

Members

Michael Fast, *Chair*
 Roger Johnson, *Vice-Chair*
 Greg Benton
 Ross Buffington
 Elizabeth Chambers
 Phillip Hill
 Ken House
 Tim McDonald
 Mark McIntire
 Jonathan Phillips
 Kathryn Longwell, *North Slope Ex-Officio*



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Staff

Reuben McKnight, *Historic Preservation Officer*

Date: December 12, 2007

LPC17/2008

Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Building North, Room 16

Commission Members in Attendance:

Michael Fast, *Chair*
 Roger Johnson, *Vice-Chair*
 Greg Benton
 Ross Buffington
 Phillip Hill
 Ken House
 Kathryn Longwell
 Tim McDonald
 Mark McIntire
 Jonathan Phillips

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
 Tonie Cook
 Bob Levin
 Donna Bosinski

Others Present:

Eugenia Woo; Gene Grulich; Sharon Winters; Brad Buckhalter; Alisa Xitco; Tracy Karro; Mike Dowd; Pamela Sundell; Tim Lieberman; Karsen Keever; John Larson; Tony Trunk; Han Kim; Michael Buchanan; Lester Collons; and Matt Driscoll

Commission Members Excused:

Elizabeth Chambers

Chair Michael Fast called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioner Elizabeth Chambers was excused for her absence.

B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 24, 2007, and November 14, 2007, were approved as submitted.

3. NOMINATIONS – PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Fast announced that the Landmarks Preservation Commission will hear public comments regarding three nominations to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and informed the audience of the standard protocol involved.

Ms. Tonie Cook provided rules of order: Properties on the agenda are nominated for the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, which follows procedures defined in 13.07.050, and consists of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. The initial Commission meeting of November 14, 2007, determined that the properties met the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity. The Commission moved to have the nomination scheduled for a public hearing and comment period, at which the public may enter comments into the record for consideration. Following the comment period, the Commission may deliberate on the nomination for up to 45 days before recommending to City Council listing on the register, or denying the nomination.

A. Johnson-Gehri Residence (1416 South 5th Street)

Constructed in 1909, the Johnson-Gehri Residence is being nominated as a significant example of a Craftsman-style home, thought to be built by Carl Johnson, one of the many local Swedish immigrant carpenters who were sought for their meticulous craftsman skills. Mrs. Augusta Gehri purchased the residence in 1917, whose family, in 1892, founded Gehri Sheetmetal Works, which supplied metal work throughout Tacoma. The Commission voted to forward this building for public comment and additional consideration on November 14, 2007, finding that it appeared to meet the threshold criteria in 13.07.040.

The property is nominated under the following Tacoma Register Criteria:

- a. Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation, or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.
- c. Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historic heritage of the community.
- d. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style.
- e. Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or engineering specimen.

This is a nomination for the exterior of the existing building.

If no additional comments are received, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded with recommendation for listing on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places to the City Council.

Ms. Karro, the property owner, was present. There were no public comments relative to this nomination.

There was a motion:

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to the City Council that the **Johnson-Gehri Residence** be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including the exterior of the existing building at **1416 South 5th Street**, finding that it meets Criteria a, c, d, and e of TMC 13.07.040."*

Motion: Phillips

Second: Benton

Motion: Carried

B. The Auditorium Dance Hall (1308-1310 Fawcett Avenue)

The Auditorium Dance Hall was constructed in 1922 and embodies the Entertainment/Recreational history of the City of Tacoma. In November 2007, it was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cook reported that the building was recently listed on the Washington State Register as well. Roland E Borhek, a well-known and honored architect in the region and state, designed the building. Although the interior had significant alterations, the exterior had slightly changed since its construction, and retained its original plan, cladding, and windows. The Auditorium Dance Hall is one of the few surviving buildings in the region that can tell the story of the history of dance halls and ballrooms in the Pacific Northwest. The building is associated with the early development of a core area of Tacoma which was unintentionally developed as a location for recreational, sports, fraternal and political activities. The Commission voted to forward this building for public comment and additional consideration on November 14, 2007, finding that it appeared to meet the threshold criteria in 13.07.040.

The property is nominated under the following Tacoma Register Criteria:

- a. Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation, or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.
- c. Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historic heritage of the community.
- d. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style.
- g. Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or City.

This is a nomination for the exterior of the existing building.

If no additional comments are received, staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded with recommendation for listing to the City Council.

Mr. Gene Grulich, preparer of the application, was present and available to answer any questions regarding this property. He introduced Mr. Mike Dowd, who is the owner of the building; and Ms. Pamela Sundell, the project architect, who furnished drawings of the project for reference.

Mr. Dowd explained that the building would be renovated for use as the central administrative office for Tacoma Radiology Associates.

There was no public comment regarding this nomination.

Vice-Chair Johnson expressed his agreement with the building being listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. He stated that dance halls were a significant part of Pacific Northwest's history – particularly during the war.

There was a motion:

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to the City Council that **The Auditorium Dance Hall** be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including the exterior of the existing building at **1304-1310 Fawcett Avenue**, finding that it meets Criteria a, c, d, and g of TMC 13.07.040."*

Motion: Hill

Second: Phillips

Motion: Carried

C. Manley-Thompson Ford Agency (1302-1306 Fawcett Avenue)

The Manley-Thompson Ford Agency was constructed in 1918, as a Ford dealership and showroom, and is associated with the Commerce and Architecture history of the City of Tacoma. In November 2007, it was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, and was recently listed on the Washington Register as well. Emanuel J. Bresemann, a well-known architect in the region and in Canada, designed the Manley-Thompson Ford Agency, which is one of many commercial, residential, and school buildings that are credited to him. The exterior appears to have had few alterations from its original design with no additions. The building was joined to the Crescent Ballroom building with their shared wall and became an entertainment center covering more than two generations. The Manley-Thompson Ford Agency is associated with the early development of automobile agencies and the entertainment history of Tacoma. The Commission voted to forward this building for public comment and additional consideration on November 14, 2007, finding that it appeared to meet the threshold criteria in 13.07.040.

The property is nominated under the following Tacoma Register Criteria:

- a. Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation, or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.
- c. Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historic heritage of the community.
- d. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style.
- g. Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or City.

This is a nomination for the exterior of the existing building. If no additional comments are received, Staff recommends that the nomination be forwarded with recommendation for listing to the City Council.

Mr. Gene Grulich wanted to emphasize the importance of the architect, Mr. Emanuel J. Bresemann.

Mr. Bob Levin, Tacoma's Private Capital Division Manager, commented that he had been working with Mr. Dowd to find a suitable site for his corporate administrative facility. He said he was pleased to welcome TRA to downtown Tacoma and thanked him for renovating a historic building in the process.

There was a motion:

*"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommend to the City Council that **Manley-Thompson Ford Agency** be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including the exterior of the existing building at **1304-1310 Fawcett Avenue**, finding that it meets Criteria a, c, d, and g of TMC 13.07.040."*

Motion: McIntire

Second: Hill

Motion: Carried

Chair Fast closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

4. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Old Business

1. 820 North Sheridan

Mr. Reuben McKnight delivered the staff report: The house at 820 N Sheridan is a 1910 Craftsman Bungalow Style, located in the North Slope Historic District. On September 12, 2007, the Commission denied the retroactive application to replace original wood windows with vinyl windows. The Commission denied the application based on the North Slope Historic District design guideline number 6, regarding exterior materials and the Secretary of Interior's Standards, numbers 2 and 6, with particular respect to *'replacement of missing feature shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence'* and finding that there was insufficient documentary and physical evidence to make a determination".

Subsequent to the meeting, the applicants appealed the decision, but recently requested to resolve the issue with a new proposal. The current proposal is to replace five of the vinyl windows that are most visible from the street with Anderson Woodwright windows.

The applicant is requesting reconsideration of the denial based upon the submitted compromise.

Mr. McKnight reported that the applicant had requested (and was granted) an extension on the appeal hearing date in order to present this proposal to the Commission.

Chair Fast asked for clarification of the Commission's denial on September 12, 2007, and whether the motion was simply for the vinyl windows and nothing else. Mr. McKnight reported that the application was retroactive for vinyl insert windows that had been installed on the entire house.

Commissioner Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio, requested further clarification and addressed the applicant, Ms. Alisa Xitco: "You're asking that we [the Commission] approve the wood windows in the front and that we approve the vinyl windows in the rest of the house – as one package?" Ms. Xitco stated that that was correct.

Mr. J. Bradley Buckhalter, the applicant's attorney, stated that the staff report appropriately summarized the purpose of what had occurred in the matter of the design review and the denial from the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Subsequent to the denial on September 12, 2007, Mr. Buckhalter reported that his client sought consultation from Gray's Lumber window specialist. As a result, his clients selected the Anderson Woodwright, double-hung, insert windows as an alternative for replacement of five front vinyl windows facing the street, Mr. Buckhalter explained. He said that rather than incurring the cost (\$20,000) for total window replacements on the house, the applicants were hopeful that the Commission would consider this alternative proposal.

Commissioner Longwell inquired if the applicants had obtained a bid for total window replacement. Mr. Buckhalter said that they had done so. Mr. McKnight recalled that a bid had been submitted at the

time of the application, which was for seventeen windows to be replaced with Marvin inserts. It was determined that it was the same bid, which was dated May 2, 2007.

Commissioner Longwell asked if the applicants, in order to defray the cost, had considered replacing all of the vinyl windows with Anderson Woodwright windows, albeit in stages. Ms. Xitco replied that \$20,000 was "extreme" for a house in "this" neighborhood. Commissioner Longwell said that it would have been helpful to have received, at least, a couple more bids for comparison purposes.

Mr. Buckhalter commented that it was unfortunate that the application was retroactively submitted. He said: "The Xitcos did not realize that they had to replace any windows or take any out, but simply comply with the Land-use Regulatory Code. The fact is, they do. I would like to think that if we had come in beforehand, we could have worked out some sort of reasonable accommodation – and that's what we're trying to do. Unfortunately, after the fact". He said that to replace the windows in stages may spread the cost over years, but the cost was still there.

Commissioner Longwell indicated that if the Xitcos had applied for a building permit, and had come before Landmarks Preservation Commission, as they are required to do according to City code, they never would have had the expense of removing the windows and replacing them with vinyl windows. She explained: "It is highly unlikely that we (Landmarks Preservation Commission) would have approved vinyl windows in this house, in place of the original windows". Commissioner Longwell expressed her steadfastness regarding vinyl windows not being installed in the North Slope Historic District.

Mr. Buckhalter: "I realize this is not an issue of comparative compliance". He went on to relay his recent drive on North Sheridan Street, where he estimated that possibly 75 percent of the homes on that street have vinyl windows. "Perhaps, they are out of compliance; perhaps, they replaced the windows before the regulatory code was enacted. The end result is that they (the Xitcos) are being asked to replace all of the windows in the house – a \$20,000 project. When you look around the neighborhood, other people don't bother to do that". Commissioner Longwell reminded Mr. Buckhalter that the Xitcos had removed all of the windows in the house, and are simply being asked to be upheld to the same standards as everyone else in the North Slope Historic District – that is, those who come before this Commission and are in compliance. Mr. Buckhalter asked how many residents were in compliance and came to the Commission before making any changes.

Mr. McKnight wanted to address some of the points that Mr. Buckhalter mentioned. He stated that the North Slope Historic District has had residents who install vinyl windows without the proper approval, as well as many other homes previously having vinyl windows prior to becoming part of the district in 1996 or 1998. He said that there are also cases of homes no longer having any historical materials, in which case, the Commission will focus on the configuration of the windows. As far as how many residents come before the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to changing out their windows, Mr. McKnight estimated that the Commission reviews similar projects in that district at a rate of probably 30 per year. Some of the projects are retroactive, but most of them are caught at the time the homeowners apply for a permit.

Chair Fast inquired if the windows were replaced by a professional contractor. Ms. Xitco stated that that was the case. Chair Fast stated that the City of Tacoma requires a building permit in order to replace windows, and that the contractor would have been made aware of the need to come before the Commission if he had properly applied for a permit beforehand. He continued: "The Commissioners are being pointed about their questions, and that is why – because it's not just your project or what other people have done, it is what we have going forward". He stated that a precedent would be set and others will also want to save money by only doing the front of their house, which is not the idea behind the North Slope Historic District guidelines.

Mr. McKnight reiterated that the Xitco's are in the midst of an appeal with the Hearings Examiners. The City does provide an opportunity for the appellant and the Commission to reach an agreement to avoid going through the full appeal process. Because this action is an approval by the full Commission, which requires a quorum vote, there is not the pre-hearing process where a settlement can be negotiated away from the Commission. In this case, Mr. McKnight continued, this is an appeal request for settlement or negotiation and is not typical in the Landmarks Preservation Commission's design review process by being asked to amend the application - as a reconsideration of the full denial on September 12, 2007. The next course of action will be determined by the outcome of the reconsideration by the Commission.

Commissioner Jonathan Phillips recollected that on September 12, 2007, he informed the applicants that they were not to blame for the neglectfulness of seeking the Commission's approval; rather, that it was the contractor's responsibility to seek proper permitting before replacing the windows. He asked the applicant's attorney if he had been in contact with the contractor regarding not having followed proper procedures. Mr. Buckhalter stated that he had not involved the contractor up to this point. Commissioner Phillips wanted his opinion on record: "It would be my preference, if we did this at all, I would want to see substantially more windows replaced, rather than just two or three on the front of the building. It's the primary facade, but it's not the only way that somebody would see the vinyl windows". He went on to say that the North Slope Historic District Board of Directors has charged us (Landmarks Preservation Commission) to not approve vinyl windows. "It would be a stretch for us to do it, in any case. My preference would be for the hearing process to play itself out, because we have, in fact, upheld the standards that we are charged with upholding. And, if it's overturned, I wouldn't want it to be overturned by us, but by a subsequent authority", Commissioner Phillips said.

Mr. Buckhalter said that the windows that are most visible on the sides are the leaded-glass windows, which add great historic character to a home, and the Xitcos would not disturb those.

Commissioner Phillips asked about the \$20,000 bid, which indicated that 17 windows were to be replaced; in which case, if the applicant were to replace just the front and the back - and the front has three windows - if that meant that there are 12 windows on the rear of the house. It was ascertained that it was unknown exactly how the number 17 came to be.

Chair Fast indicated that possibly it would be more palatable if the applicants were to agree to replace the front and the sides with the Anderson Woodwright windows. Mr. Buckhalter then asked for clarification as to whether the Anderson Woodwright windows would be approved as an acceptable replacement for the vinyl windows. Chair Fast put that question to the Commissioners. Mr. McKnight stated that he could recall one instance where the Anderson Woodwright windows had been approved. Chair Fast said that the Anderson Woodwright windows are probably the closest in detail, and possibly the most accurate replacement available. Having heard no opposition from any of the Commissioners, Chair Fast said that the choice for replacement was not the issue, but the quantity of windows being replaced.

Commissioner Phillips: "So, if you have \$2500 for 5 windows, and you have an addition 12 - and if we use the same math, the whole project would cost about \$8,000 instead of \$17,000?" Chair Fast said that cost was just for the windows, not for installation. He stated that he personally felt that if the Xitcos would replace the front and the two side facades, that would take care of the needs of the neighborhood - because the rear of the house is not seen at all from the public right-of-way. Mr. McKnight asked if it would be helpful to have more information regarding visibility from the public right-of-way, for the side elevations. Mr. Buckhalter stated that he would provide additional photographs to better clarify the street visibility issue. Chair Fast asked Ms. Xitco if she would consider replacing the windows on the front and side elevations. Ms. Xitco replied that she was unsure because of the cost involved, but would ask a contractor for a bid to that effect.

Commissioner Phillip Hill asked the applicant if she intended to proceed with replacement of the five front windows, regardless of the Commission's motion at this time. Ms. Xitco said that she would not, because she would continue through the appeal process. Mr. McKnight interjected that if the applicant and the Commission settled on an acceptable alternative, then the appeal process would be discontinued.

Chair Fast summarized the action before the Commission: "We have an alternate application to replace the five windows in the front. We can approve it as submitted, deny it as submitted, or offer a modification to that". Mr. McKnight added that the Commission could also defer if there was additional information required by the Commission.

Commissioner Phillips: "I'd like to propose that we defer taking action on this until you (the applicant) can receive a firm bid on replacing the front and the sides. And we could also get a little more information as to how many windows there are on the front and sides, total; as well as better photographs showing those windows, in the absence of an actual site visit".

Commissioner Hill: "We have been charged with certain rules to follow. I think we should follow through the appeals process and see where that takes this".

Commissioner Greg Benton: "It's important for us to be consistent. I'm concerned about having applicants coming in, after the fact. I would hate to set a precedent or an example where our decisions would be altered or made more lenient. I do appreciate the fact that you've come in here and are proposing a compromise; I think, for the betterment of the Commission, that we need to follow through on the appeals process".

Commissioner Ross Buffington: "I recognize that \$20,000 is a tremendous amount of money; but the problem I have is that we are looking at vinyl windows that have replaced original wood windows, and also as a retroactive application. In all the time I've been on the Commission, we have never approved vinyl windows to replace the original wood windows. Unfortunately, we don't have the original materials, or even photographs of them to see what kind of shape they were in - whether they could have been salvaged, or something else could have been done. I'm afraid that if we did approve this compromise proposal, that we would be setting a dangerous precedent".

Mr. Buckhalter inquired about how the outcome may have been different, if the application had not been retroactive, and if the original windows were not repairable. He asked if it would have been within the Commission's purview to approve, basically, what the Xitcos are requesting at this time. Chair Fast indicated that, as window projects come before the Commission, the first assessment is that of the condition of the windows and if they are beyond repair. In most cases, a site visit would take place to determine the condition of the windows. If it were to be determined that the windows needed to be replaced, the Anderson Woodwright window would be a suitable replacement, but not with vinyl windows.

Commissioner Hill added that the Commission endeavors to reach a reasonable solution for the owner. "We make a site visit, and try to get the owners in contact with people who rehabilitate windows", he said.

Mr. Buckhalter wanted specific clarification of whether the problem of the application was that it was retroactive, or the nature of the request. Chair Fast said that the Commission has great empathy relative to retroactive applications, because of the expenditure involved. He further indicated that whether or not it was a retroactive application, replacement with vinyl windows would not have been approved, per the North Slope Historic District Standards and Guidelines.

There was a motion:

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission deny the alternative proposal for window replacement on 820 North Sheridan".

Motion: Phillips

Second: McDonald

Chair Fast asked for qualification that the request was not denied because of the type of windows proposed. Commissioner Phillips: *"The replacement window is acceptable, but the replacement of less than all of the replaced windows is unacceptable".*

Commissioner Longwell wanted to clarify that the standards and regulations are not City-wide, but rather in certain parts of the City that have been legislated to have their historic integrity remain intact. The North Slope Historic District is listed on the local, State, and National Registers of Historic Places.

Motion: Carried (Fast recused)

Mr. McKnight indicated that he would convey the outcome of the meeting to Ms. Debbie Casparian, Assistant City Attorney, who would advise the applicant's attorney of subsequent action.

B. New Business

1. 917 Pacific Avenue (Provident Building)

Built in 1903-04, the Provident Building is individually listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and located in the core of Tacoma's historic central business district. In May and October 2007, the Commission approved repainting of the brick exterior, removal and replacement of the storefront including the doors and awning. The current proposal is to remove the four non-historic retail signs and replace with four exterior signs consisting of three new gooseneck lights installed

above each sign. One set of address letters will be attached to the canopy above the main entrance. One set of applied cut vinyl address numbers will be installed on the window above each tenant's entrance. One rear exterior light will be replaced with an aluminum architectural wall mount.

Each sign is a pre-finished steel panel (Cool Copper Penny color) laminated to the decorative painted black aluminum backer. The black painted foam letters will be attached using silicone to the copper color panel. The backer panel will be attached to the building wall using clips and screws every two feet at the top and bottom of the sign. Two of the four signs have tenant names. The remaining two signs, without tenant names, are included with the proposal based on the same specifications in this application.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards, numbers 9 and 10 for new additions.

This proposal will not cover or alter the character-defining historical features of the building. The four signs and gooseneck lighting appear to be proposed for installation in the same location as the previous signage areas on the building. The rear light fixture replaces an existing non-historic light.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the condition that the signage for future tenants be delegated for administrative review.

Ms. Eugenia Woo was present to answer any questions and provide sample materials and colors.

Commissioner Buffington asked about a photograph depicting holes in the brick for the junction boxes. He asked if the holes were pre-existing and if in the original application, the lighting fixtures had been chosen. Mr. McKnight reported that the original design review depicted the locations of lights and signs, as part of the schematic; however, the approval was reserved for future review. The conduits, boxes, brick, brick veneer, underlayment and membrane are all new material and were placed on the backer-board during the construction process.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the application before us, and be accepted, with the condition that the signage for future tenants be delegated for administrative review".

Motion: McIntire

Second: Benton

Commissioner Hill asked the Commissioners if they had any questions regarding the lettering style (font). Commissioner McIntire stated that the Helvetica font style goes back to 1957; however, fonts, such as San Serif have been used since the early 1920's. He said that it is such a common font that he believed it would pass.

Motion: Carried (Phillips and McDonald recused)

Ms. Woo asked for clarification of the motion relative to future tenants. Mr. McKnight stated that any future signs could not be different than what was approved on this application.

2. 1302 Pacific Avenue (Luzon Building)

The Luzon Building was constructed in 1891 and was designed by the prominent design firm of Burnham and Root. The design of the building is transitional between steel frame construction and load-bearing masonry, and is an early example of construction that eventually became skyscrapers. The building has been derelict for many years, and has significant structural damage from exposure to the elements. Recently, the Gintz Group entered into a purchase and sale agreement for the building and is forming a plan for its rehabilitation as an office building. The purpose of this review is: 1) to introduce the project and its scope, 2) provide a conceptual overview of the proposed changes to the building, and 3) to seek short term approval of several

“emergency” actions that are required to stabilize and secure the building, and to mitigate the existing violations of City code. These include: removal of a 40’ section of the brick party wall for demolition access and to facilitate the construction of an external elevator core and stairwell (approximately 20’ x 40’). The stairtower will eventually become a shared structure between the Luzon and a future building on the adjacent property, and thus will be shielded from view. The final stairtower design will be presented to the Commission for final approval at a later date. The action is:

1. Conceptual approval for its overall massing and location;
2. Approval for the removal of a portion of the party wall.

Staff recommends that Secretary of the Interior Standards, numbers 2 and 10 be considered.

This project will be under review for a Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit, as well as the Special Valuation Tax program. Components of the overall work program will be submitted to the Commission at a later date (including masonry treatment, window restoration specifications, etc). Regarding the current proposal: temporary shoring will be necessary to begin interior demolition, as the existing internal structure is extremely dilapidated. The removal of the wall section will facilitate access to the interior of the building, and the opening eventually will be filled by a new tower. Ultimately, the party wall will be enclosed by a new adjacent structure. It is not considered a character-defining feature of the building.

