

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: September 23, 2009
Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 708

LPC 131/09

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ross Buffington
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD. (arrived at 4:08)
Fred King
Megan Luce
Mark McIntire
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook
Charlie Solverson

Others Present:

*Jennifer Dean, Caroline Swope, Candy Tingstad,
Blaine Johnson, Jim Shea, Bob Boggess*

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

N/A

B. Approval of Minutes

N/A

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

Chair Mark 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 August 26, 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.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments regarding the nominated property, and to determine if the property meets one or more of the eight nomination criteria in the City Ordinance. The Commission may elect to leave the record open until the next regular meeting, or, if no additional comment is warranted, take action on the nomination following public testimony.

NAME CHANGES

Per Council Resolution 30525 (July 25, 1986), the Mayor and City Council may request that the Landmarks Preservation Commission consider requests for name changes and make a recommendation to Council. Following this hearing, there is an automatic 30 day written comment period. The Commission will take action following the close of this comment period at its next regular meeting.

A. 902 Market St (Urban Grace)

Mr. McKnight continued with the staff report and background information: Constructed in 1924, the Gothic Revival style First Baptist Church building is located in the downtown theatre district at the corner of Market and 9th Streets. The history of First Baptist Church represents development of Tacoma's urban core and the challenges the city faced in the late 20th century. Its association with early leaders of Washington's Baptist community, distinctive architectural style designed by the well known architectural firm of Heath, Gove, & Bell, and prominent downtown location make this building eligible for the Tacoma Register of Historic Places under criteria A, B, C, and F.

The Commission voted to forward this property for public comment and additional consideration on August 26, 2009, finding that it appears to meet the Landmarks designation criteria in 13.07.040.

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; or
- F. Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or City.

This is a nomination for the exterior of the existing building.

Mr. McKnight noted that the New Tacoma Neighborhood Council submitted a letter of support for the nomination.

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

Dr. Caroline Swope stated that there was no additional information since the previous presentation.

Mr. Blaine Johnson said the application's documentation speaks to the specifics and as a neighbor was pleased to support the listing of the Urban Grace to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

Commissioner King offered his support as another neighbor to the nominated building.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, recommend to the City Council that the Urban Grace be included on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, including the exterior of the existing building at 902 Market Street, finding that it meets criteria A, B, C and F of the TMC 13.07.040."

Motion: Buffington

Second: Sundell

Motion: Carried

Mr. McKnight indicated that the request will be made to put the nominations on the City Council's agenda. All interested parties will receive a letter informing them of the date.

NAMING REQUEST

Per Council Resolution 30525 (July 25, 1986), the Mayor and City Council may request that the Landmarks Preservation Commission consider requests for name changes and make a recommendation to Council. Following this hearing, there is an automatic 30-day written comment period. The Commission will take action following the close of this comment period at its next regular meeting.

i. Celebration Park (423 S 80th Street)

Celebration Park is located at 429 S 80th Street and is the name that was previously approved for a new park area. The name change was selected as a way to commemorate the life of the person, Ryan, who is now again being remembered in the same location, the same park area, but with the use of his name. This request is to make the name "Ryan's Park" the legal name of the park. The request was forwarded by Mayor Baarsma for consideration by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Following this hearing, there will be an automatic 30-day comment period before the Commission may take action.

There was no further discussion, and no public comments regarding this item.

ii. Harry P. Cain Promenade (1300 Block of Broadway Plaza)

The proposed Harry P. Cain Promenade is located in the area of the Broadway Plaza between the Murano Hotel and the Convention Center. Currently there is no name for this area other than the Broadway Plaza area. This request is to make the name "Harry P. Cain Promenade" the legal name of the area. He noted that this was for the pedestrian area and the intent was not to change the addressing of the street. The request was forwarded by Mayor Baarsma for consideration by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Following this hearing, there will be an automatic 30-day comment period before the Commission may take action.

Chair McIntire invited the public to speak.

Candy Tingstad

Ms. Tingstad stated that she had nothing to add to her previous (August 26, 2009) comments, other than she was following the proposal and thanked the Commission for their consideration. She added, *"Harry P Cain Promenade is a great idea, the more I learn about the man, the more I respect him and I think it is wonderful that Tacoma would remember him"*.

Commissioner Buffington noted the photo of Mayor Harry P. Cain in a recent newspaper report.

Commissioner Sundell asked for clarification on interpretive materials' procedures.

Reuben McKnight explained that the Commission's process included the name change consideration; interpretive signage/materials would most likely be designed by the proponent with the permit process facilitated by the city.

Commissioner King stated that he supported a recommendation for a plan on interpretation.

iii. Ben Gilbert Park (728 St. Helens)

The Ben Gilbert Park is the park area located at immediately north of the Tacoma Municipal Building, at 728 St Helens. Currently there is no name for this area other than north of the Tacoma Municipal Building North. This request is to make the name "Ben Gilbert Park" the legal name of the area. The request was forwarded by Mayor Baarsma for consideration by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Following this hearing, there will be an automatic 30-day comment period before the Commission may take action.

Chair McIntire invited the public to speak.

Blaine Johnson

Mr. Johnson stated that he appreciated consideration and asked about the process during and at the end of the 30-day comment period.

Mr. McKnight explained that written comments will be accepted for the next 30 days. After that time, the proposed name change would be an action item w/findings and conclusions presented at the Commission meeting. Any additional comments submitted during the 30 days will be summarized or no public comments noted. The Commission's recommendation will be prepared as a resolution for consideration by the City Council. He noted that preparation for the City Council will take about one month.

Chair McIntire closed the public hearing.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Old Business – 2602 S Holgate

Mr. McKnight stated that action on the application was deferred by the Commission on May 13, 2009.

He then 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 its use as 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 property is protected by a covenant between the owner and the City related to historical property tax abatement (Special Tax Valuation Program).

At the May 13, 2009 meeting, the Commission voted to defer action on the application pending submittal of additional alternative designs to install six cell antennas and peripheral equipment to the roof of the property. Commission's concerns included the visibility of the equipment from several elevations and the installation of equipment adversely impacting the building's historic features.

In August 2009, the applicant submitted a new proposal to install the cell antenna equipment within a screened brick wall with faux transparent sections which would allow signal transmission. The design plan and photo simulation with the screened wall are included with the staff report.

In addition, the property owner has submitted a letter of support with copies of various photos showing the views of the building from various nearby locations including I-705.

Copies of the design review application and staff report dated May 13, 2009 are also enclosed.

Standards and guidelines to be considered:

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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:

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 next door is listed on the Tacoma and National Registers of Historic Places.
3. The property is protected by a covenant between the owner and the City related to historical property tax abatement (Special Tax Valuation Program).
4. 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 façade. Further: The existing roof covers the top of the original parapet on all sides*", which further describes the building.
5. 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*".
6. 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.
7. The May 13, 2009 staff report presented the location and attachment detail on the proposed cellular equipment including antennas, attachment pole, equipment cabinet and coax cable that will be installed primarily on the northeastern section of the rooftop, approximately 22 to 24 feet from the primary elevation's roof edge.
8. The May 13, 2009 staff analysis report stated that the six antennas and each attachment pole will be highly visible approximately 9 feet above the top of the building's parapet 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.

9. On May 13, 2009, the *Landmarks Preservation Commission*, deferred action on the proposal and requested submittal of a revised proposal with options that address, in particular, 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.
10. The alternative proposal submitted on August 28, 2009 includes the installation of a 15-foot brick faux chimney that completely covers the cell antennas and poles; in addition, the chimney screen wall has a transparent section that allows for cell signal transmission.
11. In a letter dated September 10, 2009 along with photos (Exhibit A) submitted by the property owner supported consideration that the six antennas and equipment would be difficult to see from several viewpoints of the building. Further, Mr. Boggess stated that the hillside creates a camouflaging background and it would be difficult to see the antennas from I-705, which is ¼ to 1/3 mile in distance from the building.
12. The view of six antennas from I-705 with the hillside in the background does appear to camouflage the antennas from that greater distance of ¼ to 1/3 mile and thus being less conspicuous from the right of way, thus may meet *Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation* specifically, for not being "...conspicuous from the public right of way."
13. The view of the antennas in the Staff Photos dated April 13, 2009, show the views from the Jefferson Street area (rear of the building). The antennas will be visible, however, the proposed cell antennas would be attached closer to the front of the building, thus lessening the view and conspicuousness of the cellular equipment from the right of way, thus may meet *Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation* specifically, for not being "...conspicuous from the public right of way."
14. The addition of the faux chimney screening wall with transparent sections may not meet Secretary of Interior's Standard No. 3, specifically, for, "...adding a false sense of historical development...adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken" because the proposal disguises the antennas in a feature designed to look original. However, the faux chimney may be read as a background feature designed to blend in with its surroundings.
15. The addition of the faux chimney screen or installation of cell equipment without a screen will not remove or destroy historic materials, thus meeting Secretary of Interior's Standard No. 9, specifically, for, "...will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property..."
16. The installation of cellular equipment would allow for a modern use of the building in the historic industrial neighborhood. The equipment can be removed in the future without damage to the historic materials and features, thus meeting Secretary of Interior's Standard No. 10, specifically, for, "New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired"

Staff recommended approval of the installation of cellular equipment as proposed in the May 2009 application with the screening wall.

Mr. Bob Boggess, owner and reconstruction of the building, stated that he was not supportive of the screening (i.e. faux brick chimney addition) because of the larger impact to the visibility than without the screening addition.

There was discussion on the visibility of the six antennas with dimensions approximately 2'X6', the visibility of the faux chimney structure addition and the location of the antennas' installation on the rooftop.

Mr. McKnight stated that the screening increases the mass. He clarified that the cellular company's presentation is an alternative with screening surrounding the antennas and the preferred alternative by the owner which is without the addition of screening.

Commissioner House summarized the possible proposals including no addition of antennas, antennas installed, grouping of antennas and screening the antennas.

Commissioner Sundell stated that the overall height was 15 feet which includes the nine foot pole with a six foot antenna.

Mr. Boggess stated that there were very few sites in driving around the neighborhood that show the building and he was not supportive of the 15 foot high brick screening.

Commissioner King supported the clustering of the antennas without benefit of the screening structure.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the analysis as findings and approve the proposal to cluster the antennas together without the use of screening as in the original application, for the property at 2602 S Holgate".

MOTION: King

SECOND: Sundell

Commissioners Buffington and Luce were concerned with twenty-first century communication equipment installed on a historic building and screening which changes the character of the building.

Commissioner Sundell proposed an amendment to the motion:

"The proposed motion shall be amended that there be no more than six antennas installed on the rooftop".

Commissioner House seconded the amendment.

The Commission approved the amendment.

Chair McIntire presented the original motion for the vote:

MOTION: Carried (2 opposed)

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

B. New Business – 817 N I Street

It was noted that the owners were not in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. McKnight read the staff report:

Constructed in 1890, the property at 817 N I Street is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The exterior was previously altered including the covering of the front façade with asbestos siding and vinyl windows. The current retroactive proposal is to remove the non-original siding and expose the original shingle exterior, repairing and replacing missing shingles with matching cedar

shingles; the upper front façade will be covered with stucco; wood trim will be added to the non-original windows. The application also states that the chimney may be restored. Enclosed photos from 1977 and 1996 show the shingle siding. The house will be painted in the submitted colors.

Staff talked with the applicant about the upper front façade which is covered with stucco. The current owner removed asbestos shingles uncovering plywood; the stucco was recently installed on this altered façade. The owner did not have an early photo showing the original exterior.

The owner also said that she may also restore the non-working chimney by resealing and repairing the brick to retain the original appearance of the chimney; in-kind repair matching the original materials is exempt from review.

North Slope Historic District guidelines and Secretary of the Interior's Standards to be considered:

North Slope Special Review District

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.

Secretary of Interior's Standards

#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 analysis to be considered:

1. The home on the property is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it was constructed in 1890. 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 including new construction per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. The house had been altered including the installation of asbestos siding and vinyl windows.
4. Some of the original cedar shingle siding has not been removed, but is covered; the original siding will be repaired and any missing shingles will be replaced matching in-kind. Thus, 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*".
5. The upper front elevation was previously covered with asbestos siding with plywood underneath, thus the original siding was no longer there. The current owner removed the asbestos siding and covered the non-original plywood with stucco as shown in the staff photo. The earliest photos of the home, dated 1977, show shingle siding on the front elevation, which may or may not be original.

6. Covering the altered non-original front façade with an exterior material that is more compatible to the historic materials of the North Slope Historic District is appropriate. The owner did not have an early historic photo of the home and reviewed the neighborhood for possible compatible materials which resulted in the use of stucco, which meets North Slope Historic District Guideline No. 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. 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”*. The owner also consulted with children of the previous owners who said that there may have been a turret, which is a feature on Queen Anne era homes in the North Slope Historic District, and as stated in the District’s nomination form, many of which had upper stories with stucco or shingles.
7. The original windows were replaced with vinyl windows by a previous owner; wood window trim was custom made and installed by the current owner as shown in the staff photos.

Staff recommended adoption of the above analysis as findings, and approval of the proposal as submitted, based upon those findings.

There was discussion on the previous alterations on this retroactive application including the difficulty of not knowing the original architecture and treatment, subsequent alterations, and current treatment.

There was a motion:

“I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the above analysis as findings and deny the application on the property at 817 N I Street”.

MOTION: Sundell
SECOND: House

Mr. McKnight recommended the final decision on the application be considered when the property owner was present.

Commissioner King asked if adequate research had been conducted on the original property.

Mr. McKnight stated that the owners will be informed on reviewing the condition of the building and clarification on the currently selected treatment.

Commissioner Sundell withdrew the motion. Commissioner House seconded the motion.

There was a new motion:

“I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, defer the application on the property at 817 N I Street, until the owner can be present”.

MOTION: Sundell
SECOND: House
MOTION: Carried

4. **BOARD BRIEFINGS**

1302 Pacific – Luzon Building

Mr. Charlie Solverson circulated three handouts (i.e. site layout, narrative on salvage plan, and photos of specific building elements) on the proposed documentation and salvage plan for the Luzon Building. He

then outlined the work sequence explaining that salvaged items would be sold to offset the removal and demolition costs.

Commissioner Buffington asked about any possible alternatives to demolition.

Mr. Solverson responded that the meeting of the interested party on Friday, September 18, 2009 proposed a structural scheme but the party backed out on Tuesday, September 22, 2009.

Commissioner House asked for clarification on the difference between the decision process to brace the building and to demolish the building was the loss of private investors.

Mr. Solverson agreed with Commissioner House's clarification, adding that alternatives were looked at all along in the process including the following: 1) the preferred alternative was renovation; 2) bracing or other repair to stabilize the bldg; and, 3) the demolition of the structure; work continued including peer review to look at what was proposed. During the course of that work deflection was found on the wall on Commerce Street, which was in addition to the earlier assessment of the building. He said the concern with the building was progressive collapse and it was determined that all four walls needed to be braced.

Mr. Solverson continued: Along with looking at alternatives since August 26, 2009, several notices were given to the owners with direction to address the hazards, and in the interest of public safety the only possible option was demolition; bracing was a continual process leading toward renovation; there was the concern that even with bracing, the building could collapse in on itself.

Commissioner House talked about the decision process and wanted to make sure there was a clear record of the process including the Commission meeting minutes. He summarized the possibilities including the possibility of bracing all four sides of the building and nothing (i.e. further collapse) could happen since no one was interested in renovating it. He continued: There was the possibility of no renovation by property owners and if the building was braced on all four sides, then the building could still collapse on itself.

Commissioner Longwell asked about contamination of the property requiring additional money to fix it (i.e., the site contamination).

Mr. Solverson stated that the site has asbestos (fibrous), lead contamination, and there has been some information that there may have been underground storage tanks of bunkersee tar (i.e. heavy tar like fuel). He had not heard of any contamination associated with drycleaners on the site nor that the site is a source. He stated that there could be unforeseen conditions once they get into the structure.

Commissioner Sundell asked about the disposal of artifacts and whether any could be saved and not sold but re-applied to the new structure in the future. Further, the artifacts could be used to mark the presence of the building so the artifacts are not lost or dispersed and have no meaning anywhere else.

Mr. Solverson replied that removal of the artifacts includes an inventory; the artifacts will be put into secure storage; if the artifacts are moved there will be a chain of custody; an RCW speaks to the disposal; the city attorney would be consulted on the disposal and disbursement.

Commissioner Buffington asked about maximizing the saving of as many artifacts as possible. Mr. Solverson stated artifacts will be removed as much as possible but will be limited due to the hazard and contamination exposure.

Commissioner Longwell asked about the plan's narrative description of what will be salvaged: i.e. the section of a few window sills, section of belt courses, etc. and whether sections will be salvaged versus the entirety of some elements. Mr. Solverson stated that items were identified and inventoried for retrieval; some of the items have a high value but even fragments were identified to at least document.

Commissioner Luce asked about who would be on site to identify elements for salvaging. Mr. Solverson stated that Reuben McKnight, Gene Grulich, and perhaps Michael Sullivan, and a salvage company with field staff to identify and salvage.

Commissioner House asked about the possibility of taking the building down to the first and/or second floors so that the exterior walls could at least be salvaged.

Mr. Solverson responded the demolition would start at the top to the bottom; selective demolition was ruled out. He said retaining the lower area would require some bracing and the lower area has the highest concentration of asbestos. He said they were continuing to look at taking the building down to the third floor.

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

Mr. McKnight highlighted the status of the Commission member positions reported in the Staff Report.

Chair McIntire asked if an application was previously submitted, would another application submittal be necessary.

Mr. McKnight stated that he would report on the application process at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer