

## Members

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



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

## Staff

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

Date: July 26, 2017

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

### Commission Members in Attendance:

Ken House, *Vice-Chair*  
Roger Johnson  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Eugene Thorne  
Jeff Williams  
Marshall McClintock

### Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith

### Others Present:

Shauna Hansen  
Duke York  
Scott Painter  
Bob Kadic  
Susan Johnson

### Commission Members Absent:

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Brittani Flowers  
Kevin Bartoy

Vice-Chair Ken House called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

## 1. ROLL CALL

## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 6/28/17
- C. Administrative Review
  - 625 N. M Street—replacement garage doors
  - 2156 Pacific Avenue—signage
  - 1407 S. 5th Street—window removal

The consent agenda was approved.

## 3. NAMING – PRELIMINARY REVIEW

- A. Gwilymn “Skip” Vaughn Trail (between South 80<sup>th</sup> Street and South 84<sup>th</sup> Street)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

The Office of Environmental Services is requesting to name the new trail, between South 80<sup>th</sup> Street and South 84<sup>th</sup> Street, the Gwilymn “Skip” Vaughn Trail. The currently unnamed trail was referred to as the “Gravel Pit” or the 80<sup>th</sup> Street Regional Stormwater Holding Basin. The South Tacoma Neighborhood Council, of which Vaughn was president, nominated the naming of the trail to honor Vaughn on April 27, 2017. Skip Vaughn was known for his activism in the neighborhood around the trail. Newspaper articles highlighting Vaughn’s contributions, including his advocacy and financial support for the Wapato Hills Park and open space in Tacoma, are included in the packet. He

was also known as the “father” of the neighborhood council program. In 2002, the Washington State Senate honored Skip Vaughn for his activism.

#### **CRITERIA**

**The City of Tacoma Policy on Place Names and Name Changes** is included in the packet, specifically “Initial Procedures for Considering Name Change Requests,” Section 3.1.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Determination that the application is complete and should be scheduled for public hearing. The Commission may schedule the application for a hearing, may defer the request if additional information is needed, or may deny the request. If the Commission does not take any action on the application within 60 days (either to schedule for hearing or to defer for additional information), the request is automatically denied.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. Pursuant to Council Resolution 38091, the Landmarks Preservation Commission reviews and makes recommendations to City Council on name change requests.
2. The request includes a map and photographs of the area, as well as demonstrated support from the South Tacoma Neighborhood Council and appears to be complete.

Shauna Hansen, Environmental Services, noted that as the owners of the property, they were bringing the request forward for the trail naming. She reviewed a map of the location of the stormwater holding basin, with the trail on the east side. She noted that the holding pond was design to protect Flett Creek from stormwater impacts. She noted that as part of a recent expansion project a 5 foot wide gravel trail around the east side had been constructed as an urban amenity and provided a good opportunity for recreation for the neighborhood. The trail would be officially opened in October, but the gate would be open starting September 5<sup>th</sup>. She noted involvement of the South Tacoma Neighborhood Council, which had recommended the naming after Mr. Vaughn. Mr. Vaughn’s contributions to the community were reviewed, Ms. Hansen noting his involvement in the South Tacoma Neighborhood Council and role in preserving the 80 acre Wapato Hills property. According to the requirements of the application process they had sought response to the naming request on social media sites. Summaries of the response so far were reviewed, Ms. Hansen noting that responses typically included suggestions for alternate names. The proposed trail signage was reviewed.

There was a motion

“I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis as findings and schedule the Naming of the trail between South 80th Street and South 84th Street to the Gwilymn “Skip” Vaughn Trail, recommending for a public hearing and future consideration at the meeting of August 26, 2017.”

Motion: Williams

Second: Thorne

The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **4. DESIGN REVIEW**

- A. 720 North I Street (North Slope Historic District)

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1893, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing to raise and extend the rear gambrel roof across the back façade, so that the height and pitch matches the front gambrel, and add a deck in place of the current rear addition. The materials for the siding, trim, and windows will match the existing original materials. The rear of the home has been altered in the past; no work will be done to the front façade. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this proposal on July 27, 2016, and provided positive feedback. On June 28, 2017, the Commission granted conceptual approval of the alteration. Per the Commission’s directions, the project team is now seeking final approval and has provided updated drawings showing the deck with solid railing with siding to match, and the overall proposed massing. This addition will not be visible from the street.

## **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

## **STANDARDS**

### **North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines**

#### **Exterior Siding and Materials**

1. **Avoid removal of large amounts of original siding.**
2. **Repair small areas of failure before replacing all siding.** It is rarely advisable to replace all of the existing siding on a home, both for conservation reasons and for cost reasons. Where there are areas of siding failure, it is most appropriate to spot repair as needed with small amounts of matching material. Where extensive damage, including rot or other failure, has occurred, siding should be replaced with as close a material and visual match as is feasible, including matching reveals, widths, configuration, patterns and detailing.
3. **Other materials/configurations.** It is not historically appropriate to replace deteriorated siding with substitute materials, unless it can be demonstrated that:
  - The replacement material is a close visual match to the historic material and can be installed in a manner in which the historically character defining details may be reproduced (mitered corners, dentil molding, etc); and
  - Replacement of the existing historic material is necessary, or the original material is no longer present; and
  - There is no feasible alternative to using a substitute material due to cost or availability.
4. **Avoid changing the appearance, pattern or configuration of original siding.** The siding type, configuration, reveal, and shingle pattern all are important elements of a home's historic character.

#### **Guidelines for Roofs**

1. **Preserve and retain existing roof form and appearance.** Major changes to the overall roof plan/type are discouraged. For example, changing a hipped roof to a gabled roof is generally inappropriate.
2. **Rooftop Additions should be sensitively located.** Additions that affect roof appearance may include the addition of elements such as dormers, skylights and chimneys. Additions are not discouraged, but should seek to minimize the visual impact to the overall roof form, as follows:
  - Changes to the roof form should be located to the rear and less visible sides of a home.
  - In certain cases, it may not be possible to conceal new elements such as additional dormers from view. In such cases, using examples of historic additions (location, scale, design, materials) to guide new design is appropriate.
3. **Existing roof heights should be maintained.** Changes to the primary ridgeline height of a house are generally discouraged, such as "bump ups," with the exception that: in certain cases it may be demonstrated that an overall ridgeline height increase will dramatically increase useful attic space in a house WITHOUT significantly changing the appearance of the home from the street (rare).

#### **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 of 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. This property 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. New siding will match the original materials and design.
3. The existing roof form and appearance of the front façade will not be altered.
4. The new dormer will match the existing roof in style, height and pitch. It is sensitively located at the rear of the home and will be minimally visible from the main right-of-way.
5. The primary ridgeline of the house will not be changed.
6. The project team has provided the additional materials requested by the Commission.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. York reported that they were retained by the owner to move the project through permitting, but did not have full architectural plans for permitting yet. He noted that the owner had done a great deal of work to the interior and wanted to do similar improvements to the exterior to return it to its historic appearance.

Mr. McClintock asked what the doors and windows being used would be. Mr. York responded that it would be a 5 panel fiberglass door with wood grain and the windows would be Marvin wood windows. Mr. McClintock suggested adding a scupper or two to the box railing on the south side for rain.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 720 North I Street, as submitted."

Motion: Williams

Second: Schloesser

The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **5. BOARD BRIEFINGS**

##### **A. Broadway Center Centennial Projects (Individual Landmarks)**

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The project team will provide an update on the Centennial Projects at the Pantages Theater/Jones Building, 901 and 909 Broadway. At this time, the schematic design phase is nearing completion and a federal rehabilitation tax credit application is being prepared. The project team will review the following aspects:

1. Addition to the Jones Building Annex
2. Proposed landscaping changes to the triangular plaza between the Pantages Lobby and Broadway
3. Jones Building: East (rear) elevation updates, including one shear wall
4. Possible seismic reinforcements to roof parapets (under investigation)

Susan Johnson, Artifacts Consulting, reviewed changes to the drawings from the packet, specifically the annex addition. She reviewed that the annex was built in 1983 and was considered nonhistoric, though part of the footprint of the historic Pantages building. The proposed annex addition would now be one story instead of three, would be subservient to the main building, and the cladding would be left as is. The one story bump out would not come out

any further than the Pantages lobby. The lobby plaza was discussed. Ms. Johnson noted that the landscaping was not historic and the new plaza design would not compete visually with the Pantages building. She reviewed that east side shear walls would be visible from the east exterior along Commerce Street, would involve removing some of the brick, and all work would be completed from the exterior to avoid impact to the interior. A new exit door opening might be necessary from the basement level. At the balcony level they would be replacing the modern exit doors to the fire escapes. The roof parapet walls were discussed with the possibility of bracing if they were not poured concrete which they would confirm when they do testing.

Commissioner Williams asked how the annex would align with the Pantages bump out. Mr. Kadic responded that the height would be the same and the fascia would continue across. He discussed the functional need for the addition.

Commissioner Steel asked what the three different cladding types were for the Pantages, lobby addition, and Annex addition. Mr. Kadic responded that the Jones building was terra cotta, the lobby addition was GFRC concrete thin panels that mimic terra cotta, and the annex was stucco and cement plaster above and a panel type construction for first floor. Commissioner Steel commented that he would not be opposed to mimicking the addition on the ground level or aligning it in terms of details to the annex by not having pilasters and streamlining to something more modern. Mr. Kadic responded that they were still discussing details. Commissioner Williams asked why they had not consider merging across with the old addition. Mr. Kadic responded that it was because the street bends and the vacation had to account for the door swings. Mr. Painter commented the design allows an open feel for the corner and gave access to the Jones building lobby at the same time.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if they were hoping for it to be at the same level or if they had already planned it. Mr. Kadic responded that that was the intent.

Commissioner Johnson asked how they would be doing the installing wall without impacting the interior of the auditorium. Mr. Kadic discussed the logistics of installing the shear wall, noting that the install location was behind the wall where the box seats were located.

Commissioner Steel asked if they would be removing brick to attach the structure of the Shear Wall. Mr. Kadic responded that all of the brick in the bay and clay tile behind was going to be removed and infilled with concrete. He added that they were trying to limit how much brick they would remove without ripping apart plaster on the inside. Commissioner Steel asked if other options that retain the brick had been explored. Mr. Kadic responded that other options would be difficult to complete without taking out the sidewalk and they would still require removing some of the brick and clay tile. It was noted that they had discussed possibly putting the brick back after removing the clay tile. Commissioner Steel commented that having anything forward of the flat facade would be a concern, though he would prefer putting the brick back after installing the shear wall.

Commissioner Williams asked if the clay tile behind the brick was historic. Mr. Painter confirmed that it was part of the original facade, but was considered secondary in its historic value. Commissioner Steel suggested doing a stucco pattern if the brick could not be replaced. He added that setting it back an inch so that it read as a bay with two pilasters would be his preference over a stamped concrete solution.

The applicants briefly discussed updates that had been made to the building in the past.

## **6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS**

### **A. Code Updates Discussion**

Mr. McKnight noted that there were multiple code areas that were being considered for updates: demolition review; the nomination process and how interior spaces work, how the handoff to City Council is handled, and streamlining the nomination process for things on the National Register; general code cleanup; making the Landmarks Preservation Commission no longer the primary steward for naming policy; looking at the pallet of uses offered in the code for Historic Conditional Use Permits; the purpose and outcome of Conservation Districts; and demolition review in the Downtown subareas.

Demolition review was discussed. Mr. McKnight reviewed that there are many older buildings in the City that are important to people, but they don't know about all of them or protect them. He reviewed key questions including if there should be addition review for historically important buildings, how to conduct the review, and how to identify buildings for review. He reviewed that state law allowed them to use SEPA at any time; that the current status quo

was to do demolition review in the Downtown subarea; and that there was an exemption for 12,000 square feet regardless of historical significance. Mr. McKnight reported that one approach would be to amend SEPA code to create the framework within SEPA. He reviewed potential approaches including looking at everything, reviewing things only in inventories, or lowering SEPA exemption thresholds for demolition permits and reviewing in geographically targeted areas. He discussed the different inventories, concluding that the existing inventories were insufficient for demolition review. Mr. McKnight discussed the policy framework proposal to lower the SEPA threshold for demolition citywide, require demolition review within mixed-use centers, and exclude single-family residences. Mr. McKnight commented that he was considering a threshold of 4000 square feet, which would catch a lot of the smaller commercial buildings. He commented that the important question was what happens when they have something proposed for demolition that they know is important, what the limits on authority are to intervene, and who is responsible for intervening. He commented that in most cases, the expectation would be that the review would result in a mitigation package and that only in the most significant cases where there would be an involuntary landmarks designation.

Commissioner Steel asked if the goal was mitigation or to prevent buildings that shouldn't be demolished from being demolished. Mr. McKnight commented that part of it was making sure that they were ensuring that it would be a category of review that a project would go through when applying for permits. Commissioner Steel suggested there might be a threshold for what size of building should be required to do mitigation.

Discussion ensued. Mr. McKnight discussed different potential scenarios for how the demolition review would work where permits would get flagged and the historic preservation office would be made aware of incoming demolition permits and would be able to determine if each required further review.

Mr. McKnight noted potential code amendment areas and asked if any Commissioners were interested in looking at the separated code language at a number of monthly meetings before returning to the Commission.

Commissioner Williams asked how widespread the demolition of historic buildings was. Mr. McKnight responded that most demolitions they saw were residential buildings. Most of the commercial demolitions that fell inside the age bracket would not likely have been considered historic.

Mr. McClintock offered to help with the code, noting that Historic Tacoma had been pushing for demolition review for a long time to at least provide a review to identify things that may be significant and save them. Discussion ensued. Commissioner Steel expressed concern that it might ultimately create SEPA mitigation for buildings that should be torn down due to their present condition, inhibiting economic development. He commented that he would rather historic preservation be more incentive and advocacy focuses. He added it would be all about where they set the threshold. Mr. McKnight responded that they would try to balance it moving forward. It was noted that other major cities in Washington State had demolition review.

#### B. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Hoogkamer discussed the youth heritage project and noted the following upcoming events:

##### **2017 Events**

1. Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Youth Heritage Program: Maritime Heritage Recap
2. South Tacoma Walking Tour (11am TBD, September 16th)
3. Social Justice Tour (TBD September 30<sup>th</sup>)
4. Prairie Line Trail Arts Symposium (October 19<sup>th</sup> TBD)
5. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance (Tour: 5pm; Dance: 6-9pm @ Browns Point Improvement Club, November 3<sup>rd</sup>)

#### C. Recognition

Mr. McKnight reported that Milt Tremblay was retiring. The Commissioners concurred with commemorating his work bringing many UWT projects through the Commission.

## **7. CHAIR COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the Vice-Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.