

Members

Jeremy C. Doty, Chair
 Thomas C. O'Connor, Vice-Chair
 Chris Beale
 Peter Elswick
 Donald Erickson
 Sean Gaffney
 Scott Morris
 Ian Morrison
 Matthew Nutsch



Minutes

Tacoma Planning Commission

Community and Economic Development Department

Ryan Petty, Director
 Peter Huffman, Assistant Director
 Charles Solverson, P.E., Building Official

Public Works and Utilities Representatives

Jim Parvey, City Engineer/Assistant Director, Public Works Department
 Heather Pennington, Water Distribution Engineering Manager, Tacoma Water
 Diane Lachel, Community and Government Relations Manager, Click! Network, Tacoma Power

747 Market Street, Room 1036
 Tacoma, WA 98402-3793
 253-591-5365 (phone) / 253-591-2002 (fax)
www.cityoftacoma.org/planning

Approved as Amended on 11-3-10

MEETING: Regular Meeting

TIME: Wednesday, September 15, 2010, 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Room 16, Tacoma Municipal Building North
 733 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

Members Present: Thomas O'Connor (Vice-Chair), Chris Beale, Peter Elswick, Scott Morris, Ian Morrison, Matthew Nutsch, Donald Erickson

Members Absent: Jeremy Doty (Chair), Sean Gaffney

Staff Present: Donna Stenger, Karla Kluge, Jana Magoon, Brian Boudet, Jennifer Ward, Reuben McKnight, Lisa Spadoni, Josh Deikman, Lihuang Wung

Landmarks Commission Members Present: Ross Buffington, Ken House, Imad Al Janabi, Fred King, Megan Luce, Bret Maddox, Mark McIntire, Ha Pham, Pamela Sundell

Others Present: Noré Winter, Michael Sullivan, Mary Thompson, (preservation consultants)

Vice-Chair Thomas O'Connor called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The minutes of the regular meeting on September 1, 2010 were approved as submitted.

GENERAL BUSINESS**1. Critical Area Preservation Ordinance Revisions**

Ms. Karla Kluge, Senior Environmental Specialist for BLUS, gave a general overview of the Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance, current issues and potential revisions to be considered as part of the update process. The scope, schedule and stakeholder outreach plan was



provided for review prior to the meeting. Staff discussed the key issues in the proposed scope, which includes the need to revise and develop code that supports voluntary restoration projects, simplifies permitting of small developments, addresses wetland buffer revisions, and provides additional and appropriate successful mitigation options for development.

The Commission generally concurred with staff's proposed scope, schedule, and outreach plan and requested to be notified when specific dates and times get established for the stakeholder meetings so that interested Commissioners could attend. The Commission also inquired about the approach for involving the Neighborhood Councils, to which staff noted that the annual amendments were scheduled to be presented to the Community Council later in September. The Commission and staff discussed the interaction between the Critical Areas regulations and the Shoreline Management regulations and the basic framework for critical areas buffers, mitigation banking, and fee-in-lieu programs. Staff indicated that future discussion would include more detailed analysis and policy options relative to these programs and the other key issues included in the scope.

2. Annual Amendment #2011-06 – Regional Center and Safety-Oriented Design

Ms. Donna Stenger explained that Amendment #2011-06 has various components, one of which is to improve guidance provided in the Comprehensive Plan that deals with addressing safety in the design of both public & private projects. The most well known program is CPTED or Crime Prevention Through Environment and Design. The Plan currently has policies about incorporating safety and the use of CPTED but they are scattered through the many elements. The intent is to consolidate the policies in one section of the Plan and to expand the discussion to include improved direction on how CPTED principles can be balanced with other design and policy objectives for development projects.

She noted that while the City has amended development regulations to incorporate some aspects of CPTED principles, not all have been codified. She also noted that City Staff currently use the CPTED principles in a variety of non-regulatory ways as a part of programs and services offered to citizens and businesses. She provided some examples of these work efforts. She also noted that staff work with businesses on a voluntary basis in response to requests or in response to increased crime activity; however, retrofitting site and building design to implement CPTED concepts is difficult, expensive, and often less effective. The preference is to incorporate safety considerations at the building and site design phase.

The Commission suggested that staff conduct benchmarking and look at successful models. The Commission concurred that safety considerations are important but they need to be balanced with aesthetics, economics and functional issues associated with the project. The Commissioners noted the importance of defining how to resolve conflicts. The Commissioners also suggested that staff exercise caution when making reference to legitimate and illegitimate users of public space, i.e., avoid referring to illegitimate users as "offenders" or "undesirable people," because public space is for everybody.

3. Annual Amendment #2011-02 – Historic Preservation Plan and Code Amendments

Members of the Landmarks Preservation Commission joined the Planning Commission for a joint session to discuss the proposed amendment. Mr. Reuben McKnight, the Historic Preservation Officer, provided an overview of the draft Preservation Plan, a copy of which was

distributed to both Commissions at the meeting. He stated that the proposed Preservation Plan is Application # 2011-02 in the annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment package for 2011, and will include some amendments to the Land Use Regulatory Code as well.

Mr. McKnight said that the joint meeting was scheduled to take advantage of the fact that the Consultant, Noré Winter of Winter and Company, is in Tacoma, and that this joint meeting of Commissions was thought to be the best manner to introduce this document, which is subject to review by both Commissions. Although the Planning Commission is the body authorized under state law to review and make recommendations to Council regarding annual updates to the Comprehensive Plan, the Landmarks Preservation Commission is the City's subject matter expert body on historic preservation and cultural resource issues.

Mr. McKnight noted that a Culture and History Element was added to the Comprehensive Plan, in 2006, which includes policies related to Historic Preservation, the Arts, Cultural Tourism, and International Programs. This element reflected the organizational structure of the former Culture and Tourism Division in the department, which no longer exists. He said the draft Historic Preservation Plan will update and build upon the existing historic preservation and heritage policies and is proposed as a new element to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. McKnight reported the draft Preservation Plan will be discussed and reviewed by Mr. Winter and amendments to the Regulatory Code will be discussed at a later meeting. The code amendments will implement some of the immediate policy changes proposed in this plan and would likely include:

- Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) Title 2 (Buildings): may include updates for energy efficiency in historic buildings, enforcement and dangerous buildings, minimum maintenance
- TMC 13.02: area wide rezone procedures integrated with preservation policy considerations, especially for potential historic and conservation districts.
- TMC 13.05: consolidation and integration of permitting and review procedures for the Landmarks Commission that presently resides in TMC 13.07, with other land use permitting procedures
- TMC 13.06 and 13.06A: may include changing parking requirements for historic properties
- TMC 13.07: technical clean up, conservation district overlay amendments, preservation design guidelines (sustainability updates), delisting/changing listing status of buildings, designation criteria, commemorative marker program.

Mr. McKnight explained that the packet that the Commissioners received is the Executive Summary, which shows the basic content, scope, and structure of the draft Plan element.

Mr. Winter went over the organization of the draft plan. He said that the plan was organized into four chapters, including an overview of preservation in general (the state of the 'art'), a chapter devoted to the description and functions of the City's preservation program and current conditions, a chapter that contains the proposed goals and policies of the plan, and then a chapter, which is currently still under development, that contains the implementation priorities.

Mr. Winter said that it is important to realize that preservation means to keep buildings in active use while preserving their character defining features, as opposed to freezing a building in time. Mr. Winter provided an overview of the plan development process, which included a review of the Comprehensive Plan and an analysis of TMC 13.07, which contains the landmarks

regulatory code. He described the purpose and intent of the historic buildings survey, and discussed the potential for using tiered categories of significance. He also provided examples of improving economic incentives, for instance, allowing including infill second housing units on existing lots to encourage preservation of principal structures. Mr. Winter noted that the current code and policies regarding conservation districts are inadequate and poorly defined – noting that a historic district and conservation district are currently defined in nearly identical terms. Mr. Winter discussed how preservation and sustainability are linked with one another, and provided an example of “embodied energy” calculations for demolition and reconstruction of a new 2,500 SF home.

Specific comments from the Commission included encouragement for education and outreach, especially in light of the Luzon demolition. It was mentioned that the City should expand its ability to prevent demolition by neglect, including the potential use of liens for City-initiated repairs used as a last resort. Mr. McKnight did mention that this is currently a City priority separate from the planning process, and Mr. Winter noted that the Plan does include language about demolition by neglect. It was also suggested that the City consider design guidelines for sites like the Luzon site, where there has been a loss of historic buildings that encourage acknowledgement of the past in new design (not just requiring new design compatible with its immediate surroundings). Other comments included an emphasis on promoting tourism associated with historic buildings and sites.

Staff noted that the Preservation Plan would be an agenda item on November 3, where the Commission could offer feedback and guidance, and staff would be prepared to discuss public comment to date and offer information about preliminary recommendations for code updates.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Vice-Chair O'Connor acknowledged receipt of the following:

1. Revised Work Program for Mixed Use Centers Packet

COMMENTS BY LONG-RANGE PLANNING DIVISION

Ms. Donna Stenger summarized the numerous public meetings and City Council presentations that will be coming up in the next few months and indicated that staff would e-mail the Commissioners a complete list of dates and times to assist them in scheduling their attendance if interested.

COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSION

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.