

Members

Roger Johnson, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
Greg Benton
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD
Fred King
Megan Luce
Mark McIntire
Caroline T. Swope, PhD

Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: January 14, 2009

LPC35/09

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Imad Al Janabi
Greg Benton
Ross Buffington
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Roger Johnson (excused at 7:00 pm)
Fred King (excused at 7:30 pm)
Kathryn Longwell
Mark McIntire
Caroline Swope

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook
Charlie Solverson
Lisa Wojtanowicz
Dan McConaughy

Commission Members Excused:

Megan Luce

Others Present:

Heather Hammond, Loren Combs, Joe Buskirk,
Milt Tremblay, David Boe, Andrea Tull, Allan Wallace

Chair Roger Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioner Luce was excused.

B. Approval of Minutes

N/A.

2. NOMINATIONS – Tacoma Register of Historic Places (preliminary)

Mr. Reuben McKnight cited the general procedural notes, followed by the staff report:

Tacoma Register listing follows procedures defined in TMC 13.07.050, and consists of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. This initial meeting will determine whether the property meets the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity. If the Commission finds that the age and integrity standards are met, then the Commission may move 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. Owner consent is not required for the Commission to recommend designation.

A. 725 East 25th Street (Carman Manufacturing Company Building)

The original four-story building was built in 1893, designed by Carl August Darmer and in 1896, a two story-building to the west was constructed with two other buildings added by 1899. In 1900 fire did not destroy the buildings, but required repair to the roof, foundation and interior; there were several additions in 1901, 1917 and between 1931 and 1949. The Carman Manufacturing Company Building was

nominated under Criteria A, B, C, and D, for its association with Tacoma's industrial growth and development as the Pacific Northwest's largest furniture making factory; Tacoma's longest-running family-owned businesses; it is one of Tacoma's few extant wood-framed, heavy timber manufacture warehouse buildings designed by one of Tacoma's most prolific architects, Carl Darmer.

In 2008, the property was submitted for Part 1 certification for federal tax credit rehabilitation program consideration as a National Register eligible property which was later declined for that consideration. This was a correction from the staff report. In August 2008, the Commission was briefed on the property and on that process which resulted in sending a letter of support for the national register listing.

The threshold criteria for Tacoma Register listing are located at 13.07.040B(1), and include:

1. Property is at least 50 years old at the time of nomination; and
2. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association such that it is able to convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

The purpose of the preliminary meeting was to determine that the age and integrity standards were met. The building retains the wood-framed, heavy timber construction and most of its original wood cladding exterior. Staff requested that Criterion D be stricken because there the application lacked evidence that the property "...has yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history" as required in the eligibility criteria.

Staff recommended scheduling the nomination for public testimony for consideration as a City of Tacoma Landmark at a hearing on February 11, 2009.

Ms. Hammond presented a PowerPoint on the history of the building. She showed a copy of a proposed conceptual design. Mr. McKnight confirmed that the applicant was not currently seeking approval of the design.

Chair Johnson inquired about the amount of non-historic siding that had been removed. Ms. Hammond explained approximately 60 percent was removed and they were now in the process of protecting the original siding from weather damage.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, find that the property at 725 East 25th Street, Carman Manufacturing Company Building, meets threshold criteria and meets Criteria A, B, and C with special note that it does not include Criterion D; that we take no action on the proposed future design, and that we schedule the nomination for public testimony on February 11, 2009".

Motion: Buffington
Second: Hill

Mr. McKnight clarified that the nomination was for the exterior of the building and its one site and did not include the adjacent parcels. He further stated that if the three parcel set was requested for consideration, then the parcels may be included in the public notice for the hearing, but that it would not affect the Commission's decision on the nomination.

Motion: Carried

3. DESIGN REVIEW

OLD BUSINESS

A. 1406 North 7th Street

Mr. McKnight presented the background on this project: The Landmarks Preservation Commission reviewed and denied a retroactive application for design review for a vinyl window

replacement at the above address on August 13, 2008. The applicant subsequently filed an appeal with the City Hearings Examiner, which was pending.

The applicant also requested a period of time to pursue a settlement for the remediation of the inappropriate vinyl windows with the installer, Sound Glass. The applicant was to present three options for the removal and replacement of the new windows, which have been agreed to by Sound Glass and the homeowner, as follows:

1. Option one: Remove existing vinyl windows and install ten Lindal wood sash kits in double hung window openings, as well as to salvage and install repairable original sashes into fixed and casement openings. Nine of the new windows will be overlaid by aluminum storm panels.
2. Option two: Remove existing vinyl windows and install ten new Lindal wood sash kits, as above, with wood storm windows in fixed and casement openings.
3. Option three: Remove existing vinyl windows and install 19 new wood windows, to include 3/8" pewter grid pattern in the front.

Mr. McKnight indicated that staff made no recommendation regarding the three options.

Mr. Combs stated that his client, who was the owner of the property at 1406 N 7th Street, purchased new windows from Sound Glass without getting approval for the window replacements from the Landmarks Preservation Commission; which resulted in the subsequent design review application, denial, and appeal. Mr. Combs stated that through discussions with Mr. Willoughby, Sound Glass Company owner, they proposed the three options previously presented by Mr. McKnight. He explained that option three included the installation of a 3/8" pewter grid pattern system that had been on the original primary elevation window, which was included on the window specification sheets. He clarified that he had a preferred option, but wanted to submit all of the options and to ask the Commission for appropriate direction. He also reported the estimate of installing all of the old wood windows would be approximately \$59,000.

Commissioner Kathryn Longwell asked for clarification regarding the original windows. Mr. Buskirk confirmed there were 19 windows that were removed; and some or all were now stored in his garage, and each had been gridded. She stated that the Commission's direction should be to salvage and repair as many of the original windows as possible and to delegate the number of new windows

Mr. Buskirk presented his family's safety concern regarding the front single-pane elevation window and asked for consideration of option three. Commissioner Longwell suggested installation of an internal storm window with the original windows reinstalled.

Commissioners Ken House and Caroline Swope asked that no internal grids be included in option three, because these grids do not reflect the historic profile of the individuality on each of the leaded grid panes.

Mr. McKnight said that the Lindal products have an applied lead striping that looks close to the lead soldering assembly as a possibility for consideration.

Mr. Combs stated that samples of the "striping" and the internal systems could be brought to the Commission.

Commissioner Buffington summarized that Option Three sounded like it would be the least desirable and a option with repair would be more acceptable.

Mr. McKnight clarified that exterior wood storm windows have wood sashes which are clipped at the top for easy dismount and internal would be inserted onto the window; he also referenced the submitted specification sheet profile of the storm windows.

Commissioner Longwell described her first preference, which was to salvage and repair every window that can be salvaged and repaired and the second preference was to install the wood sash kits in the double hung windows but repair the original sashes into all of the fixed

casements, adding that this would meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the North Slope Historic District Guidelines.

Commissioner Swope asked for clarification on who determines the salvageability of the windows.

Mr. Buskirk said that the work would not be done by Sound Glass because their company does not work with wood windows or restoration; the work will be bid based on the outcome of this meeting's decision. He added that their settlement and agreement with Sound Glass was for \$15,500 (for Option 3) in consideration of the appeal; he also clarified that Option 2 would cost \$13,500 and Option 1 is \$12,500 with a cost difference between the aluminum and wood storm windows.

Concern was expressed by Commissioners that there were many unknowns regarding the preservation of the windows, specifically the ability to salvage which windows and on which elevations of the house.

Mr. McKnight explained that once an option was selected by the Commissioners then the review of the windows for salvage value could be delegated to staff.

Chair Johnson reminded the Commission that it could consider the economic hardship on the owner and that the LPC needs to consider the "big picture."

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve Option Two which includes 10 new Lindal windows and repairing and reinstalling nine existing windows, if possible, and installing wood storm windows, and if for any reason original windows cannot be salvaged, then the Historic Preservation Officer shall be consulted".

Motion: House
Second: McIntire

Commissioner King asked if the Commission had dealt with the difference between wood and aluminum storm windows, qualifying the difference in terms of visual impact and historic qualities of the house. Commissioner McIntire confirmed that the difference in storm and wood had been discussed at this level. Chair Johnson clarified that storm windows were temporary elements, which were not reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. McKnight asked for clarification on the exterior or interior approach to the storm windows in the motion. Commissioner Longwell, House, and Johnson affirmed that an interior storm window would be acceptable.

Motion: Carried

NEW BUSINESS

A. University of Washington Tacoma (flags)

Ms. Cook read the staff report: The University of Washington Tacoma campus is located within the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic Special Review District. The current proposal is to install 19 flags on university buildings for the purpose of identifying the campus. A map showing the installation locations planned for the flags is enclosed with the application.

- 19 Building Flags: 3.6 feet in width X 11 feet in height at the maximum point
- The pole will project a maximum of 8 feet from the face of the buildings and a minimum of 10 feet from the sidewalk to the bottom of the flag. The pole will be installed on the second floor level on each building.

- The pole will be attached to the building by engineered holders and fastening devices. Staff requested the applicant to provide mounting details at the January 14 Commission meeting.

Additionally, it was noted that the project will most likely require a permit to enter public rights of way with projections.

Union Depot/Warehouse Historic Special Review District and Union Station Conservation District were enclosed with the staff report.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards to be considered:

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

National Park Service Preservation Brief #25 was also referenced for consideration.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to buildings as well as streetscapes and right of ways per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
2. Applicable guidelines for consideration of this application include: TMC 13.07.270 for building design and streetscape improvement review in the Union Depot-Warehouse Historic District, specifically Guideline #7 regarding signs, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, particularly #9, and National Park Service Preservation Brief #25, regarding historic signs and new signs on historic buildings.
3. National Park Service Preservation Brief 25 states that signs refer to a countless number of symbolic markers that can include flags and logos as well as lettering, and discusses signs as a way for owners to communicate and reflect their signatures and identification; signs provide direction and can reveal different periods of human occupancy and use.
4. The proposal for flags was designed to enhance identification of the University of Washington Tacoma campus facilities and to mark entrances on specific buildings. The flags are consistent with National Park Service Preservation Brief 25, which states specifically, that flags are a way to communicate building owner's identity.
5. The intent of the guidelines in TMC 13.07.270 for building design and streetscape improvement review is to ensure a certainty of design quality with the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic Special Review District and Union Station Conservation District, and were established as guidelines for rehabilitation, new construction, and public amenities. The guidelines "will be used as a baseline by the Landmarks Preservation Commission for the design review process, but will not supersede the authority of the Commission to exercise its judgment and discretion on a case-by-case basis."
6. TMC 13.07.270 includes Design Guideline #7 a. General, (1) All new signs and all changes in the appearance of existing signs displayed so as to be visible from streets, sidewalks, or alleys require Landmarks Preservation Commission approval. Components of the following sections of the Sign Design Guidelines are highlighted:

Guideline #7 b: Location and size of signs on buildings –The guideline states that signs shall not dominate the bldg, must be an appropriate scale; coordinated in height and proportion; projecting signs shall generally not exceed nine square feet on the first floor level. The proposed building flags dimensions are 3.5' X 11" which would exceed the size standard stated in this guideline. The poles will be installed on the second level. Attachment mechanisms will be presented at the Landmarks Commission meeting.

7. The contents on the proposed flags are considered with the below listed elements of guideline #7:

Guideline 7 c: Messages and lettering should be simple, brief, and logos are encouraged; traditional block or curvilinear and proper size of lettering that is uncluttered and flat and easy to read;

Guideline 7 d: Color should not clash with the bldg color; no more than 3 colors; light-colored letters on dark background generally required as more traditional and visually less intrusive;

Guideline 7 e: Materials should be durable and traditional: This item references metal and wood as traditional type signs versus the proposed flag type signage material. Illumination: The flags will not be illuminated.

8. The contents proposed for the Building Flags are simple, brief, clear, straight forward and were part of an overall identification plan for the University of Washington's campus and meet Guideline # 7.
9. The flag attachment to any historic building shall be done in a manner to avoid damaging bricks or other historic materials. Building material will be removed in order to fasten the pole holders; therefore meeting Guideline #7f, specifically for, "*avoid damaging bricks, etc.*" The attachment method would also meet Secretary of Interior's Standard #9 *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property*". This item would be confirmed at the January 14, 2009 meeting.

Staff recommended adoption of the above analysis as preliminary findings and dependent upon new information including the attachment/mounting methods and materials of the poles.

Mr. Tremblay stated that the purpose of the application was to receive approval on the proposal but also to obtain feedback and comments including the number, location and the attachment detail of the flags. He said the proposal was initiated and would be funded by students and his concern was to be fiscally responsible because of limited funds. He added that the students' desire for the flags was for increased campus identity explaining that the University's focus has been the campus within a historic district. He said the Chancellor's recent suggestion was to reduce the number of the flags and adding the building's name onto the flag. He presented the campus buildings and proposed flags and locations on the PowerPoint.

Commissioners House and King asked for clarification on the use of durable materials and the type of flag material proposed, maintenance, acceptance of a banner concept with additional approval through the Administrative Review process or condition certain items, such as number of flags, for returning to LPC for additional approval.

Mr. Tremblay stated that a nylon material was proposed; the maintenance life cycle would be five to six years.

Commissioners discussed the concern for increased clutter, the negative impact on the historic nature of the buildings which would not meet Secretary of Interior's Standard #9; consideration of attachment of a more permanent historic type signs to light poles (versus the buildings); the inability to meet the regulations for durable material nor appropriate mounting method to joints; suggestion on additional clarity on what is being identified since the University's commercial tenants are also within the campus; University was here for the long-term and concerned that flags are more short-term and suggested the identity program was of a more permanent nature.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, request the University of Washington to return with a revised proposal that considered the Commission's comments including the

potential clutter, total number of flags and a more permanent markings program to differentiate the campus”.

Motion: Buffington
Second: Hill
Motion: Carried

B. 110 South 9th Street

Ms. Cook read the staff report into the record: The Bowes Building was built in 1907 and is listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places in 1979 as well as listing on the Washington State and National Registers. Its location is on the southwest corner of 9th and A Streets across the street from the southern boundary of the Old City Hall Historic District and across from the Totem Pole landmark at Firemen’s Park. The current application is for installation of one canvas awning above the first floor windows at the South Ninth Street elevation entrance. The application enclosures included drawings that showed the proposed awning location and a photocopy of the awning fabric pattern and color. The applicant would be available to discuss the attachment method (for the awning). The application was for the awning proposal only.

Secretary of Interior’s Standards to be considered:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Designing an Awning or Canopy for your Older Building, City of Tacoma Historic Preservation, was to be considered:

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. The Bowes Building is historically significant. Built in 1907, the building is a significant example of Beaux Arts Architecture, and was designed by prominent Tacoma architect Fredrick Heath. It is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The location and setting of the Bowes Building is also historically significant. It lies across the street from the Old City Hall Historic District, which is also listed on the Tacoma, Washington, and National Registers of Historic Places.
3. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
4. The building has had previous alterations to its exterior including the windows and storefronts. The building had a major restoration in the late 1980s at the time of its listing as a landmark.
5. The addition of an awning does change the appearance of the 110 South 9th entrance; there is no historic photo demonstrating that an awning had previously been on the building. However awnings were a part of the history of Tacoma’s commercial building facades, added for practical reasons, as stated in the *Designing an Awning or Canopy for your Older Building* brochure. The addition of an awning appears to *meet SOIS #1* specifically for “...requiring minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment”.

6. The proposed awning will be located within the recess of the building bay and attached in the six inch reveal between the upper windows and pilaster. The applicant will be available to discuss the attachment methods at the Commission meeting. The top of the awning will be centered between the second and first floors and below the upper balcony. A portion of the upper façade wall will be covered with the addition of the awning yet it remains centered within the area of the bay, it does not cover significant exterior features, the awning is removable, and helps to *accentuate the entrance for improved business use. The awning meets SOIS #9 specifically, "...not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property."*
7. The awning material would be fabric with a striped pattern in a width (i.e., stripes) similar to the transom windows' width located above the entrance door and as stated in the application, which states, *"...incorporates a scale similar to the ornamental ironwork balconies and railings..."* The proposal appears to meet SOIS #9 for new additions, specifically, *"The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.* Mr. McKnight added that the proposal would be temporary.

Staff recommended adoption of the above analysis as preliminary findings and dependent upon information presented on January 14, 2009 regarding the awning's attachment mechanism.

Mr. Boe stated that there had not been a canopy on the original building; he briefly described the history of the building and its tenant and stated the purpose of the canopy was to increase identity and visibility for the businesses which occupy the building.

Commissioners discussed the grout joints and concern of having just one awning on the building's entrance and interior lobby improvements.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the awning proposal for property at 110 South Ninth Street as presented, and the attachment method detail be delegated for review by the Historic Preservation Officer".

Motion: McIntire
Second: Benton
Motion: Carried

4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. Code Enforcement – Building and Land Use Services

Mr. McKnight introduced Charlie Solverson, Division Manager for the Building and Land Use Services, who would provide an overview of the code enforcement program, including a discussion of complaint management, inspections, notifications, and enforcement actions. He stated the overview would also include discussion on the importance of public education and awareness and opportunities for the community to partner with the city to improve compliance.

Mr. Solverson introduced staff Lisa Wojtanowicz who oversees the code enforcement and Community CARES program and Dan McConaughy, Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Solverson continued by showing a few slides providing information on the case volume on enforcement, 4,000 cases in 2008, nuisance code to improve property standards, code enforcement on a complaint basis and enforcement as necessary; stating that 2008 changes included enforcing proactively by adding five new inspectors and procedural administrative changes.

He said that the majority of cases is nuisance code issues with a small portion in the land use code; in addition, key issues in the North Slope Historic District was directly connected with awareness of such items as alterations which are subject to design review. He said that

voluntary compliance working with the homeowners was a priority and there were options such as civil penalties. Challenge with land use code was not having a comprehensive set of option within the code. He explained the complaint notification tracking system and staff follow-up through the Community CARES program phone number at 253.591.5011. Mr. McConaughy described the process and its recent improvements, adding that a call to that number resulted in a next day inspection visit and individuals were in the field for code enforcement and another for permit inspection. Mr. Solverson asked for feedback and comments from the Commission.

There was Commission and staff discussion on projects that many times occurred after the work week hours especially on weekends and the trigger for stop work order issuance. The priorities from the discussion included the following:

1. As a first response to a complaint (i.e. violation), the priority would be to issue a Stop Work Order
2. Field item: City enforcement officials should watch for demolition items, such as siding or windows that have been removed in the North Slope Historic District.
3. Education: How can everyone do more to make an impact on building contractors (such as window vendors)? The Commission and staff discussed additional educational materials and activities through pamphlets and increased door-to-door contact.

Mr. Solverson talked about the development of a standard procedure to consolidate the management of code enforcement for increased consistency and comprehensiveness with the goals of providing appropriate response and follow-up to complaints. Ms. Wojtanowicz presented information on the ongoing need and improvements on education and training both internally and within the community. She said the best community education was door-hanger type pamphlets were found to be effective.

Mr. Solverson stated that internal staff including Mr. McKnight as the Historic Preservation Officer was part of the communication process so that the notification was tracked through CARES, which would trigger appropriate and consistent actions and follow-up.

Commissioners House and Longwell described individual violations by property owners that do not receive any type of corrective sanction (by the City) could add up to a loss in the effectiveness of the Commission's work that could eventually lead to an overall decrease in the existence of historic properties and districts.

Mr. McKnight described the status of educational projects being developed to contact contractors and the Master Builders Association.

Vice chair Buffington thanked the staff for the presentation stating appreciation for the efforts being made to make improvements and would look forward to working together to make the system as good as it could be in the future.

5. BOARD BUSINESS / PRESERVATION PLANNING

The Commission discussed the number of the meeting's agenda items that remained, noting the late hour.

A. Wedge Neighborhood – District Regulation

1. Mr. McKnight suggested a revision to the calendar for the nomination process be considered.
2. Mr. McKnight reviewed the staff report describing the basic content of the Wedge Neighborhood Historic District nomination. He focused on the statement of significance, district boundaries mentioning the issues previously discussed requiring additional information on such items as buffers and conservation areas, consideration of consistency with the code requirement of containing some historic character within conservation areas, and reviewed several versions of possible alternative boundaries explaining the advantages and disadvantages including having contiguous boundary. He asked Commissioners to review the 12-page Wedge staff report but no

action was required at this time.

Ms. Tull, representative of MultiCare, stated that she was following the work of the nomination process and MultiCare wanted to be involved in the process, but did not have an official position saying further that they viewed the neighbors as a community partner and respected the Wedge residents and support at a high level the neighborhood's objective of preserving the residential neighborhood as MultiCare looked at how the hospital zoning and any elements such as overlays would be balanced within the final proposal.

Mr. Wallace, land use attorney for MultiCare, presented the hospital's concerns would be design guidelines and district boundaries and the hospital owned property near the "L" Street homes which are mostly investor owned. He spoke specifically about the certificate of appropriateness process and how to address new construction guidelines since MultiCare does not own historic commercial properties but they do own four single family residences.

Ms. Tull stated that MultiCare has no long range plans for further hospital campus expansion within the next twenty years plus to purchase additional property, the current footprint would meet the needs of the community.

Mr. Wallace talked about design guidelines using the example of surface parking lots that were included in the HM(Hospital Medical) zone and how future guidelines would be sympathetic to the goals of the historic district. He concluded by stating that MultiCare would not want to be included within the boundaries of the future proposed historic district and Ms. Tull added that the proposed boundaries follow the existing zoning.

Commissioner Hill stated that the approach to design guidelines was not as a punitive measure and that preservation was viewed as a long-term interest of the community.

There was a motion.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, defer consideration of the Wedge Neighborhood Historic District application until Staff presented a revised schedule".

Motion: Hill
Second: Buffington
Motion: Carried

Mr. McKnight reminded the Commission that the public information session on the Wedge Neighborhood Historic District proposal would be held on January 28, 2009, as advertised.

B. North Slope Historic District Standards

This item was rescheduled to the next meeting.

C. Preservation Month Committee and Awards Activities

This item was rescheduled to the next meeting.

D. Officer Elections

Commissioner McIntire asked if there were any Commissioners who would want to be considered for nomination as an officer.

There was a motion.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, nominate and elect Ross Buffington as Vice chair and Roger Johnson as Chair".

Motion: McIntire

Second: Hill
Motion: Carried

9. COMMUNICATION ITEMS/ITEMS OF INTEREST

Mr. McKnight requested the Commission's consideration of Administrative Review on the in-kind replacement of the worn cables on the Murray Morgan Bridge. He stated that he asked the City Engineer to provide an informational briefing to the Commission in the future.

Commissioner Hill stated that he would report at a future meeting on how banners on the downtown light standards were reviewed.

Commissioner Swope asked about future plans to manage the increased workload of the Commission in consideration of the lengthy twice monthly meetings. Mr. McKnight responded that there was recognition and staff consideration for resolution.

~~*~*~*~*

~~*~*~*~*

The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer