



Meeting Minutes

Heritage Commission

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Heritage Commission
Contact: Marygrace Goddu
(360) 753-8031

Monday, June 27, 2022

12:00 PM

**On Site at 918 San Francisco
Street**

Heritage Review Committee

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Miller called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: 3 - Vice Chair Garner Miller, Commissioner Kenneth House and
Commissioner Jessica Hull

Excused: 2 - Chair Holly Davies and Commissioner Gary Stedman

1.B OTHERS PRESENT

Community Planning and Development Historic Preservation Officer Marygrace Goddu
Project Architect Sheila Swalling

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.A [22-0624](#) Approval of December 6, 2021 Heritage Review Committee Meeting
Minutes

The minutes were approved.

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

4.A [22-0623](#) Consultative Review of proposed ADU at 918 San Francisco Street

INTRODUCTION: Ms. Goddu reviewed the process for consultation, in which the Committee offers guidance to the property owner prior to the submission of an application for permitting, to help inform the homeowner's planning and design regarding applicable regulations for historic properties. No decisions are made, and the guidance is based on the information made available to the Committee at that time. Consultation does not guarantee approval and additional review will be required when a permit is

submitted.

BACKGROUND: Ms. Swalling walked the Committee around the existing garage structure, and provided information about its known history, current condition, and owner's intentions.

Important points included:

Garage may not have been constructed at the same time as the house, which is evident in the way the roof lines intersect where they meet on the southwest corner; but was built soon after.

Distinctive elements of craftsmanship seen in the main house are not evident in the garage construction.

The structure is mentioned in the inventory listing, which notes the double doors.

The building's design with covered car port is distinctive.

Additional notable features evident on site include the windows and siding materials.

There are multiple structural concerns: roof and ceiling joists are undersized and roof trusses are sagging; there are no headers at doors or windows; the foundation slab is cracking and not strong.

The owner wants to add a second story to create an ADU and retain the historic character of the building. The current design proposes to demolish the existing structure, retaining as much material as possible for re-use or re-installation including all doors and windows, salvageable siding, and lumber. New building design and exterior treatment would differ from the original but be compatible, per SOI standards: the footprint will remain the same but is proposed to move slightly to the east, away from the original house; the new roof would be designed at a pitch to match the house, which is a departure from the original design; and old siding material will be used alongside new, but on different faces of the building.

DISCUSSION: While the building makes a significant contribution to the property, it is clearly secondary as supported by the construction style and its deep setback from the road.

This, together with the building's condition, make demolition an acceptable consideration, depending on the planned design for the replacement structure.

The condition of the building is such that, if not given a new use, it is not likely to receive attention to needed repairs and will be vulnerable to continued decay and eventual loss.

Re-use of original materials, placed similarly to their original location on the building, is strongly encouraged.

Measures proposed to differentiate are very good. Compatibility of new design is also thoughtfully proposed.

The Committee supported shifting the building slightly east.

The Commissioners applied the city's Heritage Review Checklist to the proposal and found that standards 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 are met. The removal of the original structure compromises original historic character, representing a conflict with standard #2 however the contribution of the garage structure overall to the primary historic structure of the residence is secondary and that conflict is mitigated by reconstructing a similar building with similar relationship to the primary structure. Standards 4, 7 and 8 are not applicable in this example.

If the permit and design submissions do not substantially differ from those shared, the Committee expects to be supportive of the proposal.

The Committee noted a few additional features for the homeowner to consider:

- shingling and siding are both used on the main home. Shingles appear to be newer. Old photos may reveal more about original finish.
- architectural band below 2nd floor windows is missing on the front of the main house.

The discussion was completed.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.