Because of the status of the building as dangerous, and due to the construction timeline, City staff is working with the ownership to phase the approval process.

Staff recommends 1) approval of the removal of a portion of the party wall, 2) preliminary conceptual approval of the construction of the external stairtower, subject to final design review; and 3) that the Commission raises any concerns or questions about the project, and provides general feedback.

Mr. Tim Lieberman introduced Mr. Karsen Kever, who also will be involved in the renovation of the Luzon Building. He said that as soon as the final contractual agreements are in place, engineering and planning will begin for the project. Mr. Lieberman proceeded to relate the project scope, noting that the seismic upgrade would be the first phase, and the most critical. The entire interior of the building will be removed, with the exception of the elevator shaft and an original, historic Otis elevator. A new steel and concrete building will be built inside of the existing masonry structure. They will strip the existing paint off the building in such a way that the patina of the brick will not be damaged. All windows will be stripped and restored.

Commissioner Buffington asked for clarification regarding removing/replacing anything inside the building made of wood. He asked if the support columns were made of wood or steel. He said that the historic significance of the building is being a prototype skyscraper, one of the first buildings in which they used steel beams. Mr. Lieberman replied that all of the floors were collapsing and he was unsure if any of the columns were steel or possibly made of cast iron; however, whatever materials are salvageable will be reused.

Commissioner Hill inquired about the vision regarding the stair elevator tower. Mr. Lieberman said that the stairtower is wide enough to install two modern, code-compliant stairwells. He said that if they are unable to use the elevator shaft, in its current location, there would be room to put an elevator shaft in there as well.

Chair Fast was concerned about not having a timeframe for the building being constructed on an adjacent structure, which would then conceal the concrete stairtower. Mr. McKnight indicated that, at this time, the applicant was seeking preliminary conceptual approval. The final design would come back before the Commission. Mr. Lieberman stated that they hoped to be finished with the entire project by the end of 2008.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the conceptual design at 1302 Pacific Avenue (Luzon Building) for its overall massing and location, as well as approval for the removal of a portion of the existing party wall".

Motion: Hill
Second: McIntire
Motion: Carried (McDonald recused)

5. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 2120 South C Street (Columbia Heidelberg Company)

Mr. McKnight reported that the briefing would be relative to the redevelopment of the Columbia Heidelberg Brewery, which was constructed in 1900. The building has been altered several times and is listed as a non-contributing structure located in the Union Station Conservation District. The owners would like to brief the Commission on a redevelopment proposal that includes demolition of the existing building and construction of a new hotel on the site. Provided to the Commissioners was the chronology of the building and its use since 1900, the Historic Property Inventory Report that is on file with the City, historic photos, and a photo showing current conditions. In addition, a copy of a letter from Wells Fargo introducing Hotel Concepts was provided. The proponent is asking for feedback on the proposal from the Commission.

The demolition of non-contributing structures that are located within the Union Station Conservation District are not exempt from review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The Commission would follow the demolition decision process established in TMC 13.07 which, in brief, includes an approval of non-contributing status of the property and review of the new construction proposal. The Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District Design and streetscape guidelines would be utilized for review of new construction.

Mr. McKnight reported that this briefing affords the Commission the opportunity to be introduced to the project, to ask questions, request additional information, and to provide guidance and feedback. No action is required.

Mr. Tony Trunk, one of the owners of the south half (approximately) of the site, was present to discuss the project. He introduced Mr. Han Kim, of Hotel Concepts, which owns the north portion of the property. He stated that before making a formal application, they wanted the Commission's feedback regarding demolition.

Commissioner Ken House asked what part of the structure would be demolished. Mr. Trunk replied that the entire structure would be demolished. Commissioner House then inquired if any studies would be conducted regarding the possibility of preserving the building or finding out what the structural problems are of the building. Mr. Trunk said that, over the past several years, they had entered into several agreements with different construction firms that were interested in renovating the project. The most recent estimate for rehabilitation was in excess of \$14 million.

Mr. McKnight stated that the question as to the age of the building was complicated. Work on the original Columbia Brewery began in April 1900. Parts of it could be one hundred years old; however, much of the structure is from the 1940's. One determination required by the Commission for the demolition approval process, is to ascertain whether or not the building has historic merit, which would guide the decision-making process; for instance, if mitigation for adverse historical impact may be appropriate – if, in fact it would be determined to be a historic building. Some of the questions the Commissioners should be contemplating are: Is it a contributing building to the District? Withstanding its condition, does it have historic design and merit? Does it appear to meet criteria for being a Landmark? At this time, Mr. McKnight continued, general feedback would be helpful to the property owners.

The Commissioners studied photographs for added clarification of the boundaries for demolition. Commissioner Phillips read from the staff report regarding the construction of a new hotel on the site following demolition. He asked if the owners had anything relative to the massing, etc. of the new hotel. Mr. Kim answered that they did not have the massing, but offered a rendering of a hotel.

Commissioner Phillips: "If there is anything that I like less than a retro-active vinyl window application, it's any demolition of a building of this nature. Speaking for myself, I would consider this to be a historic structure, not just because of its use and its existence in the City, but also, where it's located. It's located on a slope, overlooking a great deal of that part of Tacoma. It has been seen by people in Tacoma, ever since the first day that they opened its doors. The mitigation to allow the demolition of this building, in my opinion, would have to be significant".

Commissioner House: "I would also look at the context of the building in the neighborhood – that it has been an industrial neighborhood. In demolishing the building, there is an issue that it has historical significance. Second, if the building is demolished, then the design needs to be sensitive to the existing and remaining buildings, and I'd be concerned if we ended up with a hotel that looked like a hotel that could be anywhere in the United States and wasn't necessarily related to the context of the neighborhood. Assuming that we got to the point of demolition – just for feedback, we should be thinking about the [Heidelberg] sign and the water tower. Maybe that's a mitigation issue, to include that in the design. I would look very critically at any design of the new structure to see how it reflected the design elements in the neighborhood, and the massing issues as well".

Commissioner Tim McDonald inquired: "If it's a non-contributing structure, does that mean that the demolition ordinances and the requirements for demolition apply, or don't apply?" Mr. McKnight replied that the Conservation District was designed to provide design buffer around the Union Depot Historic District. The Conservation District does not have a listed inventory of contributing/non-contributing, as does the Union Depot, Old City Hall, or the North Slope Historic Districts. Periodically, the City will update its records for architectural surveys which were initially conducted in the late 1970's. In 2003, the City had architectural consultants study the central business district and the port areas, and this building was updated at that time. "Non-contributing" is not entirely accurate, Mr. McKnight reported. The consultant's report, which was provided to the applicant, read – in part: *Following 1959, further expansion totally destroyed any traces of the old brewery* – indicating that the building had lost its historic integrity. This is the only building in the block that was ever recorded. The adjacent buildings are not on the survey. In conclusion, the building is neither contributing, nor non-contributing. By virtue of the Conservation District, the Landmarks Preservation Commission reviews demolition and new construction as part of its normal design review process. Commissioner McDonald asked, since the building is adjacent to the University of Washington Tacoma, have they been notified as to what is being proposed. Mr. McKnight said that, as part of the SEPA submittal and notification process, he believed that the university would have been notified. He stated that he would find out that information for the Commission.

Commissioner McDonald commented that developers often say they will demolish a building and replace it with something appropriate, but Tacoma ends up with a parking lot. "I'm really concerned that there is really financing behind this – that there is a good design. What I've seen here doesn't impress me. I've seen that along any freeway throughout America. I'm hoping that we'll see something of a higher quality and something that speaks a little more about Tacoma than that. I'm concerned, before we start tearing down something, that we know that this project is really going to happen and that it is a good project", he said.

Mr. McKnight stated that the Code stipulates that certain conditions must be met before the City can permit the demolition, after the Commission has reviewed it; that includes evidence of financial commitment, as well as the design review for the new structure.

Commissioner Mark McIntire: "Some of us have gone through the Marriott process and I don't think we want to see that happen again – where the design got railroaded through. It was a 'cookie-cutter' design, just like what we see in front of us. You could do a regular hotel, but keep some of the facades. Some of the older parts of the building have cast concrete. You could preserve those pieces and have the hotel behind them. That would be preferable to just taking everything to the ground".

Commissioner Hill: "Tacoma has unique places that have a certain feel, unique from another place in town. That has to be somehow respected, architecturally, in this neighborhood. It's called the Brewery District for a reason and the uniqueness needs to be capitalized on".

Mr. Kim: "It seems to me that there's some sort of a backlash against the Marriott project. We just don't want to be overly criticized because of that". Commissioner Phillips assured Mr. Kim that this project would be reviewed on its own merit.

Commissioner Benton: "As you approach the design of the project, one of the things to look at very, very carefully is the impact of what you are proposing on the overall character of what is there now. It's our purview to protect the integrity of that character of the neighborhood. And so, your new design – the care that you take in developing that will go a long way in forming our decision on what happens with the existing building".

Ms. Sharon Winters, of Historic Tacoma, had signed up to make comment on this item. Chair Fast gave her the opportunity at this time.

Ms. Winters agreed with the Commissioners who stated that mitigation could possibly be in the re-use of building materials, such as facades, the sign and the water tower. She said that the massing and scale of the Columbia-Heidelberg Building is very prominent in that part of town and; further, the Brewery District is unique for the City of Tacoma. Having been on the Commission during the Marriott fiasco, Ms. Winters said that the City will be sensitive to that issue.

Chair Fast again wanted to clarify that this project would be reviewed based on its merits, alone; not related to any other projects that have been built in the City.

"A site visit would be appropriate"; "formation of a sub-committee could be helpful"; and "any future proposals should include a massing study of what is existing and what is proposed" were all suggestions proposed by Commissioners.

Mr. McKnight indicated that the next "official" step in this project will be for an Application for Demolition to be submitted to the Commission, which will be scheduled for review. The TMC stipulates that, at the time of review, the Commission will make the official determination of whether or not the building has historic merit. If it is determined that the building does not have historic merit, the design review process for the new construction would then begin. If the Commission determines that the building does have historic merit, the objective of the Code is to discuss alternatives/compromises, and then set a public hearing date for additional public comment relative to the building. During the review, engineering, feasibility, architectural significance, etc. can be considered, as appropriate.

Chair Fast concluded by stating that it was exciting to see some interest in that building.

B. North Slope Historic District Standards Development

Mr. Gene Grulich stated that this was an update of the standards development project underway, which is a component of the North Slope Historic District code update. The project entails the street right-of-way, from property line on one side of the street to the property line on the other side of the street, to include:

- Curbs and Curbcuts for Alleyways
- Street Paving
- Sidewalk Paving
- Street Lighting

Regarding street paving, Mr. Grulich concluded that the existing street surfaces should be maintained, rather than being replaced; which means that the cobblestone and brick streets will remain and be repaired, if/when necessary. His goal is also to "fix" any cobblestone and/or brick streets which had previously been repaired improperly, using concrete, etc.

Relative to curbs and curbcuts, Mr. Grulich stated that a compromise was reached with the Public Works Department to retain the radius curbs.

It has been proposed to forbid anything other than a decorative, fluted streetlight – approximately 13 to 15 feet in height, with an acorn-shape luminaire. This would be the standard throughout the district.

New and replacement sidewalk paving shall be similar to traditional sidewalk paving, Mr. Grulich reported.

The standards will be presented again in final form for Landmarks Preservation Commission's approval at a later date.

Mr. McKnight stated that the ADA accessibility ramps are proposed to be exempt from the Commission's purview at this time.

On behalf of the North Slope Historic District Board of Directors, Commissioner Longwell expressed her appreciation to Mr. Grulich for his recommendations and guidance on the standards.

6. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. North Slope Historic District Inventory/Bylaws

Per rules and regulations of the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission, §I: Administrative Procedures, XI: Amending the Rules and Regulations.

The single proposed change was the adoption of an official inventory of the North Slope Historic District for 2008. Mr. McKnight stated that, based on feedback from the Commission, some changes were made to the draft inventory, which was previously submitted. Several comments/recommendations were received from residents in the District, most of which had already been incorporated. The only exception was the cutoff date, based on a nomination.

The rules and regulations may be amended by the Commission by a majority vote on an annual basis, at its first regular meeting in December. If there are inadvertent omissions, they will be defaulted into the inventory and will automatically be protected, Mr. McKnight reported.

Commissioner Phillips asked if it would be possible to send a copy of the entire inventory to every title company in Pierce County, so that any future buyers would be fully aware of the North Slope Historic District and its standards. Mr. McKnight stated that staff would research that issue and return to the Commission with an action plan.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, re-adopt the bylaws".

Motion: Phillips
Second: McIntire
Motion: Carried

B. Officer Nominations

Per rules and regulations of the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission, §I: Administrative Procedures, I. Election and Terms of Office, 1. Nominations and Elections – Officers shall be nominated at the first meeting in December of each year. Elections shall be held at the following meeting. New officers will assume duties at the meeting following their election.

Mr. McKnight reported that at a previous meeting, the Commissioners voted to nominate its officers in an informal manner. Nominations were open.

Commissioner Buffington was nominated for Chairman; however, he explained that his term was soon to expire and was unsure about his re-appointment to the Commission. Commissioner Buffington declined the nomination for Chairman, but agreed to accept the nomination for Vice-Chairman.

Commissioner House was nominated for Vice-Chairman; however, he declined, stating that he would like to have more experience with the Commission before becoming an officer.

Vice-Chair Johnson was nominated for Chairman, and agreed to accept the nomination.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Fast stated that it was an honor and privilege to have served on the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer