

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Megan Luce
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell
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: February 11, 2009

LPC37/09

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Megan Luce
Mark McIntire
Ha Pham (excused at 6:44 pm)
Caroline T. Swope, PhD.

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook

Others Present:

Heather Hammond, Sean Finnigan, Curtis Morrison,
Terry Coggins, Ryan Nofziger, Roger Johnson

Commission Members Excused:

Ross Buffington
Pamela Sundell

Commission Members Absent:

Phil Hill

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated that at the previous evening's meeting, the City Council appointed two new Commission members resulting in the lack of a Chair and Vice Chair Buffington previously requested excusal from this meeting. Mr. McKnight said the bylaws call for appointment of a Chair Pro Tem to administer the meeting.

Commissioner McIntire offered to Chair the meeting and would defer if another Commissioner would like to Chair the evening's meeting.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, appoint Commissioner McIntire as Pro Tem to Chair the meeting."

Motion: King
Second: Swope
Motion: Carried

Chair Pro Tem Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. He welcomed new Commissioners Ha Pham and Pamela Sundell who was not in attendance.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioners Buffington and Sundell were excused.

B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 24, 2008 were approved.

2. PUBLIC HEARING – NOMINATION TO THE TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Chair pro Tem McIntire opened the public hearing and Mr. Reuben McKnight delivered notes on general order for nominations to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

The Tacoma Register listing will follow procedures defined in 13.07.050, and will consist of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. The initial meeting was on January 14, 2009, and the Commission determined that the property met the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity and scheduled a public hearing and comment period; at which, the public may enter comments for the record. 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.

The Tacoma Municipal Code lists six criteria for designation in Chapter 13.07.040.

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

Mr. McKnight continued with the staff report and background information: The original four-story building was built in 1892 and in 1896, a two story-building to the west was constructed with two other buildings added by 1899. A 1900 fire had not destroyed 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 being nominated under Criterion A, B, and C, for its association with Tacoma's industrial growth and development as the Pacific Northwest's largest furniture making factory and Tacoma's longest-running family-owned businesses; it was one of Tacoma's few extant wood-framed, heavy timber manufacture warehouse buildings designed by one of Tacoma's most prolific architects, Carl Darmer.

The property was nominated under the following Tacoma Register Criteria:

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

This is a nomination for the exterior of the existing principal structure.

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

Ms. Hammond stated that the building was being nominated for its history along with its significant architecture, original wood siding and framing, and the Carman family-owned business.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, recommend to the City Council that the Carman Manufacturing Company Building be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including the exterior of the existing building at 725 East 25th Street, finding that it meets criteria A, B, and C of the TMC 13.07.040."

Motion: House
Second: Al Janabi

At this time, Chair Pro Tem McIntire called for any public comment and/or testimony. There was none.

Motion: Carried

Chair Pro Tem McIntire closed the public hearing.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Old Business – 1513 North 7th Street

Mr. McKnight stated that the retroactive application was denied by the Commission on October 8, 2008 and the current application was a proposal from the owner to bring the property into compliance. He added that since the applicant was not present, the Commission could review or defer the item until later in the meeting so the applicant would be available.

The Commission agreed to defer this item until after the New Business Design Review agenda items.

B. New Business – 913 North 6th Street

Ms. Cook read the staff report:

Built in 1901, this residence is a contributing property located in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal was a retroactive application for removal of one wood coal chute window and replacement with a vinyl awning window. The window was replaced due to damage of the siding below the window; the new window installation required “shimming” the opening which had a slope (coal chute type window) and also repair with sheetrock material placed on the interior of the wall. New trim was also installed in a width wider than the other windows’ trim, this width covered the “jagged” edge of the exterior wall at the bottom of the window opening.

The current property has a stop work order pending historic property review on this design review application. According to the Landmarks Preservation Commission bylaws, a single window could be reviewed administratively for approval; subsequent notification to the Commission for Administrative Review resulted in a request for further review through the Design Review application process.

North Slope Historic District and Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties were enclosed, for consideration.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. This house, built in 1901, is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. 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.
3. The wood window was removed and replaced with a vinyl window by the owner without approval by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
4. The replacement window does not meet Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #6, which states, *“Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.”* The new vinyl window differed in design details and was materially different than the original.
5. The original window was not repaired thus not meeting Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #6, which states, *“Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.”*

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings and deferred recommendation to the Commission.

Commissioner Longwell stated that the concern was the size of the trim which did not match the existing window trim on the other windows on that elevation.

Commissioner King agreed that the new window trim did not match the other window trim on the house.

Mr. Morrison explained that the new wider trim was used to cover the damaged siding at the bottom of the window.

Mr. McKnight suggested remediation by adding a piece of crown to that facing or replacement with smaller dimension lumber with backbanding.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, reject the proposal and recommend removal of the window, frame and trim, repair or replace the siding and re-install the window with trim configuration that matches the trim as in the nearby window, for the property at 913 N 6th Street.

Motion: King

Second: Swope

Mr. McKnight discussed meeting the visual objective by repairing the window in place without removal of the window and frame. Commissioner King and Swope agreed with the clarification as an amendment to the motion.

Motion: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that a written decision would be forthcoming within a few days.

C. New Business - 515 North I Street

Mr. McKnight read the staff report: Built in 1909, the property at 515 North I Street is a contributing structure located in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal is to remove two existing original wood double hung windows and replace with two Marvin Wood Ultimate Double Hung windows; in addition, replacement siding will be matched to the original. The purpose is to accommodate interior remodeling of living space and appliances in the kitchen. The two windows will be reduced in height by 5" (from 53" to 38") and will remain the same width (each are 35"). The head height of the windows will be retained in line with the existing windows on their respective elevations.

One window is located on the rear side elevation and the other is on the rear and both cannot be seen from the street.

The exterior trim and sill will be refinished and re-installed using as much of the existing material as possible; matching in-kind materials if needed. The existing windows feature a "lug" on the upper sash, which will be re-installed. Staff requested the applicant to request an estimate to accommodate this historic feature if a replacement was needed. The applicant will be available at the meeting to respond to any questions.

North Slope Historic District and Secretary of the Interior's Standard for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties were enclosed, for consideration.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. This 1909 house is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. 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.

3. The use of existing wood window materials including sash and trims does appear to meet Secretary of Interior's Standard #6, which states, *"Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence."*
4. The existing original windows will be replaced with custom-made windows matching the original window materials using Marvin Brand Wood Ultimate Double Hung Windows, which meets SOIS #6, which states, *"the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials..."* and meets North Slope Special Review District Guideline #6, Exterior Materials, which states, *"Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings..."*
5. The windows are located in the rear of the house and are not visible from the street.
6. Installation of new clapboard siding that matches the original siding does meet SOIS #6, which states, *"..., the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials...replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence."* The use of the same siding materials meets North Slope Special Review District Guideline #6, for Exterior Materials, which states, *"Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings..."*
7. Retaining the windows' location with the exception of five inches in height meets North Slope Special Review District Guideline #2 for Scale, which states, *"Scale is also determined by the proportions of the architectural elements within the composition of the individual building facades. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood."* and meets North Slope Special Review District Guideline #7, Rhythm of Openings, which states, *"Respect the patterns and orientations of door and window openings as represented in the neighboring buildings. Typically, older buildings have doors and transoms that matched the head height of the adjacent windows. Doors also tend to be paneled, or contain glazed openings. Windows are vertically oriented. Large horizontal expanses of glass are created by ganging two or more windows into a series. Most windows are either single or double hung, with a few casement windows being incorporated into the designs. Many of the buildings had the upper sash articulated into smaller panels, either with muntin bars, leaded glazing, or arches. Most older windows were also surrounded with substantial trim pieces or window head trim."*

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings and recommended approval to the Commission.

There was discussion on the window specification sheet and matching the existing windows' dimension and grids.

Mr. McKnight clarified that the new windows would match the existing windows. Mr. Coggins stated that the lugs on the existing sashes would be used in the new windows or replicated exactly if new sashes would be needed.

Commissioner Longwell was concerned with destroying historic fabric but respected the need to remodel the kitchen interior for modern use.

Mr. McKnight referenced the Secretary of Interior's Standards and consideration as to whether the proposal adversely affects the character of the building by changing spatial relationships; if the window removal and configuration on this corner of the house is an elemental feature of the historic significance or the historic character of the building. He added that the remodel of the kitchen was to change the counter height and the Commission may consider this as an adaptive reuse and the intent of the Secretary of Interior's Standards to accommodate the change.

Commissioner Luce added that she was also concerned with the proposal, but because of the location of the windows on the house and matching the existing windows' design while the purpose was for increased livability, then she would be supportive.

Commissioner King asked if there was a different configuration that would be possible to retain the side elevation window. Mr. Coggins stated that the basement door's location and the consideration of several designs limited the options when compared to the proposal.

Commissioner Longwell asked that a motion include an exterior grid system on the windows.

Commissioner Swope asked that the existing window sash with the lugs be given to a recycling yard rather than destroying historic fabric.

There was a motion.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the analysis as findings correcting Secretary of Interior's Standard number 6; approve the removal of the two window, which will be placed at a salvaged yard and replace with new windows matching the existing windows, as in the proposal submitted, for the property at 515 North I Street".

Motion: Swope
Second: McIntire
Motion: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that a written decision would be forthcoming within a few days.

D. New Business - 312 North J Street

Ms. Cook read the staff report:

Constructed in 1905, this Queen Anne era home is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal was to enclose the rear corner porch area, remove one non-historic window, and move the existing rear porch door and transom to the rear wall, and adding a covered porch, steps and railing at the new rear door area. The new rear exterior cladding would match the original in design, color, and material. The new porch gable style roof would be a composition material; the remaining porch features (steps, columns, railing) would match the primary façade porch details in material and dimensions. The decking would be painted cedar.

North Slope Historic District and Secretary of the Interior's Standard for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties were enclosed for consideration:

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. This 1905 house is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. 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.
3. The non-historic window would be removed without its replacement (of a window).
4. Enclosing the approximate 5'6" X 5'6" rear porch removes original fabric from the home; however, the applicant proposed to reuse the existing rear door with transom, and the changes to the building were primarily located on the rear of the building. Therefore, the enclosure would not change any distinctive or character defining spaces or spatial relationships, meeting Secretary of Interior's Standard #2, which states, "*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved.*"

5. Adding new rear porch steps, gabled roof, deck, railing system and columns that matched materials in design, materials and color of the front elevation porch appeared to meet SOIS #9, which states, *"New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction...will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment."*
6. Locating the new porch on the rear met North Slope Special Review District Guideline No. 8 for Additional Construction, which states, *"Sensitively locate additions... to allow the architectural and historical qualities of the contributing building to be dominant. While additions to contributing buildings in historic districts are not discouraged, they should be located to conceal them from view from the public right-of-way."*
7. The proportion of the new porch and its gable roof and pitch appeared to be compatible with the house and the neighborhood, therefore meeting North Slope Guideline #2 for scale, which states, *"Scale is also determined by the proportions of the architectural elements within the composition of the individual building facades. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood."*

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings and recommended approval to the Commission.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the proposal, as submitted, for the property at 312 North J Street".

MOTION: Luce

SECOND: King

MOTION: Carried

Ms. Cook stated that a written decision would be forthcoming within a few days.

Old Business Item 3A, 1513 North 7th Street, continued.

Mr. McKnight read the staff report:

Built in 1892, this Queen Anne era house is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The roof is hipped and a pedimented two-story square bay is on the left side. The upper bay and surrounding sides of the bay are one-over-one double-hung windows. The lower bay has a large six-panel window. A shed roof covers the front porch and door. This house has been in enforcement status since last year for siding and windows with the previous owners.

A retroactive application for siding, windows, and a new porch (deck) was denied by the Landmarks Preservation Commission on October 8, 2008, but the rear addition was approved at that time.

The current application was a proposal from the owner to bring the property into compliance. By approving the application, the violation status would be removed and citations would not be issued. Due to the expense of bringing the property into compliance, the applicant was requesting 6 months to correct the siding.

The application items included the following:

- 1) Cladding/Trim: Removal of the two layers of non-historic siding (Hardie Plank and wide shingles) and new trim and trim boards. Repair of the original clapboard siding; replacement matching in-kind any non-repairable original clapboard siding and original trim.
- 2) The fascia and soffit would remain as is, with repair and in-kind replacement and repainting.
- 3) Windows: The windows on the side and rear elevations were replaced with vinyl by the previous owner. The current owner proposed restoring and repairing the existing historic windows on the front elevation, and leaving the existing vinyl windows on the side and rear elevations in place.
- 4) The existing door would remain but new 1" X 6" wood trim would be added.

- 5) Porch including pillar, decking, steps, and rails: Exhibit "A" was referenced for new front porch dimensions. The material for the rails, railing, stairs and posts would be wood. Exhibit "B" was referenced as a photo of a porch showing the rails and stairs in a similar design as proposed in the current application.

North Slope Historic District and Secretary of the Interior's Standard for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties were enclosed for consideration.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. This house is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it is a Queen Anne era home built in 1892 as part of the first development within the District. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. 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.
3. The replacement vinyl windows and new window openings were constructed and installed by the previous owner without approval by the Landmarks Preservation Commission; the current owner was not aware at the time of the sale that they were installed without proper approval. The Commission previously found that these windows did not meet the district design guidelines or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
4. The Hardie Plank was installed without approval by the Commission over nonhistoric asbestos siding. The retroactive application for approval of this siding was found to not meet the district design guidelines or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and was denied by the Commission. The Commission recommended in its discussion that the preferred approach would be to remove the asbestos siding and to restore the original drop siding beneath.
5. The applicant proposed to follow the Commission's recommendation for the siding, by removing both the Hardie Plank and the asbestos siding, and to repair the original siding (and replace in kind where there was damage or missing siding).
6. It was acknowledged that the removal of the inappropriate siding and windows introduced considerable expense to the project.
7. The applicant proposed a compromise based on cost-benefit, considering the following factors: 1) the vinyl windows were located on secondary elevations; 2) the vinyl windows were installed by a previous owner and the current owner was not aware of the violation; 3) the front windows would be retained and restored; 4) because the siding was installed without the proper approvals by the current owner, the current owner proposed to correct this violation; and 4) the combination of siding removal and restoration, and window replacement, may make the project infeasible.
8. The proposal included installation of shingles onto the front gable area, meeting aforementioned North Slope Historic District Guideline #6 for Exterior Materials, for "...*respecting the visual appearance of the neighborhood and using compatible materials similar to those found in the neighborhood.*"
9. The existing porch column would be retained and re-painted; the replacement of the existing deck, three closed steps, and rail system appeared to meet North Slope Historic District Guideline #7, which states, "*Sense of Entry. Goal: Emphasize entrances to structures. Entrances should be located on the front facade of the building and highlighted with architectural details such as raised platforms, porches, or porticos to draw attention to the entry. Entrances not located on the front facade should be easily recognizable from the street.*"

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings and deferred approval recommendation to the Commission.

Mr. Finnigan stated that his intent was to follow the recommendations of the Commission but added that there were some economic considerations of this proposal, noting that they wanted someone to live in the house since the project was on the exterior.

Commissioner Swope asked about Exhibits A (designs and photos) and B (photo of a different porch) focusing on the proposed porch photo which did not appear to match the appropriate style for the house. She asked that research be conducted to better match the historic porch style. Mr. McKnight added that staff could assist with the documentation for the porch and return to the Commission if it was requested.

Commissioner Longwell asked that the new corner boards not be retained on the house, however, Mr. McKnight stated there could be existing original corner boards which would be restored or replaced in-kind. Mr. Finnigan confirmed that there were corner boards on the original drop siding.

Commissioner Longwell asked about the vinyl windows on the sides of the house that were installed by the previous owner. Mr. McKnight explained that the staff recommendation asked the Commission affirm its previous finding, which stated that the vinyl windows were not appropriate however, under the remediation, the proposal was to create a situation of compliance. Further, he stated, the Commission would consider this approach for compliance at this time.

Commissioner King asked if the vinyl windows requirement would be waived by acceptance of the proposal. Mr. McKnight confirmed this was the situation of the remediation proposal for the siding removal and restoration plan during the six-month timeline submitted by the applicant. Commissioner Longwell added that the record should show that this current owner was not the owner who initially installed the vinyl windows.

Commissioner King asked if the findings were clear that the vinyl windows were waived as a requirement. Mr. McKnight responded that the Commission could consider additional details for the scope of the proposal presented. He summarized the Commission's discussion which included there was not enough information on the appropriateness of the proposed porch; the current owner had not installed the vinyl windows; and the Commission discussed the previously adopted finding whereby the vinyl windows were not appropriate.

Commissioner Swope asked about Staff Analysis number 7 discussing the original front windows restoration and repair plan. Mr. Finnigan affirmed that the windows would be repaired in place and said not all of the window elements such as the pulleys and weights were in working order.

Mr. McKnight provided technical clarification stating that if the windows were repaired without removal then the project would be under the repair threshold for jurisdiction of the Commission. He noted as a remediation proposal it was a valid point of discussion.

Commissioner Luce asked for a description of the windows on the side elevations. Mr. Finnigan responded the windows were the same width but shorter than the original windows. Mr. McKnight said the windows were single-hung windows.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the analysis as findings and approve the agreement with the owner including removal of the two outer sidings, repair original siding and replacement in-kind of any damaged or missing original siding; retain the existing rear and side elevation windows; restore the front windows as appropriate; and defer the final porch design to administrative review and approval, for the property, at 1513 North 7th Street".

MOTION: King
SECOND: Swope

Ms. Cook asked for clarification on the motion to restore or repair the front windows as previously discussed.

Mr. McKnight also asked for clarification on the project completion dates, which included one-month for the porch and six months to remove the two outer sidings and repair the original siding, as submitted by the applicant.

Commissioners King and Swope accepted the clarifications.

MOTION: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that a written decision would be forthcoming within a few days and the Building and Lands Code Enforcement Division would be notified of this agreement.

4. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments.

5. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. North Slope Historic District Standards

Mr. McKnight introduced the application for the adoption of Works construction standards for certain Right of Way projects, including sidewalk replacement, curb cuts such as alley approaches and driveways, and streetlights. This item was deferred at the January 28 meeting for clarification on several items that follow:

- Material proposed for expansion joints
- Would applicants need to receive commission approval for repairs?
- Clarification on the sidewalk dimensions
- Status update on the nomination of historic pavements to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places

He said that these were a set of engineering standards which were a result of code amendments in 2008 that will govern the construction standards in the District. He reviewed the materials enclosed with the application which were both preliminary and proposed recommendations for sidewalks, alleys, driveways, and streetlights.

Commissioner Longwell asked for clarification on the existing four foot wide sidewalks with page 81 of the proposed Standards which called for a five foot minimum. Mr. McKnight responded that there may be contractor choice but if the Commission wanted this detail included in the Standards and if it was easily remedied, then staff would request the Standards to specifically state, "maintain the existing width" (versus the five foot minimum). Commissioner Longwell agreed with this approach.

Commissioners Al Janabi, Longwell, and King discussed the sidewalk width including practicality, comfort, and ADA requirements. Commissioner Longwell stated that she liked the narrative recommended by the consultant, "...maintain existing paving width and location".

Mr. McKnight presented information on the cost and responsibility of the cost of the sidewalk; history on the lack of a sidewalk standard and the use of the new standards for increased clarity and consistency including jurisdiction.

Chair pro Tem McIntire clarified that four foot sidewalks met the handicap accessibility requirements.

Commissioner Al Janabi asked about the proposed sidewalk lampblack material since it was not historic material. The Commission discussed the material but made no adjustments to the proposed lampblack material.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the North Slope Historic District Standards proposal, as submitted, with the amendment that the sidewalk width match existing sidewalk width".

MOTION: Luce

SECOND: Swope

MOTION: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that the proposed Standards item would not be returned to the Commission level unless the condition on the width becomes a technical or feasibility problem.

B. Revisions to Review Schedule for the Wedge Neighborhood Historic District

Mr. McKnight briefly reviewed the previous work to date and asked for consideration of a revised schedule due to the need for additional review time and the complexity of some of the issues raised by Commission members. He recommended revising the review schedule from that adopted by the Commission on September 10, 2008. Mr. McKnight reviewed the proposed schedule:

PROPOSED REVIEW SCHEDULE		
Date	Item	Comments
2/25/09	General summary of ongoing discussions and additional review steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify options and factors to be considered for boundary development Guidance regarding design guideline approach Provide guidance to staff for additional review/research steps
3/25/09	Review proposed district boundaries and contributing buildings inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission selects preferred alternative (by motion)
4/22/09	Review proposed design guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission selects preferred alternative (by motion)
5/13/09	Presentation of Recommended Alternative	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed statement of significance and district description General structure of proposed design guidelines District boundaries (recommended) District inventory Commission releases document for public distribution; set hearing date (motion)
5/27/09	Release public opinion survey and public hearing notice	
6/24/09	Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment period potentially from 6/24/09 until 7/8/09
7/22/09	Findings and Recommendation	

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the revised schedule for the Wedge Neighborhood Review Schedule, as submitted".

MOTION: King
 SECOND: Luce
 MOTION: Carried

B. Nominations for Chair

Chair pro Tem McIntire asked for nominations for the Chair position.

Commissioners Buffington, McIntire, and Swope were nominated for the office of Chair.

Mr. McKnight stated that he would provide an update of the Commission terms.

Chair pro Tem McIntire stated that the election would occur at the beginning of the next meeting.

C. Commission Appointments

Commissioners discussed the appointment process and the difficulty of timing, specifically in this case with the previous evening appointments made by the City Council which required immediate changes the following day.

In addition, the following items were addressed in the discussion:

- 1) concern with the loss of institutional memory;
- 2) concern that more time was needed to appropriately change membership such as two weeks or a month transition;
- 3) include an expression of appreciation of those who have served the City for long periods of time;
- 4) concern with bitterness by those who have served on the Commission because of the lack of recognition;
- 5) request consideration of including the Historic Preservation Officer in the selection process as well as communication on the changes in membership, during the process and/or immediate notification by City officials;
- 6) include orientation for new members prior to their Commission responsibilities, i.e. consider complexity of the issues addressed by the Commission;
- 7) consideration of how to educate volunteers into the City as commissioners, advisors, etc.;
- 8) re-evaluate the duration of the appointment and consider term staggering, etc;
- 9) no objection to new Commissioners; appreciate the goals of the City to bring diversity to the Commission.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, write a letter to the Mayor and City Council addressing the Commission's concerns and suggestions for the City's appointment process".

MOTION: House

SECOND: Luce

MOTION: Carried

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, write a letter of appreciation to Roger Johnson, for signature by the Commission Chair".

MOTION: House

SECOND: Swope

MOTION: Carried

D. Other

Mr. McKnight reported that new Commissioner's orientation was scheduled for Friday, February 13, 2009.

Commissioner King requested that new Commissioners' bios be available during their introduction at the next meeting.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, form a Meet the Commissioners Committee as part of an outreach strategy".

MOTION: King
SECOND: Swope
MOTION: Carried

Mr. Roger Johnson confirmed with the Commission that the Architectural Review Committee meeting was a public meeting. He reported that the Historic Preservation Plan was being considered at this time and recommended the Commission contact city officials regarding the work plan and the concern of limited staff.

Mr. McKnight stated that the Commission's recent thank you letter to BLUS was welcomed which will most likely result with an update on code enforcement issues at a future meeting.

Mr. McKnight presented the request for a letter of support for a grant application which will be submitted by Historic Tacoma.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, draft a letter of support for signature by the Chair for Historic Tacoma's grant application submittal to The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America".

MOTION: McIntire
SECOND: Swope
MOTION: Carried

Mr. McKnight briefed the Commissions on upcoming funding and budget decisions at the county and state levels which would impact the City of Tacoma.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, draft letters to the Mayor and City Council addressing the funding and budget impacts by Pierce County and State of Washington".

MOTION: McIntire
SECOND: Swope
MOTION: Carried

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer