

Members

Kevin Bartoy, Chair
Jennifer Mortensen, Vice-Chair
Jonathan Hart
Sarah Hilsendeger
Roger Johnson
Alex Morganroth
Lysa Schloesser
Holly Stewart
Carol Sundstrom
Jeff Williams
Deborah Cade, North Slope Ex-Officio
Leah Jaggars, Wedge Ex-Officio



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
Lauren Hoogkamer, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Zoe Scuderi, Historic Preservation Intern
Mary Crabtree, Administrative Assistant

Date: August 11, 2021

Location: *Virtual Zoom Webinar*

Commission Members in Attendance:

Kevin Bartoy, Chair
Jennifer Mortensen, Vice-Chair
Jonathan Hart
Sarah Hilsendeger
Roger Johnson
Alex Morganroth
Lysa Schloesser
Holly Stewart
Carol Sundstrom
Jeff Williams
Deborah Cade
Leah Jaggars

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Lauren Hoogkamer
Zoe Scuderi
Mary Crabtree

Others Present:

Jeffrey Ryan

Commissioner Members Excused:

N/A

Commission Members Absent:

N/A

Chair Bartoy called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INDIGENOUS LANDS

2. ROLL CALL

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Bartoy proposed switching Item Nos. 4 and 5, to hold the Q&A session first. The agenda was approved as amended.

A. Excusal of Absences

- N/A

B. Approval of Minutes: 6/9/21

The minutes of the June 9, 2021, meeting were approved as submitted.

C. Administrative Review:

- 1110 MLK Jr. Way—sign

- 918 N. J St.—doors
- 1021 N. Steele St.—porch and door

5. College Park Historic Nomination Public Information Session Q&A

A. Overview of Historic District process followed by public question and answer session

Reuben McKnight presented an overview of the historic district creation process, including the proposed College Park area, a comparison of a national register district versus a local register district, common questions, other local historic districts, and the Landmarks Preservation Commission review process.

The Q&A session began at approximately 5:49 p.m.

Several community members inquired about the review permit process, responses to climate change, the design guidelines, fees, the Home in Tacoma Project, redlining and equity, house values, who determines the review standards, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, College Park boundary lines, City employees working in the Historic Preservation office, the parameters of the 400 feet boundary area, and siding style guidelines.

Community members' questions continued regarding an equity/inclusion analysis on proposed historic districts, how the preservation of properties affects climate and affordable housing, benefits of a historic district designation, timeline of the historic nomination, how a historic district designation affects home purchases, criteria for establishing the historic district, and opportunities for public comment.

The Q&A session ended at approximately 6:56 p.m.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission recessed at 6:57 p.m. and reconvened at 7:03 p.m.

4. NOMINATIONS TO THE TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

A. Proposed College Park Historic District

Discussion of district significance and designation criteria

Mr. McKnight read the staff report as provided in the packet.

Commissioner Williams stated that the University of Puget Sound (UPS) is the defining characteristic of the neighborhood and could meet Criterion G.

Vice-Chair Mortensen spoke against Criterion G, noting that Criterion G is more reserved for unique properties that don't readily fit into other categories. Commissioner Hart and Chair Bartoy agreed with Vice-Chair Mortensen and suggested that the neighborhood does not stand apart and there are no prominent homes.

Commissioner Stewart asked if there has been communication with UPS.

Vice-Chair Mortensen indicated that the district does meet Criterion A and C.

Commissioner Hart provided comments on equity and redlining.

Commissioner Johnson stated the district is the embodiment of Criterion A.

Chair Bartoy noted that Commissioner Hart's comments regarding equity are valid and using an equity lens is important.

Commissioner Williams provided comments on how to address redlining.

Vice-Chair Mortensen stated that Criterion A should not be discarded but should be more clear an open regarding the history.

Commissioner Stewart requested data on the number of single-family homes versus multi-family and owner versus rental properties.

Chair Bartoy requested information on equity analyses for proposals.

Commissioner Stewart noted that information on compatibility between the Home In Tacoma project and historic preservation should be included going forward.

Commissioner Hilsendeger noted that the district does meet Criterion C.

Mr. McKnight summarized the discussion, noting there is less support for Criterion G; however, the area meets Criterion A and C and there may be room for additional narrative relating to demographics and equity.

6. BOARD BUSINESS/COMMUNICATION ITEMS

A. 811 N Ainsworth enforcement update

Mr. McKnight read the staff report as provided in the packet.

Discussion ensued regarding if the property would require an additional review by the Commission, side yard setbacks, civil penalties, the construction timeline, how the City ensures the property owner is upholding standards, and potential future actions for violations.

B. Events and Activities

- The How Fire Shaped Tacoma video can be found on social media pages.
- The 70s Turn 50 by State Architectural Historian Michael Houser on August 19, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.
- Historic Seattle & Forterra: Affordable Housing/Acquisition Strategies on September 16, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.
- Sea Level Rise & WA Archeology on October 21, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

7. CHAIR COMMENTS

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.