



Members

Kevin Bartoy, Chair
Ken House, Vice-Chair
Roger Johnson
Lysa Schloesser
Jeff Williams
Jennifer Mortensen
Alex Morganroth
Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Commission
Planning and Development Services Department**

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
Lauren Hoogkamer, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Amylena Figueroa, Office Assistant

Date: September 12, 2018

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 243

Commission Members in Attendance:

Kevin Bartoy, Chair
Ken House, *Vice-Chair*
Roger Johnson
Lysa Schloesser
Jennifer Mortensen
Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer
Amylena Figueroa

Others Present:

Claire Keller-Scholz
Judy Tucker

Commission Members Absent:

Jeff Williams
Alex Morganroth

Chair Kevin Bartoy called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Administrative Review
 - Nisqually Substation – transformer vault roof

The consent agenda was approved.

3. NAMING – PRELIMINARY REVIEW

3427 Ruston Way, Judge Jack Tanner Park

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff review.

BACKGROUND

Metro Parks Tacoma is requesting to rename the 4.92-acre Marine Park, at 3427 Ruston Way, Judge Jack Tanner Park. The park would commemorate Judge Tanner’s contributions to civil rights and social justice in Tacoma. The parcels currently known as Marine Park were sold to the City of Tacoma and Metro Parks in the 1970s/80s. On February 13, 2018, the Park Board decided to rename Marine Park in honor of Judge Jack Tanner (1919-2006) as part of Metro Parks commitment to social equity, inclusion and diversity, key elements of the Strategic Master Plan formally adopted by the Park Board in January 2018. Judge Tanner was the first African-American in the Pacific Northwest to be appointed to the federal bench as a district court judge. He presided over several landmark cases involving social and environmental justice in Washington and Tacoma.

CRITERIA

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

ACTION REQUESTED

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

ANALYSIS

1. Pursuant to Council Resolution 38091, the Landmarks Preservation Commission reviews and makes recommendations to City Council on name change requests.
2. The request includes a narrative, map and photographs of the area, as well as a summary of public outreach and letters of support from Tacoma Historical Society, Loren Miller Bar Association, Tacoma/Pierce County Bar Association, University of Puget Sound, Washington State Historical Society, Superior Court of the State of Washington, Pierce County; and the Tacoma Pierce County Black Collective.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended language for scheduling a public hearing:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis as findings and schedule the **Naming of the Judge Jack Tanner Park** recommendation for a public hearing and future consideration at the meeting of October 24, 2018.*

Recommended language for deferral:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission defer consideration of the request to **name Judge Jack Tanner Park** so that additional information (specify) can be presented for consideration to the Commission.*

Recommended language for denying the application:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission find that the request to **name Judge Jack Tanner Park** does not appear to meet the standards [cite specific reasons] in the Policy on Name Changes, and deny the request.*

Ms. Keller-Scholz, from Metro Parks, attended the meeting to answer any questions that the Commissioner's may have. Commissioner Johnson wondered about the western boundary, and why they cut it off where they did. Keller-Scholz noted that there is the city part of the Marine Park at that boundary. There were no more questions.

Commissioner Mortensen made a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission defer consideration of the request to name Judge Jack Tanner Park so that additional information (specify) can be presented for consideration to the Commission."

Commissioner Schloesser seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

1218 North I Street (North Slope Historic District) Dormers

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1889, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing remodeling the existing attic space for a new master suite. This would include new stairs from the upper floor to the attic, a new dormer over the stairs on the west and raising the roof/changing the roof pitch on two existing dormers on the east. The exterior would be repainted, but there would be no other changes to the front façade. The applicant will be presenting paint samples and additional photographs.

ACTION REQUESTED

This is a briefing, no action requested.

Judy Tucker, the architect of the project, and Jenny Jacobs, the owner, came to present pictures to show the commission. She noted that they would be raising the back bay lights. The bay starts roughly at the line of the chimney. She's wanting to raise the dormer height for the windows. She's proposing a wood window to match what's already there. Where the existing chimney is, she will shift the weight to make it safer and will not impact the chimney visually. She explained the neighbor's house is very close, so she is not proposing windows on that side of the house. She would like to add more vibrancy to the colors that can bring back the detailing of the home. She will also add bud shingling instead of the straight shingle to have more continuity to the character of the home.

Chair opened to questions and comments.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if staff has met with the applicant prior to this. Ms. Hoogkamer said no, but they have reviewed the drawings.

Commissioner McClintock commented that he had a problem with the dormers, and noted there is a guideline that roof additions be in scale. He thought that the dormers are out of scale. He noted that the vegetation may be there now, but vegetation can change. The house is in great shape and hasn't changed much, and the applicant can rethink some of the proposed plans. He noted that on a house like this, the dormers are going to be quite small and the pitch of the overall roof reflects the overall pitch, and raising them up to be equal to the roof would be a non-historical change.

Chair Bartoy read the roof and rooftops guidelines from the historic guidelines that commissioner McClintock was referring to. Commissioner Mortenson asked, is the main reason for the elevation pitch for code compliance. Ms. Tucker responded, that it's for more livable space and to get more head height. In order for the attic to be usable space, she would need to add height.

Commissioner Schloesser agreed with McClintock on roof pitch.

Mr. McKnight asked Ms. Tucker if she's at the steepest she can be in order to accommodate the head height. She responded that yes they are at the steepest, without exceeding head height.

Commissioner Schloesser asked Commissioner McClintock if the mudroom was an addition. He noted that he's most concerned about the dormers.

The applicant noted that each bay is detailed differently, and she can look at a different alternative. McClintock noted another possibility would be to do the stairs from the third floor to the back that would allow you to get your access and not necessarily have the dormer for the stair height.

McKnight said what he's hearing is the form of the dormers is not appropriate to the house because of the pitch and the other concern is the size is not sensitive to the house.

Ms. Tucker asked what next steps are. The detailing true to the Victorian style stops part way through, would she have to detail the rear.

Mr. McKnight answered that this is a briefing so there are no actions, just feedback from the commission. Following that, the feedback is helpful and when you have a revised design that addresses the issues to bring back as an action item, or even another design briefing before having the commission take a vote.

Commissioner House commented that if she gets to the point of a design review, she can take it to the board. Other applicant noted that the scale is not changing, just the height. Commissioner McClintock noted that the pitch and the entire shape is changing, not just the height. Commissioner Mortensen mentioned it's the relationship between all the elements and the whole, in relation to the house it's quite a large volume change. Commissioner McClintock noted that he does not have a problem with the chimney. Ms. Tucker thanked the commission for their time.

5. DESIGN REVIEW

516 North Cushman (North Slope Historic District) Porch

Mr. McKnight offered for the commission to defer to take a motion on the incomplete application for 516 North Cushman. He noted it's not a requirement that the applicant be here but it's nice for them to be present to answer questions that may arise. Commissioner House commented that he's not opposed to deferring, but since this is the second time the applicant hasn't appeared, and the full application is in place, to take a vote.

Commissioner McClintock noted that he agreed with Commissioner House, and the applicant is aware that the application has been submitted and ready for a vote.

Mr. McKnight offered to have staff read the staff analysis for record, and the commission can vote afterward what they would like to consider.

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1915, this building is a contributing structure in North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing front porch to span the front of the home. The windows enclosing the porch would be removed and the new porch would have a shed roof with Craftsman details and columns. On August 22, 2018, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this proposal and expressed concerns about altering the original porch design through expansion; the Commission supported removing the enclosure to reopen the porch.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work,

STANDARDS

North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines

Guidelines for Porches

1. **Retain existing porches and porch details.** The original design elements of existing historic porches, when present, should be maintained. Major changes to configuration or ornamentation should be avoided. Missing or deteriorated details, such as columns and railings, should be repaired or replaced in kind.
2. **Avoid adding architecturally inappropriate details.** Items such as porch columns reflect the architecture of the home. Tapered columns atop piers are emblematic of Craftsman homes, but are not appropriate on Victorian era houses. Likewise, scrollwork, turned posts, or gingerbread are not appropriate on a Craftsman home. Replacement elements that have no historic design relationship with the architecture diminish the historic character of the building.
3. **Replace missing porches with designs and details that reflect the original design, if known. Avoid adding conjectural elements.** Photographic or other documentary evidence should guide the design of replacement porches. Where this is unavailable, a new design should be based on existing original porches from houses of similar type and age.

ANALYSIS

1. This property is in the North Slope Historic District and, as such and, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The original porch design and details would be altered by expanding the porch. According to the design guidelines, major changes to configuration should be avoided.
3. The proposed alteration would introduce design elements that are not based on historic evidence. Historic photos show that although the porch was enclosed, the original design is still intact and could be restored by removing the enclosure.
4. The Commission was briefed on August 22, 2018 and expressed concern with the proposed design, particularly that it does not match the historic design and introduces a design element that does not have precedent on the house.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff defers recommendation.

Recommended language for approval:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 516 North Cushman Street, as submitted.

Recommended language for denial:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission deny the application for 516 North Cushman Street, based on the following [cite design guidelines.]

Mr. McKnight noted that Item three should say it was “NOT enclosed”.

Chair Bartoy asked if there is anyone who would object the application as it is before the commission, and opened up questions to the commission.

Commissioner House voted against the change.

Commissioner Mortenson agreed with Commissioner House, for the removal of the original porch as well as adding a third roof style would be a glaring visual component.

Commissioner’s Johnson and Schloesser agreed.

Chair Bartoy noted as the commission stated in the previous review of the app, that he agrees with everything that’s been brought to the table.

Commissioner House made a motion.

“I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission deny the application for 516 North Cushman Street, based on the following design criteria including guidelines for porches: 1) Retaining existing porches and porch detail, 2) Avoid adding architecturally inappropriate details, 3) Replace missing porches with designs and details that reflect the original design if known.”

Commissioner Schloesser seconded the motion.

The motion approved unanimously, and the application was denied.

Mr. McKnight stated he would notify the applicant, and would notify him of the appeal process.

6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

Code Amendments

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The regulations that govern historic preservation activities in Tacoma appear in various sections of the Municipal Code, including Title 1 (Administration – composition, powers and duties of the Landmarks Preservation Commission), Title 8 (Public Safety – historic property maintenance code), and Title 13 (Land Use – including designations to the register, design review and permitting, and demolition review).

For several years, potential amendments to certain aspects of historic preservation regulations, primarily the question of a demolition review process, have been discussed in various venues, including at the Landmarks Commission meetings, council committees and other community groups. This year, updates to sections of the Land Use Code relating to historic preservation have been included in the Planning Commission 2018-19 amendment package.

The proposed revisions include:

1. Establishment of a citywide demolition review process that would include review of demolition permits for adverse effects to historically significant properties over 4,000 SF, within Mixed Use Centers, and within National Register Historic Districts or affecting National Register listed buildings, as well as clarifying existing demolition review language in code.
2. Amendments to clarify the nomination and designation process, including improvements to language regarding elements that can be included in historic designations, as well as improvements to the language regarding City Council review of nominations (TMC 13.07.050 and others).
3. Changes to nomination requirements to ease nominations locally for properties already on the National Register of Historic Places.
4. Increase effectiveness of Historic Conditional Use Permit by clarifying elements of listed properties eligible for Conditional Use, as well as potential expansion of use palette.

In addition, there are a number of “clean up” items proposed for the historic preservation codes, including TMC 1.42 (which is outside of Title 13), including general language clean up (removing outdated references and revising language to be gender-neutral), removing the “arts commission liaison” position from the Commission – which has not been used for several years – and other minor changes.

On August 8, the Commission was briefed on these proposed amendments.

ACTION REQUESTED

Guidance and feedback.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The following is a summary table of potential amendments:

Topic	Code Area	Current Status	Proposed/Policy Issue
Administrative	All	Certain areas of the code have outdated language that refers to old organizational structure, outdated processes, etc.	PROPOSED: All mentions of BLUS and CEDD, gender neutral language, paper copies for applications
Commission composition	1.42	The Commission composition includes a position for “Arts Commission Liaison.” The corresponding “Landmarks Commission Liaison” on the arts commission was eliminated several years ago, and the “Arts Commission Liaison,” which is appointed by the Arts Commission chair, has been vacant for several years.	PROPOSED: Remove Arts Commission Liaison position and convert to another At Large position to preserve 11 member size.
Demolition review	13.12.570	Currently, there are specific provisions in the code for demolition review for designated City landmarks and buildings within locally designated historic and conservation districts, as well as demolition review within the Downtown Subareas through the “Cultural Resources Management Plan” provision in TMC 13.12.570. However, outside historically designated areas and the Downtown Subareas, there is no formal provision for demolition review of potentially historic	PROPOSED: 1. Revise existing code for the Downtown Subarea for clarity and 2. Create a new pilot citywide demolition review that creates a lower threshold for review of the demolition of structures that are 50 years of age and older to 4,000 SF, and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exempt SF homes,

		resources other than through SEPA. The SEPA review threshold for demolition permits is 12,000 SF.	<p>except houses within NR historic districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 4,000 SF exempt, except in NR districts and mixed use centers • Create a checklist process • May refer demolition permits to LPC
Nomination process	13.07.030 and 13.07.050	<p>Currently code definitions include the term <i>significant interior features</i>, which is defined as “architectural features, spaces, and ornamentations which are specifically identified in the landmark nomination and which are located in public areas of buildings such as lobbies, corridors, or other assembly spaces.” This is the only area in code that interiors are specifically defined. Elsewhere, in the nomination section, the term <i>significant interior spaces</i> is used to define interior spaces that may be included in the nomination, and this section further limits this to “publicly owned buildings.”</p> <p>The City’s interpretation of this set of codes is that “significant interior features” and “significant interior spaces” are intended to mean the same thing.</p>	<p>PROPOSED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the definition “significant interior features” to “significant interior spaces” to match the term elsewhere in the code • Eliminate the limitation to “public” areas for areas of exceptional significance where there is a broad public benefit to preserving such a space. • Eliminate the limitation of interior spaces to publicly owned buildings.
Nomination and designation	13.07.050.D.1	<p>Clarification of City Council review. Currently the code states that council may approve a resolution designating a landmark, deny it or refer the nomination back to the Commission, as it may deem appropriate. Further, the code states that if the designation is approved, the Council shall include in its resolution the elements that are part of the designation and subject to LPC review. This means that when Council passes a resolution, it may not contain all of the elements recommended by the Landmarks Commission.</p>	<p>PROPOSED: Clarify the language to distinguish between the nomination, designation and the controls within the resolution that council passes.</p>
Nomination of NR listed properties	13.07.040 and 13.07.050	<p>Currently, individual properties that are on the historic register must still go through the full local nomination process to be locally designated, including a local nomination form and the “two meeting” process. There has been some discussion regarding individual NR listed properties and whether it should be easier to nominate them to the Tacoma register of</p>	<p>PROPOSED: Revise the code so that NR listed properties are automatically considered eligible for the Tacoma Register, eliminating the need for a “preliminary meeting,” and expedite the nomination process for NR listed</p>

		historic places.	properties (i.e. use existing nomination forms without further work)
Conditional Use Permit	13.06	The historic conditional use permit was created in 2007 in order to provide a land use tool that expanded potential uses in historic structures beyond what is allowed in the base zone. A prototypical example is an institutional building in a single family neighborhood, such as a school. However, since 2007, there has been only one successful application for the program that has resulted in an operating conditional use. Moreover, there has been some confusion whether all elements of a historically designated property may utilize the CUP or only the historically “contributing” elements.	<p>PROPOSED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional uses to the potential use table • Add clarifying language to indicate that the historic CUP is available for all elements on the parcel of the historically designated property. • Add language for review criteria based on the need.

NEXT STEPS

The Landmarks Preservation Commission will review the proposed amendments over the summer and fall, which will culminate in a set of recommendations for the Planning Commission to consider (for the amendments within Title 13). The following is an anticipated schedule for this review:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| September 12 – Landmarks Commission | Draft code |
| September 19 – Planning Commission | Briefing |
| October 10 – Landmarks Commission | Draft code |
| November TBA – Landmarks Commission | Recommendation to Planning Commission |
| January 2019 – Planning Commission | Code review, authorize release |
| March 2019 – Planning Commission | Set hearing date |

Mr. McKnight noted that the LPC is located in title one, and title 13 is where the LPC activities are described. The three main components of the proposed amendments are demolition review, code clean up, and conditional use permit usage. The table in the staff report reviews the proposed changes and the working language is proposed in the back of the packet. Mr. McKnight reviewed the code changes.

Commissioner McClintock mentioned that the definition for the public area needs to be addressed and defined further. Mr. McKnight offered public areas such as public, or common areas. (page 3 of code cleanup)

Commissioner House agreed with McClintock to make that area more clear. Mr. McKnight commented that he will look into the verbiage of the sentence. Mr. McKnight noted that what is regulated in landmarks should have a tie to public benefit.

Commissioner McClintock had a question under B – the Commission may either nominate or edit the commission. He noted that its typically friendly language, but he can envision a nomination where the commission changed the nomination and group that’s nomination will withdraw it. He wondered if this was a real worry. Mr. McKnight thought it’s a clarity issue. Chair Bartoy wondered if that will meet quorum vote. Commissioner Mortenson asked if it would be a separate vote to amend.

Mr. McKnight noted that pages 4-7 are restructuring code with sequential steps that aren’t currently present to make the language easier to decipher. There have been confusion with consultants in the past from customers on how to read the code language. Commissioner McClintock asked if on page 5, section 2a1, if the code is referring to

specifically designated historical sights, and that some of the language is confusing there. McKnight read the code section for that part and agreed that it needs revision.

Mr. McKnight commented that on page 8, the code that discusses demolition is the new code language that is proposed.

McClintock offered that the verbiage should be reviewed regarding footprint vs square footage, as when the planning commission reviews this, this language becomes critical.

Chair Bartoy noted that the last line on page 9. If the LPC nomination is denied, and noted he would like the last sentence to have more clarification. Further discussion ensued regarding code cleanup.

The last piece is the conditional use and historic structures code language. The clarification on page 9 entailed whether or not a CUP is necessary and is there a need to justify the new use or conditional use not allowed by zoning due to unique circumstances.

Commissioner McClintock was bothered by the verbiage of "group housing", because a grouping of adult homes is under the DSHS and is not called group housing. The CUP should be granted only on the condition that the owner maintains the character. Mr. McKnight stated that the group housing language was already there in the code. Discussion ensued regarding religious organizations.

Mr. McKnight noted he would look into these suggestions and comments and report back.
Chair Bartoy moved to the events and activities updates calendar

Events & Activities Update

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed the activities and events.

2018 Events

1. LPC Training (9am @ TAM, September 25th)
2. Trivia Night (6pm @ The Swiss, September 19th)
3. Your House is History: Learn How to Research Your Property
 - I. Moore Library Workshop (10am, Sept. 22nd)
 - II. Mottet Library Workshop (4:30pm, Sept. 27th)
 - III. NW Room Workshop (5:30pm, Oct. 17th)
4. Fifth Annual Holiday Heritage Swing Dance (6-9pm @ Tin Can Alley, Nov. 4th)

She noted there was a community request for how to create a historic district in your neighborhood, and noted that staff made a brochure and it's also posted online.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

None.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 P.M.