

Members

Katie Chase, *Chair*
 Vacant, *Vice-Chair*
 Chris Granfield
 Duke York
 Jonah Jensen
 Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Jeff Williams
 Eugene Thorne
 Lauren Flemister

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
 Lauren Hoogkamer, Historic Preservation Coordinator



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: February 10, 2016

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

Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Chase, *Chair*
 Duke York
 Eugene Thorne
 Jonah Jensen
 James Steel
 Lysa Schloesser
 Lauren Flemister
 Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
 Lauren Hoogkamer

Others Present:

David Fischer

Commission Members Absent:

Jeff Williams

Chair Katie Chase called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL**2. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 1/13/2015

The minutes of 1/13/2015 were reviewed. Staff provided a correction to the attendance record. The minutes were approved as amended.

- C. Administrative Review: 702 N I Street (basement windows)

3. BOARD BRIEFINGS

- A. Broadway Center naming proposal

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Council Resolution 38091, the Landmarks Preservation Commission reviews and makes recommendations to City Council on name change requests.

The Broadway Center for the Performing Arts (BCPA) would like to solicit investment in exchange for naming rights, both inside and outside their facilities, as part of its Centennial Campaign fundraiser. The campaign is intended to support programming and fund interior and exterior restoration and upgrades for the historic theaters under the Broadway Center's management. The City of Tacoma owns the buildings (Pantages, Rialto, Theater on the Square and Jones Tower), but has contracted with BCPA to operate and maintain the facilities since the re-opening of the Pantages Theater in 1983.

The operating contract between the City of Tacoma and BCPA provides for the conveyance of naming rights to BCPA; however, the City naming policy still applies.

Because this is a component of a fundraising campaign, it is unlike most renaming requests reviewed by the

Commission. Prior to embarking on its campaign, BCPA seeks to provide an overview of the campaign and a preliminary review of the proposed campaign approach. If the Commission concurs with the approach and overall scope, BCPA will conduct its campaign and return to the Commission with its final formal request.

BCPA is requesting concurrence/preliminary approval for the following exterior naming right options:

- Theatre on the Square
- Studio One
- Canopy, entrance to exterior elevator (gives access to 3rd and 2nd floor rehearsal halls)
- Backstage/Production Load-in Door
- Exterior landscaping and re-organized entrance to the Pantages lobby
- Entrance to educational classrooms at 9th and Commerce

ACTION REQUESTED

Preliminary approval for the Centennial Campaign donor naming rights. The Broadway Center understands that formal approval, by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, will be required once the proposed names are identified.

David Fischer, Broadway Center for the Performing Arts, reviewed that they have been in partnership with the City of Tacoma for 33 years; they have brought private sector investment into City-owned buildings since 1979; and they have brought in an average 60% of any given capital drive. He commented that there was nothing different from what they were proposing for public assets being named in recognition of private donors and what happens at the zoo. He reported that they were not proposing anything for the exterior of the historic building except for one spot near the entrance to the classroom space where directional signage is needed anyways. Mr. Fischer noted a number of changes being proposed for safety, function, and aesthetic improvements. Exterior landscaping would improve safety by removing slipping hazards. They would open up a paved area in front of the theater for outdoor activities and construct a modest pedestal. The backstage area and freight elevator entrance would be the location for a proposed extension of the building to increase interior space. He commented that they would like to identify the backstage entrance and canopy entrance and include donor names on the entrances. He noted that they would also like to include naming rights for Studio One and Theatre on the Square. Mr. Fischer commented that the Theater on the Square was identified by writing that was not clearly visible and that it was unlikely that there was any emotional attachment to the name in the community. He commented that the hope was that they would be able to attach two women's leadership names to the Theater on the Square and make the lobby a permanent exhibit that would tell the story of women's leadership in the region.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if there was anything that designated the site as the Broadway Center for the Performing Arts. Mr. Fischer commented that it was a different topic that they would like to discuss with the Commission and related to signage. Commissioner Schloesser commented that she liked the idea of moving the totems down so that they marked the entrance and suggested that they might include a location map. She also suggested that they consider a permeable paving option for the exterior landscaping.

Commissioner Steel asked if the names would be presented at the public hearing. Mr. Fischer confirmed that they would be, but that if there were any issues it was important that they be brought up at the meeting.

Mr. Marshall McClintock asked if signage going onto the other buildings would need to be reviewed by the Commission. Mr. McKnight responded that other non-historic buildings including the Theater on the Square would not need to be reviewed. Mr. Fischer noted that Michael Sullivan would be their historic preservation consultant and would participate in the design review process.

Mr. McClintock noted that there had been issues with permanent naming rights at Lincoln Center. Mr. Fischer responded that they were not anticipating renaming anything as Lincoln Center had done, with the possible exception of the women's leadership panels on the interior of the building.

Commissioner Steel asked if the gifts would be going directly to the projects that they are associated with. Mr. Fischer responded that they wanted to maintain flexibility in order to pay for seismic improvements.

Chair Chase noted for the record that she worked for Artifacts Consulting with Michael Sullivan and that she would be recusing herself for the signage on the Pantages.

Chair Chase cited City policy on place names and name changes and asked if corporations would be considered organizations that could receive naming rights. Mr. McKnight responded that they could be.

There was a motion.

"I move that we make a preliminary approval of the Broadway Center campaign donor naming rights."

Motion: York

Second: Flemister

The motion was approved.

Mr. Fischer discussed how there was tremendous brand confusion about the district, theaters, agencies, etc. He commented that if they could get better branding for the Broadway Center, it could be an anchor for the district and a helpful innovation tool. He noted that there was a marquee near the lobby that faces 9th Street and that the signage was antiquated. He expressed concern that the plastic tiles can be blown off the building and changing the sign involve sending a staff member up onto the roof, which requires expensive yearly repairs as result. He reported that in a discussion with the design team they had considered whether they should include a monument sign with a reader board. He added that they were interested in the Commissions thoughts on what issues or concerns they might have.

Commissioner Steel commented that he had always thought of the Broadway Center for the Performing Arts as an organization and not a building or place. He added that it would be difficult to compete with the Rialto or the Pantages buildings and establish the Broadway Center for Performing Arts as a place. Mr. Fischer commented that they work to find the right balance in the relationships between the different brands, adding that attention given to the Broadway Center for Performing Arts brand benefited and drove traffic to the other brands.

Commissioner Flemister commented that location of the monument sign made sense and that worked without trying to brand a specific building with the name of the organization.

Mr. Fisher commented that the corner of 9th & Broadway was higher than the entrance to the lobby and that a monument sign might impact the visibility of the entrance. Commissioner Steel noted that the lobby might not be original to the building and that a monument signs would not likely be an issue. Commissioner Flemister commented that a person would be able to see into the lobby regardless of the signs location.

4. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Officer Elections

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

Each year, normally in December, the Landmarks Preservation Commission nominates its officers for the coming year. This action has been deferred this year, and at its meeting of January 13, 2016, the Commission nominated Vice Chair Katie Chase for Chair for 2016. No nomination has been received for Vice Chair. Because no other nominations have been received for Chair, Commissioner Chase can be considered elected by acclamation.

There are no specific requirements in the Bylaws specifying the manner in which officers must be elected.

ACTION REQUESTED

Nomination/election of a Vice Chair.

Mr. McKnight reviewed that the Commission had nominated Chair Katie Chase to the Chair position at the previous meeting and that the nomination had been unopposed. There had been no nominations for Vice-Chair. Commissioner Jensen was nominated to the Vice-Chair position by Commissioner Steel and was confirmed as Vice Chair.

B. Window replacement submittal requirements

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

Commissioner McClintock has requested a discussion regarding the development of application materials that could assist the Commission in acquiring adequate information regarding window replacement requests. This time will be used for Commissioners to provide feedback and suggestions for the contents/requirements of such a form.

ACTION REQUESTED

Discussion/guidance

Mr. Marshall McClintock reviewed that there had been concern about maintaining consistency in the requirements expected of applicants in the design review process. He suggested that they consider having a separate tip sheet that outlines what the Commission expects to see when a window replacement is requested. Commissioner York commented that it was an excellent idea so that people have a clear idea of the criteria before they come before the Commission. Discussion ensued among the Commissioners on the appropriate expectations to have on the tip sheet. Commissioners considered the level of supporting documentation required and consistency of requirements across residential and commercial buildings. Mr. McKnight reported that the Planning and Development Services Department had recently changed software and that applications would be submitted electronically. As a result, only fully complete applications would be accepted in the future. Staff would return at a future date with a draft tip sheet.

C. Demolition Review

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the staff report.

In 2016, staff will be developing procedures for the review of demolition permits that involve historically significant or potentially historically significant properties. Although the City does require review by the Landmarks Commission for properties within local historic and conservation districts, and individual City Landmarks, it does not require review for non-designated buildings that are historically significant but that are not local landmarks. The code revisions will primarily reside within the City of Tacoma's SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) regulations (Tacoma Municipal Code 13.12).

Washington State Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11 is the enabling legislation for SEPA review. Under state law, local jurisdictions can set thresholds for exempting certain projects from SEPA requirements. In Tacoma, the threshold for demolition is 12,000 SF. However, there is no exemption for the demolition of historically significant properties under state law.

SEPA regulations require the assessment of potential impacts resulting from development projects within several environmental categories, and proposed measures to reduce those impacts. Impacts to historic resources is one of the categories. Projects that are determined to have no significant impact to the environment receive a Determination of Nonsignificance from the reviewing official, whereas those that would result in an adverse impact that can be mitigated receive a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS). Projects that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact may be required to develop an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Although impacts to historic properties is one area of review, there is little in the environmental code guiding this review. A key objective of this initiative is to lend clarity to the code by providing additional guidance in this area. Key issues include:

1. Currently there is no clear review process for the assessment of adverse effect resulting from the demolition of (non-listed) historically significant structures in Tacoma, although review of impacts to historic resources is a general component of SEPA review.
2. Identification of historic resources affected by proposed demolitions. These may include properties identified in the City's Historic Property Inventory or predictive model.
3. There is also no defined policy or regulations for mitigation of demolitions – which could include documentation, salvage, avoidance or other means.

TENTATIVE REVIEW SCHEDULE

Amending TMC 13.12 will require the review of the Landmarks Commission and Planning Commission, as well as City Council. Staff will be meeting with stakeholders through the spring.

February	Briefing to the Landmarks Commission (addition briefings as needed)
Feb – April	Policy development/Stakeholder input
March	Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability Committee Briefing
April	Landmarks Commission recommendation
April	Briefing to the Planning Commission
May	Planning Commission Public Hearing
June	Planning Commission Recommendation

ACTION REQUESTED

This is an introduction to the topic for the Commission. Staff will provide a more detailed briefing on the framework at its February 24 meeting.

Mr. McKnight commented that there had been a desire to have some sort of demolition review for buildings that are not listed on the register. He reviewed that they currently do demolition review for building that are listed on the register, located in historic districts, or projects that might impact historic resources. Mr. McKnight commented that the challenge was that they do not have a formal SEPA review process for historically significant unlisted properties. The other challenge was that many demolitions will go below the SEPA exemption level. He noted that the State had revised the SEPA rules, allowing jurisdictions to set flexible thresholds. Specific language had been provided into the State Administration Code that allowed Cities to not exempt historically significant buildings. The Landmarks Preservation Commission had been requested to examine how to improve the SEPA process.

Mr. McKnight reviewed the process through which a permit would trigger a SEPA review. The proposal was that the demolition of buildings listed on the City's Historic Inventory, the State Heritage Register, or buildings referenced in the 2011 predicted model would trigger SEPA review even if otherwise exempt. The categories within the predicted model were reviewed. Mr. McKnight noted that Tacoma would be the lead agency for the SEPA review. He reported that demolition would have a posted notice on the property and language to be created that would specify mitigation standards and levels. Mr. McKnight noted that over the spring he would be seeking feedback from different organizations that would be incorporated into the proposal.

Discussion ensued on what to review and how best to determine if buildings are significant. Mr. McKnight noted the criteria that would be used to document whether a home was eligible for the register that could be considered and possibly mitigated should a DNS be issued. The outcome would be to provide guidelines for staff and applicants for mitigation standards.

Chair Chase commented that there are many buildings that can fall through the cracks, where people can assume something is a landmarked when it is not. She commented that the proposal would make sure that at least there is a process that happens and procedures that are followed.

D. Events and Activities Updates

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

2016 Events:

1. Heritage League Mixer Recap
2. CLG Commissioner Workshop (9:30am-4pm @ Tacoma Convention Center, March 15th)
3. Wood Windows Workshop (1pm-4pm @ Earthwise Tacoma, April 9th)
4. Historic Preservation Month, May 2016
 - a) Historic Homes Tour with Tacoma Historical Society(April 30th –May 1st)
 - b) Proclamation (5pm @ City Council, May 3rd)
 - c) Kick-Off with Historic Tacoma (May 6th)
 - d) Amazing Preservation Race (11am @ UWT, May 14th)
 - e) Midcentury Modern Ride—Formerly Known as the Tweed Ride (10:30am, May 21st)
 - f) City of Destiny Poetry Slam: Lincoln District Edition (6pm @ Lincoln High School, May 20th)
 - g) Awards Ceremony (1pm-3pm @ The Swiss, May 22nd)
5. Neighborhood History Walks with the Councilmembers, June 2016 TBD

5. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer