

## 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: October 10, 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  
Jeff Williams  
Jennifer Mortensen  
Marshall McClintock

## Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
Amylena Figueroa

## Others Present:

Anthony Guido, Red Pyramid LLC

## Commission Members Absent:

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. Approval of Minutes: 8/8/18; 8/22/18

Minutes approved as submitted.

- 924 North L Street—Basement window

No Comments were made.

### 3. SPECIAL TAX EVALUATION

Mr. McKnight read the staff report for each of the following items A-D in succession. Commissioner McClintock wanted to mention that the work on 616 North K street was amazing.

#### A. 2101 Jefferson Avenue, Heidelberg Brewing Co. Warehouse and Shipping Depot (Individual Landmark)

## ANALYSIS

Property Eligibility:

Individual Landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places

Rehabilitation Cost Claimed:

\$2,199,955.12

Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation:

\$1,358,200

Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value:

162%

Project Period:

1/2/16 – 1/1//18 (24 months)

Appropriateness of Rehabilitation:

Rehabilitation of the former Heidleberg Brewery warehouse to the 7 Seas Brewery; most of the work occurred prior to Landmarks designation

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application for the amount of \$2,199,955.12.

Recommended language for approval:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 2101 Jefferson Avenue, in the amount of \$2,199,955.12*

There were no Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Johnson made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 2101 Jefferson Avenue, in the amount of \$2,199,955.12."*

Commissioner Mortensen seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

**B. 616 North K street (North Slope Historic District)**

**ANALYSIS**

Property Eligibility:	Contributing property in the North Slope Historic District
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed:	\$425,000
<b>Adjusted Cost Claimed:</b>	<b>\$419,799.63</b>
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation:	\$216,600
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value:	196% adjusted to 194%
Project Period:	4/26/2017 – 10/1/2018 (18 months)
Appropriateness of Rehabilitation:	LPC approved extensive rebuild of fire damaged structure.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application for the adjusted amount of \$419,799.63. Staff has subtracted \$5,200.37 for ineligible expenses, such as landscaping.

Recommended language for approval:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 616 North K Street, in the amount of \$419,799.63.*

Commissioner Mortensen made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 616 North K Street, in the amount of \$419,799.63."*

Commissioner Johnson seconded it, and the motion passed unanimously.

**C. 1405 North 10<sup>th</sup> Street (North Slope Historic District)**

**ANALYSIS**

Property Eligibility:	Contributing property in the North Slope Historic District
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed:	\$202,005
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation:	\$189,000
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value:	107%
Project Period:	9/1/16 – 9/1/2018 (24 months)

Appropriateness of Rehabilitation:

LPC approved deck, kitchen and bath remodel, plumbing, electric, sewer, HVAC, flooring, windows, and asbestos removal.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application for the amount of \$202,005.

### Recommended language for approval:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 1405 North 10<sup>th</sup> Street, in the amount of \$202,005.*

Commissioner Williams made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 1405 North 10<sup>th</sup> Street, in the amount of \$202,005."*

Commissioner Schloesser seconded it, and the motion passed unanimously.

## D. 539 Broadway, University Union Club (Individual Landmark)

### ANALYSIS

Property Eligibility:	Individual Landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed:	\$314,196.08
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation:	\$789,500
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value:	40%
Project Period:	6/1/16 – 2/1/2018 (21 months)
Appropriateness of Rehabilitation:	LPC approved exterior and interior rehabilitation work.

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the itemized expense sheet per the Commission bylaws for STV cost eligibility and recommends approval of this application for the amount of \$314,196.08.

### Recommended language for approval:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 539 Broadway, in the amount of \$314,196.08.*

There were no Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Williams made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 539 Broadway, in the amount of \$314,196.08."*

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

## 4. DESIGN REVIEW

### A. 811 N. Ainsworth Ave. (North Slope Historic District) *Garage design amendment*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

## BACKGROUND

Built in 1890, this is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. On May 11, 2016, the Landmarks Preservation Commission approved a new addition and garage. The garage was 25'x25' with a 12/12 pitched roof to match the main home.

The applicant is now seeking approval for a design amendment for the garage. The new design would be 24'x26' and 21' to the roof ridge. The garage would have a gambrel roof to accommodate two-stories, within the land use approved height limit. The site will also be regraded to stay within the height limit.

The garage materials for siding, windows, and doors would be the same as on the main home, as was approved. The garage would be sited towards the rear of the lot and alley-accessed.

## ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work,

## STANDARDS

### North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines

#### Guidelines for Parking and Garages

**1. Alley accessed parking is the typical and predominant residential parking configuration in the district.**

Residential driveways and garages facing the street are typically only appropriate when there is no alley access, or other site constraints prevent alley accessed parking (such as a corner lot).

**2. Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way.** Parking areas and garages should be set toward the rear of the lot to minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Where it is not possible to locate a parking structure to conceal it from view, it should be set well back from the front plane of the primary structure on the property. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in the residential areas of the neighborhoods and should be located behind the building and away from the street.

**3. Attached garages and carports are inappropriate.**

**1. New curb cuts are discouraged.** Residential driveways requiring curb cuts from a street or arterial are generally prohibited, unless the applicant can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that because of special circumstances not applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of this standard prevents alley-accessed parking. If approved, such curb cuts and approaches shall be consistent with the standards approved for the historic districts and on file in the Public Works Department.

#### Guidelines for New Construction

- 1. Goal:** Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. **Guideline:** New buildings should be comparable in height to adjacent structures. Buildings that are substantially taller or shorter than the adjacent historic buildings should be avoided.
- 2. Goal:** Relate the size and proportions of new buildings and their architectural elements to those of the neighborhood. **Guideline:** Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations.
- 3. Goal:** Break up the facades of buildings into smaller varied masses comparable to those contributing buildings in the residential historic districts. **Guideline:** Variety of forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the North Slope and Wedge residential communities. Smaller massing—the arrangement of facade details, such as projections and recesses—and porches all help to articulate the exterior of the structure and help the structure fit into the neighborhood. Avoid large, blank planar surfaces.

4. **Goal:** Emphasize entrances to structures. **Guideline:** Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details, such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.
5. **Goal:** Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing contributing buildings where such elements are visible from the street.

**Guideline:**

1. Shape and Pitch: Typically, the existing historic buildings in the districts either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower.
  2. Architectural Elements: Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or "widow's walks" to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.
  3. Materials: Roofs that are shingle or appear to be shingle, or composition roofs, are the typical historic material compatible with the district. Seam metal may be an acceptable material for simple roof structures. Slate, faux slate and terra cotta tiles are not appropriate for the districts.
6. **Goals:** Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope and Wedge Neighborhoods were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco-covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood.

**Guideline:**

1. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar in type, pattern, configuration and appearance to those typically found in the neighborhood.
  2. Stucco, especially commercial EIFS systems like Dryvit, is not acceptable for the historic district.
  3. Faux materials, such as vinyl or metal siding, are not acceptable for the historic district.
  4. Certain siding patterns, including board and batten and panel, are not historically common in the district and should not be used.
  5. Cementitious products, such as Hardiplank, may be acceptable in the district if installed in a historically correct pattern (for example, horizontal lapped siding or shingle). In such cases, the product used shall be smooth in texture (faux wood grain finish is NOT acceptable).
  6. Engineered products for trim and molding, if demonstrated to be similar in appearance to painted wood, may be an environmentally responsible substitute for wood on new structures. In such cases, the applicant should demonstrate to the Commission, via product literature and material samples, that the product is compatible.
7. **Goals:** Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings, as represented in the neighboring buildings. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.

**Guideline:**

1. Placement. Typically, older buildings have doors and transoms that matched the head height of the adjacent windows. New structures should utilize this pattern.
2. Doors. Doors should be or appear to be paneled and/or contain glazed openings.

3. Windows. New structures should utilize existing historic window patterns in their design. Windows should be vertically oriented. Large horizontal expanses of glass may be created by ganging two or more windows into a series. Historically, the typical window in the district was a double hung sash window. Casement windows were commonly used for closets, nooks, and less commonly, as a principal window type in a structure. Many double hung sash windows had the upper sash articulated into smaller panels, either with muntin bars, leaded glazing, or arches. Commonly, windows were also surrounded with substantial trim pieces or window head trim.

## **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 garage design and materials match the main home and are compatible with the district guidelines, although the introduction of the gambrel roof does not match the existing home. The height of the garage would not be taller than the home.
3. Both the addition and the new garage utilize wood siding, doors, and windows that match the original materials.
4. The window and door configurations, on both the garage and addition, match the original structure.
5. The garage would be alley-accessed and sited towards the rear of the lot. It would not be visible from the primary right of way.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

### Recommended language for approval:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 811 North Ainsworth Avenue as submitted.*

### Recommended language for denial:

*I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission deny the application for 811 North Ainsworth Avenue, based on the following [cite design guidelines.]*

Commissioner Williams asked how this will be roofed. Mr. Guido answered that the theme of it being a farm house is consistent with the first meeting a long time ago. Commissioner McClintock commented that he would agree with the staff evaluation but is curious as to how one would regrade this. Mr. Guido answered that he will clear it down to the average grade and there will be a driveway to the alley way. It will be a flat slab on average grade and everything else will be graded. From the alley it will be about 3 or 4 feet.

Commissioner Schloesser made a motion.

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 811 North Ainsworth Avenue as submitted."*

Commissioner Williams seconded, and the motion carried.

## **B. B. 721 Pacific Avenue (Old City Hall Historic District) Awning**

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOAR BUSINESS**

**A. Code Amendments**

Mr. McKnight reviewed 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. On September 12, the Commission considered draft language.

**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.	<b>PROPOSED:</b> 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	<b>PROPOSED:</b> Remove Arts Commission Liaison position and convert to another At Large position to preserve 11

		years ago, and the “Arts Commission Liaison,” which is appointed by the Arts Commission chair, has been vacant for several years.	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 resources other than through SEPA. The SEPA review threshold for demolition permits is 12,000 SF.	<p><b>PROPOSED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revise existing code for the Downtown Subarea for clarity and</li> <li>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"> <li>• Exempt SF homes, except houses within NR historic districts</li> <li>• Under 4,000 SF exempt, except in NR districts and mixed use centers</li> <li>• Create a checklist process</li> <li>• May refer demolition permits to LPC</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
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><b>PROPOSED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the definition “significant interior features” to “significant interior spaces” to match the term elsewhere in the code</li> <li>• Eliminate the limitation to “public” areas for areas of exceptional significance where there is a broad public benefit to preserving such a space.</li> <li>• Eliminate the limitation of interior spaces to publicly owned buildings.</li> </ul>
Nomination and designation	13.07.050.D.1	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><b>PROPOSED:</b> 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	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 historic places.	<b>PROPOSED:</b> 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 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.	<b>PROPOSED:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add additional uses to the potential use table</li> <li>• Add clarifying language to indicate that the historic CUP is available for all elements on the parcel of the historically designated property.</li> <li>• Add language for review criteria based on the need.</li> </ul>

**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:

- |                                     |                                       |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 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 what has changed in the draft language. In the strike though sections and underline sections there is a green section that includes the feedback from the commission. He presented this to the planning commission on September 19<sup>th</sup> and believes it to have been well received. The word “approved” was stricken from the draft on page 4, because there was question as to whether or not it was necessary. On page 8 and 9, and Mr. McKnight reviewed the changes. Further discussion ensued regarding some the of the changes, and Mr. McKnight noted that he will check with the Commissioner’s in regards to some of these comments and come back with a more solid draft.

**B. Commissioner Term Expirations**

Mr. McKnight reviewed the staff report.

The following appointments are expiring/vacant on December 31, 2018:

#	Incumbent	Position
1	Roger Johnson	(At-Large 3)
2	Vacant	(Architect 2)
3	Vacant	(Architect 3)
4	Vacant	(At-Large 2)
5	Vacant	(At-Large 3)
6	Vacant	(Wedge Ex Officio)

The City Clerk’s Office will be issuing a recruitment announcement and scheduling interviews in the upcoming weeks.

Mr. McKnight reviewed which Commissioner positions will be open. Chair Bartoy asked if Commissioner Johnson will return to the Commission this year and Commissioner Johnson answered yes.

**C. Amendments to Guidelines, Bylaws, and Inventory**

Mr. McKnight reviewed the staff report.

Once annually, the Commission may review and amend inventories, guidelines, and Commission Bylaws. The proposed changes include the following:

Inventory

2114 Pacific Avenue (Build date to 1955 – the owner is requesting it be changed from “noncontributing” to “contributing”)  
617 North K Street (Proposed in 2017 to be changed to “contributing,” it is currently not included in the district inventory)

Old City Hall Design Guidelines

Adopt district design guidelines.

Bylaws

Adopt language pertaining to Detached Accessory Dwelling Units.

The language should be finalized by the December 12th meeting, to set a public hearing date for January 9th.

Mr. McKnight noted that the house was clarified as address 619, while the alley is 617. This would be an addition to the inventory. It’s proposed to be changed to contributing.

**D. Events & Activities Update**

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed the events and activities updates:

**2018 Events**

1. Your House is History: Learn How to Research Your Property
  - I. NW Room Workshop (5:30pm, Oct. 17<sup>th</sup>)
2. Fifth Annual Holiday Heritage Swing Dance (6-9pm @ Tin Can Alley, Nov. 4th)

**6. CHAIR COMMENTS**

None.

Meeting adjourned at 6:08 pm.

***These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For a full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit: <http://www.cityoftacoma.org/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=67980>***