

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
Imad Al Janabi, PhD
Phillip Hill
Ken House
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: May 13, 2009
Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Bldg North, Room 16

LPC79/09

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ross Buffington
Ken House (arrived at 5:25 p.m.)
Imad Al Janabi
Fred King
Kathryn Longwell
Megan Luce
Mark McIntire
Ha Pham (arrived at 5:40 p.m.)
Pamela Sundell

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook

Commission Members Absent:

Phillip Hill

Others Present:

Maryn Feliciano, Jamie Lawrence, Todd Walton,
Andrea Tull, Diane Walkup, John Barline

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. **Approval of Minutes** - The minutes of April 8, 2009 and April 22, 2009, were approved as submitted.

2. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Old Business

- i. It was noted that the 819 N Sheridan Avenue application was omitted from the agenda because it was approved per Administrative Review.
- ii. 1130 N L Street

Ms. Cook read the Staff Report: In July and August, 2008, the Commission reviewed the proposal to replace (7) existing wood windows with Milgard fiberglass windows on the side and rear elevations at 1130 North L Street. The original application was included with the Commission's meeting packet and a copy of the staff report was available if requested by the Commission.

The following windows were proposed for replacement:
West elevation – Second Story – 2 windows
West elevation – First Story – 1 kitchen window
South (rear) elevation – Second Story – 2 double hung windows
South elevation – First Story – 1 (kitchen window)
East elevation – Second Story – 1 window
North elevation (front) – no proposed changes

The Commission deferred the decision and requested:
1) estimates for restoration and

2) ARC visit the property to inspect the condition of the existing windows and make a determination and proposal to bring back to the next ARC meeting.

The estimates were submitted last fall to staff. The site visit with available ARC members was on April 24, 2009, and an ARC meeting was held on April 29, 2009.

The North Slope Historic District and Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were offered for consideration:

13.07.320.C. The following guidelines are also intended to provide a basic set of standards for architectural and physical design within the North Slope Historic Special Review District. These guidelines will be used by the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission as a base-line for the design review process. These guidelines will also assist owners, developers, and designers involved in project planning by providing general design and technical recommendations. When applying the guidelines, the Commission will be considerate of clearly documented cases of economic hardship or deprivation of the owner's reasonable use of the property.

North Slope Design Guidelines:

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.

7: Rhythm of Openings. Goals: 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.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties Number 9:

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. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

The Architectural Review Committee and Staff provided the following analysis for consideration:

Summary of the estimates, which were submitted last fall in 2008 for the proposed 7 windows:

1) Home Depot original quote (7/1/2008)

(6) Milgard Ultra Fiberglass new construction thermal pane windows with Legacy simulated divided light external sculptured grids (please note that this estimate included only 6 windows, and staff was not able to determine if the new construction nail on windows in the quote would differ in cost from insert windows, which this project would require)

- \$3,299.45 not including WSST.
- WSST estimated at \$290.
- Installation to be completed by a friend or \$800
- Staff estimated total cost for this option is \$4,389.80 or approximately \$731 per window installed

2) Bear Wood Windows Bid (8/5/08)

Option One:

- (7) CVG fir wood sash replacements, single hung, with thermal pane Simulated Divided Light and rope and pulley
- \$6,190, including WSST
- Installation not included

- Staff estimate for this option, including independent installation as above approximately \$7,123 or approximately \$1,017 per window installed

Option Two:

- 7 CVG replacement windows, single hung, with thermal pane Simulated Divided Light (includes complete functioning window, including case)
- \$7,814.02 including WSST
- Installation not included
- Staff estimated total cost for above option is \$8,747 or approximately \$1,249 per window installed.

3) Legacy Restoration bid (10/16/2008)

- 15 existing single glazed windows and jambs restored and fabrication of 15 wood storm windows
- \$19,261.69 including WSST and installation
- \$13,445.50, including tax and installation is for window restoration, or approximately \$896 per window
- \$5816.19, including tax and installation is for the storm windows, or approximately \$387 per window

April 24, 2009 Site Visit

Commissioners McIntire and Sundell and Staff Tonie Cook visited the property. An additional window (i.e. in addition to the 7 original windows that were proposed in the original 2008 application) in one of the upstairs bedrooms was also evident of needing repair/replacement.

ARC meeting on April 29, 2009

1. Commissioners made the observation that the existing original windows can be repaired.
2. The Commissioners, Staff, and Applicant reviewed the estimates for the Fiberglass inserts, restoration and wood replacement windows.
3. The interior of the second floor bedroom windows had been covered with plexiglass by the previous owner; the applicant is concerned with safety and egress on the second floor.
4. The applicant indicated that she is now proposing that the (3) windows in the second floor childrens' bedrooms and (1) window at the landing to be replaced. Subsequent window replacements will be applied for separately.
5. Staff analysis of the quotes and bids estimated that the Milgard Fiberglass option for the above (4) windows installed (w/tax) would be approximately \$2,993. This assumes that the installation by the applicant's friend would be prorated to reflect (4) windows, instead of the (six) originally proposed.
6. Restoration of these (4) windows would cost approximately \$3,604 (w/tax) based on Legacy's 2008 bid. Storm windows for these (4) windows is estimated to cost \$1,468, bringing the total cost to \$5,072.
7. Staff analysis of the cost of replacement of these (4) windows based on Bear Option One (sash replacements) is \$4,046 including tax and estimated prorated labor based on the applicant's friend's rate. It should be noted that installation of the sash replacements may require more expertise and therefore cost more than the Milgard insert option.
8. Staff analysis of the cost of replacement of these (4) windows based on Bear Option Two (full replacement windows) is \$4,901.65 including tax and estimated prorated labor based on the applicant's friend's rate. It should be noted that installation of new full replacement windows will likely be more labor intensive and require more expertise and therefore cost more than the Milgard insert option.
9. The Applicant offered her concern with the financial ability to pay for restoration. There was a discussion of priorities, location of windows, and request for financial hardship.
10. Commissioners discussed the following proposal items:
 - a) The second story bedroom windows are located on the rear and side elevations; none are on the front elevation.
 - b) The applicant is requesting replacement of all of the upstairs bedroom windows with double hung Ultra Fiberglass (upper lite grids) matching the opening size and style, based on financial considerations.

- c) The ARC suggested that repair all of existing the first floor windows and replacement in kind, where necessary, may mitigate the proposed fiberglass windows on the upper story.
- d) The Applicant will request financial hardship in writing to the Staff. This information will be provided to Commission at the meeting.

Ms. Cook noted that the written request for financial hardship was provided to staff.

The Architectural Review Committee recommended adoption of the analysis as findings and deferred recommendation on the application to the Commission.

Commissioners Sundell and McIntire confirmed the current proposal was replacement of windows on the upper level side, windows in the children's bedrooms and one on the rear landing. This proposal was verified by Ms. Feliciano.

Commissioner Buffington requested clarification that the proposed replacement windows would be Milgard wood clad windows estimated at approximately \$2,993 as described in Analysis Item number 5. Ms. Feliciano confirmed that the proposal was for the Milgard wood windows.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the analysis as findings for the property at 1130 North L Street, and approve Milgard Ultra Fiberglass windows as replacements for the second story side and rear windows".

Commissioner Buffington noted Analysis Item number 1 stated that the windows can be repaired and the option to restore the four single pane windows was approximately \$3,600 which did not include the cost of approximately \$1,400 for storm windows. He stated that it would be difficult to substantiate the difference of \$600 and noted the issue of egress for children's bedrooms as well as mentioned that the project costs were not his own.

MOTION: Sundell

SECOND: Luce

MOTION: Carried (6-yes; 1-no)

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

B. New Business

i. 1018 N M Street

Mr. McKnight read the Staff Report: This house is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The current project is a retroactive proposal to stabilize the rear dilapidated garage, replace the original exterior siding with T-111 vertical siding and replace the garage door with a roll-up metal door. The garage will be painted to match the existing house. In addition, the exterior wall of the house was temporarily covered due to a leak and dry-rot repair, which will be temporary until exterior siding can be installed. In the application materials, the owner submitted a written request for financial hardship consideration for the garage project.

The North Slope Historic District and Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were offered for consideration:

13.07.320.C. The following guidelines are also intended to provide a basic set of standards for architectural and physical design within the North Slope Historic Special Review District. These guidelines will be used by the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission as a base-line for the design review process. These guidelines will also assist owners, developers, and designers involved in project planning by providing general design and technical recommendations. When applying the guidelines, the Commission will be considerate of clearly documented cases of economic hardship or deprivation of the owner's reasonable use of the property.

2. Scale. Goal: Relate the size and proportion of new buildings to those of the neighborhood. Scale refers to a building's comparative relationship to neighboring structures, and its fit within the district. Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings, and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings as permitted by applicable zoning regulations. 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.

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.

9. Parking. Goal: Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Most early houses provided space for storing various means of transportation, from horses and carriages to automobiles; however, these structures were nearly always entered from the alley rather than from the street. Parking lots and banks of garage doors along the front facade of a building do not conform to the character of the neighborhood. Off-street parking lots have no historic precedent in this neighborhood, and should be located behind the building and away from the street. Proposed residential driveway approaches requiring curbcuts off a street or arterial are generally prohibited, unless the applicant can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that, because of special circumstances not generally applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of this standard prevents alley accessed parking. If approved, such curbcuts and approaches shall be consistent with the standards approved for the historic district and on file in the Public Works Department. Setting garages and carport structures back from the front of the building reduces their visual importance.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 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.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Number 6: 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 provided the following analysis for consideration:

1. The home on the property 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. The garage is a secondary outbuilding on the property.
2. 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.
3. Applicant states that she was required to remediate the garage to insure the home, which she moved into after failing to sell it.
4. The proposal to stabilize the rear detached garage meets Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 2, specifically, for, "The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved...", because the rear garage was leaning to one side and the doors would not open, which decreased its usability.
5. The removal of deteriorated exterior siding and door does not meet Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 6, specifically, for, "... 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..." and does not meet North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 6, Exterior Materials, specifically, for, "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..." The new siding material is vertical T-111, which is not a traditional material found in the North Slope Historic District.
6. The applicant stated that the original design would not be changed on the rear alley garage. The original footprint, size, door opening and flat roof was retained on the garage. North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 9, Parking, discusses the parking goal to: "*Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way*", which is met with the proposal to retain the garage in its original historic rear alley location.
7. The proposal to replace the door with a new metal roll-up door is consistent with convention within the North Slope Historic District.

8. It is not a requirement that repairs to exterior siding on the house that are not subject to building permit requirements be approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
9. The garage appears to be a flat roofed utilitarian structure constructed in the 1910s, based on the size and original drop siding. It's integrity prior to the work, and therefore it's significance to the property and district, are unknown.
10. Previously, the Commission has allowed the demolition of deteriorated garages and the reconstruction of larger garages, provided guidelines for alley access and other parking guidelines were met.
11. The applicant submitted a request for approval of the proposal based on financial hardship, which has been previously considered by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
12. Staff has also requested any existing home inspection or insurance paperwork, documenting the hazard.

Mr. McKnight noted that the inspection and insurance documents were submitted by the Applicant.

Staff recommended adoption of the analysis as findings and deferred recommendation on the application to the Commission.

Ms. Lawrence stated that she had a cd with photos of the neighborhood showing similar projects; in addition, she stated that the garage's alley location was not visible from the street as well as the urgency to stabilize the building to protect her belongings and vehicle. She also noted the roof was angled and not flat. She said that she was in a reverse mortgage and described the difficulty of selling the property.

Commissioner Longwell stated the garage was deteriorated and mentioned that she had driven past the project.

Ms. Lawrence confirmed the new metal roll-up door was part of the proposal.

Mr. McKnight offered that potentially the T-111 could be used as sheathing if siding is installed at a future time. Chair McIntire added that it depended on the material—whether the T-111 was actually plywood and therefore structurally adequate as sheathing.

Ms. Lawrence confirmed there was drop siding without a layer of shiplap.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the analysis as findings for the property at 1018 North M Street, and approve the proposal as submitted".

It was confirmed by Chair McIntire that the metal roll-up door was part of the application.

MOTION: Sundell
SECOND: Luce
MOTION: Carried

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

ii. 2602 S Holgate

The application was deferred because the Applicant was not present.

3. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair McIntire and Commissioner Luce reported on Historic Preservation Month and the Meet and Greet event scheduled for May 20, 2009. Chair McIntire reported that Historic Tacoma was planning a Sacred Places Tour on October 25, 2009.

Mr. McKnight announced the annual report and historic preservation awards presentation was scheduled for the City Council meeting on May 19, 2009.

4. Design Review continued

A. 2602 S Holgate

Chair McIntire recognized the Applicant's late arrival and requested the application be considered.

Mr. McKnight presented the Staff Report: Built in phases beginning in 1922 through 1930, Tacoma Cold Storage Building was designated a Tacoma Landmark in 2005 as a good example of industrial vernacular style architecture and for its association with the industrial area in Tacoma. The building was remodeled changing the use of a cold storage building to a self-storage warehouse, which involved retaining its exterior historic features. The building is located within the old "Brewery District."

The current proposal is to install one equipment cabinet, six cell antennas, and other peripheral cellular equipment to the existing elevator's roof penthouse wall, roof, and the existing parapet. The description follows:

- The new antenna equipment will be located approximately 65 feet from the west (rear elevation) edge of the roof and approximately 22 to 24 feet from the east (front elevation) roof edge and 21 feet from the north;
- The poles with antennas total approximately 15 feet in height;
- Two antennas (w/pole) will be attached to the existing 30 inch (in height) interior roof parapet wall which is approximately 16 feet from the east (primary) elevation's roofline;
- Two antennas (w/poles) will be attached to the existing elevator's east elevation penthouse wall;
- Two antennas (w/poles) will be attached to the existing elevator's west elevation penthouse wall;
- The new equipment cabinet is approximately 4'X4'X3',
- Six coax cables will be 18 to 90 feet in length that will be installed onto the floor of the roof;
- Equipment will be painted to match the existing building.

The building is located on a hillside; the staff photos show the views of the roof from the west elevation.

The property is protected by a covenant between the owner and the City related to historical property tax abatement (Special Tax Valuation).

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were offered for consideration:

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.

Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation were also offered for consideration::

Building Exteriors, Roof: Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right of way.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. The Tacoma Cold Storage Building is historically significant. First constructed in 1922, the building at 2602 South Holgate Street was built in several phases; it was nominated to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places as a good example of industrial vernacular style architecture and for its association with the industrial area in Tacoma.
2. The location and setting of the Tacoma Cold Storage Building is also historically significant. As stated in the nomination form, "It lies within the city's original industrial area south of downtown and is prominently situated at the south end of the old brewery district with Holgate Street on the East, Hood Street on the west, and 25th Street to the north. This area is made up of thirteen industrial masonry buildings that comprised the Pacific Brewing and Malting Company at the turn of the 19th century." This complex of buildings is listed on the Tacoma and National Registers of Historic Places.
3. The east and west elevations are both listed as primary elevations according to the nomination form; in addition, "*A non-historic CMU parapet was constructed over the original parapet line on the north and south facades. The existing roof covers the top of original parapet on all sides*", which further describes the building in the nomination's narrative. The nomination further stated that, "*The only decorative features on the building are*

the brick inlay patterns at the top of each concrete pier at the top story of the two primary facades and the diamond shaped brick pattern on the first level of the east façade just below the piers”.

4. 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.
5. The cellular equipment including antennas, attachment pole, equipment cabinet and coax cable will be installed primarily on the northeastern section of the rooftop, approximately 22 to 24 feet from the primary elevation's roof edge.
6. Two antennas will be attached to the interior (approx 16 feet from the east elevation roof edge) parapet wall (12 inches wide and approximately 30 inches in height) using standard bolt anchoring methods. The parapet wall does not appear to be visible from the street.
7. The six antennas and each attachment pole will be highly visible approximately 9 feet above the top of the building's parapet the proposal to install additional rooftop equipment, and thus does not meet Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 9, as it is not compatible with the historic scale, proportion and massing of the building, specifically, for failing to "...protect the integrity of the property and its environment." The antennas will be most visible from the primary front (east) elevation roofline.

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

Mr. Walton asked for clarification on the deferral and stated it was possible to provide an option for screening the antennas.

Chair McIntire stated that the antennas would be visible nine feet above the parapet; he added, the building is significantly visible from Interstate 705, and asked if other buildings could be considered for the installation of antennas.

Mr. Walton described the need to install the antennas at the nine foot height level to gain the necessary cell range requirement; he added that other antennas on other buildings were allowed by city code installation height of up to sixteen feet. He stated that this proposal was not unique and the antennas would be painted to match the building's existing exterior color. Mr. Walton said that the proposal could be upgraded substantially so the view impacts would be mitigated.

Commissoner Sundell asked about the building's function and this cell antenna proposal.

Mr. Walton said that the proposal was to assist with the economic viability of the building, adding that he was not sure if the building would go away without the antenna project, but the property owners have made large investments (in the building) and have worked with the Landmarks Preservation Commission. He said the current proposal was submitted without the option of screening in order for the antennas to appear as a more natural feature of the building.

He continued with a description of Cricket Company, which was a relatively new business within a niche market of the cellular industry, developing economic feasibility into each proposal. He summarized by stating that this proposal's submittal was approached with those economic feasibility parameters without additional options such as screening to create a new faux architectural feature; he said that this building's site is an important site for the location of cell antennas.

Chair McIntire offered information on the history of cell antenna proposal reviewed by the Commission, including the problems of locating cell antennas on historic buildings and understanding the economics of it; he added, there was always an attempt to work on mitigating the appearance and, in some cases, the applications have been rejected.

Mr. McKnight added to the discussion about previous decisions when there had been cellular antenna installation proposed on historic buildings. He said that typically for approved proposals, because of the building's height, the new equipment was not as visible from the right of ways. He also said that the Commission has deferred proposals in cases where there was flexibility and the proponent would return with a revised proposal. Mr.

McKnight stated that it was appropriate for the Commission to provide feedback on the current proposal so the applicant could consider the suggestions with his clients.

Commissioner Buffington asked about the protection covenant agreement, which the property owners had with the City on tax abatement for this building and the requirement of design review for proposals on all proposed changes to the building's exterior. Mr. McKnight said that the design review requirement, because of the tax abatement received by the owners through the special tax valuation program, was redundant, because the design review requirement was also based on the building's landmark status. However, violations on changes to the exterior would compromise the building's existing tax abatement.

Commissioner Sundell requested revisions to the proposal that would show integration of the cell equipment with the historic building, adding that the current cell equipment proposal would not be appropriate on the roof of this building.

There were suggestions, such as cell antenna placement behind windows and the addition of new features, such as a faux chimney.

In addition, there was a discussion on the physical appearance of the cell antennas with and without screening, the industrial appearance of the building, the industrial appearance of cell features; the concern of mimicking architectural features; and the Secretary of Interior's Standards on new uses having an effect on historic buildings.

Chair McIntire commented on the possibility of mounting the antennas adjacent to the sign, near the concrete or brick portions of the façade for the possible integration of the cell antennas with the building's exterior.

There were brief comments on the visibility and the integrity of the structure versus the historic integrity of the building.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, defer action on the proposal and request submittal of a revised proposal with options that address, in particular, Staff Analysis item number 7, that the height of the proposed antennas fail to meet Secretary of Interior's Standard number 9, as it is not compatible with the historic scale, proportion and massing of the building; and, particularly, since the building sits in close proximity of Interstate 705 and also downhill from the views of the upper portions of that area of Tacoma.

Commissioner King commented that he was not sure of the applicability of Secretary of Interior's Standard number 9 in this manner.

MOTION: Buffington

SECOND: Luce

MOTION: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that Staff is available to work with Mr. Walton to schedule a revised proposal with the Commission and, in addition, to meet with him at Building and Land Use Services.

5. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. Wedge Neighborhood

i. Presentation of Recommended Alternatives and Public Hearing Date

Mr. McKnight presented the draft nomination form for the Wedge Neighborhood to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

He stated that the document was proposed for public distribution, and included the following:

1. June 27, 2008 letter from the Wedge Neighborhood Association requesting consideration;
2. Draft nomination form to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including a district map, legal description, and preliminary inventory;

3. A sample ordinance for a Wedge Historic District, which includes language for design guidelines based on the North Slope Historic District, specific district exemptions, and a set of guidelines for commercial structures in the district vicinity.
4. Draft hearing notice and questionnaire

He emphasized that the documents (i.e. the nomination form, district map, legal description and preliminary inventory) contained the discussion and recommendations, which have been organized in a working document format, and were proposed to be released for the review and comment by the public, prior to any further action by the Commission, Planning Commission and / or City Council. He stated that the working documents were not final documents nor final recommendation to become a historic district.

He stated that the notice and questionnaire were proposed for distribution on May 27, 2009. He highlighted the copy of the draft mailer notice and questionnaire in the Commission's materials. He mentioned that he will change the notice to add a section for citizens to place their name as an optional item.

Mr. McKnight added that if the Commission finds the proposed documentation acceptable, and reflective of the discussions that have occurred regarding this proposal over the last six months, Staff recommended that the document be approved for public distribution along with a Public Hearing Notice and Questionnaire.

Commissioner Buffington suggested adding a more direct link to the Wedge proposal on the website and to include a section for name and address as an option.

Ms. Diane Walkup made a correction to add 401 South M Street on page 12.

Mr. John Barline made a correction on the draft guidelines: delete North Slope text and add Wedge in the exterior materials goal and to review the text for similar errors.

Mr. McKnight stated that errors including typographical should be sent to staff for tracking and recording, however, the final document approved tonight will be released to the public; additional changes will be incorporated into a future document after the public comment period.

Ms. Tull asked for clarification on the comments received and notice to the public during and after the public comment period. Mr. McKnight stated that there would be issues and comments tracked throughout the process and presented for review regarding incorporation into the document.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, Landmarks Preservation Commission, accept the documents as presented tonight with two corrections identified by the audience, and staff move forward with the release of the public opinion questionnaire and public hearing notice and schedule the public hearing for June 24, 2009".

MOTION: Buffington

SECOND: Sundell

MOTION: Carried

~~*~*~*~*

The meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer