

## Members

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Duke York  
Lysa Schloesser  
James Steel  
Jeff Williams  
Eugene Thorne  
Brittani Flowers  
Roger Johnson

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

## Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer  
Lauren Hoogkamer, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
John Griffith, Office Assistant



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: December 14, 2016

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

### Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*  
Duke York  
Eugene Thorne  
Jeff Williams  
James Steel  
Lysa Schloesser  
Brittani Flowers  
Roger Johnson  
Marshall McClintock

### Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight  
Lauren Hoogkamer  
John Griffith

### Others Present:

Ross Buffington  
Curt Stoner  
Carla Good  
Jeff Ryan  
James Blessing  
Kristi Evans  
Hugh Hoover  
Sharon Hoover  
Connie Guffey  
David Strauss  
Bill Peretta  
Mike Bartlett  
Spencer Howard

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

### 1. ROLL CALL

### 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 10/26/16
- C. Administrative Review
  - 539 Broadway, University Union Club—exterior repairs
  - 1102 A Street, Federal Building—freestanding sign
  - 913 N. Ainsworth—in-kind window replacement
  - 764 Broadway, Bostwick Building—barber pole
  - 524 S. Sheridan—heat pump

The minutes were approved as submitted.

### 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS AND INVENTORY—PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Pratt called the public hearing to order and reviewed the procedures. Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

#### BACKGROUND

Tacoma Municipal Code 13.07 requires the Landmarks Commission to adopt and maintain an inventory of historically "contributing" and "noncontributing" properties as well as district guidelines to guide the design review process. "Contributing" properties are those that contribute to the district's historical associations or architectural qualities. Exterior alterations to contributing properties require the approval of the Commission prior to the issuance

of building permits. The Commission may review and amend these inventories and guidelines once on an annual basis.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:

Inventory

1315 N 11th (correct build date to 1940)

1320 N 8th (change from "noncontributing" to "contributing")

Wedge-North Slope Design Guidelines

Amend the guidelines for new construction for windows to prohibit vinyl windows in new construction projects (except for garages).

EFFECTS

Exterior alterations to contributing properties require the approval of the Commission prior to the issuance of building permits. Adjacent properties are not affected by this inventory change. Future new construction will be required to incorporate historically compatible windows in the design.

ACTION REQUESTED

Following the close of the Public Hearing, the Commission shall review public testimony and take action to approve, amend, or deny the proposed changes no sooner than its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Chair Pratt called for public comments. The following citizens provided comments:

Ross Buffington commented that he strongly supported the change to prohibit vinyl windows on new construction. He commented that the application to place the Wedge Neighborhood on the National Register of Historic Places had been approved by the State Advisory Commission was currently being considered in Washington D.C.

Curt Stoner commented that he strongly supported the amendment prohibiting vinyl windows in new construction and that it would help preserve the value of the North Slope.

Carla Good reported that she owned the home at 1320 North 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which had been proposed to be added to the list of contributing properties. Ms. Good commented that they were having a difficult time understanding why their home was proposed for addition to the contributing list as it had been built in the 1952 and used cinderblock construction.

Mr. McClintock expressed support for prohibiting vinyl windows; for the change in the inventory 1350 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street to correctly update the date of construction; and for adding 1320 North 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which was already listed as contributing on the National Register, to the City Register as well.

Chair Pratt closed the public hearing.

**4. TACOMA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES—PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

A. 3713 North 19<sup>th</sup> Street & 1920 North Adams Street, Cushman and Adams Street Substations

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

**BACKGROUND**

The Cushman and Adams Street Substations, at 3713 N 19th Street and 1920 North Adams Street, were built in 1926. This nomination includes both neoclassical revival substations, the North 21st Street steel lattice towers, the switchyards and the interior of the Cushman Substation's Condenser Room as contributing. The Cushman Substation (contributing), North 21st Street Towers (contributing) and the switchyard (noncontributing) are already listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which does not include the Adams Street Substation. The buildings were predominantly designed by engineer Vern Grongwer and built by Dougan and Chrisman. The complex is

nominated under Criterion A, for its association with the region's growth as a result of hydroelectric power production. The substations housed the means for efficient distribution of electricity, making the Cushman Substation one of the most important and influential buildings of its time as well as the only urban building constructed for the Cushman Hydroelectric Project. The property is also nominated under Criterion C as an excellent example of monumental, neoclassical revival style architecture. The Cushman Substation is a visual statement as to the importance of the city's municipal hydroelectric system. The period of significance is 1926 to 1949, which is the date of construction up until the transmission line was rerouted. Tacoma Public Utilities currently owns and maintains the property and was notified of the pending nomination on November 1, 2016. The nomination was prepared and submitted by Jeff Ryan. Letters of support have been received from the North End Neighborhood Council and some community members.

#### Issues and Considerations

There are several related factors that the Commission should be aware of as it considers the nomination, as follows:

- The 21st Street lattice towers are scheduled for replacement by Tacoma Public Utilities, as a component of a larger effort to improve pedestrian safety and street design along 21st Street. There has been extensive public outreach and City Council discussion on this issue. Although the towers are listed as contributing in the National Register nomination form, they are similar to lattice towers elsewhere in the system. Tacoma Public Utilities, the City of Tacoma and the State Historic Preservation Office have had discussions relating to mitigation steps for tower removal prior to the submittal of the Tacoma Register nomination. Because they are already slated for replacement and because of the ongoing community discussion about the 21st Street design, staff recommends removing the towers from the nomination under consideration. Staff has asked TPU to explore the feasibility of retaining one representative tower near the Adams Substation as a representative example.
- On the National Register nomination, the switchyards, which have been altered, are considered non-contributing, but functionally and visually related to the substations. Staff concurs with this assessment and recommends amending the Tacoma Register nomination to reflect this.
- The Cushman Substation Condenser Room interior is also included in the Tacoma Register nomination. TMC 13.07 allows for the designation of "significant interior spaces" in public areas of publicly owned buildings, although there are few such spaces. Examples of such spaces include the Tacoma Municipal Building lobbies and grand staircase and the theater space inside of Pantages.

The properties are nominated under the following criteria:

- A. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; 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;*

Staff recommends the additional criteria of:

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

#### **REQUESTED ACTION**

Determination of whether the property nominated to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places appears to meet the threshold criteria for nomination, and if so, scheduling the nominations for public hearing. The commission may forward all or part of the nomination for future consideration.

#### **EFFECTS OF NOMINATION**

- Future changes to the exterior will require approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission prior to those changes being made, to ensure historical and architectural appropriateness.
- Unnecessary demolition of properties listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places is strongly discouraged by the municipal code, and requires approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.
- Future renovations of listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places may qualify for the Special Tax Valuation property tax incentive.
- The property will become eligible for the Historic Conditional Use Permit.

## STANDARDS

The threshold criteria for Tacoma Register listing are listed at 13.07.040B(1), and include:

1. Property is at least 50 years old at the time of nomination; and,
2. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association such that it is able to convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

## ANALYSIS

1. At 90-years-old the property meets the age threshold criterion.
2. The property retains a high degree of integrity; it retains its original setting, design, massing, materials, and the majority of window openings and ornamentation, among other character defining features. Only the interior equipment has been removed, along with some window panes on the east elevation and six of the original light poles on the exterior on the Cushman Substation site. The switchyard, although part of the original site, has been altered over time and is noncontributing in the National Register listing. The North 21st Street Towers are also intact, but in need of restoration. The Adams Street Substation also retains its integrity, with the exception of missing exterior light fixtures, removed equipment, and a small ventilation shaft that has been added to the south façade.

Jeff Ryan, Ryan Architecture, reported that he had nominated the Cushman and Adams Street Substations as a community member and not an architect. He commented that the building was of value to the community and the City as an educational feature. He reviewed that the building represented the second and third dams in the City, which had allowed them to cancel the power from Puget Power and become self-sustaining. He reviewed that the City had been motivated to become self-sustaining in response to Puget Power using power outages as leverage for public funds. He noted the less than 15% of the power in the United States was through a public utility. He commented that the Adams Street substation was one of the distribution substations that supplied that neighborhood and that he would like to see the site become a public park. Mr. Ryan suggested that adding the building to the register would allow them to have some say in what happens to it after TPU sells it. He commented that he wasn't proposing saving all of the towers on 21st Street, but that he would like at least the one on 21st and Adams to be saved as an example.

James Blessing, Tacoma Public Utilities, reviewed his background as a professional engineer and noted that he had worked on various elements of the historic line and was slated to be the construction manager for the 21<sup>st</sup> Street project. Mr. Blessing reviewed that the project had been a major historical effort, adding that the transmission line which crossed the Narrows had been an engineering achievement at the time. He noted that the substation at Cushman had only been one piece of the process to get power to residents and that the Adams Substation, which was fed directly by the Cushman dam, was the piece that supplied power to the homes. He reviewed that the Cushman project started generating power in 1926 and they had added another dam in 1932 to meet increased demand. He commented that today the substation is a remnant and is used for storage and maintenance. Mr. Blessing reported that the Adams Substation is currently surplus. The overall goals for the project included maintaining safety, to improve street design, public outreach with surveys and investigations, and striking a balance between progress and historic preservation.

Mr. Blessing discussed the scope and benefits of the proposed changes. He reviewed that the plan was to remove all of the steel lattice towers along 21st Street. He noted that the intent was to maintain the reliable system in North Tacoma. They would bypass and retire the substation and remove associated outdoor equipment. He discussed the state of the towers which were old, would not meet design standards, and would not support the new lines. He added that the towers would not meet their needs in terms of safety. The new towers would have improved aesthetics and would be spaced further apart. An image of the existing towers and the proposed replacements was discussed. Mr. Blessing commented that there would be space for turn lanes with the new towers.

Mr. Blessing commented that they had reached out to organizations including the historic preservation office and had decided to focus on the buildings. They supported adding Adams Substation to the national register. They would also rehabilitate the existing light standards.

Mr. Blessing discussed amendments that he recommended adding to the nomination. He recommending removing the nomination for the lattice towers, substation switchyards, and building interior which he noted was not a public

space. They supported keeping the substation building exteriors in the nomination. The rationale for the recommended amendments included the existence of historic documentation for many of the elements discussed with the substation and lines on the National Register; the potlatch line and Cushman station adding to the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER); and the narrows crossing NAER. On removing certain nomination elements, Mr. Blessing reviewed that the Potlatch Line and Cushman Substation complex had been altered significantly over time; that the transmission line system and switchyards have been deemed non-contributory; that towers, switchyard, and building interiors are representative of the current power industry; and that the 21<sup>st</sup> Street and Adams Substation towers interfere with the new transmission line.

Photos of the Cushman Substation and the 21<sup>st</sup> Street tower at Adams were discussed. Mr. Blessing noted that a lot of the equipment shown in the yard had been removed. He noted structures that had been added after the original construction. He commented that the new line would run along the same alignment, which would require a safe distance from any kind of structure, necessitating the removal of the existing towers including the tower at 21st and Adams.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if they had any plans to keep one of the towers as a representative. Mr. Blessing responded that they had representative lattice towers in other locations and that their preference would be to remove it.

Mr. Blessing commented that they agreed that the buildings were important. He reviewed that they felt the interiors did not meet the definition of a public area; the towers and equipment were significantly documented and could be removed; that they understood that the upkeep of the buildings was important; and that the towers and substation equipment did not have as much support from the community for their preservation. He commented that based on experience, the amendments posed a nice balance between preservation and the proposed improvements.

Mr. Ryan commented that the setting of the building was important as part of the character of the building. He commented that the openness was part of the building and that the sites surrounding the building were also important. He commented on some of interior features and the craftsmanship in the space. He commented the towers had a quality to them as well and that he wanted to save at least one.

Mr. McKnight noted that the only thing to be determined at the meeting was the geographic bounds of the nomination as it would impact how they send out notification. He commented that there had been discussion over the year regarding the design of the 21<sup>st</sup> Street corridor and that if the recommendation was not to include the transmission line in the nomination, there would need to be a balance to sending out the public hearing notice about the potential designation. Commissioner Steel asked if the nomination would include the last tower on the site. Mr. McKnight confirmed that for the notice purposed, it would.

Commissioner Steel commented that there had been a lot of talk about the need for compromise before adaptive reuse and that after the buildings have been nominated, there was still room for that compromise to take place. He commented that the nomination should be weighed on the merits of the structures and not the need for compromise. Mr. McClintock expressed concern that the public hearing would become a discussion of the towers on 21<sup>st</sup> Street if they remain in the nomination which would create a huge distraction. Vice-Chair Jensen commented that there was no question that the substations were historic and that moving forward with them would be appropriate. He noted parallels between the application and some of the initial designs for the Prairie Line Trail which originally removed the tracks. He added that saving a representative of one tower would be adequate.

Mr. McClintock commented that it would be important to share pictures of the interior of the substation with the Commission and the public prior to the public hearing.

Commissioner Williams commented that they were not in a position to make a judgement on the interiors, but that it would be important to maximize the reuse and rehabilitation of the interiors. He expressed concern that if the interiors were landmarked it would inhibit the adaptive reuse of the building.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis and schedule the Cushman and Adams

Street substation nominations for a public hearing and future consideration at the meeting on Feb 8, 2017 with the boundaries limited as recommended by staff.”

Motion: Williams

Second: York

The motion was approved unanimously.

## 5. DESIGN REVIEW

### A. Wright Park Bridge (Individual Landmark)

#### *Paint Color*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

Dating back to 1890, Wright Park is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. Due to safety concerns, MetroParks Tacoma is replacing the existing wood pedestrian bridge, between the upper and lower ponds. The wood bridge was installed in 2003 and is not historic. The design for the new bridge was approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission on July 13, 2016. At that time, silver or gray were discussed as potential color options by the design team, but were not included in the approval. Metro Parks would now like approval for a “walnut brown” paint color. The Trex decking surface will be gray. On October 27, 2016, staff proposed this for administrative review and full Commission design review was requested.

### ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

### STANDARDS

#### **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings**

6. 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.
9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

### ANALYSIS

1. This property is an individual landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, as such, it is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 modifications.
2. The new bridge reflects historic elements in the park and is based on photographic evidence.

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Kristi Evans, MetroParks, provided samples of the walking surface material along with color samples for the Walnut Brown color, noting that it would have a protective marine coating. Commissioner Johnson asked if the paint was added in the factory or painted on later. Ms. Evans confirmed that it was painted at the factory. Ms. Evans confirmed that the color would be shiny and not flat. Commissioner Steel was asked why the brown color was chosen rather than the white color that had been shown at the last meeting. Ms. Evans responded that the brown color blended into the surroundings, that the previous bridge had been wood, and that there were other elements in the park with similar colors. She added that graffiti is harder to cover up on white. Commissioner Steel commented that part of the reason they approved the rail design was because it echoed the Conservatory and could be painted a similar color.

He commented that he did not know why they chose a decorative design if they were going to choose a subdued color. Commissioner Flowers asked if the color choice had been publicly discussed. Ms. Evans responded that it had been an internal discussion.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the design amendment for 501 South I Street, Wright Park, as submitted."

Motion: Schloesser

Second: Williams

The motion was approved with Commissioner Steel voting against.

B. 402 N K Street (North Slope Historic District)  
*Siding Material*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

### BACKGROUND

Built in 1891, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. On September 13, 2016, the removal of the non-historic siding was administratively approved. On October 26, 2016, the Landmarks Preservation Commission approved replacing the non-historic front and back stoops with new roofs, brackets, and railings; as well as installing a stained glass window. At that point, the owners intended to repair the original siding underneath, if it was feasible.

After removing the original siding, the upper floors were found to be intact enough for in-kind repairs with cedar shingles. However, the first floor was found to have no insulation and numerous areas of failure, and heating costs have been high. In order to install the new insulation correctly, a vapor barrier is required. The contractor has advised that the framing would be open to water damage if the existing siding is repaired without a vapor barrier. The owners have provided several estimates, but the preferred course of action is to replace the first floor with smooth-faced HardiPlank with the original reveal or smooth-faced HardiPlank with a bead (similar to the original siding) but with a 7" reveal instead of 4". This option is significantly cheaper than custom milled siding or stock cedar siding. The cheaper options are preferred, because of the scope of the rehabilitation work which includes foundation stabilization.

The owners' first choice is HardiPlank with the original reveal. Original trim will be repaired where possible. There is no original siding where the front porch used to be, that area was rebuilt as a bedroom and entry. The salvaged material is not enough to reside the entire first floor.

### ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

### STANDARDS

#### North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines for Exterior Siding and Materials

1. **Avoid removal of large amounts of original siding.**
2. **Repair small areas of failure before replacing all siding.** It is rarely advisable to replace all of the existing siding on a home, both for conservation reasons and for cost reasons. Where there are areas of siding failure, it is most appropriate to spot repair as needed with small amounts of matching material. Where extensive damage, including rot or other failure, has occurred, siding should be replaced with as close a material and visual match as is feasible, including matching reveals, widths, configuration, patterns and detailing.
3. **Other materials/configurations.** It is not historically appropriate to replace deteriorated siding with substitute materials, unless it can be demonstrated that:
  - o The replacement material is a close visual match to the historic material and can be installed in a manner in which the historically character defining details may be reproduced (mitered corners, dentil molding, etc); and

- o Replacement of the existing historic material is necessary, or the original material is no longer present; and
  - o There is no feasible alternative to using a substitute material due to cost or availability.
4. **Avoid changing the appearance, pattern or configuration of original siding.** The siding type, configuration, reveal, and shingle pattern all are important elements of a home's historic character.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The wood siding was covered with aluminum siding. The applicant intended to repair the wood siding if it was intact.
3. Original siding, on the upper floors, and trim will be repaired and preserved.
4. It is not recommended to repair the first floor siding without installing a new vapor barrier. The new wood siding options were found to be too costly, considering the other necessary repairs and there is not enough reusable original material.
5. HardiPlank siding has been approved in this district when other options have been determined infeasible (such as large areas of siding loss).
6. The overall visual condition of the house will be greatly improved from the previous alterations.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. McClintock commented that it seemed like Hardie Plank was particularly difficult to miter, adding that the house did not have corner boards and that the areas around bays would require mitering. Sharon Hoover, owner, confirmed that it could not be mitered. Hugh Hoover, owner, added that they would be using corner trim and that they would be changing the visual appearance in that respect. Mr. McClintock expressed concern that they would be changing the look of the house considerably.

Commissioner Steel commented that in the past they had recommended metal corners if Hardie siding is being used. He concurred that the style of house would not have corner boards. Commissioners discussed whether corner board would be appropriate.

Commissioner Johnson asked what the reveal was for the original siding. Mr. Hoover responded that it was 4 1/8". He added that they could purchase Hardie Plank with a four inch reveal or a seven inch reveal that would have a similar profile to the existing siding. It was noted that it would be prohibitively expensive to have a custom siding made with both the same reveal and profile as the existing siding.

Commissioner Steel recommended that if they order the fly corner trim, they paint it the same color as the body of the siding to diminish the visual impact.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 402 North K Street as submitted."

Motion: Williams

Second: York

The motion was approved unanimously.

C. 2106 Pacific Ave (Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District)

*Sign*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1906, this building is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District. The applicant is proposing 15"x10" aluminum letters that read "Brown & Brown Insurance;" The total sign area will be 2'9"x13'4". The



letters will have a gloss white finish. The sign will be installed on the brick, above the third floor windows and to the left of the recently approved Infoblox sign. The sign will be mounted to studs attached at the mortar joints; there will be no drilling into the brick face.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

#### **STANDARDS**

##### **The Union Depot/Warehouse District Design Guidelines for Signs:**

##### General:

1. All new exterior signs and all changes in the appearance of existing exterior signs require Landmarks Preservation Commission approval. This includes changes in message or colors on pre-existing signs.
2. If there is a conflict between these standards and the requirements in the City's Sign Code, the more strict requirement shall apply.

##### Location and Size of Signs:

1. Signs shall not dominate the building facades or obscure their architectural features (arches, transom panels, sills, moldings, cornices, windows, etc.).
2. The size of signs and individual letters shall be of appropriate scale for pedestrians and slow-moving traffic. Projecting signs shall generally not exceed nine square feet on first floor level.
3. Signs on adjacent storefronts shall be coordinated in height and proportion. Use of a continuous sign band extending over adjacent shops within the same building is encouraged as a unifying element.
4. Portable reader board signs located on sidewalks, driveways, or in parking lots are prohibited.
5. Existing historic wall signs are a contributing element within the district and should be restored or preserved in place. New wall signs shall generally be discouraged.

##### Messages and Lettering Signs:

1. Messages shall be simple and brief. The use of pictorial symbols or logos is encouraged.
2. Lettering should be of a traditional block or curvilinear style which is easy to read and compatible with the style of the building. No more than two different styles should be used on the same sign.
3. Letters shall be carefully formed and properly spaced so as to be neat and uncluttered. Generally, no more than 60 percent of the total sign area shall be occupied by lettering.
4. Lettering shall be generally flat or raised.

##### Color:

1. Light-colored letters on a dark-colored background are generally required as being more traditional and visually less intrusive in the context of the Union Station District's predominantly red-brick streetscapes.
2. Colors shall be chosen to complement, not clash with, the facade color of the building. Signs should normally contain not more than three different colors.

##### Materials and Illumination:

1. Use of durable and traditional materials (metal and wood) is strongly encouraged. All new signs shall be prepared in a professional manner.
2. In general, illumination shall be external, non-flashing, and non-glare.
3. Internal illumination is generally discouraged, but may be appropriate in certain circumstances, such as: (i) Individual back-lit letters silhouetted against a softly illuminated wall. (ii) Individual letters with translucent faces, containing soft lighting elements inside each letter. Metal-faced box signs with cut-out letters and soft-glow fluorescent tubes. (iii) However, such signs are generally suitable only on contemporary buildings.
4. Neon signs may be permitted in exceptional cases where they are custom-designed to be compatible with the building's historic and architectural character.

##### Other Stylistic Points:

1. The shape of a projecting sign shall be compatible with the period of the building to which it is affixed, and shall harmonize with the lettering and symbols chosen for it.

2. Supporting brackets for projecting signs should complement the sign design, and not overwhelm or clash with it. They must be adequately engineered to support the intended load, and generally should conform to a 2:3 vertical-horizontal proportion.
3. Screw holes must be drilled at points where the fasteners will enter masonry joints to avoid damaging bricks, etc.

#### **ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The proposed signage meets the district design guidelines for location, size, messaging, and lettering.
3. The light-colored, metallic sign also meets the district guidelines for color and materials.
4. No illumination is proposed.
5. All drilling will be into the mortar joints; there will be no drilling into the brick face.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there was any lighting on the sign. Connie Guffey, Plumb Signs, confirmed that there was not.

There was a motion.

"I move the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 2106 Pacific Avenue as submitted."

Motion: Williams

Second: Schloesser.

The motion was approved unanimously.

## **6. BOARD BRIEFINGS**

### **A. Seymour Conservatory (Individual Landmark) *Restroom Addition***

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1907, the Seymour Conservatory in Wright Park is an individually listed landmark on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. Metro Parks is planning on expanding the Conservatory to accommodate its programming. The Landmarks Preservation Commission was briefed on this project on October 14, 2015 and April 13, 2016. On November 4, 2015, the Commission conducted a site visit at the Conservatory. In addition, Metro Parks has conducted a number of public meetings and opinion surveys. The project team will provide an update on the current design concept and plans for an ADA restroom addition. This addition will include the renovation of the existing outdoor work area at the northwest corner of the Conservatory.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

David Strauss, SHKS Architects, reviewed the proposal for the expansion to the Conservatory which would include a pavilion to the northeast; a new entry lobby; and an underground connection. He reviewed images of the proposed expansion, showing views from different locations in the park. Mr. Strauss reported that they were looking at a scaled down and phased project. He reported that fund raising was currently underway, but that in the meanwhile the conservatory was in need of additional restrooms. He commented that the conservatory currently had only one that was not accessible to the disabled. He commented that they were looking at the smallest addition they could do to get ADA compliant restrooms in.

The proposed addition would go into the northwest section of the grounds in what was currently the work yard area. The existing work yard area was discussed, Mr. Strauss noting a yew tree that was not historic would either be removed or relocated. The proposed structure would stay below the eaves of the existing conservatory, Mr. Strauss

noting that the section that connected to the existing structure would be transparent. The section containing the bathrooms and storage would be an opaque structure that would be enclosed with a green screen of plants and vines so that it would become a garden element much like a laurel hedge. Additional renders showing different views of the proposed structure were reviewed. Mr. Strauss reviewed that they would try to leave the existing grade as it is, the connection would be as transparent as possible, and a green screen would cover the entire added structure.

Commissioner Steel asked for more information on future phases, noting that the previous proposal had indicated that the bathrooms would be built in the basement. Mr. Strauss responded that in future phases they would remove the bathrooms and rebuild them underground. The new connector would become an open space that could be used for a lobby or gift shop.

Commissioner Williams asked if they were required to have ADA restrooms, when they are available elsewhere in the park. It was noted that they were not being required to install the restrooms, but wanted to do so because there was a definite programmatic need for them. Discussion ensued. Mr. McClintock asked why the restrooms needed to be attached to the conservatory. It was noted that the plan that they had brought before the Commission in prior meetings had shown an attachment to the building.

Commissioner Johnson asked who would maintain the glass roof of the gasket. It was noted that Metro Parks would maintain the facility.

Commissioner Williams commented that he did not like to see the building changed at all and wished there was a way to not have to tie into the building. He commented that he felt it was denigrating the building to pierce the exterior. Commissioner Schloesser questioned whether the glazed gasket was necessary or if the bathroom could be freestanding instead. Commissioner Steel noted that the proposal for the full project still connected to the building in the same location. Commissioner Steel expressed concern that there had been support given previously regarding the proposed direction of the project and that they were now changing their feedback to the applicant. The discussion from previous meetings was reviewed. Vice-Chair Jensen commented that plan met the criteria of the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Chair Pratt commented that in the previous conversations it met the 10<sup>th</sup> standard, specifically. She added that the proposal was maintaining the structure's historic use. Commissioner Thorne commented that it was a good way to introduce the public to an element of the future design. Vice-Chair Jensen commented that he would be in support of the immediate addition and the addition in the future as well as they were complimentary given the parameters, program, and the desire to extend the life of the building.

B. 715 South 11th Street, Armory (Individual Landmark)  
*New entry*

Mr. McKnight read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Built in 1909, the Armory is individually listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The project team is looking for feedback on the proposed conversion of an existing ramped entrance into a suitable event entrance. The current entrance has a 1:8 slope that was originally intended for horses, but is too steep for an accessible entrance. The rehabilitation would include replacing the ramp with stairs to match the existing materials, adding a handrail, rebuilding the wooden doors, adding lighting fixtures, and improving the sidewalk area.

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Bill Peretta, AustinCina Architects, reported that they would also be repairing a soffit above the door and adding a few light fixtures. They would also be adding a security gate that would lower behind the arched opening. He noted that the Pantages Theater would be using it as a temporary facility during a planned yearlong closure. He noted that the building had no clear entry feature and that the proposed entry would be the perfect location. The history of the building was discussed. Mr. McClintock reported that the ramp was originally so that the units could march out in formation and the horse entrance was on the other side of the building.

Commissioner Schloesser asked how they would meet ADA requirements. It was noted that there was another entrance with a ramp that was installed in 1939. The ramp was too steep for modern ADA standards and there was a long term plan to fix it for ADA compatibility.

Commissioner Steel commented that the proposed entry had always appeared like it should be the main entrance, that the proposal was moving the project in the right direction, and that it was good to get the building back into use.

Mr. McClintock requested that the element be well documented as it was an original element from the design.

Chair Pratt recused herself from items 6.C. and 6.D.

C. Commerce Street Block (Union Station Conservation District)  
*Mixed Use Development*

Mr. McKnight read the staff report

**BACKGROUND**

Horizon Partners is proposing to redevelop the entire block of Commerce Street, between 21st Street and 23rd Street for mixed use, residential, office, retail, and restaurant space. This area is in the Union Station Conservation district, Landmarks Preservation Commission design review is required for new construction. The project area includes 2105 South C Street, the J. E. Aubry Wagon & Auto Works Building, which is on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and has recently been rehabilitated for retail and office use. Next to it, 2201 South C Street will also be adaptively reused. 2109-2115 South C Street, the Hunt-Mottet Warehouse, is also on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. This building will be rehabilitated with the intention of adding additional floors, as was originally intended during its construction. 2120 and 2200 Commerce Street are the sites of garages that were recently destroyed in a fire. New construction that reflects the design of the conservation district is proposed for those sites. 2250 Commerce Street is slated for a future mid-rise building that is not yet designed. The project team has provided floor plans and renderings of the proposed development for the Commission's feedback.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Mike Bartlett, President of Horizon Partners Northwest, reviewed the they had been looking at projects for locations 1, 2, and 3 in 2012, but the rental market had not been as strong and banks had not been interested in the area. He reviewed the extent of the fire damage, with damage in location 5 and to a lesser degree in location 4, noting that they had torn down building 5 and would be tearing down the other soon. He commented that when they considered what to do with the site that burned, they had discussed replacing both buildings with a single structure. Mr. Bartlett commented that they were excited to be trying out a new product called CLT in the addition, which is a cross laminated timber that would be used for the decking. It would allow them to have the exposed wood ceiling of a traditional heavy timber building and also have a two hour fire rating. They would also do a concrete floor finish. He commented that the addition and the garage projects would be back before the Commission in January. He commented that they wanted to use elements of the original buildings and possibly incorporate original elements, but the fire had destroyed the concrete. They had incorporated the language of the two-story Tacoma Steel building for a restaurant space that would be in the former garage location. Mr. Bartlett commented that they saw the neighborhood evolving into an entertainment focused social gathering place as the University continued to grow. He commented that they were seeking feedback on the proposal to swap the densities of the two buildings, which had resulted in one of the buildings going over the height allowed by the zoning. He noted that they were also voluntarily adding two pedestrian link points between South C and Commerce Street.

Commissioner Schloesser asked whether they could have the building at 2120 be taller, so that 2200 would not need to be as tall. Mr. Bartlett responded that at 2120 if they added two stories on top of the parking garage they would have to add many different kinds of elements making it more of a building and less of a parking garage with a restaurant as it was currently designed.

Mr. Bartlett reviewed that the historic building had originally been designed for six stories, so they would not need to

do anything to the foundations to accommodate the vertical load. He reported that they would need to do seismic work for the addition. He noted that due to power lines on the C Street side, the buildings would have to be set back from the street 10 to 14 feet to comply with safety regulations.

Commissioner Williams commented that he preferred the proposal to vary the height along the street as opposed to an entire block at 85 feet, especially since it was at the end of the district.

Commissioner Steel commented that he had issue with the design emulating the historic structure that was originally there, commenting that it represents a false historic narrative that was not appropriate. He added that the intent of honoring the character was important, but building a replica to the building that was there was not appropriate for the district. Vice-Chair Jensen suggested that they take into consideration how the block is split up, possibly with consideration for a single wider stairway. Discussion ensued. Commissioners recommended making the stairs wider.

Mr. Bartlett commented that they originally had a design for a very modern, industrial building for the restaurant. He asked if it would be better to try and match the style of the district or go with something different and modern. Vice-Chair Jensen noted that one of the standards is not making new things that appear to have been original or imply what had been there before.

#### D. Prairie Line Trail Interpretation Plan

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Artifacts Consulting has been working with the Historic Preservation and Planning staff to prepare a historic resources assessment and interpretive plan for the Prairie Line Trail. The historic resources report contains the results from a survey of the city-owned portions of the rail corridor, a historic context outlining the history of the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods, and recommendations on eligibility to the local, state, and national registers of historic places. The interpretive plan has established a vision statement for interpretation, three historical themes to help guide interpretation along the trail (Place, Transportation, and Cultural Interaction), locations for public art, and approaches for future interpretive efforts. Drafts of these reports are available online.

Historic Resources Assessment: <https://db.tt/cpA7V0DT>

Interpretive Plan: <https://db.tt/yndt6uVXcc>

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

This is a briefing. No action is requested.

Spencer Howard, Artifacts Inc., reviewed that there were two reports: the Assessment and the Interpretive Plan which had been completed at the same time. The Assessment developed the significance statements which informed the themes and provided historic context. With the Interpretive Plan all of that information would then be available to the artists. The other component of the Assessment was to identify what remained of what had existed along the corridor, with the survey focused only on the City owned right of way. He reported that they had looked at each of the blocks and how the development patterns had changed and found that each block had different character based on the uses. The catalogue of character defining features looked at the rail features along the study area that still exist, Mr. Howard adding that there was still a lot including rails, attachment mechanisms, and sheds.

The Interpretive Plan provided the interpretive direction for the corridor that would help visitors understand and appreciate resources when they come to the site. The Interpretive Plan had three parts: strategy, themes, and approaches all of which had been based on the history and the context for the trail that was developed in the assessment report. They had also worked with the Prairie Line Trail Interpretive Committee to get public comment. Mr. Howard reviewed a map of the trail and discussed the themes that they had identified. The three key themes identified were place, transportation, and cultural interaction. There were also subthemes that would help break out specific stories for artists. For the approaches, they had looked at public art, signage, online content, public amenities, walking tours, live performance, and curriculum development. He noted that the project was also a stewardship tool for all of the communities and businesses along the corridor. He commented that they had looked at

different locations for installations along the corridor to provide some guidance to the artists.

## 7. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### A. Commissioner Term Expirations

Mr. McKnight noted that it was Commissioner York's last meeting. He reported that the City Council had reviewed applications and there would likely be two new positions that would get appointed in the new year.

### B. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Hoogkamer provided an update on the following events and activities:

#### 2016 Events

1. History Happy Hour Trivia Night Recap

#### 2017 Events

1. Landmarks Commissioner Training (9am-4:30pm TBD @ Tacoma Convention Center, March 7<sup>th</sup>)
2. Historic Preservation Month (May TBD)
3. Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Youth Heritage Program: Maritime Heritage (July TBA)
4. Arts Month (October TBD)
5. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance (November TBD)

## 8. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Pratt thanked Commissioner York, noting that he had been on the Commission since she had joined, and wished everyone a happy holiday season.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



---

Reuben McKnight  
Historic Preservation Officer