

**Members**

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

Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio

**Staff**

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: March 25, 2009

LPC 58/09

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

**Commission Members in Attendance:**

Ross Buffington  
Ken House  
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.  
Fred King (arrived at 5:07 p.m.)  
Megan Luce  
Mark McIntire  
Pamela Sundell

**Staff Present:**

Reuben McKnight  
Tonie Cook

**Commission Members Excused:**

Ha Pham

**Others Present:**

Paul McCreary, Caroline Swope, Brett Santhuff, Paul Post

**Commission Members Absent:**

Phillip Hill

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

## 1. CONSENT AGENDA

### A. Excusals

Commissioner Pham was excused.

### B. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Luce requested the minutes be amended to note her absence at the January 14, 2009 and February 25, 2009 meetings. Commissioner Buffington requested the January 14, 2009 minutes be corrected on the motion for agenda item, 725 East 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

The minutes of January 14 and 28, and February 11 and 25, 2009 were approved as amended.

## 2. PRESERVATION MONTH

### A. Committee Report

Chair McIntire introduced Ms. Caroline Swope and stated that she had resigned her position on the Commission for professional reasons.

Ms. Swope reported the recommendations prepared by Preservation Month Committee members Roger Johnson, Chair McIntire, and herself. The recommendations for the annual preservation awards within specific categories included the following:

#### Historic Preservation Nominations:

Park Universalist Church, 206 No. J Street--Congregation  
St. Luke's Memorial Church, 3615 No. Gove Street--Congregation  
Frisko Freeze, 1201 Division--Marshall McClintock and Owners, Mr. and Mrs. Jensen  
Blue Mouse Theater, 2611 North Proctor--Blue Mouse Associates

Historic Preservation: 1416 South 5th Street, Dr. Jason Karro and Ms. Tracy Karro (Ms. Swope stated that she recused herself because of her professional association with the property)

Public Service: Historic Tacoma, for outreach, advocacy and education to the community

Church Buildings which deserve Designation:

First Congregational Church, 209 So. J Street  
First Lutheran Church, 524 South I Street  
First Church of Christ Scientist, 902 Division Avenue  
Sixth Avenue Baptist, 2520 6th Ave

The Commission will finalize the nominations at the next meeting.

Chair McIntire reported on the annual Tacoma Historical Society home tours and Historic Tacoma was finalizing spring activities.

Mr. Reuben McKnight reported that the Commission is required to provide an annual report to City Council, which was typically presented by the Chair at a council meeting in May. He added that the council has declared May as Historic Preservation Month, which corresponds with the National Historic Preservation Month celebration. The report by the Chair to the council has included local numbers on types of projects and major issues.

Chair McIntire invited Commissioners to email their ideas for the annual report to either Mr. McKnight or to him.

### **3. DESIGN REVIEW**

#### **A. 1214 North I Street**

Mr. McKnight read the Staff Report: Constructed in 1889, this Queen Anne era house is a contributing property located in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal is to remove the hipped porch roof and bay window roof that will be replaced with a new second story deck atop the existing porch. The new deck's railing system will match the existing porch railing in design, size, and design. Any front siding that is removed as well as existing siding in need of repair, will be restored to match in-kind the existing siding.

He added that a copy of the application was enclosed with the Staff Report and the Architectural Review Committee reviewed the proposal on March 18, 2009.

He stated that the Architectural Review Committee considered the North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines and Secretary of Interior's Standards including the following:

NSHD Guideline Number 6. Exterior Materials. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope Neighborhood were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.

NSHD Guideline Number 8. Additional Construction. Goal: Sensitively locate additions, penthouses, buildings systems equipment, or roof-mounted structures 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. Some new additions, such as the reconstruction of missing porches or the addition of dormers in the roof may need to be located on the front facade of the building. When an addition is proposed for the front of the building, appropriate and sensitive designs for such modifications should follow the guidelines for scale, massing, rhythm, and materials.

SOIS Number 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

SOIS Number 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

SOIS Number 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.

The Architectural Review Committee's observations and Staff analysis:

1. The ARC observed that Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 5, which states, "*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved*", was met by the proposal, because the porch roof is not a defining feature; however, the existing porch including the columns were distinctive features and will be retained.
2. The ARC observed that Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 2, which states, "*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided*", was met by the proposal, because the removal of the roof on the window and porch will affect a minimal amount of original historic material.
3. The ARC observed that Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 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*", may be of concern to the Commission because there is an alteration of original materials and spatial relationships.
4. The ARC observed that the proposal met Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 9, for, "*The new work...will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*", because the construction will use compatible materials that match the existing porch, railing, and siding.
5. The ARC observed the use of compatible materials to the house and surrounding homes' materials met North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 6, for Exterior Materials, specifically, for, "*Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically observed in the neighborhood*".

6. The ARC observed that the proposal met North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 8, Additional Construction, for, *“When an addition is proposed for the front of the building, appropriate and sensitive designs for such modifications should follow the guidelines for scale, massing, rhythm, and materials”*, because the proposal on the primary façade, was an *“...appropriate and sensitive design...”*.

7. The home on the property is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it was constructed in 1889. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.

8. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building including new construction per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.

Mr. McCreary added that the proposed deck would be built within the existing footprint of the porch and window roofs and would not replace any original materials including the existing porch post.

Commissioner House complimented the owner on recent improvements made to the property. He stated that he did not agree that the porch roof was not a defining feature and added that the deck replacement was a “replica” and did not represent new work that was “...differentiated from the old...”, thus not meeting Secretary of Interior’s Standard Number 9. He made the observation that the recent application for the addition of skylights was approved for an opening on the roof; in this case, the current proposal was for the removal of an entire roof. He added that his comments argued against approval of the proposal.

Commissioner Sundell stated that she was not a part of the Architectural Review Committee and her understanding was that the proposal was strictly an embellishment.

Mr. McCreary commented that the advantage for the deck was for utility, which allowed access for cleaning the windows.

Commissioner Sundell commented on the significant character of the building and the addition of the balcony would cause the loss of its distinctive character, appearing to look like all of the other neighboring homes, which have balconies on the street. She added that the roofs were extremely significant and were part of the character of the house.

There was discussion of the flat deck and need for a downspout, which Mr. McCreary reported that he thought the existing downspout on the corner would be retained.

Commissioner Luce stated that her concern with the proposal was a change to the primary façade.

Commissioner King commented that the ARC had discussed the possibility that the porch roof had been a previous addition and the difficulty of determining that this had been an alteration without a historic photo.

Commissioner Buffington summarized the Architectural Review Committee’s discussion, which focused upon the determination that the roof was not a defining character of the building; the proposal used in-kind materials, and the design was compatible with the neighborhood.

There was a motion:

*“I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, finds that the roof on the porch, at 1214 North I Street, was not a character defining feature on the house and the proposed alterations met North Slope Historic District Guidelines Numbers 6 and 8, and Secretary of Interior’s Standards*

*Numbers 2, 5, and 9, and approve the application”.*

MOTION: Buffington  
SECOND: Al Janabi  
MOTION: Carried (4-yeah; 3-opposed)

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

#### **4. CHAIR COMMENTS**

There were no comments.

#### **5. STAFF COMMENTS**

There were no comments.

#### **6. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING**

##### **A. Wedge Neighborhood**

##### **i. Proposed district boundaries and contributing buildings inventory**

Mr. McKnight presented the Staff Report stating that it included a staff recommendation regarding the boundaries of the proposed historic district. He further clarified that this was not the final document but rather what had been discussed thus far by the Commission. He explained that the recommendation was proposed to the Commission for their consideration as one of the elements of a package that would be publicly released to the residents of the neighborhood inviting comment at the public hearing.

He then reviewed the Staff Report dated, March 25, 2009, Wedge Neighborhood Historic District proposal on Boundaries, which a summary follows:

On June 27, 2008 a request was submitted to the City of Tacoma for the Wedge Historic District proposal.

Boundary considerations included the following elements and analysis: Historic character and age; Underlying zoning and land use development regulations; Cohesiveness under TMC 13.07.040C; Neighborhood goals; Property owner and public sentiment.

Mr. McKnight highlighted the schedule for a property owner survey on May 27, 2009. He also added, there had not been a public hearing on the proposal but the Commission had received several written letters and presentations at recent meetings.

Mr. McKnight presented Staff's underlying rationale and detail analysis for the proposed boundary recommendation. Mr. McKnight summarized the Commission's discussion on conservation districts and recommendation to the Commission for their consideration of establishing a Conservation District with the Wedge Historic District proposal.

Chair McIntire opened the discussion to the Commission clarifying that after conclusion of the motion, he would open the discussion to the audience to speak on the agenda item.

Commissioner discussion is summarized below:

There had been no formal contact with the Trinity Episcopal Church;  
The historic district proposal included all property types and not just residential;  
The MultiCare ownership included properties, which were historically contributing, located within the geography and part of a cohesiveness which argued for inclusion (of a district);  
The 500 block of L was difficult, because it was not the fault of these homes that others nearby had been torn down and recognition that these existing homes were somewhat isolated;  
The citation of SEPA rules was noted, but its effectiveness in the area of historic preservation would be another issue;

An additional reason for including the hospital owned property on South M & 4<sup>th</sup> Streets and for excluding the 500 Block of South L Street was the underlying zoning. The MultiCare-owned residential properties were zoned residential and the homes on the 500 Block of South L were zoned Hospital Medical.

The homes at 500 Block of L Street would not have the same protection against demolition, if proposed; the homes would be subject to any rule requirement as any other property in the City, based on the proposal and "SEPA checklist" consideration that the homes were built in 1889.

There was reference to SEPA citations submitted by Al Wallace, dated March 9, 2009.

The Commission may want to consider SEPA rules as the Commission's continued deliberations may indicate the need for additional rules at the boundary edges of the historic district.

There was clarification that most of the warehouse type properties were built in the 1920s and one property was from 1948.

There was a motion:

*"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt for planning purposes, as the Commission pursues the application of the Wedge Historic District, the boundaries as proposed by staff, noting in particular, the inclusion of the four MultiCare owned residential properties along South M and South 4th Streets, finding they are historically valuable, contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood, and are zoned residential; and excluding the homes on the 500 block of South L Street noting the high concentration of vacant land and non-historic development on the 500 block of South M Street, which makes the properties on the 500 block of South L Street isolated from the proposed District".*

MOTION: Buffington

SECOND: House

MOTION: Carried

Chair McIntire opened the discussion to the audience.

Ms. Caroline Swope read a letter from Historic Tacoma, dated March 25, 2009, supporting the Wedge area as a Historic District, the proposed boundaries and inclusion of a conservation district. The letter described the support of including the addition of the 500 Block of South M Street within a conservation area and highlighted the City's proposed Mixed Use Center that would impact the proposed Wedge Historic District. The letter also announced Historic Tacoma's plan to co-host a walking tour of the Wedge area with the Tacoma Historical Society.

Mr. Paul Post presented a written statement signed by all property owners on the 500 Block of South L Street on the west side, which supported the Staff Report's recommendation on the proposed boundaries, specifically opposing the inclusion of the 500 Block of South L Street. The owners included: Darrell D Mueller, 510 South L; Kim Triller, CareNet Executive Director, 1209 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Robin T. Swift, 512 and 514 South L Street; Leland Bowman, 502-04 South L Street and Paul W. Post, 1203 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 1210 South 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and 506, 508, 516 and 518 South L Street.

Mr. McKnight reviewed next steps for the Wedge Historic District application review:

April 22, 2009: Review proposed design guidelines and selection of preferred alternative

May 27, 2009: Release of Opinion Survey and Public Hearing Notice  
June 24, 2009: Public Hearing

Commissioner Sundell requested a map that shows the property addresses discussed, such as for the apartments and warehouse.

## **B. Other Business Items**

Chair McIntire asked Commissioner Luce to work with Ms. Swope on scheduling the Meet and Greet Commission activity on May 20, 2009.

Mr. McKnight reported that the previously submitted landmark nomination application for the North Slope Brick and Cobblestone roads had been pending, because the definition in the municipal code for property did not include roads. He stated that the code has been amended to include roads in the definition.

Commissioner Longwell stated that this item would most likely be requested for re-scheduling onto the Commission's nomination calendar.

Commissioners discussed points of view, recommendations, and straw poles at the Architectural Review Committee. Mr. McKnight clarified that the Architectural Review Committee has been a consensus process without the use of a formal recommendation to the full Landmarks Preservation Commission. He added that the ARC could become more formal with a motion and vote for recommendation procedure to the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer