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1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Excusal of Absences
   B. Approval of Minutes: 8/26/15

3. BOARD BRIEFINGS
   A. Prairie Line Trail

4. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS
   A. Affordable Housing Code Amendment Comments
      Commissioners McClintock and Granfield 5:50 – 6:05
   B. Approval of Minutes: 7/22/15
      Staff 6:05 – 6:10
   C. Events and Activities Updates
      Staff 6:10-6:15

5. CHAIR COMMENTS

Next Regular Meeting: September 23, 2015, 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Bldg., Rm. 248 5:30 p.m.

This agenda is for public notice purposes only. Complete applications are included in the Landmarks Preservation Commission records available to the public BY APPOINTMENT at 747 Market Street, Floor 3, or online at http://tacomaculture.org/historic/resources.asp. All meetings of the Landmarks Preservation Commission are open to the public. Oral and/or written comments are welcome.

The City of Tacoma does not discriminate on the basis of handicap in any of its programs or services. To request this information in an alternative format or to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at (253) 591-5056 (voice) or (253) 591-5820 (TTY).
Chair Chris Granfield called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Excusal of Absences
   B. Approval of Minutes: 7/22/15

The minutes of 7/22/15 were reviewed. Discussion ensued to clarify motion language associated with the UWT Streetscape Guidelines. The Commission agreed to postpone approval until a future meeting.

3. TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES—PUBLIC HEARING
   A. 2702 North Puget Sound Ave

Chair Granfield called the public hearing to order and reviewed the procedures, noting that the hearing was for public comment on the nomination of 2702 North Puget Sound Avenue to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND
This one-and-a-half story Colonial Revival bungalow was built in 1903. It is nominated under Criterion C as an example of a Colonial Revival bungalow. This house is one of the earliest in the area and one of the only examples of this style in the neighborhood. The property is also unique in that it showcases a collection of locally significant architectural salvage pieces which have been sensitively incorporated into the house and yard. These pieces have intrinsic value as part of Tacoma’s architectural heritage. The proposed period of significance is from 1903, for the original construction, to 1956, the year the Keyser family moved in and began the series of alterations during which the salvaged pieces were installed. The first owners of the home were Ferdinand and Laura Mead.
On July 9, 2015, the Landmarks Preservation Commission found that the property meets the threshold criteria for nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

STANDARDS
The building is nominated under the following criteria:

C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

EFFECTS OF NOMINATION
- Future changes to the exterior will require approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to those changes being made, to ensure historical and architectural appropriateness.
- Unnecessary demolition of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places is strongly discouraged by the municipal code, and requires approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
- Future renovations of listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places may qualify for the Special Tax Valuation property tax incentive.

ANALYSIS
1. At 112-years-old the structure meets the age threshold criterion.
2. The exterior of the home retains a high degree of integrity. The garage and greenhouse were added by the Keysers between 1955 and 1965. Between 2006 and 2014, the current owners enlarged the east dormer to meet egress requirements. The addition of salvaged architectural elements is part of this building’s significance.
3. The house meets criterion C as an early example of a Colonial Revival bungalow. The collection of incorporated salvaged pieces has high artistic and historic value.

RECOMMENDATION
The Commission may recommend designation to the City Council, deny the nomination, or defer if additional information is needed. Based upon the criteria listed in TMC 13.07.040, if no further public comments are received, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for designation.

Chair Granfield called for testimony. The following citizens testified:

Ms. Lari Ryan commented that the designation was more important than ever with what was happening in their neighborhood. She noted that the home had no wasted spaced due to being designed without hallways. The home was described as a beautiful house, with wonderful light, and a perfect scale.

Ms. Joan James commented that she had lived next door for many years. She described the home as a neighborhood landmark where everyone in the neighborhood knew of the home and its history. She discussed how the Keysers added to the value of the home by including historical elements from around Tacoma. She wished for the home to be added to the register to preserve it for future residents of the neighborhood.

Ms. Mary Sudar commented that she was a personal property appraiser. She commented that the home was significant because the artifacts were going to stay with the house. She commented that the home also represents two generations of people who had celebrated Tacoma’s history.

Chair Granfield closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Chase recused herself.

There was a motion.

“I motion that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to the City Council that the Keyser house be included in the Tacoma Register of Historic Places under criterion C”

Motion: York.
Second: Williams.
The motion was approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW
   A. 776 Commerce Street, Winthrop Hotel (Old City Hall Historic District)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND
The Winthrop Hotel, built in 1925, is a contributing structure in the Old City Hall Historic District. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the proposed restoration work on January 28, 2015. The applicant is also applying for Historic Preservation Tax Credits and has presented the proposed work to the State Historic Preservation Office. On March 11, 2015, the Commission approved the full restoration project. On July 22, 2015, the Commission approved the widening of the service entry, but asked the applicant to present alternative options for the replacement door that better fit the building’s architectural style. The applicant has since met with staff and is now proposing a roll-up, wood garage door, that simulates swing doors, as the Commission requested. The new doors would be painted to match the windows.

The applicant will also brief the Commission on the replacement canopy.

ACTION REQUESTED
Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings
2. 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.
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 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.
2. The historic character of the property is being retained.
3. The changes do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new doors are compatible in massing, size, scale, and design.
4. Then new doors could be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the property.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Les Tonkin commented that he felt they had gotten close to what a 1923 service door would have looked like with a two panel wood door.

Mr. Tonkin reported that the overall restoration of the Winthrop was proceeding within the budget and there were plans to possibly use the remaining budget to restore the canopy. He discussed the plan for the canopy restoration, sharing images of the plans and the current conditions. He commented that they would also like to restore the missing storefronts by replicating the originals.

There was a motion.
“I move that we approve the application for 776 Commerce Street, Winthrop Hotel as submitted.”
Motion: Jensen.
Second: York.

The motion was approved.

B. 423 N G Street, The Ellington House (Individual Landmark)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

**BACKGROUND**

Built in 1889, this home—located in the National Register Stadium-Seminary Historic District—is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The applicant is proposing a new 16’x14’ shed dormer on the North 5th side of the property, which is a visible secondary elevation, to increase the head height in the existing bedroom. The dormer will include four 36”x48” Anderson wood, double hung, windows to match the existing windows. The siding, trim, and roofing will also match the existing. The dormer will not be taller than the roof ridge.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

**STANDARDS**

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

2. 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.

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 individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.

2. The historic character of the property is being retained and preserved.

3. The new addition does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work is differentiated from the old but compatible in size, scale, architectural features, and materials.

4. The new dormer could be removed without harming the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Dan Koch commented that the dormer was meant to accentuate the view and provide additional ceiling height for the bedroom.

Commissioner Williams asked what direction the dormer would face. Mr. Koch responded that it would face west towards the street. Mr. Koch confirmed that the dormer would have exposed rafter tails.

There was a motion.

“I move to approve the proposed dormer for 423 North G Street as presented.”

Motion: Williams.

Second: Schloesser.

The motion was approved.

C. 1702 Pacific (Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District)

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.
BACKGROUND
Built in 1892, the Pagni & Lenti building is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District. In 2014, the Landmarks Preservation Commission approved the rehabilitation of this building. Currently the Pacific Avenue façade is painted red; the applicant is proposing to repaint the Pacific Avenue façade Hale Navy with Black Beauty trim from the Benjamin Moore historical color palette. The rear brick façade, along the Prairie Line Trail, has not been painted and will remain unpainted. The application also includes two blade signs and window graphics. The signs would be approximately 30”x30” blackened steel signs with an LED strip to illuminate the bronze lettering with the wording “Elemental wood fired pizza”. The signs would be attached at the mortar joints. The existing awning will be removed.

ACTION REQUESTED
Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS
Design Guidelines for the Union Depot/Warehouse District
7. Signs.
   a. General.
      All new exterior signs and all changes in the appearance of existing exterior signs require Landmarks Preservation Commission approval. This includes changes in message or colors on pre-existing signs. If there is a conflict between these standards and the requirements in the City’s Sign Code, the more strict requirement shall apply.

b. Location and Size of Signs.
   Signs shall not dominate the building façades or obscure their architectural features (arches, transom panels, sills, moldings, cornices, windows, etc.). The size of signs and individual letters shall be of appropriate scale for pedestrians and slow-moving traffic. Projecting signs shall generally not exceed nine square feet on first floor level. Signs on adjacent storefronts shall be coordinated in height and proportion. Use of a continuous sign band extending over adjacent shops within the same building is encouraged as a unifying element.

   Portable reader board signs located on sidewalks, driveways, or in parking lots are prohibited. Existing historic wall signs are a contributing element within the district and should be restored or preserved in place. New wall signs shall generally be discouraged.

c. Messages and Lettering Signs.
   Messages shall be simple and brief. The use of pictorial symbols or logos is encouraged. Lettering should be of a traditional block or curvilinear style which is easy to read and compatible with the style of the building. No more than two different styles should be used on the same sign. Letters shall be carefully formed and properly spaced so as to be neat and uncluttered. Generally, no more than 60 percent of the total sign area shall be occupied by lettering. Lettering shall be generally flat or raised.

d. Color.
   Light-colored letters on a dark-colored background are generally required as being more traditional and visually less intrusive in the context of the Union Station District’s predominantly red-brick streetscapes. Colors shall be chosen to complement, not clash with, the facade color of the building. Signs should normally contain not more than three different colors.

e. Materials and Illumination
   Use of durable and traditional materials (metal and wood) is strongly encouraged. All new signs shall be prepared in a professional manner. In general, illumination shall be external, non-flashing, and non-glare.

   Internal illumination is generally discouraged, but may be appropriate in certain circumstances, such as:
   (i) Individual back-lit letters silhouetted against a softly illuminated wall.
   (ii) Individual letters with translucent faces, containing soft lighting elements inside each letter. Metal faced box signs with cut-out letters and soft-glow fluorescent tubes.
   (iii) However, such signs are generally suitable only on contemporary buildings.
Neon signs may be permitted in exceptional cases where they are custom-designed to be compatible with the building’s historic and architectural character.

Other Stylistic Points:
The shape of a projecting sign shall be compatible with the period of the building to which it is affixed, and shall harmonize with the lettering and symbols chosen for it. Supporting brackets for projecting signs should complement the sign design, and not overwhelm or clash with it. They must be adequately engineered to support the intended load, and generally should conform to a 2:3 vertical-horizontal proportion. Screw holes must be drilled at points where the fasteners will enter masonry joints to avoid damaging bricks, etc.

8. **Color.** Building colors should contribute to the distinct character of the historic building. Original building colors should be researched and considered in any new color scheme. Whether contrasting or complementary, the colors should reflect the design of the building. Building colors should utilize a limited palette. Colors should be selected to emphasize building form and highlight major features of the building. Color schemes using several colors should be avoided and surfaces which are not historically painted should not be painted.

**ANALYSIS**
1. This property is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse 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 proposed signs meet the design guidelines in terms of size, location, materials, lettering and colors.
3. The Pacific Avenue façade is already painted. The proposed colors reflect the design of the building and utilize a limited color palette.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Ben Mauk reviewed that at a previous meeting, they had discussed approving a color palette for Pacific Avenue in general. He reported that they were seeking a separate approval for the proposed color scheme for the Pagni & Lenti Building.

Ms. Jenn LaFreniere, Graham Baba Architects, commented that there had been several ideas for color schemes with the preference being to go with a darker color to anchor the building to the block, using a Hale Navy that complimented the adjacent buildings. The interior would leave the exposed brick structure and include a large naval bronze oven. The sign would be a simple black and steel blade sign with an illuminated naval bronze backing. It was noted the storefronts were not original, so not much detail was being lost.

Commissioner Steel commented that the color was a good improvement and an appropriate adaptation of a building that didn’t have much historic character left.

Mr. Mauk commented the Hale Navy color was drawn from the color palette discussed at a previous meeting, while the black was not from the approved color palette.

Ms. LaFreniere clarified that that there was ongoing discussion regarding a possible blade sign on the Prairie Line Trail side, but only one blade sign planned for Pacific Avenue. Mr. Mauk clarified that they were only seeking approval for the Pacific Avenue blade sign.

There was a motion.
"I move to approve the application for 1702 Pacific, Elemental Pizza. The motion is to include just the Pacific Avenue side of the building and includes one blade sign and the color scheme as presented."
Motion: Steel
Second: York
The motion was approved.
5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Affordable Housing Code Amendment comments

Mr. Reuben McKnight reviewed that there had been a good deal of discussion on the affordable housing amendments at a public hearing the previous week. He noted the concerns that had been raised including many comments on duplex and triplex conversions within the historic district.

Mr. Marshall McClintock discussed a number of comments for consideration. One proposal was for a demolition review for structures that might not be currently protected by the city code including buildings that might not meet the minimum requirements. He suggested that the Commission was not involved enough in policy development for issues relating to historic preservation. He discussed subdivision of lots and suggested that the Commission could provide review of proposed subdivisions of historic lots. He discussed a proposal that duplexes and triplexes include design language that would require maintaining the single family appearance and limiting exterior changes. Mr. Ross Buffington expressed support for Mr. McClintock’s comments, noting that many of the concerns were shared by the Wedge Neighborhood.

Mr. McKnight reported that they were also seeking to involve the Commission in the CUP and Variance decision making process. He suggested that the Commission could also comment that the design guidelines should be updated. Commissioners concurred that updating the design guidelines, particularly for new construction would be a good change.

Discussion ensued on the nature and the appropriate format for comments. There was concurrence for submitting comments as items for consideration. Mr. McKnight reviewed the recommended comments that the Commission could consider including in a letter. Mr. McClintock and Chair Granfield agreed to work with Mr. McKnight on drafting the letter that would be sent out for review before the next meeting.

B. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer provided an update on the following events and activities:

1. Eyes of the Totem
   a. Eyes of the Totem Week Proclamation (City Council, September 15th)
   b. Willow Frost, HC Weaver & Me: An Evening with Jamie Ford (7pm @TPL, September 17th)
   c. Re-premiere (7pm & 10pm @ the Rialto, September 18th)
   d. No-Host Speakeasy Reception & Washington State History Museum Gold Rush Exhibit (8-11pm @ Pythian Temple, September 18th)
   e. Eyes of the Totem viewing and Suffering Heroines and Leering Villains: Eyes of the Totem and Silent Movie Melodrama lecture by Claudia Gorbman Professor of Film Studies (2pm @ the Rialto, September 20th)
2. Holiday Heritage Dance (6-9pm @ Titlow Lodge, November 13th)

6. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer
BOARD BRIEFINGS

### AGENDA ITEM 3A: Prairie Line Trail

*Chris Storey, Public Works*

**BACKGROUND**

The design team will present the Prairie Line Trail Phase II to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to receive their comments. The project is located between South 21st and South 25th along the former BNSF rail line. The team will update the Commission on the project scope and timelines and would like the Commission to identify any concerns related to the surrounding Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District and Union Station Conservation District.

The design team will present a brief presentation showing the projects extents, anticipated look and feel, and the known timelines for completing design at this time. The project builds off of the design work completed for Phase 1 of the project, north of UWT extending to Dock Street and is complementary to the UWT portion of the trail.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

### PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### AGENDA ITEM 4A: Affordable Housing Code Amendment Comments

*Commissioners McClintock and Granfield*

See attached draft letter.

### AGENDA ITEM 4B: Approval of Minutes for 7/22/2015

*Staff*

See attachment.

### AGENDA ITEM 4C: Events & Activities Update

*Staff*

1. **Eyes of the Totem**
   a. Eyes of the Totem Week Proclamation (City Council, September 15th)
   b. Willow Frost, HC Weaver & Me: An Evening with Jamie Ford (7pm @TPL, September 17th)
   c. Re-premiere (7pm & 10pm @ the Rialto, September 18th)
   d. No-Host Speakeasy Reception & Washington State History Museum Gold Rush Exhibit (8-11pm @ Pythian Temple, September 18th)
   e. Eyes of the Totem viewing and *Suffering Heroines and Leering Villains: Eyes of the Totem and Silent Movie Melodrama* lecture by Claudia Gorbman Professor of Film Studies (2pm @ the Rialto, September 20th)

2. **Holiday Heritage Dance** (6-9pm @ Titlow Lodge, November 13th)
September 9, 2015

Chris Beale, Chair
Tacoma Planning Commission
747 Market Street Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

RE: 2015 Annual Amendment Application #3 Affordable Housing Regulations

Dear Chair Beale:

The following comments are offered for the Planning Commission’s consideration as formal comment from the Landmarks Preservation Commission, regarding the proposed regulatory code amendments relating to the Affordable Housing Regulations and potential effects to historic resources citywide and within local historic overlay and conservation districts.

Tacoma is a historic city that is fortunate to have many architecturally and culturally significant buildings citywide, including both designated City Landmarks and buildings within protected districts, and many buildings without such protections that are nonetheless historically significant. As many citizens and historic preservation advocates have pointed out, it is critical that the City consider potential adverse impacts to Tacoma’s character that may result from code amendments and policy changes, including the proposed Affordable Housing Regulations. The Landmarks Preservation Commission generally supports the policy objectives of increasing housing choice, affordability, and diversity, but also is concerned that efforts to achieve these objectives could result in losses to Tacoma’s essential historic character, if not considered carefully.

The Commission specifically would encourage the Planning Commission to consider the following:

- The Landmarks Commission supports improved coordination between the Historic Preservation Office and Land Use staff during review of discretionary permits, including Conditional Use Permits and variances, as well as improved coordination between the Planning Commission and Landmarks Commission regarding policy initiatives that affect historic preservation generally. Language within CUP and variance criteria that considers adverse effects to historic resources and compatibility with district design guidelines, and that provides for input from the Landmarks Commission in the permit review process, would greatly improve outcomes when such permits are approved. This is also consistent with our recommendations for the Narrowmoor Addition Conservation District.
• The Commission also generally supports the proposed design review of duplex and triplex developments within R districts, when such projects are approved. However, the success of this design review process will depend on the quality of the design guidelines that are established.

• The North Slope and Wedge Historic Special Review District Guidelines for New Construction have not been significantly updated since their creation in 1994. If the proposed amendments for Accessory Dwelling Units and small lot development are adopted, the City should devote resources to updating and strengthening the historic district guidelines to provide the tools for review of these types of developments.

• The Landmarks Commission also recommends that the City consider establishing a citywide demolition permit review process to protect historically significant buildings that are not City Landmarks or within a locally designated historic or conservation districts. This could include review of buildings identified in the City Historic Building Inventory and buildings located within National Register or Washington State Heritage Register Historic Districts, which currently have no protection from demolition. It is our understanding that this is a current initiative for the Planning and Development Services Department.

Much of the public comment received thus far has been tied to the protection of historic resources. The City of Tacoma currently has approximately 165 designated City Landmarks and six local historic districts and conservation districts, not including the proposed Narrowmoor Addition Conservation District currently under consideration by the Planning Commission. However, there are hundreds of buildings and neighborhoods areas across the City that residents value for their historic character and contribution to the quality of life within Tacoma. The Landmarks Preservation Commission strongly encourages neighborhood groups and individuals to proactively advocate for and seek historic designation for those sites and areas that matter most.

These comments are offered in the spirit of constructive feedback. The members of the Landmarks Commission appreciate the difficulty of the task set before the Planning Commission during the review of these proposals and the continuum of perspectives that must be weighed accounted for.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chris Granfield
Chair
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: 7/8/15

The minutes from the meeting of 7/8/15 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW**
   A. UWT Streetscape Guidelines

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

**BACKGROUND**

The University of Washington Tacoma is seeking approval for streetscape guidelines, concerning storefront paint colors and awnings, which the university can provide to tenants who wish to differentiate their storefronts from their neighbors and create visual variety. The proposed guidelines would set parameters that have been preapproved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The University is requesting that modifications that conform to these guidelines, once approved, be allowed upon administrative approval from the Historic Preservation Office. Proposed changes that do not conform to these guidelines would go through the typical Landmarks Preservation Commission design review process. The proposed awning guidelines are being presented for feedback and will be finalized for approval at a later date.

The proposed painting requirements only allow painting on previously painted storefronts. The painting of common building elements or masonry would not be allowed. Only one color palette will be allowed per window bay. Only the Benjamin Moore Historic Palette (colors) and the Benjamin Moore Williamsburg Palette (black and white) would be allowed.
The preliminary awning guidelines would require that all awnings: have rectangular fronts and wedge-shaped ends; relate to the storefront window bays; have either open or closed ends; utilize Sunbrella brand awning fabric that is loose-laid over the frame; and appear operable, but be inoperable. All awnings on individual buildings will be required to have matching valences and attach to the window frame or mortar joint in a manner that does not harm character defining features. Awnings may be solid or striped (no patterns), but must be complimentary to the storefront paint scheme.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the proposed design guidelines for storefront paint color and feedback on the proposed awning guidelines.

**STANDARDS**

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

6. **Awnings.** Awnings have been a traditional addition to the facades of buildings within the districts and shall be encouraged within the districts as a functional exterior feature. All awnings shall be compatible with the historic character of the buildings and shall be based in design upon historic counterparts. They shall also:

   a) Reflect the shape and character of the window openings;
   b) Be, or appear to be, retractable in the form of historic awnings;
   c) Constructed with canvas-like fabric rather than high gloss in texture;
   d) Not be back-lit or translucent;
   e) Be in colors and/or patterns which complement the building and have basis in the historic record;
   f) Be attached to the buildings in a manner which does not permanently damage the structure.

8. **Color.** Building colors should contribute to the distinct character of the historic building. Original building colors should be researched and considered in any new color scheme. Whether contrasting or complementary, the colors should reflect the design of the building. Building colors should utilize a limited palette. Colors should be selected to emphasize building form and highlight major features of the building. Color schemes using several colors should be avoided and surfaces which are not historically painted should not be painted.

F. The Landmarks Preservation Commission may, at its discretion, waive mandatory requirements imposed by Section 13.07.290 of this chapter. In determining whether a waiver is appropriate, the Landmarks Preservation Commission shall require an applicant to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that, because of special circumstances not generally applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of those mandatory requirements of Section 13.07.290 would be unnecessary to further the purposes of this chapter. Such waiver shall not exceed the requirements set forth in the underlying zoning district, except where specifically provided for in TMC 13.06A.070.B. (Ord. 27748 Ex. A; passed Oct. 14, 2006; Ord. 27429 § 3; passed Nov. 15, 2005)

**ANALYSIS**

1. The proposed guidelines for storefront modification pertain to contributing structures in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District, as such, they are subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.

2. Awnings are encouraged by the district design guidelines.

3. The proposed guidelines for awnings correlate with the district design guidelines.

4. The proposed guidelines for storefront colors correlate with the district design guidelines and colors previously approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Ben Mauk, Real Estate Manager, commented that as the real estate manager for the retail strip on Pacific Avenue he gives a lot of consideration to what tenants are needed and what kind of customer experience they want to create. He
noted that the presentation was a follow up to a presentation from the previous year on conceptual ideas for what Pacific Avenue might be and how they might implement it. They were proposing the approval of the color palette options to the Commission so they could make future decisions more efficiently. He noted that the awning proposal would incorporate feedback from the previous presentation and the awning for an ATM proposed a month earlier.

Ben Ferguson, Ferguson Architecture, reviewed that the discussion would focus on five central buildings on Pacific Avenue and that the approval requested was only for the retail floor. He added that the West Coast Grocery building would not be part of the Awnings proposal. Images of the historic streetscape were shown, demonstrating that the area used to have a bit more texture. It was noted that none of the photos included the buildings being discussed. The stated goals of the proposal were to draw attention to the storefronts through differentiation and increase business with respect to how Tacoma might have looked, but in a way that is relevant to contemporary businesses. Mr. Ferguson reported that the components being discussed would be the window frame, door, and the wainscot/field/details. They were proposing allowing one historic color for the window frame, a complementary contemporary color for the door, and up to two historic colors for the wainscot. It was noted that the University would have a review process that the color schemes would have to go through before the color schemes would go to the administrative review process. The color palette was discussed. Mr. Ferguson reported that they would be using the Benjamin Moore Historic Palette of muted colors with black and white colors from the Williamsburg palette. Examples of the proposed colors simulated on elevation photos were shown in comparison to the current appearance. Mr. Ferguson commented that the color variation was not changing the appearance of the building as a whole, but it was providing interest and energy at the street level.

Awnings were discussed. Historic photos were shown and Mr. Ferguson noted the varieties of awnings along Pacific Avenue. Mr. Ferguson reported that the University had expressed a preference for all awnings to be open. They awnings that would be rectangular in the front and wedge shaped on the side with the sides open. Awnings would be restricted to the size of a bay and awnings would not cross pilasters. Wall signs would be moved above the awnings in places where they would be covered. The material used would be Sunbrella awning fabrics that would have a textile quality rather than a taut plastic quality. The only characteristics that would be variable would be the color of the awnings and whether they were solid or striped. The valance type would be the same across each building and the valances would not be fixed. Commissioner Williams expressed preference for limiting some of the awning color options and using the Lean-to Awning structure option. Commissioner Schloesser requested material samples for when the presenters returned to discuss the awnings at a future meeting. Commissioner Jensen requested that the guidelines clarify that storefronts with two bays would be consistent. Chair Granfield asked if there would be text or imagery on the awning. Mr. Mauk responded that they would allow up to 25% of the awning or valance to have text or imagery. Commissioner Williams expressed preference for not having signage on the awnings.

Commissioner Steel commented that the previous year they had provided feedback that each buildings should have a single color pattern for the storefront system. He added that it was critical that they read as buildings and not individual storefronts. Mr. Ferguson responded that the basis for the proposal started with the McDonald Smith building where the Commission had approved allowing three storefronts to differentiate themselves. He added that paint was subtle and transient and should reflect the contemporary style. Vice-Chair Katie Chase commented that paint schemes were part of the design guidelines for the Union Depot Warehouse District, which specified that paint schemes with multiple colors should be avoided. Discussion ensued. Commissioner Jensen commented that the whole building did not need to be fully homogenous as the building was typically experienced at the street level, and he didn’t want to restrict a retailer from expressing their brand. Commissioner Schloesser suggested that the wainscot could be kept to one color across the building. Vice-Chair Chase agreed with maintaining a consistent color for the wainscoting and bulkheads across the building while still allowing some customization options. Commissioner Williams concurred.

There was a motion

“I make a motion that you go with one color for the wainscoting across the building, allow for variation on door color and window color, and approve the paint colors that were presented.”

Commissioner Williams clarified that the motion allowed for variation in color on the window frame, but not the casing or the transom windows. The transom windows would be consistent with the wainscot color. It was clarified that the motion would allow for changes within the approved color palette to go through administrative review.
The Motion was approved unanimously.

Chair Granfield noted that Commissioner Schloesser was present.

B. 776 Commerce St, Winthrop Hotel  Les Tonkin

Chair Granfield noted that the Les Tonkin was present and asked if the Commission would be open to giving him time to discuss the garage door at the Winthrop Hotel, which had been an item discussed at the previous Commission meeting. Commissioners voted in approval of the item being added to the agenda with Vice-Chair Chase voting against.

Mr. Les Tonkin commented that the service door was currently a roll up steel coil door and was not wide enough for the garbage equipment. He noted that it was originally two standard doors that swung out. The owner and contractor wanted to expand the door to nine feet wide but the height would remain the same. There would be no structural issues with the expansion. He noted the previous feedback from the Commission that the proposed design was too residential and they were now looking at a standard sectional aluminum door with panels in the center and lights along the top. He distributed images of three proposed options to the Commissioners. Mr. Tonkin clarified that the door would be expanded to the currently boarded up window to the left. Vice-Chair Chase commented that none of the options distributed at the meeting seemed appropriate for the Winthrop and that it would be better to have the proposal in a packet so that the Commissioners would have a better chance to review it. Discussion ensued. Commissioners provided suggestions on the door design. Vice-Chair Chase noted that an in swing double might be a good starting point. Commissioner Steel added that he would like to see a traditional operating door and not an overhead door. Mr. Tonkin commented that the change was needed and that it was preferable to get the door out of the way, but they did have the room for in swing doors. Commissioner York noted that there are garage doors that raise but appear to be older swing doors.

Commissioners concurred that the widening was acceptable.

There was a motion.

“I move to approve the widening of the opening for the door at 776 Commerce Street to 9 feet as submitted and defer the selection of the door until the applicant has presented options to the Commission.”

Motion: Steel.
Second: Jensen.

The motion was approved unanimously.

4. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

   A. Comprehensive Plan Update  Steve Atkinson, Planning Services Division

BACKGROUND
The City of Tacoma is currently undertaking a significant update to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. While the Historic Preservation Plan is not proposed for update at this time, there are other goals and policies that relate or directly support the City’s preservation goals woven throughout the Comprehensive Plan. A public hearing on the public review draft is scheduled for August 19th at 5:00 pm in Council Chambers. On July 22nd, staff from Planning and Development Services will present a brief update to the Landmarks Preservation Commission on changes to the Plan that may be of interest to the Commission, specifically relating to the following:

- Land Use Designations update
- Urban Form and historic land use patterns
- Design and Development policies
The purpose of the presentation is to encourage the Commission to consider providing comments on the proposed draft to the Planning Commission during the comment period or at the public hearing and to provide the Commission with some guidance on the new policies and structure of the Comprehensive Plan so that the Commission can more effectively review and comment on proposed changes.

**ACTION REQUESTED**
This is an informational briefing. No action is requested.

Mr. Stephen Atkinson provided a presentation on some of the items from the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update. He noted that as part of the comment period they were doing outreach to encourage comments on some of the items. He reviewed that they were required by the State to have a plan on how to accommodate anticipated future growth. He reported that some elements were not being proposed to be changed and some older documents were being rescinded. The next steps were reviewed with the town hall events on August 12th and 13th and the public hearing planned for August 19th. The comment period would end on August 26th with some discussion ongoing on extending the comment period. He provided some detail on the past outreach efforts. Mr. Atkinson reviewed content of the Comprehensive Plan. For the Urban Form Element they were using some concepts to consider design, thinking about the relationship between the centers, patterned corridors, employment area, transit station areas, open space corridors, signature trails, and historic neighborhood pattern areas. Maps of mixed-use centers, employment areas, parks and recreation, and residential pattern areas were discussed. The review of residential pattern areas included a discussion of alleys, intersection density, era built, and intensity of land use. Mr. Atkinson discussed efforts to make design policies more prevalent by identifying the range of design issues that need to be considered by the city. The transition from intensities to land use designations was discussed with the North Slope noted as an area where the intensity was not consistent with the zoning. He urged Commissioners to help raise awareness of the update and encourage people to submit comments.

Commissioner Thorne asked if there were any changes to the live-work proposal. Mr. Atkinson responded that he would follow up on the status of the proposal.

Mr. McClintock commented that it was a significant update and urged Commissioners to review the document.

**B. Events and Activities Update**

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer provided an update on the Tacoma Narrows Event being held on August 13th.

Mr. McClintock, noting the yearly bylaws update, made the following recommendations: that staff take a look at the new construction design guidelines for the North Slope Historic District; that they make a statement to clarify the period of significance for the North Slope Historic District; and that they consider several homes, currently non-contributing, that might be characterized as contributing structures.

**5. CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Granfield reminded Commissioners that on June 24th Elliot Barnett had provided a presentation on residential zoning amendments and that there was still time to provide feedback. He thanked the Commissioners for their patience and for allowing Mr. Tonkin’s item to be added to the agenda during the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

______________________________
Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer
STOREFRONT PAINT ATTRIBUTES
UWT STREETSCAPE GUIDELINES
Birmingham Hay & Seed Building (BHS)
Grand Re-Premiere Weekend for H.C. Weaver Productions’

EYES OF THE TOTEM
(1927)

Lost for almost 90 years, celebrate the film’s return home to Tacoma’s Rialto Theater Sept. 17-20

WILLOW FROST, H.C. WEAVER & ME: AN EVENING WITH JAMIE FORD
THURS. SEPT. 17 – 7 PM
Tacoma Public Library
For more information, contact (253) 292-2001, Ext. 1220

RE-PREMIERE OF H.C. WEAVER PRODUCTION’S EYES OF THE TOTEM (1927)
FRI. SEPT. 18 – 7 PM & 10 PM
Rialto Theater
Tickets are $15 per person, available starting Tuesday, Sept. 1, through the Broadway Center Box Office (253) 591-5894 or 1 (800) 291-7593

EYES OF THE TOTEM RECEPTION
1920s Speakeasy and Washington State History Museum Gold Rush Exhibits
FRI. SEPT. 18 – 6-12 AM
Tacoma’s Historic Pythian Temple (Enter through Court C and give the password “HC Weaver Sent me!”)
Hosted by Commencement Lodge, Knights of Pythias (suggested donation)

EYES OF THE TOTEM SCREENING
Followed by “Suffering Heroines and Leering Villains: Eyes of the Totem and Silent Movie Melodrama” by Professor of Film Studies Claudia Gorbman from the University of Washington
SUN. SEPT. 20 – 2 PM
Rialto Theater
Tickets are $15 per person, available starting Tuesday, Sept. 1, through the Broadway Center Box Office (253) 591-5894 or 1 (800) 291-7593

No one can evade the EYES OF THE TOTEM

Sponsored by: Team Totem, Tacoma Historical Society, Broadway Center for the Performing Arts, City of Tacoma, Mariposa Productions, Northwest Costume, Knights of Pythias, Tacoma Public Library, LeMay Family Collection Foundation–Marymount, Tacoma Art Museum

For more information, visit eyesofthetotem.com