

Members

Kevin Bartoy, Chair
Ken House, Vice-Chair
Roger Johnson
Lysa Schloesser
James Steel
Jeff Williams
Jennifer Mortensen
Alex Morganroth

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

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



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: November 14, 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
Alex Morganroth
Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Linnea Meredith

Others Present:

Don Russell
Alastair Moyer

Commission Members Excused

Jennifer Mortenson

Commission Members Absent:

Jeff Williams

Chair Kevin Bartoy called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commission Member Mortensen was excused.

B. Approval of Minutes: 9/12/18

Mr. McKnight stated the 9/12/18 minutes contained errors that needed to be fixed, including the fact that some Commission Members were listed as present and absent at the same time. The minutes were approved pending corrections.

C. Administrative Review:

- 901 Broadway – Temporary Banner
- 1102 A Street – Exterior Lighting
- 1415 North 5th Street – In-ground Pool
- 565 Broadway – Café Seating

The consent agenda was approved.

3. SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

Mr. McKnight provided the analysis and other background information.

AGENDA ITEM 3A: 603 North Ainsworth (North Slope Historic District)

Don & Barbara Russell, Owners

ANALYSIS

Property Eligibility:	North Slope Historic District
Rehabilitation Cost Claimed:	\$214,271.96
Assessed Improvement Value Prior to Rehabilitation:	\$505,800
Rehabilitation percentage of assessed value:	42%
Project Period:	6/4/18 – 9/28//18 (4 months)
Appropriateness of Rehabilitation:	Kitchen remodel

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 \$214,71.96.

Commissioner Johnson made the motion.

“I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the Special Tax Valuation application for 603 North Ainsworth, in the amount of \$214,271.96”.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schloesser, and unanimously approved.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 919 North L Street (North Slope Historic District) – House Raising

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

AGENDA ITEM 4A: 919 North L Street (North Slope Historic District) – House Raising

Alastair Moyer, Owner

BACKGROUND

Completed between 1888 and 1908, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing to raise the home by two feet and dig out the basement to increase living space in their existing 998sf home. On October, 25, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on the proposal and expressed approval. The applicant would also like to add black stainless steel porch railings and turned posts, and vinyl basement windows and back doors to match the existing windows. The trim would be wood to match the existing materials. The non-original front porch would be rebuilt. The existing siding will be retained and the added two feet would be concrete.

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.

Guidelines for Roofs

1. **Preserve and retain existing roof form and appearance.** Major changes to the overall roof plan/type are discouraged. For example, changing a hipped roof to a gabled roof is generally inappropriate.
2. **Rooftop Additions should be sensitively located.** Additions that affect roof appearance may include the addition of elements such as dormers, skylights and chimneys. Additions are not discouraged, but should seek to minimize the visual impact to the overall roof form, as follows:
 - Changes to the roof form should be located to the rear and less visible sides of a home.
 - In certain cases, it may not be possible to conceal new elements such as additional dormers from view. In such cases, using examples of historic additions (location, scale, design, materials) to guide new design is appropriate.
3. **Existing roof heights should be maintained.** Changes to the primary ridgeline height of a house are generally discouraged, such as “bump ups,” with the exception that: in certain cases it may be demonstrated that an overall ridgeline height increase will dramatically increase useful attic space in a house WITHOUT significantly changing the appearance of the home from the street (rare).
4. **Materials and colors.** Composition roofs are an acceptable substitute for shingles, and have been in use on homes since the early 20th century. Composite and engineered materials that mimic the visual qualities of shingles vary widely in quality and appearance. If an engineered material is proposed that is not common in the district, material samples and product specification sheets should be furnished to the Commission. Metal roofs are not acceptable for historic homes. Clay tile roofs are appropriate only on the few examples of Mission or Spanish influenced architecture seen in the districts.

Guidelines for Additions

1. **Architectural style should be compatible** with the era and style of the principal structure, including massing, window patterning, scale of individual elements, cladding, roof form, and exterior materials.
2. **Additions should be removable** in the future without harming the character defining elements on the principal structure.
3. **Additions should be sensitively located** in a manner that minimizes visibility from primary rights of way. Where this is not possible, the design should respect the style, scale, massing, rhythm, and materials of the original building.
4. **An addition should be subservient** in size, scale and location to the principal structure.
5. **Seamless additions are discouraged.** There should be a clear visual break between the old structure and the new, such as a reduced size or footprint or a break in the wall plane, to avoid creating a falsely historic appearance (such that the original, historic portion of the house can be distinguished from the new, non-historic addition).

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 non-original porch would be rebuilt to match what exists. The applicant has researched historic photos of this and similar properties to base the design of the railings and posts.
3. In order to retain the existing roof form and appearance, the applicant is proposing to raise the home and dig out the basement, which will have minimal visual impact while allowing for additional space.
4. Although not removable, the added two feet of height will be concrete to distinguish it from the original siding.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. McKnight provided background information, and noted that he is seeking the approval of the above scope of work. Mr. McKnight reviewed the standards.

Commissioner McClintock asked why there is not a post, and wondered where it was going to go? Mr. Alastair responded that the post is not structurally needed. Commissioner McClintock then wondered about the steps and the need for the railing because of the step placement. He mentioned that it seemed like you could raise your yard level enough to not need the railing. Mr. Alastair stated his wife wanted it as a beautification project. Discussion ensued about the guidelines for the steps and the railing, window materials, and landscaping for that district.

Mr. McKnight provided his recommendation. Commissioner Johnson agreed with Mr. McKnight's interpretation.

Chair Bartoy, in regard to the front porch, noted to follow the guidelines. He stated there is an issue of space come up with growing families and people wanting to stay in historic neighborhoods. He said that Mr. Alastair did a good job of keeping consistent with historic needs. The Commissioner's concurred to replicate or continue the railing design on the new porch. The window design should be wood or wood clad, and there is no need for a post.

There was a motion made by Commissioner Morganroth.

"I move to approve the application for 919 North L Street with the following conditions:

- *Replicate or continue the railing design on new porch.*
- *Window design should be wood or wood clad.*
- *No posts on the porch.*

Commissioner Schloesser seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

AGENDA ITEM 5A: Code Amendments
--

Staff

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).

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 and October 10, the Commission considered draft language. Recommended revisions to the draft language based upon the feedback from the Commission have been incorporated. The most recent draft is attached to this staff report.

ACTION REQUESTED

Review and approval; recommendation to the Planning Commission for adoption of the proposed amendments within Title 13.

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 resources other than through SEPA. The SEPA review threshold for demolition	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: • Exempt SF homes, except

		permits is 12,000 SF.	<p>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 historic places.</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 properties (i.e. use existing</p>

			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 following is the current schedule for this review:

PREVIOUS MEETINGS

August 8 – Landmarks Commission	Briefing, scope and general direction for amendments
September 12 – Landmarks Commission	First review of draft language
September 19 – Planning Commission	Briefing
October 10 – Landmarks Commission	Second review of draft language

UPCOMING MEETINGS

November 14 – Landmarks Commission	Recommendation to Planning Commission
January 16, 2019 – Planning Commission	Code review, authorize release
March 6, 2019 – Planning Commission	Set hearing date

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the amendment package, including a recommendation to the Planning Commission that the proposed amendments be included in the 2019 amendment package.

Mr. McKnight apologized that the draft code amendments were not included in the packets. He reviewed the changes. He noted that the Commission is scheduled to go to the Planning Commission with this information in January.

Mr. McKnight highlighted:

1. Establish city-wide demolition process.
2. Clarifying nomination and designation process.
3. Nomination of NR listed properties
4. Modifying Conditional Use Permits

Mr. McKnight compiled the Commissioners questions and comments, and noted that he will incorporate the language and come back in December with some updates for the LPC.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Bartoy thanked the Commissioners for their service.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:19 p.m.