

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
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: July 22, 2009
Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Bldg North, Room 16

LPC 115/09

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ross Buffington
Ken House
Fred King
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight

Others Present:

Derek deVille, Thomas Hacker Associates;
Ysabel Trinidad, Vice Chancellor of Administrative
Services, UWT; Jeff Millheisler, Harriet Millheisler

Commission Members Excused:

Megan Luce, Imad Al Janabi, Kathryn Longwell, Mark
McIntire

Vice Chair Ross Buffington called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted Chair Mark McIntire's absence.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioners Imad Al Janabi, Megan Luce, and Kathryn Longwell were excused.

B. Approval of Minutes

The May 27, 2009, June 10, 2009, and June 24, 2009 meeting minutes were approved.

2. WEDGE NEIGHBORHOOD

A. Findings and Recommendation

Mr. Reuben McKnight presented the Staff Report, stating that the Commission held a Public Hearing on June 24, 2009 to consider the Wedge Neighborhood as a Historic District. He said the schedule called for the public comment period to remain open to July 8, 2009, with review of the Findings and Recommendations on July 22, 2009. He referenced the Commission's meeting materials which included a copy of the Findings and Recommendations. He stated the proposal's description includes creating an overlay zoning district, establishing a historic buildings inventory, establish a requirement and process for design review of projects involving historic properties within the boundaries of said overlay zoning district, and establish and adopt a set of design guidelines for the overlay zoning district. He presented the map of the proposed area boundaries which extend from Division Avenue, to South M Street, to 6th Avenue, to Sprague Avenue.

He listed additional items included with the proposal: Copies of comments received between September 10, 2008 through the close of the public comment period on July 8, 2009, and mentioned that most of the comments were on record as part of the public hearing testimony conducted on June 24, 2009. He said that two additional written comments were received and included in the compilation of written comments distributed to the Commission: a postcard in support of the proposed district and a letter from MultiCare restating their position on

the boundaries and the list of specific properties to be included and excluded in the boundaries by their request.

He then read the Findings and Recommendations report and concluded with the following recommendation:

“The Landmarks Preservation Commission recommends the Planning Commission review and concur with the establishment of a historic special review district overlay zone for the Wedge Neighborhood, and recommends the same to City Council”.

Vice Chair Buffington stated for the record that he was a resident within the boundaries of the Wedge Neighborhood; he was not involved in the preparation of the Wedge Historic Special Review District application and to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest has not taken a position either in favor or opposition of the proposed historic district.

Vice Chair Buffington offered the floor to discussion.

Vice Chair Buffington offered his comments and now stated his strong support of the application as presented; he commended the neighborhood for banding together, doing the necessary research, conducting the meetings, working very diligently with staff to prepare the proposed application; he agreed with staff report that the Wedge Neighborhood does show conclusively that the Wedge Neighborhood does qualify as a historic district. He encouraged the Commissioners to state their opinions.

Commissioner Sundell highlighted the time spent to create boundaries; the designated area reflects a great conscientious effort to keep the area intact and breaking up the area would be detrimental.

Commissioner House agreed with the staff report saying that retaining the commercial zoning and excluding the hospital zoning is a good compromise; he supported keeping the neighborhood intact.

There was a motion:

“I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, accept the staff recommendations and findings as presented and the proposed Wedge Neighborhood Historic District does meet criteria a, b, and c of Tacoma Municipal Code 13.07, and recommends presentation to the planning commission and city council for further action and approval”.

MOTION: House

SECOND: King

MOTION: Carried (Unanimous)

Vice Chair Buffington invited the audience to make brief comments at this time; he thanked neighborhood members who worked on the application.

Vice Chair Buffington asked that the record show the vote was unanimous.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

1716 Pacific - Joy Building

Mr. McKnight presented the staff report which follows:

Constructed in 1892, the Russell T. Joy Building is a contributing structure with the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District which is listed on the Tacoma and National Registers of Historic Places. According to the Historic Inventory Report, various wholesale and retail firms occupied the building over the years, the building is now vacant. The current proposal is to renovate the building for the purpose of meeting educational and faculty needs at the University of Washington Tacoma campus. In addition, the first floor on Pacific Avenue will be occupied

with retail tenants. He said that there are two primary phases in the project explaining further that the entire project was called UWT Phase 3.

Phase 1 includes interior demolition and abatement, exterior/interior masonry restoration, and roof and interior structural demolition. In conjunction with the structural demolition, the new structural work will be installed. This work was approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission on February 25, 2009.

Phase 2 includes removal of existing double hung wood window systems and replacement with aluminum clad wood window systems, and installation of Mechanical Engineering and Plumbing and interior systems as well as site work. Detail was submitted on the plan sheets: LM 001, 002, 003, 004 and 005.

Union Depot/Warehouse Design Guidelines and *Secretary of Interior's Standards* were offered for consideration.

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to buildings per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
2. Applicable guidelines for consideration of this application include: TMC 13.07.270 for building design and streetscape improvement review in the Union Depot-Warehouse Historic District and Secretary of Interior's Standards.
3. The review on the interior portion of the building, which is being renovated, is exempt according to Union Depot-Warehouse District guidelines, specifically for, "*Interior alterations to existing properties, unless those modifications affect the exterior appearance of the structure*".
4. On February 25, 2009, the Commission recommended maintaining the transom configuration as shown in historic photographs and centering the entry doors, and opting for the narrowest possible storefront member dimensions to meet the Design Guidelines #5 and Standard #9 of *Secretary of Interior's Standards*, regarding scale and proportion. It appears that the transom window configuration and dimensions of the storefront system have been amended consistent with this set of recommendations.
5. Because the addition of a new aluminum storefront system does not remove historic material nor alter the original storefront openings between the brick pilasters, it is reversible and meets Standard # 10.
6. SOI 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,*" applies to Commission's consideration of the proposed replacement of the original wood windows.
7. The replacement of original windows in the Union Station Historic District with aluminum clad windows has been previously approved by the Commission for the University campus noting there are numerous examples.
8. The applicant states that the purpose of the aluminum clad wood windows' replacement plan is part of the requirement of the State of Washington for achieving a LEED Silver Rating. The new window system is one of the measures to increase thermal performance of the building.
9. Staff has requested additional information from the applicant regarding the existing windows and product specifications for the proposed replacement windows.

Staff recommended deferral of the application pending the presentation of additional information by the applicant.

Mr. Derek deVille of Thomas Hacker Associates presented the project, which is renovation of the Joy Building, a

three-story building at Commerce and Pacific Streets. He stated that Tacoma's enrollment has been growing and the current classroom space is at its capacity with 400 additional students accepted; Phase 3 funding is one step to meet the needs for both office and classroom space. Unfortunately, an additional challenge is the legislature not releasing funding for facility space as planned at the new Jefferson building. He noted that a separate effort was being made by the University in working with the city on the development of the rail line with design plans in process; this project would add to the entrance to the campus.

Mr. deVille provided an overview of the project details which follows:

On Pacific, there will be retail in the northern three bays; the southern bay is being divided into two classrooms but is being equipped to adapt to retail in the future. He reviewed the common spaces, flat floor and tiered classrooms.

The existing storefronts will be removed on Pacific and Commerce; the proposal includes replacement with new aluminum storefronts on Pacific and at the loading dock on Commerce. Aluminum clad windows are proposed on the upper floor on Commerce; the windows will be operable meeting one of the project's goals for sustainability.

The lack of facility office space is being addressed with flexible temporary space in the bays; the intention of the University is to have retail on Pacific.

He said that saving such artifacts as the elevator will be accomplished through re-installation in the facility to capture the spirit of the past in this part of town. The proposal includes refurbishing the brick walls, reinstalling some of the doors; remilling the wood material for reuse; exposing the heavy timber, and the covered loading dock will be used as common space; roof waters will be captured in filters.

The proposal includes restoration of the building's masonry exterior. He talked about the existing finished veneer brick on Pacific and the common type of brick that is consistent with existing adjacent buildings. The brick will be repointed and repaired. Through the analysis of the masonry, existing actual steel ties were found therefore no drill holes will be made in the existing brick.

There will be concrete work at the loading dock; the large stair tower made with steel panels with a natural rusting patina.

The lower level will introduce the storefront using a grey color to separate it from the windows at the above level; the above aluminum clad windows will pick up on the historic color of the existing windows. The proportion of the windows will be retained; the proposed smaller double hung windows allow operability by students. Part of the intention of aluminum clad windows is to retain the window proportion. The existing windows showed deterioration of the glazing compound; there were chips and nails in the sashes, most sashes are reinforced with metal angles (because of deterioration over the years); there is cracking of the wood.

Lower level walls have a thicker system, the second floor windows were recessed about 18 inches on the face, and this has resulted in extra protection on the first floor windows. The proposal includes removal of sashes and replacement with aluminum clad windows retaining the same window proportion in the existing bldg.

The challenge is to meet the needs of increased enrollment with limited funds. In other buildings, where most windows are aluminum clad, they have a longer maintenance cycle and this proposal to incorporate the same type of windows will help in the best use of the building's maintenance funds.

As a result of previous reviews by the Commission, the 1920's Pacific Avenue design was reviewed; side entries in the bays are proposed; the main entrance will be pushed back resulting in being different than the retail bays (with side entries).

In conclusion, Mr. deVille stated that the intent of the renovation is to bring life back to the building which has been closed for a number of years by retaining the proportions of the existing building, and the proportions of the fenestrations within the openings of the building.

Vice Chair Buffington asked for clarification on the timeline of the review by the Commission. Mr. McKnight stated that, if the project was approved at this meeting, then it would be the final review by the Commission.

Vice Chair Buffington asked about the Pacific Avenue elevation and the amount of original fabric. Mr. deVille responded that the only element that appears to be of any age is one bay's panel windows; further, the new storefronts would allow views directly into the storefronts.

Mr. deVille talked about the LEED goals and the ability to achieve a higher performance through the exterior by using such items as windows. Mr. McKnight discussed the previous use of new windows on campus buildings. Mr. deVille talked about the goal to recycle the windows.

Commissioner Sundell stated that she supported the use of aluminum clad windows by the University.

Commissioner House stated that he supported preserving the context of the building through the use of some of the existing materials especially as an education tool for the University. He also stated that window glazing and deterioration are not compelling arguments for the replacement of windows.

Commissioner King asked for clarification on the use of the Pacific Avenue bays as classroom and/or facility offices versus retail use. Mr. deVille stated that the legislative's last round of review action cut the funding needed for office capacity and each bay will be constructed with the infrastructure for converting to individual retail space as is the intent by the University in the future.

Commissioner King asked staff for clarification on this project's final review status conducted by the city. Mr. McKnight stated that the Commission is the only design review process for the project and the Commission's review and decision supersedes downtown standards because it is a historic property which is being reviewed for historic standards.

Commissioner King talked about faculty, classroom, and retail space along the Pacific Avenue streetscape and the previous work of the city and university, highlighting the city's help to procure this campus site and the University in return would help get a vital shopping district to give a commercial focus to the museum area. He added his concern of abandonment of this concept and suggested that a representative from the University present the intention of the previous commitment to retail vitality on Pacific.

Mr. deVille provided clarification that the proposed windows were retail storefront windows; he also talked about internal University meetings with personnel who were committed to retail on Pacific and mentioned the difficult economic environment.

Commissioner Sundell agreed that the installing internal sunshades would not be a change to the current appearance of the building on Pacific.

Mr. McKnight provided clarification on the Commission's design review authority. He stated that the Commission's review includes the design proposal as presented and does not include land use or interior proposals such as sunshades, adding that the component built as a retail unit is a requirement. He stated that the Commission can direct staff to issue correspondence making comments to the city.

Ysabel Trinidad, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, described the difficult decision made by the Chancellor on the proposed classroom/faculty/commercial space on Pacific Avenue. She added that options such as leasing office space near or on the campus could be explored in the future to find a solution to retaining retail on Pacific; she also talked about the classroom and library space that are additional student needs that have not been addressed. Ms. Trinidad acknowledged that the Chancellor is completely on board with the retail component along Pacific.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve Phase 3 final design plans as presented by University of Washington Tacoma as meeting Union Depot/Warehouse Design Guidelines and Secretary of Interior's Standards, including replacement of the windows as specified and approve the application. In addition, the Commission encourages the interior alterations that includes the use of former equipment"

Mr. deVille asked about the development of signage, specifically, the street level location of signage, he was interested in the Commission's feedback. Vice chair Buffington stated that the Commission would consider signage at a future meeting because of the full agenda of the current meeting.

MOTION: HOUSE
SECOND: KING
MOTION: CARRIED

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, request staff to draft a letter addressing the Commission's concerns about the lack of retail storefront issue along Pacific and to send it to the appropriate city representatives".

MOTION: KING
SECOND: HOUSE
MOTION: CARRIED

Commissioner House asked about scheduling a future Commission briefing on the Japanese School in that area.

4. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 1015 N 11th St (North Slope Historic District)

Mr. McKnight introduced the project and explained the requirements of the View Sensitive Overlay District. He stated that this briefing was a no action item.

Mr. McKnight read the staff report which follows:

Mr. Millheisler requested a briefing to the Commission to present the proposal on the property at 1015 N 11th Street. Since the property is located in the View Sensitive Overlay District, requirements must be completed through the Building and Land Services Division. The owner has started the process of the View Sensitive requirements but, at this point, would also like to receive feedback from the Commission on his proposal. Mr. Millheisler understands the Commission cannot act on the proposal until after the View Sensitive requirements are finalized.

Additional Background:

Built in 1940, this house is a contributing property located in the North Slope Historic District. The current proposal is to remove the roof including the front elevation dormers and add onto the second story increasing the overall height of the structure. The proposal includes the addition of a front French door, rear door and a new front deck and rail. It also includes removal of existing windows and replacement with Penguin composite PDC windows, as well as new door trim, window trim and new Hardie Plank siding (on entire structure). There may be changes to the existing garage which will be confirmed by the applicant. The purpose of the proposal is to accommodate additional living space. Specific information such as materials, colors, and specification sheets were requested of the applicant by staff.

Mr. McKnight asked the Commission to consider the North Slope Historic District Guidelines for height, additions, garages, materials and including windows, doors, siding and shutters. He reminded the Commission that the project was a briefing only.

Mr. Millheisler presented the components of the proposal with a packet of photos. He focused his presentation on the roof plans to increase the height and the proposal for replacement of the existing wood windows with exterior white vinyl triple pane and interior cherry trim that matches the interior. He emphasized the triple pane thermal efficiency and security, and stated that he would be interested in other window manufacturers preferred by the Commission for historic properties.

He also described plans to increase the height of the garage and the proposal to use Hardie Plank siding. Mr. McKnight talked about a new architectural style of Hardie Plank that is available.

Mr. McKnight stated that the Penguin window product had not been approved by the Commission in the past, explaining that he had spoken with the window manufacturer representative regarding permit requirements on windows.

Commissioner Sundell stated her concerns with removal of the historic architectural character and changes in the proposal that do not fit into the neighborhood including massing, sense of entry and height.

Mr. Millheisler talked about increasing the amount of livable space and the neighborhood homes including the adjacent house with a new dormer.

Vice Chair Buffington confirmed that shed dormers have been approved by the Commission in certain cases in the North Slope Historic District.

Mr. McKnight stated that in some cases permits have been issued improperly and sometimes projects have been done without permits.

Commissioner King agreed with Commissioner Sundell in opposing the proposal to convert a one-story to a two-story building because of poor preservation practice, but would consider a shed dormer.

Mr. McKnight summarized the Commission's discussion: 1) a shed dormer is more favored; 2) a full story addition would not likely receive approval; 3) a rear shed dormer and extension of the roof line could be developed; 4) an addition of front deck and French doors on the front elevation present a problem.

Commissioner House stated that he appreciated the owners briefing the Commission on the project as some people have not gained the proper approval. He emphasized reviewing the North Slope Historic District guidelines which always emphasize rebuilding or repairing; using storm vs. replacing windows; retaining and material of grid pattern.

There was a discussion on using landscape options to increase livable space. Mr. McKnight mentioned that the Commission's review authority does not include landscape proposals.

Vice chair Buffington stated that the Architectural Review Committee is a meeting process in which Mr. and Mrs. Millheisler could request scheduling to informally discuss future design considerations.

Mrs. Harriet Millheisler asked about next steps on the proposal.

Vice chair Buffington stated that the proposal to replace vinyl windows would not likely be approved because of previous decisions based on the Secretary of Interior's Standard #6, specifically for "...features will be repaired rather than replaced..." and further, investigating underneath the existing vinyl siding to retain the historic original siding material would be recommended.

5. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no chair comments.

6. STAFF COMMENTS

There were no chair comments.

7. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. Naming Policy Recommendations

Mr. McKnight reviewed the proposed changes to the naming policy recommended by the Naming Policy Committee which included Commissioners Sundell and McIntire, former Commissioner Roger Johnson, and staff Mr. McKnight. He mentioned that Commissioner King recently received email on the proposed changes.

A copy of the revisions was included in the Commissioner's meeting packets. Mr. McKnight described the timeline for the revision policy. He explained that existing policy is in place to cover any current proposals to change names in the City.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the proposed revisions to the City of Tacoma's policy for place names and request that Staff forward the policy to the City Council"

MOTION: House
SECOND: King
MOTION: Carried

The Meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer