MINUTES
Landmarks Preservation Commission
Planning and Development Services Department

Date: January 25, 2017
Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Commission Members in Attendance:
Katie Pratt, Chair
Roger Johnson
Lysa Schloesser
James Steel
Eugene Thorne
Jeff Williams
Kevin Bartoy
Ken House
Marshall McClintock

Commission Members Absent:
Jonah Jensen, Vice-Chair
Brittani Flowers

Staff Present:
Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer
John Griffith

Others Present:
Kurtis Kingsolver
Mike Bartlett
Teri Flynn
Michael Sullivan

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

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Excusal of Absences
   B. Approval of Minutes: 1/11/17
   C. Administrative Review
      • 1407 North 11th Street – heat pump

Chair Pratt noted that she would need recuse herself from item 4.A. As the Vice-Chair was absent from the meeting, Commissioner House volunteered to temporarily be Chair for the item.

The consent agenda was approved.

3. BOARD BRIEFINGS
   A. North Slope Historic Streets Maintenance Standards

Mr. McKnight reviewed that prior to 2005 there had not been a clear definition of streets and the role that they play in historic districts in the code. In 2005 there was a code amendment that had exempted street surfaces between curb faces from design review requirements inside historic districts. The amendment had also removed streets from the eligible properties that could be nominated to the register. In 2008, the streets were eligible again for historic designation and were no longer exempt from design review, though they were exempt from design review for the North Slope. Later a nomination was submitted which lead to the current discussion on how those nominations are treated within the City on how the Public Works Department maintains those streets.
Kurtis Kingsolver, Public Works, reviewed that in 2013 the nomination was made for the 11 blocks in question. He reviewed that they had delayed decision due to the failure of Proposition 1, a 2013 ballot measure that was meant to fund street improvements. He commented that it was a difficult conversation as the cost associated with cobblestone streets was excessive. He noted that the main issue was the cost, reporting that when they looked at a typical residential street, an asphalt street is $41,000 a block, in concrete the cost would be $98,000, stamped concrete would cost $145,000 a block, and cobblestone would cost $454,000 per block to replace like for like. He noted that a storm sewer project, which could affect multiple blocks, would potentially cost millions with the majority of the expense being the restoration of the cobblestone road. Mr. Kingsolver reported that Public Works would recommend replacing cobblestone with a stamped street when a full street repair was needed. For site specific work like a side sewer they would require them to replace it with the materials that were removed, though it would be a burden to the property owner. Mr. Kingsolver noted that even with Prop 8 and Prop 3, there was a $325 million gap in the budget for street repair over the next five years.

Questions received prior to the meeting were discussed. Mr. Kingsolver commented that when they refer to the "entire street" they were referring to the length of the block. For a question on the feasibility of keeping utilities out of the street, Mr. Kingsolver commented that moving all of the utilize would be difficult and that they could not fit all of them into an alley. He noted that sanitary was typically in the alley and everything else was typically in the street. Mr. McClintock noted that they had looked at the services in the area and there were very few, with most of the disruption being where the alleys cross the street. He noted that on North 9th Street they had discovered 3 homes were on the same sewer line and had placed the new line in the parking strip rather than the street. Mr. McClintock commented that he was concerned that those standards would not continue into the future. On question six, Mr. McClintock clarified that he hoped the streets would stay reasonably intact and that the City might be in a better financial position in 10 or 20 years, so if a block does need to be replaced, they wanted there to be an opportunity for a public discussion before action is taken. Mr. Kingsolver responded that from a public works perspective he felt an obligation to do something different and if there was a way to share costs it would be a good path forward.

Mr. McClintock commented that it was possible that they would need to give up particular blocks, but hopefully they would like to retain a block of brick and sandstone for a longer period of time. Mr. Kingsolver responded that utilities and street operations would likely avoid the areas unless something catastrophic happens. Commissioner Williams asked if they could look at the streets block by block to see which blocks don’t have utilities present and are likely to never need to be replaced. Mr. Kingsolver commented that more utilities would actually trigger more money that would come in for maintenance of those roads. He suggested that there might be a middle ground where they keep sections of the street, like a strip on each side of cobblestone with stamped pavement for the rest. Mr. McClintock reiterated that their goal was to preserve as much of the street for as long as was possible and that any of the options were good alternatives to the street going away.

Commissioner Steel asked if they were sand set pavers, noting that it has worked in the past to put them back in place after doing some type of repair. He noted that the cost estimates were not based on the cost of repair using the existing bricks, but replacing them. Mr. Kingsolver noted that a side sewer could be done without having to replace the whole street, but with a large project like a sewer line repair they would need to replace the whole road. He noted that replacing with brand new material was cheaper than storage and return of the original bricks and that it was only common to restore the original bricks on a small scale.

Commissioner Bartoy asked how often they required a full street replacement for utility work. Mr. Kingsolver responded that under the current restoration policy, they could not require utilities to replace more than have of the width of street and they would have to partner with them to do the other half.

Commissioner Thorne asked if the cobblestones were designed to be flipped. Mr. McClintock responded that they were hand carved with a round top and the rest of the surfaces were flat.

Commissioner Thorne asked if there was any thought on saving and recycling the materials. Mr. Kingsolver responded that they do it all the time if they have the room to store it, but there is an additional cost.

Mr. Kingsolver commented that he would like to come back to discuss the details on the specific streets and the cost
estimates of saving a section. He commented that picking a few streets would be tough and expensive. Commissioner Steel commented that it would be good to address the size of the repair or replacement being considered.

Mr. McClintock noted that there were two issues: the time frame for patches or total replacement and that when the Commission had originally approved the nomination the Council had asked for information on the cost, which had held up the nomination.

4. DESIGN REVIEW
   A. The Brewery Blocks (Individual Landmark/Union Station Conservation District)

Commissioner Ken House Chaired the item. Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND
Horizon Partners is proposing to rehabilitate and redevelop the entire block of Commerce Street, between 21st Street and 23rd Street for mixed use, residential, office, retail, and restaurant space. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this development on December 14, 2016. This area is in the Union Station Conservation District, Landmarks Preservation Commission design review is required for new construction. The project area includes:

2101 South C Street (indicated as Building 1 in the application) will be restored and adaptively reused. No exterior work, requiring approval, is proposed at this time.

2105 South C Street, the J. E. Aubry Wagon & Auto Works Building (Building 2), is on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and has recently been rehabilitated for retail and office use. No exterior work, requiring approval, is proposed at this time.

2109-2115 South C Street, the Hunt-Mottet Warehouse (Building 3), is on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. This building will be rehabilitated and four additional stories will be added. When constructed in 1907, the reinforced concrete building was engineered and designed as the first three floors of an eventual six-story building. At the time of the nomination, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on a proposal to add additional floors to the existing structure.

The new stories will follow the original design and structural engineering. The project will use a matching finished and painted cementitious exterior. The upper floors will conform to the historic vertical alignment of window openings on the primary east and west facades with expressed pilasters running up between windows, inset spandrel panels beneath and simple belt course detailing under the parapets on the primary east and west elevations. Wood double-hung windows, with exterior paint, enamel or metal cladding, repeating the detailing on the lower portion of the building will be used on the new upper stories. The cornice band and parapet will follow the original design; there will be no large mechanical units and a single elevator house. The plane of new floors on the C Street façade will be set back approximately six feet as required for utility line clearance but the remaining three elevations will rise from existing exterior walls. The North and South elevations will rise as a continuous smooth party wall with punched window openings and simple flat sills.

The existing bay door openings and windows on the ground Commerce Street level will be retained and refitted with retail storefronts and entries. The street level storefronts will be wood construction and borrow in detail, from the adjacent Aubry Wagon & Auto Works Building and other contributing storefronts in the historic district. On the C Street ground level the sidewalk will be elevated to meet the interior floor level and existing window and door openings will be configured to provide entries, retail shops and windows. The existing board formed concrete exterior walls will be patched and filled as needed with matching cementitious mortar and repainted using elastomeric paint. The heavy timber interior framing will be preserved and selectively exposed on the three lower floors and the new construction will incorporate heavy timber and wood framing in a similar design. Steel frame seismic braces will be added as required on the lower existing levels with setbacks from the interior walls and windows to minimize visibility.
from the outside. Canopies will be designed to reflect the historic loading dock canopies. Concrete paint color will vary slightly between the existing and new upper stories on the building distinguishing the old from the new.

2120 Commerce Street (Building 4) includes the site of one of the garages that were recently destroyed in a fire, as well as an additional garage that is fire damaged but has not yet been demolished (there were several parking shed structures damaged by the same fire that have been demolished already as hazards). This site is located in the Union Depot Warehouse Conservation District. Pictures of the remaining structure to be removed are included in the packet. If the Commission determines that the building is not historically significant, the demolition review procedures are waived and the remainder of the review focuses on the design of a new structure.

The proposal is to build a new 43,300sf. 4-story concrete brick clad building. The building will include retail/restaurant space facing the streets and a rooftop bar and garage parking for 126 cars. The new structure will incorporate design elements that reflect the industrial warehouse district including brick exterior walls on the East, North and West elevations and metal frame window and opening details. The three-story Commercial street elevation will be configured with a main floor, mezzanine and full third floor borrowings from the floor organization of the Hunt Mottet Warehouse. On the South C Street elevation, the building will have a stepped brick wall façade with a single story retail entry and storefront flanked by garage openings with wire mesh grilles. Industrial metal awnings, which reflect the loading dock covers throughout the district, will indicate the entrances on both the 2120 building and the 2150. The Commission expressed concern over the previous design, which reproduced elements of one of the structures destroyed in the fire. The applicant has revised the design in response to this feedback.

2200 Commerce Street, Phoenix Lofts (Building 5, future phase). Site of the other garage fire and will be the site of a new 64,800sf. four-story concrete podium with nine stories of apartments. The new structure will include retail/restaurant space facing both Commerce and C streets, garage parking for 122 cars and 153 apartments. At the December 14 briefing, the applicant specifically asked for guidance regarding the height of the building with respect to the Union Station Design Guidelines, which limit height to 85' to respect the dome of Union Station. The Commission indicated that, similar to the Convention Center hotel project, the building site is far enough removed from Pacific and Union Station (and within the Conservation District) that this is not a significant concern. At this time, the applicant is seeking approval for only the massing and size.

2250 Commerce Street (Building 6, future phase) is slated for a future mid-rise building that is not yet designed. The current proposal is to demolish all but the two southern shed bays; this structure was also damaged in the recent fire. At this time, the applicant is seeking approval for only the massing and size.

Stairs and sidewalks are not typically under the jurisdiction of the Commission within the Conservation District, which limits design review to new construction, demolition and addition. A 8'-wide stair climb running between the Hunt Mottet Warehouse and the 2120 building to provide mid-block access from Commerce to South C Street. It will rise in two flights with a landing served by openings in the Hunt Mottet Building. The north wall will be board formed concrete and the south wall will be brick. Following Commission feedback, the stairs have been widened and door openings onto the stairs have been added, in addition to illumination.

Floorplans, renderings, and materials and color lists have been provided in the packet.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

At this time, the applicant is seeking:

1. Approval of the design for the four story addition at 2110 S C Street
2. Approval of the design for the garage at 2120 S C Street
3. Conceptual approval of the massing for the future phases at 2200 and 2250

**STANDARDS**

Design Guidelines for the Union Depot/Warehouse District & the Union Station Conservation District (applicable to the portions of the project within the Union Station Conservation District)

Included in the packet.
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings (applicable to individually designated Landmarks)

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
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.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
5. 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.

ANALYSIS

1. This property is on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and in the Union Station Conservation District and, as such, new construction is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission may, at its discretion, waive mandatory requirements imposed by the design guidelines. 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 would be unnecessary to further the purposes of this chapter.
3. The Hunt Mottet Warehouse was originally intended to have six stories. The new addition will match the historic design and original plans, but will differentiate in color to differentiate the old and the new elements.
4. The Commission has been briefed previously on this project, including during the nomination discussion and design briefing, and has expressed support for the approach. The existing structure is being restored and rehabilitated. The historic character of the building is being retained and the additional will follow the historic design.
5. The new garage structure at 2120 has been redesigned in response to Commission feedback. The proposed materials reflect the prominent materials in the district, which include brick and metallic finishes, and the design incorporates the design guidelines emphasis on storefronts and the pedestrian experience.
6. The signs include light colored letters on a dark background, as well as exterior illumination and materials, as recommended in the guidelines.
7. The proposed building colors and materials complement both the historic and new elements of the district.
8. The proposed height of 2200 Commerce Street, is above the 85’ cap recommended in the design guidelines. However, this recommendation is set to respect the prominence of the Union Station dome cap and this site is set at the edge of the conservation district. The height of this development would not obstruct the view of Union Station and the Landmarks Preservation Commission may waive this guideline. The Commission previously reviewed this item on December 14, 2016.
9. The scale of the proposed buildings reflects the warehouse design and massing of the surrounding district.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mike Bartlett, President of Horizon Partners Northwest, reviewed a map of the two block segment, noting which projects they were seeking approval on. He reviewed plans for the four structures, noting that they had completed the renovation for the first two buildings and had signed a lease for another engineering company. He reviewed that they had exceeded the requirements for commercial zoning and wanted to get an urban, pedestrian feel for the
street. He commented that they would likely seek to form an LID for the street work with enhanced paving and historic fixtures. He reported that they had widened the stairways between the buildings from 5 feet to 8 feet which would allow for some side entrances. The stairways would be well lit with downlights. They hadn’t ruled out including timed gates, but hoped that there would be enough activity in the neighborhood to not need them. The openings between the buildings would also provide access to the Prairie Line Trail. Mr. Bartlett noted that in response to comments from the Commission, the 2120 building had been given a more straightforward design using brick instead of concrete. In preparing for construction they had salvaged around 8000 feet of 1 ½” Douglas Fir wood from the old Hunt garage. He noted that they had tried incorporate some of the old Hunt garage into the new structure, but the fire damage and condition of the concrete made it too difficult. Mr. Bartlett commented they would be salvaging enough wood that they heavy timber structure of the additional would be almost entirely recycled wood.

Teri Flynn, Flynn Architecture, discussed the new windows in the new upstairs portion of the 2110 Building, which would be in recessed. They would be new double paneled wood windows, similar to the existing building, with effort taken to replicate the sills and the wall. Ms. Flynn discussed which paint colors would be used and provided samples, noting that they were not completely committed to the color, but they would paint in the field and assess. They would return to the commission with the final colors. The existing base would be painted a darker color than the addition. The lighter paint would highlight the art deco trim between the old and the new.

Michael Sullivan noted that the three floors of the 2110 building were originally built in anticipation of four additional floors on top. What was unique about the building was that they could salvage wood from the Hunt-Mottet storage building next door, so not only would they be completing the intended floors using a 110 year old plan, but they would also be using contemporary materials. He commented that they were also working with new elements in the building code that allow for high rise timber construction using cross laminated timber technology.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the Hunt-Mottet building was a designated landmark, so the full design review authority of the Commission would apply. The fire damaged parking garage at 2120 would need a non-historic determination so that it could be removed. Commissioners concurred with voting on the individual buildings separately.

There was a motion.
"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for the Brewery Block building at 2110 South C Street."
Motion: Steel
Second: Williams
The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Bartlett reviewed images that showed the extent of the fire damage at 2120.

There was a motion.
"I move the Landmarks Preservation Commission find that the building is non-contributing to the district and wave any procedural requirements for the existing building where there was a fire at what was presented as 2120 Commerce Street."
Motion: Steel
Second: Schloesser
The motion was approved unanimously.

The conceptual design for the new garage building at 2120 was discussed. Mr. Bartlett noted that the 20 foot vertical height of the 2 story element for the proposed restaurant with the roof deck on top. It was noted that an opening on the South C Street side was for a ramp up to rooftop parking.

Commissioner Steel asked if there would be depth to the opening with the brick. Ms. Flynn confirmed that it would and that they would wrap the brick around the wall with the openings. Commissioner Steel requested that the pilasters or structural bays should fall in a brick module, so that the bricks were not cut into smaller bricks.

Mr. Sullivan noted that historically the whole block was inventory storage and heavy industrial uses, then the building later became parking. He added that parking was necessary for the reuse of historic buildings in the district.
Commissioner Johnson asked about the car capacity of the proposed garage. Mr. Bartlett responded that there would be spaces for 128 cars and they were hopeful that they could co-use between commercial and residential parking as there was currently a surplus of nighttime parking spaces.

There was a motion.
I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 2120, the construction of the garage, within the Brewery Blocks."
Motion: Steel
Second: Williams
The motion was approved unanimously.

The conceptual approval for the massing for 2200 and 2250 was discussed. Mr. Bartlett noted that 2250 would be slightly less than the allowed height in the district and that the entire block density would be lower than what was allowed by the zoning. He noted that if 2250 was any higher and it would become a high rise and trigger additional requirements.

Commissioner Steel asked for more information about what was planned for the top floor of the 2200 building and the angled structure. Ms. Flynn responded that the very top would be rooftop amenities and that the angled structure would be set back and not visible from the street.

Commissioner Steel noted that there did not appear to be a relationship between the structural bays at the ground level with the bays above. Ms. Flynn responded that below they were working with parking bays with specific dimensions and that about they had a different rhythm for the rooms above. She added that they would be recessing the top living areas due to electrical wires. Commissioner Steel asked what construction materials they would be using for the residential floor. Mr. Bartlett noted the three material options that were being considered: post tension concrete, pre-manufactured wall panels, and using mainly Cross Laminated Timber. Commissioner Steel asked if the walls with the windows and pilasters would be load bearing. It was noted that they were false pilasters and could be theoretically be lined up. Commissioner Steel commented that they had approved contemporary buildings in the district and that the top portion of the building would not need to appear to be a traditional building in terms of appearing to have load bearing walls. He suggested that they could be more creative with the wall and not necessarily attempt to resemble a historic structure, adding that he would be accepting of it because the lower stories would fit into the rhythm of the district. Commissioners concurred that having a modern design for the residential floors above would be okay.

There was a motion.
"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for the Brewery Blocks for the massing and height of the building at 2200."
Motion: Steel
Second: Williams
The motion was approved unanimously.

5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Events and Activities Updates

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

2017 Events
1. Historic Preservation Month Shirt Vote (February)
2. Landmarks Commissioner Training (8:30am-4:30pm @ Tacoma Convention Center, March 7th)
3. NSHD’s Wood Window Workshop (9am-4:30pm @ Foss Waterway Seaport, February 18th-19th)
4. History Happy Hour Trivia Night (6pm @ The Swiss Restaurant & Pub, March 15th)
5. Buying Historic Houses Workshop (TBD, April 8th)
6. Historic Preservation Month (May)
   i) City Council Proclamation (5pm @ City Council Chambers, May 2nd)
ii) Historic Tacoma Kick-Off Event (7pm TBD, May 5th)
iii) THS's Historic Homes Tour (May 6th – 7th)
iv) TAM's Prairie Line Trail Festival (TBD May 7th)
v) Amazing Preservation Race (11am TBD, May 7th)
vi) Historic Preservation Debate (TBD, May 13th)
vii) Historic Preservation Awards and Maritime History Walking Tour (1pm TBD, May 20th)
7. Northeast Tacoma Walking Tour (10am TBD, June 3rd)
8. Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Youth Heritage Program: Maritime Heritage (July 11th – 15th)
9. South Tacoma Walking Tour (10am TBD, August 12th)
10. Walking Tour (10am TBD, September 9th)
11. Arts Month (October TBD)
12. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance (November 3rd TBD)

6. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

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

Submitted as True and Correct:

[Signature]

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer