

Members

Katie Chase, *Chair*
 Vacant, *Vice-Chair*
 Duke York
 Jonah Jensen
 Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Jeff Williams
 Eugene Thorne
 Lauren Flemister

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

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



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: April 13, 2016

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Chase, *Chair*
 Duke York
 Eugene Thorne
 James Steel
 Lysa Schloesser
 Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
 Lauren Hoogkamer
 John Griffith

Others Present:

David Strauss
 Laura Lenss
 Matthew Wood

Commission Members Absent:

Jonah Jensen
 Jeff Williams
 Lauren Flemister

Chair Katie Chase called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m.

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

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 4/6/2016
- C. Administrative Review: 321 N J Street- Exterior Stairs

The consent agenda was approved.

3. TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES - PRELIMINARY REVIEW

- A. 309 S. 9th Street, The Hosmer House

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The Italianate style Hosmer House was built in 1875 on Saint Helens Street and relocated to its present site in 1904. It is the oldest known residence, and the second oldest building, in the city outside of Fort Nisqually. It was designed by Theodore Hosmer and built by P.D. Forbes. Tacoma architect C.A. Darmer designed the addition in 1888, and the architectural firm Heath & Gove remodeled the structure in approximately 1914. In 1980, the building was restored by architect Gene Grulich. It is nominated under Criterion A as the only remaining building directly associated with the selection of Tacoma as the western terminus for the Northern Pacific Railroad; Criterion B as it was the home of Theodore Hosmer, New Tacoma's first mayor and manager of the Tacoma Land Company; Criterion C as one of the few remaining examples of residential Italianate architecture in Tacoma; Criterion E for its proximity to the Old City Hall Historic District; and Criterion F as an established and familiar visual feature. The proposed period of significance is between 1875 and 1914, which was when the main structure and addition were built, relocated, and converted to apartments. Other significant dates include 1888 when the addition was built, 1904 when it was relocated from St. Helens Avenue, 1914 when it was remodeled into apartments, and 1980 for its most recent restoration.

Pioneer Human Services currently owns and maintains the apartment building and was notified of the pending nomination on February 18, 2016. The nomination was prepared and submitted by Marshall McClintock on behalf of Historic Tacoma. Letters of support have been received from Councilmember Robert Thoms, the New Tacoma and Central Tacoma Neighborhood Councils, the Tacoma Historical Society, and the Heritage League of Pierce County, and are included in the packet.

The building is nominated under the following criteria:

- A. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- B. *Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- C. *Embodies 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;*
- E. *Is part of, adjacent to, or related to an existing or proposed historic district, square, park, or other distinctive area which should be redeveloped or preserved according to a plan based on a historic, cultural, or architectural motif; or*
- F. *Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or City.*

REQUESTED ACTION

Determination of whether the property nominated to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places appears to meet the threshold criteria for nomination, and if so, scheduling the nominations for public hearing. The commission may forward all or part of the nomination for future consideration.

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.
- The property will become eligible for the Historic Conditional Use Permit.
- The property may be eligible as a sending site in Tacoma's Transfer of Development Rights program

STANDARDS

The threshold criteria for Tacoma Register listing are listed at 13.07.040B(1), and include:

1. Property is at least 50 years old at the time of nomination; and,
2. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association such that it is able to convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

ANALYSIS

1. At 141-years-old the structure meets the age threshold criterion.
2. This building retains a high degree of integrity; it retains its original style, massing, cladding, window openings and ornamentation, among other character defining features. Although it has been relocated, that relocation is more than 50 years old and significant in its own right. It is also located very near its original site and in the same downtown setting. The major additions and alterations also qualify as significant, as they are more than 50 years old and sensitively designed by noted architects. The basement, entry stairs and porch date back to 1904. Some architectural features have been lost or altered over time, the decorative balustrade on the roof of the portico was replaced with a box rail around 1980 and a bay window was lost in approximately 1918.

Mr. Marshall McClintock noted that the current property owner, Pioneer Human Services, was not a party to the nomination. He commented that Historic Tacoma and other preservation organizations had been worried about the Hosmer House for some time as it was a significant building that was not on the register. Mr. McClintock commented that Historic Tacoma believed Pioneer Human Services had done an outstanding job in their 20 years of ownership of the building and the nomination was unrelated to their maintenance, but to make sure that the building is preserved and recognized as the landmark that it is.

The front façade of the building, now known as the Exley Apartments, was discussed. Mr. McClintock noted that when the building was moved in 1904, the brick steps were added. It was unclear when the portico was added. Mr. McClintock noted the architectural characteristics including Italianate style windows, decorations on the window hoods, elaborate brackets in the cornice area, and paneling details. He commented that while there were a number of buildings built in

Tacoma during that period in the Italianate style, there were very few left.

Louise and Theodore Hosmer were discussed. Mr. McClintock discussed how Theodore Hosmer had joined the Army of the Republic, then worked on the Central Pacific Railroad in San Francisco before joining the Northern Pacific Railroad. In 1873 he was named Secretary to the selection committee to determine the terminus for the Northern Pacific Railroad, where he was the special agent in charge of the site.

Historic Photographs were discussed. On a picture from 1881, Mr. McClintock noted the Hosmer House at the center of the picture and the location of the Northern Pacific headquarters. He commented that no buildings in the picture other than the Hosmer House remained to date. He discussed an illustration from West Coast magazine from 1883 that showed the full front porch, a small bay, and a cast iron filigree along the porch and crown. He discussed a picture of the Tacoma Land Office, a picture of St. Helens Ave from 1890, a fire insurance map that showed how the building was sited before being moved, and a photo of South 9th Street from 1925. Mr. McClintock reviewed how the proposed site for the Rhodes Medical Arts building would have required the removal of the home, but was ultimately relocated up the street to gain a second entrance. A photo from 1956 showed the state of the building when it was proposed for demolition. He noted that by 1975 the building had been abandoned and condemned, shown in a newspaper photo from 1980. Mr. McClintock commented that it was remarkable that the Hosmer House had survived and that they wanted to see it survive for another 100 years.

Mr. McClintock noted that one of the criteria is association with an important member of the community. He reviewed that Theodore Hosmer in addition to being the Secretary of the selection committee, was also President of the Board of Trustees, the Mayor of Tacoma in 1882, General Manager of the Tacoma Land Company, President of the Tacoma Light and Water Company, President of the Wilkeson Coal & Coke Company, Director of the Pacific National Bank, Founder and Backer of the Tacoma Hotel, vestryman and backer of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Trustee and Treasurer of Annie Wright Seminary, one of the Incorporators for the University of Puget Sound, Founder of the University Union Club, Charter Member of the founding for the Washington State Historical Society, Founder of the Tacoma Yacht Club, and President of the Tacoma Theater Company

Chair Chase noted that Commissioner Thorne would need to recuse himself from voting as he was a board member of Historic Tacoma.

Commissioner Schloesser asked why the current owner was not part of the nomination. Mr. McClintock responded that Historic Tacoma had attempt to contact Pioneer Human Services, but they had not responded. Mr. McKnight commented that they had also sent a letter to the owner who had requested a 30 day review period, but had not expressed a position on the nomination.

Commissioner Steel asked how the nomination met Criterion A: association with historic events. Mr. McClintock responded that it had built as a double house, and managers of the Northern Pacific Railroad and other people associated the railroad would have stayed there at time. He added that the home was part of the early infrastructure of the City in conjunction with its association with the construction of the railroad.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis as findings and schedule the Hosmer House nomination for a public hearing and future consideration at the meeting of May 25th, 2016."

Motion: Schloesser

Second: York

The motion was approved. Commissioner Thorne did not vote as he had recused himself.

4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. Seymour Conservatory (Individual Landmark)

Mr. Reuben 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. 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 will provide a briefing on the current design concept and review process.

ACTION REQUESTED

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

David Strauss, SHKS Architects, commented that intent of the discussion was to review the project history and discuss the development of the program, site and building design, and their approach to complying with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He commented that while the east side of the Conservatory was well known, the building was experienced from all sides and the capacity to walk around the building was especially important in the experience of Wright Park.

Mr. Strauss discussed the topography and axial relationship of the conservatory and the park. He noted the primary axis running through the east entrance of the building and the subordinate axis running through each of the wings. He discussed how the context for the conservatory is established by the sight lines, which give an indication for where an expansion might best be sited and impact the visual character of the conservatory the least. He reviewed the ten principles informing the design of the expansion including memory, deference, and balance which were the foremost. Mr. Strauss reviewed the four early design concepts that had been presented to the Commission in October. He reviewed that the comments at the time had focused on the size of the conservatory and concerns about the impact to the western slope. He reviewed they also had met Commissioners for further discussion at Wright Park which had resulted in consideration for a concept that moved the expansion to the north along G Street. Mr. Strauss reported that after consideration, Metro Parks felt that the goals could be met with a smaller addition than what had been originally proposed.

Mr. Strauss discussed changes needed for the current building including removal of the gift shop and office from the south wing; seismic improvements; new mechanical and electrical systems; addressing mold and water leaks; providing universal access to the building; and restoration of the original arched openings at the ends of the wings based on photographic evidence.

The site diagram was shown. Mr. Strauss commented on important character defining features including the knoll, the central rotunda, and screening elements. He discussed how the site configuration provided cues on how to situate new elements. He commented that by benching the rotunda they can get it 20 feet lower and allow the historical rotunda to maintain its supremacy. He noted that they would also be retaining the network of open spaces, providing a path between the observatory and the addition by placing a portion of the addition underground. Mr. Strauss commented that the intent was to interpret the original site as a basis for an addition that extends the historic program. The form of the addition would reflect the functional requirements shared with the rotunda. Mr. Matthew Wood commented that the functional considerations included optimizing solar access, allowing enough size for flexibility, and minimizing the carbon footprint.

Ms. Laura Lenss discussed the site plan. She reported that the existing conservatory lacks a formal entry, so part of the proposal was a more welcoming entry with the extension of the driveway to connect to South 3rd Street and the removal of parking directly in front of the conservatory. The entry space would serve as a public plaza and the entry pavilion would be set back from the existing conservatory so that it would remain the prominent figure on the east facade. Ms. Lenss commented that they would terrace down to a connection with the new display space. A section drawing showed the flow from the existing wing down to the new display area. A perspective view from the east showed how the new entrance was deferential to the existing building. A perspective from the southwest showed the landscape flowing between the old and the new. A view from the northeast showed the relationship between the historic facade, Ms. Lenss noting the screening elements and the new building.

Conservatory precedents were discussed, it being noted that the materials had not changed much over time. Mr. Strauss commented that the material palette would remain familiar. He discussed the applicable standards from the Secretary of Interior's Standards including continuity of use, new work being both compatible and differentiated, and changes being reversible. He commented that standards relating to cultural landscapes were also relevant as they were retaining the character defining features and removing parking from in front of the building. He commented that the open spaces created by the addition, retain key site characteristics and are compatible in scale and materials with Wright Park.

Commissioner Thorne asked if the new dome addition would require the removal of any existing trees. Mr. Strauss commented that an Oriental Spruce would be removed due to the danger of falling branches to the existing structure. He added that they were also removing a Corsican Pine that had a split trunk due to its failing health.

Commissioner Steel asked what the original end walls of the conservatory were made out of. Mr. Strauss responded that they were made out of wood. Commissioner Steel asked if the intent was to remake them as they were originally. Mr. Strauss responded that they would be replicated visually, but not with the same materials. Commissioner Steel asked if it would meet the standards to replicate a significant architectural feature. Mr. McKnight commented that in this case, where a significant architectural feature was missing and there was good documentation on how it would have appeared, it would bring back the architectural character of the building to replicate it.

Commissioner Steel commented that the proposed design for the addition had come a long way and that it fit both the site and the existing building. He commented that the screen element at the front entry seemed strong since the existing building was so glassy. He suggested that the screen element could be reduced in height so that the roof could come over the top of it and it could be more of a landscape gesture than an architectural gesture, that way it would not compete with the bookends for architectural prominence.

Chair Chase commented that for the screen, they will be interested in what the material palette is going to be. She asked if they had any thoughts about the addition of hardscaping for the terrace and the plaza in terms of the standards and maintaining the green space. Mr. Strauss commented that they had talked about a decomposed granite and providing some plantings; treating it as a small space of Wright Park while also providing an entry for the conservatory.

5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Heritage Project Grant Recommendations

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

The City of Tacoma's Historic Preservation Office is offering a new Heritage Project Grant for 2016. The Heritage Project Grant Program is intended to support projects that increase public awareness and access to Tacoma's history. Funding can be used for exhibitions, workshops, events or educational activities, development and production of interpretive materials, professional services required to research a historical publication or register nomination, documentation of an artifact or historical site, a historic site assessment, conservation materials, and, in some limited cases, capacity building for organizations with heritage as their primary mission. Eligible applicants include non-profits, organized groups, and public and educational institutions. Applicants may apply for anywhere between \$1,000 and \$20,000 for their project. This is a matching grant with up to \$50,000 in total awards being granted.

Nine applications were received. On March 22, 2016, the Heritage Grant Panel conducted an initial review. A handout with their recommendations will be provided.

Commissioner Schloesser commented that it had been an interesting process and they had great submissions. She commented that it was exciting that they were able to give money to all but one of the submissions. Commissioner Schloesser commented that all of the submission had been worthy and she was excited to see what they would do with the money they are being given.

Commissioner Steel commented that the multicultural variety in the submissions was nice to see, especially the Foss Waterway Seaport exhibit.

Chair Chase commented that she would have to recuse herself due to her employers association with the Urban Grace project.

There was a motion.

"I move that we approve all of the candidates on the list as written."

Motion: York

Second; Schloesser

The motion was approved. Chair Chase did not vote as she had recused herself.

B. Events and Activities Updates

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

1. **Wood Windows Workshop Recap**
2. **Historic Preservation Month, May 2016**
 - a) Historic Homes Tour with Tacoma Historical Society(April 30th–May 1st)
 - b) Proclamation (5pm @ City Council, May 3rd)
 - c) Historic Preservation Month Kick Off: Historic Tacoma's Coloring Contest of Tacoma Iconic Buildings (7pm @ 1120 Creative House, May 6th)
 - d) Amazing Preservation Race (11am @ UWT, May 14th)
 - e) City of Destiny Poetry Slam: Lincoln District Edition (6pm @ Lincoln High School, May 20th)
 - f) Awards Ceremony (1pm-3pm @ The Swiss, May 22nd)
 - g) Midcentury Modern Ride—Formerly Known as the Tweed Ride (10:30am @ Point Defiance Park, May 28st)
 - h) History Speaks: "Eyes of the Totem Rediscovered" (12pm @ WSHM, May 31st)
 - i) Film Screening: Eyes of the Totem (3pm @ WSHM, June 4th)
3. **Neighborhood History Walks with the Councilmembers, June-July 2016 TBD**

Mr. McKnight reported that the partial approval for 1916 Jefferson had been appealed. He commented that they might need the Chair and a Commissioner to appear at the May 5th hearing on behalf of the Commission.

6. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Chase encouraged Commissioners to familiarize themselves with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the Design Review Guidelines within the City. She commented that she wanted to streamline the meetings and would be asking Commissioners to review the staff report first for design review applications and then base discussion and questions on the staff report. She noted that she had also requested that language for potential motions be provided in the staff report.

Mr. McClintock reported that he would be leaving the Commission as the Ex-Officio for the North Slope in May.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer