



## **MINUTES**

(Approved on August 21, 2025)

**MEETING:** Special Meeting (hybrid)

**DATE/TIME:** Thursday, June 26, 2025, 5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Brett Santhuff (Chair), Clara Cheeves, Krystal Monteros, Deborah Ranniger, Chris Reeh

**ABSENT:** Jennifer Weddermann (Vice-Chair), Stephanie Gowing

### **A. Call to Order**

Chair Santhuff called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

Chair Santhuff read the Land Acknowledgement.

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

*Board Member Ranniger moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Board Member Reeh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **C. Approval of Minutes**

- May 15, 2025

*Board Member Ranniger moved to approve the May 15, 2025, meeting minutes as submitted. Board Member Reeh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **D. Public Comments**

There were no written comments. No individuals addressed the Board.

### **E. Disclosure of Contacts and Recusals**

There were no disclosures of contacts or recusals.

### **F. Public Hearing**

#### **1. UDPR25-0002 Concept Design Review**

Chair Santhuff called the public hearing to order at 5:35 p.m. and provided an overview of the public hearing procedures.

Carl Metz, Senior Planner, presented the UDPR25-002 Concept Design Review permit, including a project overview, a context map and photos, site plan, massing concept, floor plans, elevations, renderings, the code analysis, UDPR criteria, departures, written comments received, and staff's recommendation.

The Board posed preliminary questions of staff regarding bicycle parking, the chapel on the adjacent property, tree replacements, ADA parking, design regulations for multilevel parking, and pedestrian streets.

The Board posed preliminary questions for the applicant, including the existing trees, façades in the public realm, property line setbacks, balconies and outdoor space, e-bike charging, material palette, landscaping on lower podium, garage ventilation, power poles, and unground power lines.

The following individual provided testimony:

1. Jessie Bostic
2. Justin Allison
3. Ron Melnikoff

Public comment period closed at 6:56 p.m.

Discussion ensued regarding parking.

*Board Member Reeh moved to approve the CDR Guidance Report, including two Guidance Statements, as presented in the June 26, staff recommendation to the Urban Design board. Board Member Ranniger seconded the motion.*

Discussion ensued regarding potential amendments.

*Board Member Reeh moved to amend the CDR Guidance Report to modify the Draft Guidance Statement: "Tacoma Ave S Ground level programming, access, and façade treatment" to include that the applicant provide some of the required short term parking in the parking right of way. Board Member Ranniger seconded the motion. The motion to amend passed unanimously.*

*Chair Santhuff moved to amend the CDR Guidance Report to add a guidance statement regarding Landscaping and Open Space - On-Site & Off-Site/Street Trees and to state the following:*

*a. Landscaping between the building and sidewalk should relate to the architecture and right of way improvements to create a cohesive, welcoming, and safe environment. To promote a visual connection between the exterior and interior, as well as a healthy and maintainable landscape, minimize planting areas at building entrance where storefront extends to grade and/or areas that are covered by weather protection (canopies).*

*b. Raised planter boxes along Tacoma Ave South and decorative perforated panels should be durable. Design should confirm materials, indicate relationship to unexcavated/below grade portions associated with parking that appear to extend above the bottom of the decorative perforated screen, and confirm if the planters step to follow grade as indicated in the concept design package or establish a consistent datum in relationship to the architecture or surrounding context (adjacent buildings).*

*c. Courtyard / Open Space is separated from public realm by the visual and physical barrier of concrete podium wall extending above the floor slab as an apparent guardrail. In association with finalizing architectural expression (see associated comments), design should address potential visual connection to the street. This may be achieved by changes in level within the courtyard space which raise a portion of the area to provide better sightlines to the street. Alternatively, this could be achieved by using balcony type guardrails at those portions immediately adjacent to units along Tacoma Avenue South. Solutions might also incorporate the planters that define the various public and unit associated patio areas of the courtyard to provide additional planting depth for landscape in the courtyard. Wall cladding color and articulation at the façade facing the courtyard, specifically the dark colored frame, could directly inform the placement, size, and color selection of planters that define the private unit patios reinforcing the current architectural design.*

*d. Off-site Landscape/ROW design and Street Tree selection should preference large or medium trees such that the quantity is similar to the trees to be removed, and overall tree size proportionally relates to the scale of the proposed building. Tree placement should consider architectural massing building modulation to create a cohesive whole.*

*e. The tree identified as tree #4 within the submitted Arborist Report should be re-evaluated and retained if possible. The tree has a significant presence at the intersection and could be a feature in the planned right of way improvements and building entrance experience. The Board advises City staff to allow the tree, if retained, to count toward meeting street tree requirements.*

*Board Member Reeh seconded the motion. The motion to amend passed unanimously.*

Chair Santhuff moved to amend the CDR Guidance Report to add a guidance statement regarding Architecture design, materials, and color and to state the following:

a. At parking areas, detailing and design of perforated metal panel and storefront should address integration of vehicle barriers. Design should also consider level of visibility to the public realm through both panel perforations and glazing areas, including experience of light within parking areas, particularly in evening hours. Provide details with final design on perforated panel and attachment assembly as well as glazing opacity or decorative treatment. At glazing areas, consider if weather protection / canopies should be raised to correspond to the height of vehicle barriers at the second floor.

b. At architectural cladding, with final design, demonstrate that mechanical systems including any intakes and exhausts have been thoughtfully integrated into the design. If present in exterior façade, identify placement in zones of consistent cladding and considering location of trim. Design should avoid placement of devices which overlap between different cladding materials or colors. Indicate if such items are to match the color of the field in which they are located or are intended to be a consistent color.

c. Consider the use of materials and colors with greater vibrancy than those depicted in the Concept Design Review materials as well as increasing the use of accent cladding overall. Options include greater application of the alternating accents of teal and blue tile at the stair towers or introducing color at the metal accent panel areas.

Board Member Reeh seconded the motion. The motion to amend passed unanimously.

Chair Santhuff moved to amend the CDR Guidance Report to add a guidance statement regarding building design standards, form, and expression and to state the following:

a. Provide clear articulation and delineation between base podium and middle. Resolve detail and interface where panel cladding extends past or overlaps concrete podium. Develop consistent language at each wing as well as courtyard and 3rd floor balconies, including SW corner unit. This could also include changes to column spacing at podium level to more clearly relate to the framed residential wings and ground level enhancements associated with connectivity at the entrance and adjacent amenities.

b. North elevation should reflect adjacent context. Particularly in units at corner with Tacoma Avenue South, project design should either explore means to provide additional windows in north elevation or provide roofline articulation and mass reduction at the upper floor.

c. Building Top/ Roofline Design.

i. Distinguish cornice and/or parapet height at the darkly colored panels that frame the residential floors' massing. Particularly in the courtyard and along the alley, Court C, this would further enhance the current modulation and articulation.

ii. At South Wing, consider if roof overhang at second floor wing extends over the balcony (white paneled zone) of the adjacent units all the way to the stair tower or stops associated with the amenity space.

iii. At North Wing, consider horizontal modifications at top floor to include roof overhang and balcony spaces associated with units drawing from design expression at South Wing. Roof overhang and setback at upper level could allow glazing at north façade associated with this unit to take advantage of views north towards adjacent historic properties. Changes from the roofline would satisfy concerns for modulation and architectural expression of the north elevation.

d. 2nd St façade does not meet horizontal modulation or mass reduction. Consider departure associated with satisfying requirement if applicant resolves other design elements in this section.

Board Member Ranniger seconded the motion. The motion to amend passed unanimously.

*The motion to approve the CDR Guidance report as amended passed unanimously.*

The applicant team, including Levi Nelson, Aya Rojnuckarin, and Andrew Miller, provided additional comments on the project and responded to Board questions throughout the discussions.

## **G. Communication Items**

*Board Member Ranniger moved to cancel the July meeting and hold a site visit at the same date and time for a tour of the Hilltop. Board Member Reeh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

## **H. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

*\*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit: <https://tacoma.gov/UDB>*