

**Members**

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



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

**Staff**

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

Date: February 11, 2015

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

**Commission Members in Attendance:**

Chris Granfield  
 , *Chair*  
 Katie Chase, *Vice Chair*  
 Eugene Thorne  
 Laureen Skrivan  
 Jonah Jensen  
 Lysa Schloesser  
 James Steel  
 Ross Buffington  
 Marshall McClintock  
 Duke York

**Staff Present:**

Reuben McKnight  
 Lauren Hoogkamer  
 John Griffith

**Others Present:**

David Nason  
 Dana Brown  
 David Kelly  
 Kevin McKee  
 Evette Yu  
 Jeannie Natta  
 Cameron Fine  
 Connie Guffey  
 Lawrence Aranda  
 Ely Walkowiak

**Commission Members Absent:**

Jeff Williams

Chair Duke York called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL****2. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 2/12/14, 2/26/14, 3/26/14, 5/14/14, 5/28/14, 1/28/15

The Minutes of 2/12/14, 2/26/14, 3/26/14, 5/14/14, 5/28/14, 1/28/15 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

**3. DESIGN REVIEW****A. South 19<sup>th</sup> Street & Jefferson (Union Depot/Warehouse District)**

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

**BACKGROUND**

The intersection of South 19<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson Street is in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District. Based on the recent accident history of the site, the University is proposing installing a row of crash rated bollards along the east side of Jefferson, at the bottom of South 19<sup>th</sup> Street. There would also be a second row of bollards at the top of the stairs, designed to stop a vehicle of 15,000lbs traveling at 50mph. The installation of the bollards would require the removal and replacement of the concrete sidewalk. Work would include landscaping with low shrubs and trees and a planter. Proposal also includes an illuminated plinth with a "W." The bollards would be 10-inch diameter steel pipes, filled with concrete, and finished with galvanized steel to match the other finishes on the campus. The bollards would be 36 inches apart.

The University is considering some minor design amendments, which will be presented at the meeting.

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

### **STANDARDS**

#### **Design Guidelines for the Union Depot/Warehouse District**

**Streetscape Guidelines.** Streetscaping is essential in the development of the districts in order to create value and enhance private development efforts. Proper design of streetscapes and public open spaces provides a unifying theme and unique identity for the districts, complements and extends the presence of Union Station, encourages pedestrian circulation, and creates a gateway to downtown and the waterway. The pattern of traffic routes and open space is based upon the historic function of the district and has a direct relation to such physical features as views from the upper floors of the building, sunlight, façade visibility, and streetscape appearance. Any significant loss or reconfiguration of existing open space and street corridors is discouraged. The following improvements are to be encouraged:

1. Sidewalk paving. Paving should be of brick or brick and brushed concrete. Existing granite curbs should be maintained or reconstructed, where possible.
2. Street paving. Where feasible, historic street paving and gutters, either brick or cobblestone, should be preserved and restored. Where feasible, existing railroad or streetcar rails should be preserved in place.
3. Streetlights. Historic streetlights should be used throughout the district as unifying elements.

### **ANALYSIS**

1. This building is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review 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. Work does not significantly reconfigure the existing open space or street corridor.
3. Work encourages pedestrian circulation.
4. Concrete sidewalk would be replaced in-kind.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Dave Nason gave the Commission a briefing on the 19<sup>th</sup> street and grand stair safety improvements. He noted that they were currently preparing to submit for permits and were seeking approval for the proposed bollard design and a plinth with a "W" on it.

Mr. Ross Johnson discussed the need for the barrier noting the history of accidents at the intersection including one that went past the intersection and resulted in a fatality. As the student population has grown and the campus has expanded up the hill, the need for preventative measures has increased.

Mr. Nason discussed the conditions as they are today showing a picture taken facing the east. He described the T intersection of 19<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson and the row of largely ornamentals bollards and planters. In the past the existing bollards and planters were unable to impede a moving vehicle which was able to continue through and down the stairs.

Mr. Nason discussed the proposed plan to install a row of rated bollards with underground integral footing which would be more capable of stopping a vehicle. The bollards would be installed behind the existing curb line and visually softened with plantings. A large "W", which was still being conceptualized, would be installed on a plinth further in at the top of the stairs. Mr. Nason added that it was intended as another level of safety to stop a vehicle from continuing down the stairs, should it get past the bollards. The bollards would have an ASTM M50 rating, designed for stopping a 15,000 pound vehicle moving at 50 mph. He discussed the appearance of the bollards and how they would be using the existing metals around the campus as a palette to help the bollards to blend in to the area. Some images with examples of the range of colors and materials were shown.

A map of the intended layout of the installed bollards was shown. Mr. Nason noted that in earlier plans distributed to the commission, there had been a second row of bollards, but they had determined that they were not

necessary and that the single row of bollards combined with the plinth and the metal "W" would suffice.

The intended schedule was to complete installation during the summer. Mr. Nason commented that they were seeking the Commission's approval for the bollards and the plinth, with the intention to return for further discussion of the "W" design and the plantings in the area.

Ms. Lysa Schloesser asked how deep the bollards would be and if the footing was continuous. Mr. Nason answered that above ground, the bollards would be three feet tall and below ground they would be four to six feet deep. He added that the footing would be continuous.

Mr. Eugene Thorne asked if the "W" would be designed to be a barrier. Mr. Nason commented that it would be steel with its own footing on a concrete plinth. It would not be rated, but would offer additional protection.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase asked how tall they were intending the "W" to be. Ms. Jeannie Natta answered that they have some designs that have been used on other campuses that are 7 by 9 feet. With the proposed design they would like it to be larger so that it could be visible from Pacific, so possibly 8 by 12 feet. Vice-Chair Chase commented that her only concern was that it might interrupt the view corridor down the stairs.

Mr. Jonah Jensen asked for the diameter of the bollards. Mr. Nason answered that they would have a 10-inch diameter.

Mr. James Steel commented that a galvanized finish would be preferable to a painted finish on the bollards.

There was a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the scope of work as outlined for the UWT 19<sup>th</sup> Street Barrier."*

The University will submit design specifications for the "W" and landscaping prior to installation.

Motion: York  
Second: Schloesser

The motion was approved.

#### **B. 524 N K Street (North Slope Historic District)**

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

524 North K Street, built circa 1894—altered by 1912—is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District. It has been known as "Hank's Tavern" since 1969. This application is for a projecting, illuminated sign that reads "Hanks Pizza & Beer/Cocktails." The proposed sign would have a red and black background with LED lighting and white and red neon accents. The sign would project five feet and eight inches out from the northwest corner of the building. The steel mounting would be attached into the wood wall. The sign would be six feet and ten inches high and five feet and four inches wide.

On August 28, 2013, the Landmarks Preservation Commission approved exterior alterations, which included the concept for a projecting blade identity sign, to be presented to the Commission at a later date.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

## STANDARDS

There are no Design Guidelines in the North Slope/Wedge Historic District Guidelines that directly address commercial signs. Staff therefore recommends consideration of the application under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, per TMC 13.07.320.

### 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. This building is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review 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. Work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. New material is differentiated from the old.
3. Sign could be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Ms. Connie Guffey offered to answer any questions of the Commissioners.

Mr. Marshall McClintock requested more information on the lighting for the sign. Ms. Guffey answered that the sign would have exposed neon on the arrow and "cocktails", LED lighting on "pizza & beer" and "Hanks". The black parts of the sign would be opaque, but the red parts would show through. Mr. McClintock stated that they didn't have a guideline on brightness, but it should be considered.

Mr. James Steel commented that he would like to see the scale of the sign on the building. He added that the sign seemed large for its intended location. He asked if the sign had been made yet. Ms. Guffey answered that it had not. Ms. Lysa Schloesser agreed that the sign seemed to be about 20 percent too large, considering that it was going to be illuminated at night.

Mr. Steel commented that the overall design was nice and the location was appropriate, though he had some concerns on how the size would work with the intended location. He added that he would be willing to approve the design with a recommendation for a reduction in scale of around 20 percent.

There was discussion on how large the sign would appear on the building. Mr. Jonah Jensen suggested it could impact the light fixture on the building. Mr. Duke York commented that the 20 percent reduction would possibly align the sign with the window. He noted that the owners have worked in the past to keep things appropriate with the neighborhood and have a well established relationship with the neighbors. Mr. York added that if the owners were willing to reduce the size by 20 percent he would vote for approval.

Ms. Guffey suggested moving forward with the condition for approval and returning if the owners did not agree to the reduction in size.

There was a motion.

*"With the understanding that the sign is reduced twenty percent in overall size I move that we approve the proposal"*

Motion: York

Second: Chase

The motion was approved.

Mr. Ross Buffington suggested adding a local landmark to the skyline on the sign to make it more recognizable to the community.

### **C. 1415 N 5<sup>th</sup> Street (North Slope Historic District)**

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

1415 North 5<sup>th</sup>, built in 1901, is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District. The property is the former site of the NW Kinetics office, along with the house at 1405 N 5<sup>th</sup> Street. In 2007, the non-historic additions were removed from both buildings and the property subdivided. The existing homes were subsequently sold to private owners and restored to residential use. The Landmarks Preservation Commission approved a restoration plan by a previous owner in 2008, which was constructed by a subsequent owner in 2010.

The current proposal is for a new garage with shop space and a second floor game room. The roof deck of the garage will connect to the second floor of the existing house. The main floor of the garage would be 1,613sf with an 829sf second floor. The upper story roof slope will match that of the existing house, as will the exterior materials, colors and design elements. The highest ridge of the roof will reach 28 feet and three inches. The overall structure is 38 feet by 54 feet and five inches, in an "L" shape.

Mr. Aranda briefed the commission on this project on November 12, 2014. The following is a summary of the commission's requests:

1. Explore a way to jog the plane of the bellyband element.
2. Reduce the visibility of the stairs from the Cushman side and their obstruction of a window.
3. The horizontal windows on the garage, being too horizontal, could be divided in to smaller square panes.
4. Narrow the mullions between the paired sashes and the gable ends on the garage
5. The entrance to the garage could have paired side lights instead of singular.
6. The balustrades and half walls on the deck should be one or the other.
7. The size and scale of the columns should be reduced.

The current plans reflect the requested changes.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

##### **Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Garages & Parking and New Construction**

1. Alley accessed parking is the typical and predominant residential parking configuration in the district. Residential driveways and garages facing the street are typically only appropriate when there is no alley access, or other site constraints prevent alley accessed parking (such as a corner lot).
2. Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Parking areas and garages should be set toward the rear of the lot to minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Where it is not possible to locate a parking structure to conceal it from view, it should be set well back from the front plane of the primary structure on the property. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in the residential areas of the neighborhoods and should be located behind the building and away from the street.
3. **Goal:** Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. **Guideline:** New buildings should be comparable in height to adjacent structures. Buildings that are substantially taller or shorter than the adjacent historic buildings should be avoided.

4. **Goal:** Relate the size and proportions of new buildings and their architectural elements to those of the neighborhood.  
**Guideline:** Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations.
5. **Goal:** Break up the facades of buildings into smaller varied masses comparable to those contributing buildings in the residential historic districts. **Guideline:** Variety of forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the North Slope and Wedge residential communities. Smaller massing—the arrangement of facade details, such as projections and recesses—and porches all help to articulate the exterior of the structure and help the structure fit into the neighborhood. Avoid large, blank planar surfaces.
6. **Goal:** Emphasize entrances to structures. **Guideline:** Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details, such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.
7. **Goal:** Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing contributing buildings where such elements are visible from the street.

**Guideline:**

1. **Shape and Pitch:** Typically, the existing historic buildings in the districts either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower.
2. **Architectural Elements:** Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or “widow’s walks” to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.
3. **Materials:** Roofs that are shingle or appear to be shingle, or composition roofs, are the typical historic material compatible with the district. Seam metal may be an acceptable material for simple roof structures. Slate, faux slate and terra cotta tiles are not appropriate for the districts.
8. **Goals:** Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhoods were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco-covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.

**Guideline:**

1. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar in type, pattern, configuration and appearance to those typically found in the neighborhood.
2. Stucco, especially commercial EIFS systems like Dryvit, is not acceptable for the historic district.
3. Faux materials, such as vinyl or metal siding, are not acceptable for the historic district.
4. Certain siding patterns, including board and batten and panel, are not historically common in the district and should not be used.
5. Cementitious products, such as Hardiplank, may be acceptable in the district if installed in a historically correct pattern (for example, horizontal lapped siding or shingle). In such cases, the product used shall be smooth in texture (faux wood grain finish is NOT acceptable).
6. Engineered products for trim and molding, if demonstrated to be similar in appearance to painted wood, may be an environmentally responsible substitute for wood on new structures. In such cases, the applicant should demonstrate to the Commission, via product literature and material samples, that the product is compatible.
9. **Goals:** Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings, as represented in the neighboring buildings. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.

**Guideline:**

1. **Placement.** Typically, older buildings have doors and transoms that matched the head height of the adjacent windows. New structures should utilize this pattern.
2. **Doors.** Doors should be or appear to be paneled and/or contain glazed openings.

3. Windows. New structures should utilize existing historic window patterns in their design. Windows should be vertically oriented. Large horizontal expanses of glass may be created by ganging two or more windows into a series. Historically, the typical window in the district was a double hung sash window. Casement windows were commonly used for closets, nooks, and less commonly, as a principal window type in a structure. Many double hung sash windows had the upper sash articulated into smaller panels, either with muntin bars, leaded glazing, or arches. Commonly, windows were also surrounded with substantial trim pieces or window head trim.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic Special Review District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.
2. Driveway is accessed via the alley, meeting the guidelines for location of parking structures.
3. Garage is set to the rear of the lot, but will be visible from the public right of way. However, because of the lot orientation on N 5<sup>th</sup> Street, although the garage is along the alley, it also is visible from the street.
4. Roof height and slope match that of the existing building, meeting the guidelines for roof shape and pitch.
5. Overall scale is compatible with that of the existing building, and individual architectural elements have been adjusted to both better relate to the principal structure as well as the scale of the garage elevations, meeting the guidelines for scale.
6. Façade and massing is comparable to the existing building, thus meeting the guidelines.
7. Garage materials and color match that of the existing building.
8. Window and door placement and arrangement are compatible with the existing building, and the design has been modified to better reflect typical window types in the district.
9. The applicant briefed the Commission on the design on November 12, 2014, at which time the Commission suggested several design amendments. Staff has reviewed the application and confirmed that most of these amendments have been incorporated into the design.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Lawrence Aranda introduced the owners of the property and discussed the revisions to the proposal presented in November, noting that the only change they could not make was the stairs. He added that they were able to revise the stairs and move them away from the window, but they remained in the same location. He opened for any questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. James Steel commented that he appreciated the level of documentation and the fact that Mr. Aranda had listened to their previous discussion and made design adjustments where possible.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase, noting that she had been unable to attend the previous meeting, expressed concern about the overall size of the garage, adding that it did not look like a garage. Mr. Aranda responded that it was the intention that the building would not look like a garage, adding that a smaller garage would stand out due to the size of the lot. Discussion ensued. Mr. Marshall McClintock commented that there were large carriage houses, or garages, in the North Slope, though it was rare.

Mr. McClintock stated that he still had issues with the exterior staircase. He called attention to the many ways to access the deck and questioned the need for an exterior stair in that location. Mr. Aranda explained that relocating the stairs between the garage and house would obstruct vehicle access. He added that on the side of the property where the stairs would be located there are some large trees that will prevent them from being visible from N Cushman Ave. Mr. McClintock disagreed and recommended the Commission not approve the staircase. Discussion ensued. The owners of the property commented that the stairs were needed for safety reasons to allow them an exit from the second floor of the house. Mr. McClintock clarified that exterior stairs are not typical of single family homes and that his main concern was the visibility of the stairs from N Cushman Ave. Mr. Eugene Thorne added his concern with the stairs blocking the window and discussed some possible alternative configurations. Mr. Aranda commented on the challenge presented by the stairs on the first floor and the need to allow traffic flow in the area between the home and the garage. Vice-Chair Chase asked if the stairs were a code requirement for egress. Mr. Aranda responded that they were not.

Mr. York commented on Mr. Aranda having done well to respond to their suggestions and commented that, to people driving through the area, it will appear to be another house rather than a large garage.

Mr. Steel noted that there was quite a bit of diversity in the neighborhood in terms of the size of houses and that it was one of the unique characteristics of the neighborhood. He added that though the garage was unusually large for the district, the house was as well. He also recognized the efforts of the owners to make an adjustment to the stairs by moving them away from the window and not projecting beyond the house.

There was a motion.

*"I move to approve the application for 1415 N 5<sup>th</sup> Street as submitted"*

Motion: Steel  
Second: York

The motion was approved with one Commissioner voting nay.

#### 4. BOARD BRIEFING

##### A. Convention Center Hotel and Mixed Use Project

Mr. Reuben McKnight 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 17<sup>th</sup> 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 presentation today will introduce the Commission to the concept and scope of the project, discuss review schedule, and discuss specific design questions (such as the proposed height).

##### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Feedback and guidance.

David Kelley and Kevin McKee from Ankrom Moisan Architects, provided an introduction to the project and initial stage.

Mr. David Kelley displayed a map showing the location near the Convention Center between Market and Commerce Street. He called attention to the steep slope across the site, which results in it being visually prominent from 705 and approaching the Convention Center. In terms of the overlay, they were taking it into consideration with the urban design elements they were examining. They also wanted to be sure they were reinforcing the right uses at the pedestrian scale and the open space at Tollefson Plaza.

Mr. Kelley discussed the goals of the project as it is currently in the due diligence phase. They were currently considering the overall size, massing and complexity of the project. One of the goals beyond familiarizing the Commission with the project was to set up a schedule for additional meetings to make sure there are no underlying issues further down the road. Mr. Kelley noted that the biggest anticipated topic of discussion was that



the owner wants to create a programmatically efficient tower at 250 feet.

Mr. Kevin McKee commented they were still in the programmatic phase and the images were not yet architectural. He noted that the design concepts had a lot in common with the adjacent convention center and added that the convention center had a loading dock that they would need to be accessible during construction. He discussed the potential view opportunities of Mount Rainier, Commencement Bay, and Downtown. Mr. McKee noted the design challenge of putting something between two existing buildings, one historic and one modern.

The two phases of the project were discussed. The first phase would include the hotel tower, parking decks, and retail space along Commerce Street. The second phase would include a residential tower in back with additional parking space. He discussed an image showing the locations of the drop off, lobby, café and retail. Mr. McKee discussed how they would allow access to the Convention Center's existing parking area by having a parking ramp between the hotel and the Convention Center. He discussed different elements on the map, noting the incline that necessitated two levels of entrances. Further details on the possible use for the spaces were discussed. Mr. McKee noted some of the design challenges associated with the loading dock.

Mr. Ross Buffington asked how the retail space would connect with the Carlton building. Mr. McKee responded that it would become a building to building urban infill.

Mr. James Steel asked if a traffic study had been done and how the taxis would work with the one way street. Mr. McKee answered that a traffic study had not yet been done and discussed the possible alternatives for the taxi load and unloading zones. Mr. Steel commented that his concern was how things like the taxi drop off and Convention Center ramp would impact the pedestrian experience, noting that pedestrian traffic was common there. Mr. McKee responded that the Convention Center ramp may be temporary and their preference would be to have the loading occurring off of Broadway. Mr. Steel suggested moving the retail towards the Carlton building.

Mr. Eugene Thorne asked if there was any access to the to Court C street for the loading zone. Mr. McKee responded that the loading zone was at 92' and Court C was at 108', so there is the possibility of having a ramp with a 5% grade. Mr. Thorne commented on the difficulty of maneuvering a trailer within the proposed loading area and suggested that a ramp connecting to Court C would be preferable.

Mr. McKee discussed the third level and a proposed connecting link between the Convention Center and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor ballroom. The ballroom would be a two story space that could be subdivided into smaller banquet rooms. He continued, discussing the 5<sup>th</sup> mechanical level, the 6<sup>th</sup> level which was the last level of parking. The 7<sup>th</sup> level included an amenity deck. The tower would run from levels 8 to 23 with roughly 19 suites per floor. He showed a conceptual cross section of the hotel, calling attention to the near 80 foot change in elevation at the ground level. Mr. McKee commented that they were excited by the potential of creating an iconic building in that location.

Mr. Buffington asked for the approximate height of the Murano hotel. Mr. McKee responded that it was roughly the same height as the proposed tower. Ms. Lysa Schloesser asked if there was any difference in the elevation of the slope for the two buildings. Mr. McKee responded that they were both similar in elevation on the slope.

Chair Granfield asked if the parking was intended to be shared between the hotel and future residential space from the second phase. Mr. McKee responded that the parking was intended for only the hotel and retail space. Additional residential parking would be part of the residential project. Chair Granfield asked if they were intending it to have around 200 spaces and if that was typical for a 300 room hotel. Mr. McKee responded that they were intending for over 200 parking spaces and that it was an appropriate number for an urban hotel.

Mr. Steel commented that the height and massing of the tower looked appropriate for a downtown urban center and the narrow profile of the tower would help to preserve views. He also was supportive of the location of the tower, bookending the Convention Center instead of competing with the Carlton. Mr. Steel reiterated his concerns for the street level and the pedestrian feel, noting that there was a lot of pushing and pulling volumetrically that isn't keeping with the intentions of the district for street level retail. He added that demonstrating how they would plan to mitigate the traffic impact is important. Mr. Steel also commented that as the project moves forward they will want to show what they are doing to keep the front façade appropriate for the district, considering things like

how it relates to the adjacent buildings in terms of height, profile, window head heights, and floor level heights.

Chair Granfield asked why they choose to locate the ballroom on the 3<sup>rd</sup> level as opposed to a higher floor. Mr. McKee responded that the logistics of servicing the ballroom are better on the third level and the views are just as good as they would be at higher levels.

Mr. Jonah Jensen commented that the proximity of the tower to the Convention Center is appropriate and suggested that they blend the design of the tower with the Convention Center.

Mr. Jensen requested more information on the schedule for the project. Mr. McKee responded that there is an initial due diligence phase that completes in April, followed additional deadlines for the next two to three years through project completion.

Ms. Lysa Schloesser commented on the proposed link between the hotel and the Convention Center being a compelling argument for the façade and the continuity of the design. Mr. Jensen added his support for the link, noting that he had worked for the firm that developed the Convention Center and how during development there was a lot of energy invested in the front face. He added that they had studied placing a 300 foot tower where the stairs are now.

Mr. Steel reported on changes in the massing model that they might not be aware of. The cutoff road to the south will be filled in and turned into a green space. Mr. Steel added that there also may be some changes to Tollefson square and that he wouldn't use it as a reason for connections or design ideas.

Mr. Marshall McClintock asked if there would need to be a development rights transfer for the height of the tower. Mr. McKnight answered that he was not sure but would find out what the land use requirements will be. Elly Walkowiak from Economic Development commented that the DCC zoning allows 400 feet in height so it might not be necessary.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase commented on the importance of the Commission seeing the materials that are intended to be used, noting that it was helpful in the past when reviewing the design of the Tacoma Art Museum addition. Mr. Steel reviewed the conversation over the TAM concerning bridging the two existing iconographies of the museum and Union Station, rather than creating a third. He added that the same paradigm exists between the Convention Center and the Carlton. The material used for the tower podium will be important.

Ms. Schloesser expressed support of the earlier comment concerning pedestrian access. Mr. Duke York concurred, stating that pedestrian access to the Art District and the local Transit that runs down to the Theater District is important to many members of the Commission.

Mr. McKee asked if any members of the Commission had any concerns about the height of the tower. Mr. McClintock responded that the positioning near the Convention Center made the height acceptable. Vice-Chair Chase concurred, adding that if it were positioned close to the Carlton it might be an issue. Mr. Buffington suggested that they would want to work with the residents uphill from the tower whose views might be impacted.

Mr. McKee discussed scheduling additional meetings, adding that they had anticipated coming back on April 8<sup>th</sup>. He asked if they should be considering a meeting in March as well, so the ownership can feel confident with the proposed height and massing of the project. He added that in April they will still be at a schematic level but will have some development of the exterior skin. Mr. McKee commented that what they had hoped to get from the Commission was some form of written approval. Mr. McKnight responded that the code allows a conditional approval that can be given midway through a project. It would be a conditional approval of basic elements of the project that would allow the project team to move forward with the design, while still requiring final approval of the other elements of the design. Mr. McKnight added that in the discussion he had not heard any significant fatal flaw concerns with the overall project concept or the size of the tower.

Some Commissioners requested additional images showing the view from street level. Mr. McKee responded that they would be able to show all of the street vantage points to show the scale.

**5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS**

**A. Events and Activities Updates**

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer provided an update on events and activities. The #IHeartTacoma campaign was currently underway through the end of February. The Heritage Mixer had been on February 7<sup>th</sup> and was attended by the countywide heritage community. The WA Trust Board Meeting would be on February 20<sup>th</sup> through 21<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed suggestions from Commissioners for Preservation Awards and requested any additional suggestions for awards from the Commission. Discussion ensued. Commissioners provided additional feedback on the proposed nomination process and award categories.

Mr. Marshall McClintock commented there is a new report coming out on Live/Work and requested a presentation on it and transfer of development rights in the next few months. Mr. McKnight reported that there had been an analysis of Live/Work and there had been recommendations that may lead to some code amendments.

Vice-Chair Katie Chase requested an update on Old City Hall.

**6. CHAIR COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer

