

## Members

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Brittani Flowers  
Roger Johnson  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Eugene Thorne  
Jeff Williams  
Kevin Bartoy  
Ken House



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

## Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer  
Lauren Hoogkamer, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
John Griffith, Office Assistant

Date: March 8, 2017

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

### Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Brittani Flowers  
Roger Johnson  
Lysa Schloesser  
Eugene Thorne  
Jeff Williams  
Kevin Bartoy

### Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight  
John Griffith

### Others Present:

Melissa McGinnis  
David Strauss  
Jason Lamb  
Scheer Chan  
Chris van Dalen

### Commission Members Absent:

Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Ken House  
James Steel  
Marshall McClintock

Chair Katie Pratt called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

## 1. ROLL CALL

## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 2/22/17

The consent agenda was approved.

## 3. DESIGN REVIEW

- A. Seymour Conservatory (Individual Landmark):

*Restroom addition*

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

Built in 1907, the Seymour Conservatory in Wright Park is an individually listed landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. Metro Parks is planning on expanding the Conservatory to accommodate its programming. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this project on October 14, 2015 and April 13, 2016 and December 14, 2016. On November 4, 2015, the Commission conducted a site visit at the Conservatory. In addition, Metro Parks has conducted a number of public meetings and opinion surveys.

The project team is now seeking approval for the ADA restroom addition, which will include two accessible restrooms, a storage closet, and a storage room. This 440sf addition will include the renovation of the existing outdoor work area at the northwest corner of the Conservatory. The existing non-historic shed will be removed, as

well as the chain link fence. The addition will consist of 4'x8' frameless glazing and a steel frame, painted white to match the existing building. The envelope will be a rainscreen wall clad with sheet metal panels and mounted with a green screen. The green screen will be panelized heavy gauge metal wire to support vines. The addition will eventually fit within the footprint of the future expansion.

#### **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. This property is an individual 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 modifications.
2. Historic material is not being destroyed. The addition is screened and sited towards the rear of the Conservatory so that historic views are maintained. The new addition is differentiated from the original structure, but compatible in size, scale, design, and material.
3. The addition could be removed without damaging the historic structure.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Melissa McGinnis, Metro Parks, reviewed that there had been recognition in 1949 that the Conservatory would need to have some reason to keep people coming back to it. In 1949 the Conservatory had received a complete interior remodel that included winding pathways through the wings, a koi pond, and space for changing exhibits. Ms. McGinnis commented in that in keeping with the tradition of changing exhibits they now had other activities and programs that drew new people to visit the building. In order to meet the modern needs of the building they wanted to add a restroom while meeting the Secretary of Interior's Standards and ensuring that the addition does not take away from the original building.

David Strauss, SHKS Architects, commented that the proposal consisted of accessible restrooms and was an important part of making the building fully functioning as a public building. He discussed the area west of the north wing behind the chimney and some yew trees. He noted that the yews were not listed as significant in the tree inventory, but they were leaving them in place. He reviewed a diagram of the current condition of the building, noting a prefabricated cedar shed and chain link fence. He commented that part of the project was a cleanup of the work yard to try and organize it. Mr. Strauss reviewed an aerial view of the addition, commenting that the intention was to have the addition be lower and narrower than the existing building. Mr. Strauss commented that the addition would have compatibility and deference to the Conservatory through scale and dimension. He noted that there were some privileged views of the Conservatory, the east elevation and southwest in particular, which they were preserving. He reviewed that they were proposing to remove including a chain link fence, a cedar shed, and a section of the west wall of the Conservatory where they would be removing part of the stem wall and some glass to make the connection. Mr. Strauss commented that the intent was to minimize the removal of historic material and to remove non-significant site features like the chain link fence and shed. He noted that the connection would be a transparent gasket and the opaque portion of the building would be the restroom building to the west. They would also try to minimize any grade changes, but would be expanding the terrace a bit for the work yard. Mr. Strauss commented that they were concerned about seismic strength of the conservatory, so they needed a large seismic joint in the connection to insure that the addition and original structure did not hit each other. Mr. Strauss discussed renders of

the building showing views from different locations. Interior visualizations were discussed, Mr. Strauss noting that steel plate frame and glass doors would be used for the connection to ensure that it would be as transparent as possible. The joint between the existing conservatory and the addition was discussed, Mr. Strauss noting that they had to make sure that they were collecting any water from the two buildings and distributing it out and also creating a lightweight connection that fails rather than the conservatory or the addition.

The material palette was discussed. Mr. Strauss commented that they were using glass, steel, and a green screen consisting of a wire frame and a metal panel. He commented that the intent was to make it all reversible and that the site would retain its key characteristics and relationships.

Commissioner Johnson asked if green screen would go all the way around the addition on the west side. Mr. Strauss confirmed that it would.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the connection would use glass for both walls. Mr. Strauss confirmed that it would and that viewing from the side would allow one to see the pavers and potted vegetation in the work yard.

Commissioner Bartoy asked how the fill slope would actually look, as the changing of the contour appeared significant in the aerial plan view that had been reviewed. Mr. Strauss commented they were showing some contour modification to get water away from the structure and that it would be as close to native grade as they could get. It was noted that the change in grade would be negligible.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if the restrooms would be temporary. Ms. McGinnis responded that they would be removed with when a proposed addition was built, but that the gasket would remain as part of the future design.

Commissioner Williams asked if the work yard would be unattractive when viewed from the gasket. Mr. Strauss commented that the tools would be stored and the new storage building. Commissioner Williams asked if they had thought about using opaque glass to screen the view from the north. Mr. Strauss commented that they had considered it, but were confident that it would be a decent view.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for the Seymour Conservatory restroom addition as submitted."

Motion: Johnson

Second: Schloesser

The motion was approved unanimously.

#### 4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

##### A. Convention Center Hotel (Union Station Conservation District)

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

##### **BACKGROUND**

On September 16, 2016, the Landmarks Preservation Commission issued design approval for Phase 1 of the Convention Center Hotel. The Commission deferred approval of the dichroic glass panels until more visual examples could be provided and recommended that the window sills on the brick façade be precast concrete instead of metal and that the brick façade elements continue around the corner of the building nearest to the Convention Center. The Commission also approved the demolition of the existing non-historic garage structure, adjacent to the Carlton Center.

The project team would now like to update the Commission on the project status and changes to the final design. In response to the Commission's comments, the glass fins and dichroic glass have been removed from the design. Additional changes have also been made to accommodate cost adjustments, egress requirements, and the hotel's overall program.

Jason Lamb, Ankrom Moisan Architects, reviewed that it had been six months since they were last before the Commission and that they were there to provide an update on changes being proposed. He reported they had removed the dichroic fins and had been working to strengthen the recommendations provided by the Commission including simplification of the tower, consideration for the contextual elements of the neighborhood, and

consideration for the street level.

Scheer Chan, Ankrom Moisan Architects, discussed the external revisions. He reviewed that they had enhanced the opening and enhanced the main entry of the building by moving it more to the south, creating an entry plaza with the bay volume carried through multiple floors. He commented that in trying to resolve the angled geometry with the interior program, they had decided to remove the interfering geometry where the building meets the convention center and simplify the design. Mr. Chan reported that existing structure and ramp between the convention center and the hotel had created a complicated connection with an 'L' shaped seismic joint that had resulted in awkward interior spaces. He commented that they were proposing to simplify it by having a lighter connection between the two buildings. Mr. Chan noted that the staircases had doubled in size to accommodate the convention center occupants and the hotel's public event occupancy. The stairs also had to be 50% greater than required due to the tenants design standards for levels of safety. The main entry bay in the middle of the building would be a grand hall that would be the location of the rooftop main pool. There was a lot of mechanical equipment that had not been incorporated in the approved proposal that would be relocated to a screened area on level 7. Mr. Chan discussed images comparing the elevations of the original and redesigned proposals, noting that they had removed the dichroic glass fins. He noted that they had lost the alignment of the datums between the Carlton Building and hotel due to minimum height requirements, but that the lines could still be strengthened in the design. He discussed the side entry, commenting that instead of being a large podium piece, the volume masonry had been broken down to a scale more comparable to the Carlton building. A rendering of the new design was discussed. Mr. Chan noted that some of the datums between the buildings were no longer aligned and discussed how other design features would bring back that link. He noted that the canted glass was still in the rendering between the convention center and hotel, but he was recommending flattening it out and making a simple and elegant glass connection between the two buildings. It was noted that the marquee sign would still be present on Commerce Street, but the logo had been redesigned and was not shown in the rendering. Material samples were discussed. The gasket piece would be a copper metallic color. The tower would be a metallic Cool Zactique II color that would slightly change tone in sunlight. Commissioner Schloesser requested that they provide photographs of how it would look in sunlight. Commissioner Schloesser asked what materials would be used for the trellis on the top of the building. Mr. Chan responded that it would be painted steel.

Commissioner Williams asked if there was a reason they did not continue the window configuration for the gasket between the Carlton building and hotel. Mr. Chan responded that it was because it would be looking into a back house staircase area. Commissioner Williams commented that he felt that it actually drew attention to the connection and that the vertical windows gave it a strange disconnect from both buildings. Commissioner Flowers commented that from the exterior it feels like a forgotten back end piece, while the rest of the structure has detail. She added that it seemed like they would want to carry that detail all the way through. Chair Pratt commented that the color looked stark and dark on the rendering and the horizontal orientation of the panels did not mirror the line. Mr. Chan commented that the connector was originally intended to be small, but the stairs had gotten larger. Commissioner Williams asked if there was a reason that they wouldn't be extending the brick façade to the Carlton, even though it would be fake. Commissioner Flowers asked if a glazed connection could be similar to the one for the convention center. Mr. Chan responded that if the bay was more proportional to the other ones it might work. Commissioner Flowers asked if the texture used to connect the convention center to the hotel could be duplicated on the connection to the Carlton building. Mr. Chan responded that it would be similar in concept but the lines would need to be there to tie it to the main building. Commissioner Williams suggested copying the center bay for the connection, even though the datum lines wouldn't line up exactly. Commissioner Bartoy commented that carrying the lines across might actually downplay the historic building. Commissioner Schloesser suggested that if they replicated the middle bay for the connection they might do a small flash gap where the buildings meet. Commissioners concurred that it was good to divide the size and scale of the two brick facades with glass.

The Broadway façade was discussed. Mr. Chan reviewed the previous design and commented that the new design reflected the program behind it which included a parking garage, mechanical systems, the cafeteria, and some event space. He commented that the design would make the tower stronger and the faceted planes would read strongly as planes. Commissioner Bartoy asked if they could produce a perspective rendering of the elevation on the Broadway side so they could see the ground floor element better. Mr. Chan noted that the copper portion of the building would stand out from the gray portion, so there would be some relief on the façade.

The tower was discussed. Commissioner Williams asked why the weathered copper material wasn't being used on the tower. Mr. Chan responded that he thought it would look too dark. Commissioner Williams asked if the red paint

on the stripe and roof was a Marriott request. Mr. Chan confirmed that it was and that it would be a maroon color that matches the Marriott brand. Commissioner Williams asked if it was a necessary element. Mr. Lamb responded that it was part of the place making for their brand. Discussion ensued on the visibility of the red stripe and the overhanging roof.

It was noted on the Court C elevation that the mechanical space would not be visible from the street and would be blocked by the proposed phase two.

The north elevation was discussed. It was noted that the wall outside of the stair tower would be a concrete wall that would be modulated with reveal joints. Half of the concrete tower would be obscured by the convention center.

## 5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### A. LINK Artist Selection Update

Commissioner Schloesser reviewed that they had the range of artists narrowed down to three with two of the artists coming from Tacoma. They were also offering money for the fabrication and fabrication support.

### B. Events and Activities Update

Mr. McKnight provided an update on the following events and activities:

#### 2017 Events

1. Historic Preservation Month Shirt Vote (February-March)
2. Landmarks Commissioner Training Recap
3. History Happy Hour Trivia Night (6pm @ The Swiss Restaurant & Pub, March 15<sup>th</sup>)
4. Buying an Old House Workshop (1pm-3pm @ 1532 North Anderson, April 8<sup>th</sup>)
5. **Historic Preservation Month** (May)
  - i) City Council Proclamation (5pm @ City Council Chambers, May 2<sup>nd</sup>)
  - ii) Historic Tacoma's Kick-Off Event (7pm-9pm @ Feast Art Center, May 5<sup>th</sup>)
  - iii) Tacoma Historical Society's Historic Homes Tour (May 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup>)
  - iv) TAM's Prairie Line Trail Festival (TBD May 7<sup>th</sup>)
  - v) Amazing Preservation Race (11am @ UWT Stairs, May 7<sup>th</sup>)
  - vi) Puyallup Tribe Reservation Tour (TBD, May 18<sup>th</sup>)
  - vii) Historic Preservation Awards and Maritime History Walking Tour( 1pm TBD, May 20<sup>th</sup>)
  - viii) Waterfront Bike Ride (TBD, May 26th)
  - ix) Social Justice Bus Tour (TBD)
6. Northeast Tacoma Walking Tour (12pm TBD, June 3<sup>rd</sup>)
7. Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Youth Heritage Program: Maritime Heritage (July 11<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup>)
8. South Tacoma Walking Tour (10am TBD, August 12<sup>th</sup>)
9. Walking Tour (10am TBD, September 9<sup>th</sup>)
10. Arts Month (October TBD)
11. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance (November 3<sup>rd</sup> TBD)

## 6. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Pratt thanked the Commissioners for attending the previous day's training.

Chris van Daalen extended an invitation to Commissioner for an event the following Tuesday on work/live live/work code which would encourage redevelopment of existing historic buildings into new uses with commercial and residential existing in the same space. They would also be discussing the future of green building in Tacoma.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.