

Members

Chris Granfield, *Chair*
Katie Chase, *Vice-Chair*
Duke York
Jonah Jensen
Lysa Schloesser
James Steel
Jeff Williams
Eugene Thorne
Laureen Skrivan
Ross Buffington, *Wedge Neighborhood Ex-Officio*
Marshall McClintock, *North Slope Ex-Officio*

Staff

Reuben McKnight, *Historic Preservation Officer*
Lauren Hoogkamer, *Historic Preservation Coordinator*

Draft

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department



Date: March 11, 2015

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Commission Members in Attendance:

Chris Granfield, *Chair*
Duke York
Eugene Thorne
Laureen Skrivan
Jonah Jensen
Jeff Williams
James Steel
Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer
John Griffith

Others Present:

Su Dowie
Les Tonkin
Mike McDougal
George Lenes
David Kelley
Kevin McKee
Diana Painter

Commission Members Absent:

Katie Chase, *Vice Chair*
Lysa Schloesser
Ross Buffington

Chair Chris Granfield called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes 2/25/15

The minutes of 2/25/15 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

- C. Administrative Review

3. NAMING REQUESTS— FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- A. Proposed George Weyerhaeuser Jr. Park

Mr. Reuben McKnight cited the City Council policy on name change requests and read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The Foss Waterway Development Authority (FWDA) has requested to name the park at 1955, 2101 and 2119 Dock Street the George H. Weyerhaeuser, Jr. Park. The park consists of three parcels on either side of the 509 Bridge. Two of the parcels are owned by FWDA and one parcel is owned by the City of Tacoma. The currently unnamed park was built in 2009. This was the site of a butter tub factory, which became Harmon cabinets and later burned down in the early 1990s. George H. Weyerhaeuser, Jr., served on the boards of the FWDA and the Museum of Glass from 1999 until his death on April 14, 2013. Aside from being part of the Weyerhaeuser Company family, he was influential in the development of the Foss Waterway as a founding trustee of the Museum of Glass, as the FWDA Board President from 2001 to 2004, and as the chairman and president of the Urban Design Review Committee. According to the materials submitted with the request, the Waterway is a direct result of his widely recognized advocacy and leadership. The FWDA has collected letters of support from the community, neighborhood groups, and local institutions. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has also accepted comments and letters during the comment period following the public hearing on January 28, 2015.

STANDARDS

Criteria for name changes are outlined in the City Policy on Place Names and Name Changes, adopted by City Council Resolution 38091 (attached).

FINDINGS

1. Pursuant to Council Resolution 38091, the Landmarks Preservation Commission reviews and makes recommendations to City Council on name change requests.
2. A written request from the Foss Waterway Development Authority Board of Directors was submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission on October 27, 2014, to name the park at 1955, 2101 and 2119 Dock Street the George H. Weyerhaeuser, Jr. Park.
3. On December 10, 2014, the Landmarks Preservation Commission determined the proposal was complete and scheduled the public hearing.
4. On January 28, 2015, the Landmarks Preservation Commission held a public hearing to take testimony on this item.
5. Ten written comments were received and one individual commented at the hearing. All comments were in favor of the proposal.
6. The following Name Change criteria were identified in consideration of the proposed name change:
 - a. No existing buildings or facilities are named for George H. Weyerhaeuser.
 - b. George H. Weyerhaeuser passed away on April 14, 2013.
 - c. For reasons stated in the request proposal, George H. Weyerhaeuser contributed greatly to the development of the Foss Waterway and is of citywide significance.
 - d. The park is currently unnamed.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the above, the name change meets the criteria in City Council Resolution 38091 for Name Changes.

ACTION REQUESTED

The Commission may recommend the street name change request to the City Council, deny the request, or defer if additional information is needed.

Ms. Su Dowie thanked the Commission for their work and Mr. McKnight for guiding them through the process.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis as findings and recommend, to City Council, naming the park at 1955, 2101 and 2119 Dock Street, the George H. Weyerhaeuser, Jr. Park"

Motion: Williams

Second: York

The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. McKnight noted that the matter was also scheduled for the Neighborhood Housing Committee for consideration on April 6, 2015.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Old Business

- i. 524 N K Street (North Slope Historic District)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

On February 11, 2015, the Landmarks Commission approved a new business identity sign for Hank's Pizza and Beer. The sign was originally proposed to project 5'8" from the northwest corner on the K Street elevation, using

steel mounting onto the wood wall. Overall dimensions were 6'10" high X 5'4" wide. The Commission approved the sign with the condition that the overall sign would be reduced in area by 20%.

The business owner has determined that the sign would be better placed on the corner of the building, projecting at 45 degrees into the corner, to be visible from both 6th Street and K Street, similar to the sign that existed in the 1970s. Staff proposed this as an administrative review, but requests for regular agenda review were received from the Commission.

The applicant will provide renderings of the new location at the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the amended application.

Mr. McKnight noted that the item had been put forward as an administrative review, but there had been some additional questions and requests for imagery.

Mr. Duke York commented on appreciating the change in the location and the sizing of the sign which now seemed more appropriate.

Mr. James Steel commented on being one of the people to request additional information, specifically the imagery to clarify the angle of the sign on the building, and that based on the photos provided he would have no problem approving the sign.

There was a motion

"I move that we approve the application as it stands presently."

Motion: York

Second: Jensen

The motion was approved unanimously.

B. New Business

i. 930 Broadway (Individual Landmark)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1907, the Gardener, C.N. Building, at 930 Broadway, is an individually listed landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The applicant is proposing a 143.25 inch by 35.25 inch (approximately 11.94 feet by 2.9 feet) illuminated sign with red acrylic letters and logo. Sign will include a 12 inch by 53 inch red tagline with white surface vinyl lettering. The sign will be bolted onto the raceway of the east façade. No building materials will be removed.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings

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.

ANALYSIS

1. The building is an individually listed landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, as such, it is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior.
2. Sign does not destroy historic materials and it is differentiated from the historic material. It is scaled to be located between columns of the storefront.
3. Sign can be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

A representative for the owner commented that they would not be doing any modification to the front of the building and just would be lagging into an existing wooden beam of the façade.

A representative for Kompan playgrounds commented on the location being their North American headquarters and that they hope to conduct business in Tacoma for years. She added that Kompan equipment is installed throughout the city, including an installation at the Point Defiance Zoo, and that the sign would add to the light and the energy of the Theater district.

There was a motion.

"I move to approve the sign for 930 Broadway as submitted."

Motion: Steel

Second: Williams

The motion was approved unanimously.

- ii. Winthrop Hotel (Old City Hall Historic District)

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The Winthrop Hotel, built in 1925, is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District. The hotel was converted to low income apartments in the 1970s, but the building still retains much of its historic fixtures and character, include the Crystal Ballroom. In 2004, Tonkin Architecture completed a Survey and Existing Condition Report, which detailed the necessary restoration work. This application includes repairing and cleaning the brick, terra cotta panels and decorative cornices (specs attached); restoring the existing original windows on the street levels, Crystal Ballroom and Penthouse; replacing non-original windows with windows that match the originals (Eagle Talon retrofit aluminum clad windows will be used); replacing the built-up roofs and insulation; repairing and replacing the clay tile roof on the Penthouse (examples attached); bracing and anchoring the parapets; cleaning, repainting and repairing the Crystal Ballroom and Penthouse; removing the non-original east shed; replacing the French doors on the Penthouse; upgrading the common rooms; making the laundry room accessible; repairing corridor walls, elevators, and hallways; replacing suspended acoustic ceilings; installing new plumbing, ventilation and boilers; and replacing cabinets, countertops, appliances and some fixtures.

The applicant is applying for Historic Preservation Tax Credits. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this project on January 28, 2015.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings

4. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

ANALYSIS

1. The building is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications to the structure.
2. The historic character of the property is being retained. Historic materials are not being removed. The windows proposed for replacement are not original to the building and are failing. The replacement windows will have a similar exterior appearance to the original character of the building.
3. Distinctive features and finishes are being preserved.
4. Historic features are being repaired; replacements material will match the existing original material.
5. Historic features are being cleaned and retained.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Les Tonkin, the architect for Redwood Housing Partners, commented that there had been a change regarding the clay tile roof and that they would be repairing rather than replacing the existing clay tile. The work proposed would be the first phase and they would likely return with additional work including the crystal ballroom, storefronts, and canopy in the future. He thanked the Commission for their interest in the project.

Mr. James Steel asked for clarification on whether the windows between the third and ninth levels were not original. Mr. Tonkin responded that there are some original windows in the penthouse and the lower levels and that they would keep the original windows where possible and only replace the interior windows where needed. The existing frames would be retained. Mr. Steel asked what material the new sill liner would use. Mr. Tonkin responded that it would be aluminum painted to match and the rest of the window. The existing frame and trim would be painted to match as well.

Mr. Jonah Jensen asked how the contractor would go about repairing the roof. Mr. Tonkin responded that he hadn't inquired as to the methods, but in other repairs they would take the tiles off and reattach them. He added that they would replace with matching tiles where the tiles were cracked.

There was a motion

"I move for approval of the application."

Motion: York

Second: Thorne

The motion was approved unanimously.

iii. 515 N Ainsworth (North Slope Historic District)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

515 N Ainsworth, built in 1907, is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing demolishing the existing 16' X 20' wood deck—which is failing due to water damage—and replacing it with a new deck that is 16' X 28'. The new deck will use the existing handrails and redwood decking material.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Design Guidelines for the Wedge Neighborhood and North Slope Historic Special Review Districts Guidelines for Additions

1. **Architectural style should be compatible** with the era and style of the principal structure, including massing, window patterning, scale of individual elements, cladding, roof form, and exterior materials.
2. **Additions should be removable** in the future without harming the character defining elements on the principal structure.
3. **Additions should be sensitively located** in a manner that minimizes visibility from primary rights of way. Where this is not possible, the design should respect the style, scale, massing, rhythm, and materials or the original building.
4. **An addition should be subservient** in size, scale and location to the principal structure.
5. **Seamless additions are discouraged.** There should be a clear visual break between the old structure and the new, such as a reduced size or footprint or a break in the wall plane, to avoid creating a falsely historic appearance (such that the original, historic portion of the house can be distinguished from the new, non-historic addition).

ANALYSIS

1. The building is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The design will replicate the existing deck.
3. The new deck is removable in the future without compromising the integrity of the home.
4. The deck is only visible from the rear alley.
5. The addition is subservient in size, scale, and location.
6. There is a clear visual break between the addition and the main structure.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Mike McDougal, commented that the deck was deteriorating and they wanted to repair it and keep original material like the handrail. The surface of the deck was a waterproof surface, but did not have a slope to it. He presented a sample of the wood material that he would be using..

Mr. Marshall McClintock encouraged the Commission to accept the proposal as it fit the guidelines for additions. Mr. James Steel expressed appreciation at the level of documentation.

There was a motion.

"I move that we approve the application for 515 N Ainsworth as submitted."

Motion: Jensen

Second: York

The Motion was approved unanimously.

5. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. Convention Center Hotel and Mixed Use Project *Conceptual Design Briefing*

George Lenes, Yareton Investment, LLC

Mr. McKnight noted that the Commission was last briefed on this project on February 11th and read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The City of Tacoma has entered into a development agreement with Yareton Investments, LLC, to construct a new 24-story hotel and mixed use development near 17th and Broadway, adjacent to the Greater Tacoma Convention and Trade Center. Phase 1 of the project will include a 300 room 4 star hotel, with 10,000 square feet of ballroom space, a minimum of 10,000 square feet of retail, and parking. Phase 2 would include additional retail, parking and residential units.

The site is within the Union Station Conservation District overlay zone, and will require approval from the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The Union Station Design Guidelines (included in the staff report) have specific language regarding height, but do not address the potential of a high rise development. Since the guidelines were established, several new construction projects have occurred on the north end of the conservation district, including the Convention Center, the Courtyard by Marriott, and the Tacoma Art Museum.

The project team last briefed the Commission on February 11, 2015. The team has requested an opportunity to present another briefing to follow up the previous discussion.

George Lenes, project manager for Yareton Investment, briefly commented on the project which he noted was still in the due diligence phase. He reported that there are multiple steps that they are going through and multiple activities that are going on to ensure that the project will work for both the City of Tacoma and Yareton. Part of that discussion includes getting the approval of the Commission for the height, massing, and exterior materials. He anticipated that they would be submitting an application for pre-approval in the future. He commented that there had also been some discussion with the City on access points to the site and parking stalls.

David Kelley, of Ankrom Moisan, provided an overview of the discussion which would include the updates to the overall plans since the previous discussion, a discussion of phase two, and an examination of the local history. He then briefly reviewed the neighborhood context of the site between the Carlton building and the Convention Center.

Kevin McKee discussed the history and environment of the neighborhood. Historic photos of the Carlton building and the Warehouse District were discussed and the history of the area was examined. It was noted that the built environment in 1932 consisted of five to six-story brick buildings in a warehouse fashion. Contemporary buildings were discussed in the context of the local history including the art museum which was noted as having an allegiance with the railroad language. The LeMay Museum was noted as having a nautical feel based on the shape and location near the water. The Prairie Line Trail and Museum of Glass were recognized for being modern while including the history of the environment.

Mr. McGee moved into reviewing the design and the changes that had been made for parking specifically to the ingress and egress. The ingress was now limited to a one way ingress into the hotel. They were still looking into an access ramp between the construction and the Convention Center. The ramp system was reorganized to allow three entrances to the garage. The Broadway ingress/egress would also be the main car access into the Convention Center. The second level would provide parking directly near retail and the third level where there would be two entrances to the ballroom. The loading dock had been revised to allow larger trucks to back in straight as per Commissioner Eugene Thorne's recommendations. On the fourth level there was more area for the parking footprint and direct access to Court C. On the fifth level would be the last level of parking on the residential side with the possibly of an additional parking level above it if necessary.

A schematic section was shown that demonstrated the podium elevations and the five levels of parking, with the future residential tower outlined. Mr. Kelley comment on not being able to lock in on a number of units in the future residential building but could say that the tower would have 12 levels above the parking deck. Mr. Jeff Williams asked if the zoning would allow the residential tower to be the same height as the hotel tower. Mr. Kelley responded

that the underlying zoning would allow 400 feet, but that the overlay had a height limit of 80 feet at the discretion of the Commission.

Mr. McKee discussed a massing diagram of the towers as related to the Convention center. He also showed photos of the phase one tower as it would be seen from the street level as well as a from a wider perspective of the city. He also discussed a cross section through Broadway that showed the elevation of the phase one tower relative to the hotel Murano as well as the elevation of the proposed phase two tower.

Mr. Eugene Thorne asked if they had looked into how they would be cladding the exterior of the tower. Mr. McGee responded that they are still studying the materials palette that they are going to use. Mr. Williams asked how the appearance would relate to the Convention Center. Mr. McKee responded that it would be complementary to the Convention Center and not mirror it.

Mr. Kelley reviewed the discussion and asked for any feedback or concerns on phase two in terms of the height and position on the site. Mr. Lenes added that phase two parking would be directly beneath the residential tower.

Mr. Steel commented on an image from the packet that showed a different design for the front façade and asked which was more current. He commented on the rendering of the hotel tower being placed on a podium of a lower scale which he felt was a compelling mitigating element for the height of the tower, keeping with the district standard which is four stories. He added that it was an important design element, being preferred to the tower coming down to the street level.

Mr. Steel commented on the traffic situation in relation to the district design standards that emphasize storefronts, expressing concern about the building recessing into a large drop off, which is not typical of a historic district. Mr. Kelley responded that they would want it to be a gracious entry that could also accommodate a large mass of people at once. Discussion ensued. Mr. Lenes commented that the operations of the hotel would be different from the convention center with more street front activity and that the storefront was being maintained while accommodating the high volume of drop off. Mr. Thorne commented that people attending conventions would likely be coming directly from the airport in buses and that he recognized that they were accommodating the heavy use but felt there should be some additional consideration for the storefront. Mr. Jensen expressed support for earlier statements from Mr. Steel that the storefront should be brought as close to the street as possible. Mr. Kelley commented on challenges presented by the width of commerce street, where they don't want to obstruct traffic. Mr. Steel acknowledged that it was a narrow street, but added that it was lightly traveled and that any compromise to the design standard should have evidence from a traffic engineer demonstrating the necessity of it.

Mr. Marshall McClintock, noting the research into the history of the area in the presentation, called attention to the area having been part of the Japanese community during the 1920s, which ended with the internment.

Mr. Lenes commented on an issue regarding access to the parking garage of the Convention Center during construction. The proposed plan included a temporary ramp that would be in the planned location for a stairwell. The Planning and Development group had suggested keeping the ramp permanently for valet ingress and egress. The ramp was not currently in place. There were no major objections from the Commission members as the valet traffic would be more controlled.

Mr. Jensen commented on the phase two residential tower massing, which he felt seemed appropriate and well placed. He added that the examples shared earlier for precedent were appropriate as they had been built in this era. Mr. Kelley asked if there were any other concerns on height and bulk of the phase two tower. Mr. York commented on the height seeming appropriate given the distance from the curb and recommended a four story design element.

Mr. Lenes commented that they would take the concerns for the pedestrian experience and the drop off area into consideration.

6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. West Slope Neighborhood Conservation District

Mr. Reuben McKnight updated the Commission on the change of name to the "Narrowmore Conservation District". He then briefed the Commission on the design guideline presentation and noted that the goal was to make a decision on whether or not to permit staff to schedule the matter for a public hearing. He commented on the additional handouts, including the overall review schedule with the Public Hearing potentially planned for April 8th. Mr. McKnight also noted that the Planning Commission had requested that at some point in the review process an opinion survey be sent out, a draft of which was briefly discussed. The process going forward would allow additional opportunities for hearings at the Planning Commission level and at the City Council level as well, should the Planning Commission recommend it for inclusion in the annual amendment package. The packet also included a letter from the Master Builders Association and a response letter from the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition. Mr. McKnight noted that during the presentation they would be interested in feedback from the Commission on the proposed design guidelines.

Dr. Diana Painter provide a background on how the historical guidelines and how they were being drafted. She briefly discussed the proposed district boundaries within the larger west slope neighborhood, showing a photo from 1947 that demonstrated how the neighborhood was planned out and carefully graded. Dr. Painter then discussed the history of the neighborhood's design and construction. The Narrowmore Neighborhood was developed by Eivind Anderson and the houses were built individually, occasionally from stock plans. She noted how the streets were designed to preserve views and the houses were oriented towards the west and the northwest. The houses were placed carefully in the topography. An image was shown that demonstrated the progression of construction in the lots. Mr. Marshall McClintock observed that based on the modern photo, there had apparently been a large amount of infill in many of the lots. Dr. Painter responded that there had been significant infill, but the lots were large with an average size of 0.4 acres and an average frontage of 100 feet. She moved on to discussing the diversity of architectural styles from the era from the more conservative brick homes to the colonial ranch style. The site design characteristics were noted with houses typically being one story with a daylight basement. The front façade typically has quite a bit of privacy, with recessed entryways and solid walls that extend towards the eaves. Garages are typically integrated with wood paneled doors. Windows are large and horizontally oriented. Doors were often flush occasionally with a sidelight.

On the process of designing guidelines, Dr. Painter discussed considering taking advantage of the qualities described in the historic report and looking at the existing models that might be drawn on. Examples of communities that have controlled their mid-century modern neighborhoods were discussed. Arapahoe Acres, Colorado was first mid-century national register nomination in the United States and has guidelines, but does not have mandatory design review. Oak Hills, Oregon is a national register district, but does not have design guidelines or design review. Sea Ranch, California has historic properties while not being historic as a district and has extensive mandatory guidelines. Eichler Homes, California has no historic designation but does have extensive mandatory guidelines. Mr. James Steel asked if the examples were HOAs or public and commented that it would be helpful if it were noted. Dr. Painter responded that some of the examples were HOAs. Discussion ensued.

Proposed design guidelines and how they would identify characteristics were reviewed. Dr. Painter noted that the design guidelines for the conservation district would only apply to certain kinds of activities including new construction, additions to footprints, and demolition of existing homes. She commented that the attributes to be considered in the identification of characteristics would include site design and layout, massing and scale, height, fenestration patterns, exterior cladding, and materials. Examples of the kinds of illustrations and diagrams that would be used in the design guidelines were shown.

Mr. Duke York recused himself as a past President of the Master Builders Association and a lifetime board member there. Ms. Lauren Skrivan, also a former President of the MBA, recused herself as well.

Mr. James Steel commented that his digital copy of the packet lacked the specific design guideline details.

Mr. Marshall McClintock asked for clarification on what the Commission was being asked to make a decision regarding. Mr. McKnight responded that they would be authorizing staff to schedule a public hearing, schedule the

proposal, the draft guidelines and ordinance language being the informational content, taking public testimony on that proposal, and then taking the feedback and making a recommendation at a future date. Mr. McKnight noted that the discussion could focus a specific concerns on the guidelines, but that there would be opportunities to discuss the guidelines in the future. Discussion on the procedure and scope of the action being taken ensued.

Mr. Duke York noted that there had been numerous court cases regarding the guidelines and zoning in the area that the information might be useful in future discussion. Mr. McKnight responded that he could provide a summary of the legal history, but was cautious of discussing ongoing legal concerns or current litigation. He added that he could look into having City legal staff present at a future meeting. There was discussion as to the current legal protections for the neighborhoods views and the previous discussions of the Commission concerning the proposal. Representatives of the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition commented that the current code was beyond the average building height.

Mr. Jeff Williams expressed concern about the city being put in a potentially litigious place and requested to go into depth on what the height guidelines would be, as it would likely end up being the majority of future discussions. He suggested that the guidelines would need to be explored in greater depth. Discussion ensued with representatives from the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition defending the need for the new guidelines. Mr. Steel suggested that there are issues that will need to be discussed, but the draft as presented was sufficient to set a public hearing date for it.

Chair Chris Granfield asked to clarify that the procedure would allow the Commission revisit the guidelines at a future date. Mr. McKnight clarified that the action to be taken would only be a procedural vote to schedule a public hearing and the Commission would also have an opportunity to consider public feedback before ultimately making a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Commissioners were asked to comment on any other major concerns with the draft document. Mr. McClintock noted that there are numerous instances in the draft guidelines that make reference to not obstructing views generally or blocking views of neighboring properties. He commented that such language might be appropriate in prologue information, but having it reappear in the guidelines themselves suggests that it needs to be taken into consideration, though there is no method to do so other than roof height. He suggested that they should retain the language about roof height and remove other references about not impacting views. Mr. Steel added that the language "unusual footprints" or "unusual rooflines" should also be removed as it lacks a clear definition. Dr. Painter suggested that illustrations would clarify the ambiguity of some of the language with specific examples. Mr. Steel responded that he would prefer to limit use of illustrations because they are often considered too literally. There was additional discussion regarding the language in the draft and concerns over subjective determination of view impacts. Mr. McKnight commented that the language would be polished and that issues concerning relational height could be discussed in the future.

There was a motion.

"I motion to approve the next steps for going to a public hearing."

Motion: Williams

Second: Jensen

The motion was approved.

B. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer noted that there would be a recap of the training workshop at a future meeting.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer