Recording start time (01:22:30)
Ms. Wals gave a history of the creation and adoption of the Downtown Design Guidelines for the newer members on the Board. Ms. Wals asked for some feedback from the Board for ideas on the best way to proceed with edits to the Guidelines. The Board identified and discussed the potential obstacles of using the Guidelines in their current state. Mr. Larson asked if it would be possible to hire a design professional who might be able to help with the process.

Ms. Wals stated that staff can have a conversation regarding the hiring of a consultant, and can also check other jurisdictions for ideas for the organizational layout of this document, before bringing it back before the Board.

Ms. Wals introduced the intern for the Planning Department, Sabrina Gassaway, and explained that she would be instrumental in helping with this ongoing process.

**OTHER BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Wals gave the Board an update of the status on Ashley’s Room, a former design review application that was seen by the Board.

The Board discussed graphic design requirements from applicants and asked about what staff can require them to provide in terms of design plans for proposed projects.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.
City of Puyallup  
Design Review & Historic Preservation Board  
City Hall – Room 504  
March 16, 2017  
4:00 PM

(These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of six years from the date of the meeting and are available upon request.)

DRHPB MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Kris Stamon, Vice-Chair Luke Heath, Andy Anderson, Les Gerstmann, Diane Henke; Chris Larson, Wes Perkinson

DRHPB MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Development Services – Tom Utterback; Senior Planner – Katie Baker; Associate Planner – Kendall Wals; Administrative Assistant – Michelle Ochs

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. A quorum was established.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS 2017 – 2018

Mr. Stamon was nominated as Chair. Mr. Heath moved to approve, with a second by Mr. Anderson. The Board voted, and the motion passed 7-0. Mr. Stamon will serve as Chair for the 2017 – 2018 term.

Mr. Larson was nominated as Vice Chair, and moved to approve the nomination, with a second by Mr. Stamon. The Board voted, and the motion passed 7 – 0. Mr. Larson will serve as Vice-Chair for the 2017 – 2018 term.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Perkinson moved to approve the agenda, with a second by Mr. Heath. The Board unanimously approved the agenda.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

February 2, 2017

Mr. Anderson moved to approve the minutes as submitted, with a second by Mr. Larson. The Board members unanimously approved the minutes.
AGENDA ITEMS

Pre-app: 312 N. Meridian
Ms. Baker introduced a request for a pre-application design review for alterations to a locally listed historic structure, known as the Knight Building, located at 300 N. Meridian, the applicant is proposing exterior modification to the tenant space addressed as 312 N. Meridian.

The applicant, John Hopkins, spoke briefly about the proposed modifications.

Board feedback:

- Try to match the windows as close as possible to what was previously there.
- Try to match the existing green frames.
- Maybe check for original photographs of the building for comparison

Downtown Design Guidelines Update
Ms. Wals gave an update on the Downtown Design Guidelines status, talking briefly about the background of the process, and a proposed strategy for moving forward with the update. Ms. Wals explained that the focus of the update would be on the formatting of the document, more user-friendly document navigation, guidelines versus standards, different style of graphics, and it would include the application submittal requirements and process.

Staff came up with two major questions that would play heavily into the update process, and the Board feedback was as follows:

1) What was challenging when applying the Downtown Design Guidelines and making determination for recent applications?
   a. Acceptable materials
   b. Awning standards
   c. Threshold/triggers for certain requirements
   d. DDGs versus historic register requirements (secretary of interior standards)
   e. Clarify minimum requirements
      i. Shall vs Should
   f. Variance allowance and findings
      i. Administratively or Board reviewed?
   g. Monetary threshold versus percentage of façade
      i. Timeframe between alterations?
   h. Options of pedestrian amenities

2) Can you identify any DDG sections that should not apply to certain types of projects? For Example: new buildings, remodel of non-historic buildings, remodel of historic buildings (age vs listing).
   a. Consider using a menu of options point system?
      i. Be careful about opportunities for projects to “double dip” with the standard options.
   b. Allowing for variety while preserving certain characteristics
   c. Transitional areas (e.g. areas near downtown)
   d. Contributing vs non-contributing properties
   e. Require pre-application meetings?
f. Change format of guidelines to not be by project type, but by architectural features. E.g. massing and then separate requirements by the size of the building?
g. Significant buildings; new proposals next door. Transition standards.

Staff also proposed forming a stakeholder group made up of members from the community, business owners, and architects, Kris Stamon and Chris Larson volunteered to serve as a part of this group.

OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

Design Review & Historic Preservation Board By-Laws
The Board decided to make the following revisions to their By-Laws:

- Section a, subsection 2, paragraph a: Change the beginning office term from January 1 to March 1.
- Section C, subsection 5, paragraph c: New Business will become Work Session Items, and Good of the Order will become Other Board Business.
- Section D: Change “with a majority vote of the entire membership” to “with a majority vote by a quorum of its members”.

Mr. Anderson moved to approve the revisions, with a second by Mr. Larson. The Board voted, and the motion passed 7 – 0.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.
Subject: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness - 300 N Meridian

Presenter: Katie Baker

Recommendation: Discussion/Deliberation

Background: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted for proposed exterior alterations to a building listed on the Puyallup Historic Register. The Knight Building is located at 300 N Meridian; the applicant is proposing exterior modifications to the tenant space addressed as 312 N Meridian. The proposed project was presented to the Board on March 16, 2017 as a pre-application item for initial feedback.

Puyallup Municipal Code sections 2.29.070(2) and 21.22.030 give the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board authority to review proposed changes to any existing property on the Puyallup Historic Register. The applicant proposes to raise the base plate by three inches and reduce the transom windows by 12 inches, as well as modifying the size of the windows. The intent of the proposed modifications is to replicate the storefront remodel, which was reviewed and approved approximately 12 years ago when Pierce County managed the City's historic preservation program. Please see the attached staff report and application for more information and analysis regarding this request.

Council Direction:

Fiscal Impacts:

Attachments
- A) KnightBuilding_Staff Report
- B) 300 N Meridian Application
- C) PMC 21.22.030
- D) WAC 254-20-100
To: Design Review and Historic Preservation Board

From: Katie Baker, AICP, Senior Planner

Meeting Date: June 1, 2017

RE: Certificate of Appropriateness Application – Knight Building:

Puyallup Municipal Code Sections 2.29.070(2) and 21.22.030 give the DRHPB authority to review proposed changes to any existing property on the Puyallup Historic Register. The applicant proposes to make changes to one tenant space façade, by raising the base plate, reducing the transom windows, modifying the size of the lower windows. The intent of the proposed modifications is to replicate the storefront remodel, which was reviewed and approved approximately 12 years ago when Pierce County managed the City's historic preservation program. The property is located at 300 N Meridian (specific tenant space is 312 N Meridian) within the Central Business District (CBD) zone.
PROPOSAL INFORMATION

Case Number: N/A
Applicant: John Hopkins
Location: Knight Building, 300 N Meridian; Parcel #7940400010
Zoning: Central Business District (CBD)
Staff Planner: Katie Baker, AICP, Senior Planner

BACKGROUND

The Knight Building was placed on the Pierce County Register of Historic Places in 1998. That entire register transitioned to the Puyallup Historic Register when the City took over its own historic program in 2011. The building is located on the northwest corner of West Stewart and Meridian, and the property is zoned Central Business District (CBD). The building currently houses a number of retail tenant spaces.

From the historic property inventory narrative:

The building was originally constructed in 1910 by Edward Knight as part of the commercial core of Puyallup. Mr. Knight started various auto-related businesses, including a garage/auto repair shop and a truck sales business. In the mid-1920’s, the Mueller-Harkins Motor Company was located on the first floor of the building.

This two-story brick building is sited on a corner, with primary facades on the east and south. The building is clad with brick laid in Flemish bond. The corner is clipped and provides for a corner entrance. A continuous transom band runs above the storefronts. Second-story windows are paired, one-over-one double-hung wood windows with transoms above. These transoms have a starburst muntin pattern. The corner window at the second story features a window set into an arched opening, with a fanlight above. A belt course runs above the second story level.

The application before the Board is to raise the base plate by three inches and reduce the transom windows by 12 inches, as well as modifying the size of the windows. The intent of the proposed modifications is to replicate the storefront remodel, which was reviewed and approved approximately 12 years ago when Pierce County managed the City’s historic preservation program. For more information about the proposed project, please see the attached application.

REQUESTED ACTION

Approval of the following:

(a) Modifications to one storefront along the east façade to match the other storefronts, including new glass and window/storefront surrounding.

STANDARDS

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties:

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.
Washington state advisory council’s standards for the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic properties, WAC 254-20-100 (1)

(b) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

(j) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

STAFF ANALYSIS

1) Changes to any existing property on the Puyallup historic register are subject to Design Review and Historic Preservation Board review per PMC 21.22.030.

2) In reviewing the Interior’s standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties and the WAC standards for rehabilitation, staff notes that the proposed alteration appears to not destroy the building’s historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. In addition, the proposed work will be differentiated from the old in scale and material type, while appearing to still be compatible with the historic structure. The proposed alterations could be removed, and the essential form and character of the original structure would be maintained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Per PMC 21.22.030(3)(c), the Board may issue a decision to either approve, deny, or approve with modification or conditions. Based on the above findings, staff believes the proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties and therefore recommends the Board approve this proposal.

Attachments:
1 – Certificate of Appropriateness Application
2 – Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
3 – Puyallup Municipal Code Section 21.22.030
City of Puyallup
Certificate of Appropriateness

☐ Request for Review
☐ Request for Waiver

PMC Chapter 21.22 – Historic Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME OF PROJECT:

Do the proposed changes require a building permit? ☑ Yes ☐ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor's Parcel #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I (WE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hopkins</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do hereby affirm and certify, under penalty of perjury, that I am one (or more) of the owners or owner under contract of the herein described property and that the foregoing statements and answers are in all respects true and correct on my information and belief as to those matter, I believe to be true.
Project Classification (check all boxes that apply to your project)

☐ Conceptual Review (Pre-application meeting): Discuss with the Design Review & Historic Preservation Board preliminary design ideas for a project. The Board will address the appropriateness of the proposal and provide design guidance.

☐ New Construction: Construction of a new building, additions, garages, sheds, fences, gazebos, or other structures on a designated property.

☐ Exterior Building Alteration: Includes all exterior changes to an existing building excluding ordinary repair and maintenance.

☐ Site Alterations: Removing, adding or changing site features that will alter the appearance of the property. Site features include, but are not limited to, roads, fencing, retaining walls, walks, patios, and in the case of cemeteries, grave markers and plot demarcations. Site alteration includes tree removal, land clearing, landscaping, grading and filling.

☐ Signs or Graphics: Installation of a sign or graphic on a building, or on the land parcel of record.

☐ Demolition: Removal of any building structure or portion of a structure on the parcel of record. For all demolitions, the applicant must include a written reason for the demolition, proposed plans for the site, and a time frame for project initiation and completion.

☐ Special Valuation Project: An owner of a Puyallup Registered property can apply for a for a 10-year property tax reduction based on the amount spent on an approved project. The minimum amount for the qualifying project rehabilitation is 25% of the building's value before work was begun. Once approval is granted, the property continues to be assessed on the normal schedule, but the amount spent on the rehabilitation is subtracted for a period of 10 years. This special valuation is available on current work, or projects completed within the last 2 years.

☐ Other: ____________________________

☐ Other: ____________________________
Work Description (please type or print legibly)

The information you provide to the DRHPB is all they will have of your design. It must accurately illustrate what you have in mind. Consult The Secretary of the Interiors Standards and Guidelines for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction for Historic Properties (www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/) for more detailed information.

Describe the proposed changes to the registered structure in detail below, including a written description of information on building material proposed for removal and/or replacement, and stated reasons for removal or replacement as opposed to repair and retention, changes to door and window design (fenestration), changes to siding, trim, and architectural detailing, and changes to the existing massing or form of the building, including additions, demolitions, roof modifications, and enclosure of porches, decks, etc.
Attach additional sheets as needed.

PROJECT IS TO MODIFY FACADE AT 312 N MERIDIAN

ALTERATIONS WILL MATCH OTHER STORE FRONTS ON THE SAME BUILDING (APPROVED WITH PREVIOUS HISTORIC REMODEL. MATERIALS ARE THE SAME WOOD, SINGLE PANE GLASS AND CONCRETE BOARD (BELOW THE WINDOWS.

FRAMING WILL BE STANDARD AND THEN

GLASS MEASURED AND CUT TO FIT

PAINT IS A RUBBERIZED TEXTURED COATING FOR THE BASE COLOUR AND STANDARD EXTENSION FOR THE BALANCE
Materials to Submit with Application

Color Photos: 35mm or digital only. Polaroids will not be accepted. Include photos of each side of the structures to be altered and close-ups of the specific areas on site to be changed.

Drawings for conceptual review, new construction or graphic/signage:
Ten complete sets must be submitted. One set of drawings must be 11” by 17” size or smaller for the Board’s record.

Plans MUST include:

- Name of property owner
- Address of project including lot and block
- Tax parcel number
- A written description of proposed cleaning, refinishing or resurfacing techniques, explaining how historic materials will be protected and preserved
- A description of existing exterior building colors, original building colors (if known) and proposed building colors
- **Four elevations**: drawings of front, back, and both sides; elevations must be labeled as to orientation with all materials and colors labeled, and be a minimum of one-quarter inch scale.
- **Site plan**: A site plan must be included for new construction, additions, signs/graphics, demolition, fencing and site alterations. The site plan shall show all existing structures and or/features, and their relationship to proposed work, property lines, a North arrow; fencing; retaining walls, utilities, and landscaping features.

Material Samples/Manufacturers’ Brochures: Material samples and brochures that show and describe the materials to be used (i.e. paint chips, brochures on doors, outdoor equipment, window, etc.)
TRANSON WINDOWS
CHANGE 4' → 3'
TO MATCH OTHERS.
SIGN AREA
CHANGE 1' → 2'.

2 WINDOWS
EACH SIDE
TO MATCH
OTHERS.
BASE 15'' → 18''
FOR SAFETY.
KNIGHT BUILDING 312
UNCHANGED SITE PLAN

REVISED PLACING

T.A. SPACE
312

ALCOVE UNCHANGED 2'.7"

5'.4.11

MERIDIAN

ALLEY
Materials To Match:

- 2x4 Framing
- Concrete Board Exterior Cover (Grayton)
- Exterior Rubbed and Textured Paint Coating
- Windows - Hand Framed Single Pane Glazing Sizoed to Match Others (No Pretints - All Custom Glazing)
- Trim To Match - Exterior Wood (Cedar)
21.22.030 Review of changes to properties on Puyallup historic register.

(1) Review Required. No person shall change the use, construct any new building or structure, or reconstruct, alter, restore, remodel, repair, move, or demolish any existing property on the Puyallup historic register without review by the board and without receipt of a certificate of appropriateness, or in the case of demolition, a waiver, as a result of the review.

(a) Prior to the commencement of any work on a property that is on the Puyallup historic register, the owner must request and receive a certificate of appropriateness from the board for the proposed work. Violation of this rule shall be grounds for the board to review the property for removal from the register.

(b) Prior to whole or partial demolition of a property that is on the Puyallup historic register, the owner must request and receive a waiver of a certificate of appropriateness.

(c) The review required in this section shall apply to all features of the property, interior and exterior, which contribute to the property’s designation on the register and are listed on the nomination form. The information required for board review of the proposed changes is established in rules.

(d) All other applicable building, development, zoning and similar regulations apply in addition to the requirements of this subsection.

(2) Exemptions. A certificate of appropriateness is not required for ordinary repair and maintenance and emergency repair as such terms are defined in PMC 21.22.015. Property owners are encouraged to consult with city staff prior to commencing such exempt activities to ensure that they do not compromise or jeopardize the historic register designation.

(3) Review Process for Certificate of Appropriateness or Waiver.

(a) A completed application for a certificate of appropriateness or waiver shall include the following:

(i) A completed application on a form provided by the development services department, including any required application and processing fee established in the city’s fee schedule;

(ii) A written description of the existing use of the registered structure and the proposed use of the registered structure;

(iii) Comprehensive exterior photographs showing all exterior facades of the registered structures, and close-up photographs of all existing architectural detailing and characteristics of the structure (e.g., siding, trim, turnings, braces, window design) and, if available, historic photos that show the structure’s original or earlier design and detailing;

(iv) A written description of the proposed changes to the registered structure, including:

(A) Information on building materials proposed for removal and/or replacement, and stated reasons for removal or replacement as opposed to repair and retention;

(B) Changes to door and window design (fenestration);

(C) Changes to siding, trim and architectural detailing; and

(D) Changes to the existing massing or form of the building, including additions, demolitions, roof
modifications, and enclosure of porches, decks, etc.;

(v) Elevation drawings, minimum one-quarter inch scale, depicting the structure with all proposed changes (except demolitions);

(vi) A written description of proposed cleaning, refinishing or resurfacing techniques, explaining how retained historic materials will be protected and preserved;

(vii) A description of existing exterior building colors, original building colors (if known) and proposed building colors; and

(viii) Written confirmation that the proposed work has been reviewed by city development services and meets all applicable codes and regulations.

(b) Permit Review. The city development services director or designee shall transmit to the board any complete permit application pertaining to any proposed changes to a property on the Puyallup historic register. The city shall not issue any permit for work on a property that is on the register until a certificate of appropriateness or a waiver is received from the board. City staff will assist the board in considering building and fire code requirements.

(c) Board Review of Applications. Review of applications shall follow the process as provided in this subsection.

(i) All complete applications for a certificate of appropriateness or a waiver shall be forwarded to the board for review and final decision. The board shall complete its review and approve, deny, or modify the application within 60 calendar days of the date of submittal of a complete application to the city by the applicant. If needed, the board may extend its decision up to an additional 30 calendar days if, in the opinion of the board chairperson, more time is needed to reach a decision or an extension of time may be mutually agreed upon between the board and applicant.

(ii) The board shall meet with the applicant and review the proposed work according to the design review criteria established in rules. Unless legally required by the proposed action, there shall be no notice, posting, or publication requirements for action on the application; however, all such actions shall be made at regular or special meetings of the board.

(iii) The board’s decision shall be in writing and shall state the findings of fact and reasons relied upon for the decision. Any conditions agreed to by the applicant in this review process shall become conditions of approval of the certificate of appropriateness. If the owner agrees to the board’s recommendations, a certificate of appropriateness shall be awarded by the board, and the city development services director or designee may issue permits for the proposed work. If the owner does not agree with the board’s decision, then permits may only be issued by the city if the property is removed from the Puyallup historic register. Issuance of any permit pursuant to this chapter shall not provide an exemption from compliance with any other applicable code or ordinance including, but not limited to, fire, plumbing, and mechanical codes.

(d) Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness Approval. In determining whether to approve an application for a certificate of appropriateness, the board shall use the standards for rehabilitation and maintenance of historic properties as provided for in WAC 254-20-100 as currently enacted, or as hereafter amended or recodified.

(4) Demolition. A waiver of the certificate of appropriateness is required before a permit may be issued by the city to allow whole or partial demolition of property that is on the Puyallup historic register or in a Puyallup historic district.

(a) The owner of such property shall apply for a permit for any such demolition work and apply for a waiver from a
certificate of appropriateness. The city development services director or designee shall not issue a demolition permit until the board has approved a waiver from the requirements of a certificate of appropriateness. All complete applications for a waiver of a certificate of appropriateness shall be forwarded to the board for review and final decision.

(b) The applicant shall meet with the board in an attempt to find alternatives to demolition. The board shall complete its review and approve, deny, or modify the request for waiver within 60 calendar days of the date of submittal of a complete demolition permit application to the city by the applicant. If needed, the board may extend its decision up to an additional 30 calendar days if, in the opinion of the board chairperson, more time is needed to reach a decision or an extension of time may be mutually agreed upon between the board and applicant.

(c) When issuing a waiver, the board may require the owner to mitigate the loss of the property from the Puyallup historical register by means determined by the board, and may include a historic American building survey (HABS) or historic plaques or monuments placed on the site to provide information of the site and importance of the historic structure. The applicant may voluntarily comply with any conditions recommended by the board. After the property is demolished, the board shall initiate removal of the property from the Puyallup historic register.

(5) Appeal of Board Decision. Any final decision made by the board pursuant to this section may be appealed to the city hearing examiner, as provided for in Chapter 2.54 PMC. The appeal must state, with specificity, the factual and/or legal basis for such appeal. (Ord. 2986 § 1, 2011).
WAC 254-20-100

Washington state advisory council’s standards for the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic properties.

The following rehabilitation and maintenance standards shall be used by local review boards as minimum requirements for determining whether or not an historic property is eligible for special valuation and whether or not the property continues to be eligible for special valuation once it has been so classified:

1) Rehabilitation.
   a) Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for an historic property which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use an historic property for its originally intended purpose.
   b) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.
   c) All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.
   d) Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.
   e) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site shall be treated with sensitivity.
   f) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.
   g) The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.
   h) Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any project.
   i) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment.
   j) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

2) Maintenance.
   a) Buildings and structures shall not be allowed to deteriorate beyond the point where routine maintenance and repair will return them to good condition.
   b) Buildings shall be kept in a safe and habitable condition at all times. Structural defects and hazards shall be corrected. Any condition which constitutes a fire hazard shall be eliminated.
   c) Buildings shall be protected against ongoing water damage due to defective roofing, flashing, glazing, caulking, or other causes. Moisture condensation resulting from inadequate heat or ventilation shall be eliminated if present at levels sufficient to promote rot or decay of building materials.
   d) Deteriorated exterior architectural features and any broken or missing doors and windows shall be repaired or replaced.
(e) Painted exterior surfaces shall be maintained and repainted as necessary to prevent a deteriorated appearance or damage to the substrate. Exterior masonry surfaces shall be tuck pointed where required to maintain the mortar in sound condition. Finished tuck pointing shall match the original mortar joint in hardness and appearance.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 84.26.120. WSR 86-21-103 (Order 86-11), § 254-20-100, filed 10/20/86.]