

## Members

Kevin Bartoy, Chair  
Roger Johnson, Vice Chair  
Jonathan Hart  
Sarah Hilsendeger  
Jennifer Mortensen  
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  
BT Doan, Office Assistant

**Date:** January 22, 2020

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

### Commission Members in Attendance:

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

### Staff Present:

Lauren Hoogkamer  
BT Doan

### Others Present:

Duc Dang  
Ben Mauk, *University of Washington Tacoma*  
Ricquel Cardoza, *LDC, Inc.*  
R4 Construction  
Sean Kelly, *SHKS Architects*

### Commissioner Members Excused:

Alex Morganroth  
Lysa Schloesser

### Commission Members Absent:

N/A

Chair Kevin Bartoy called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

### 1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INDIGENOUS LANDS

### 2. ROLL CALL

### 3. CONSENT AGENDA

The agenda was approved as submitted.

#### a. Excusal of Absences

- Alex Morganroth
- Lysa Schloesser

#### b. Approval of Minutes: January 8, 2020

The minutes of the meeting on 1/08/2020 was approved as submitted.

### 4. DESIGN REVIEW

#### a. 1908 Pacific Ave. (Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District) *Temporary mural*

Ms. Koogkamer read the staff report as provided in the packet.

Ben Mauk, University of Washington Tacoma, described the proposed location of the mural, which was the north face of the Walsh Gardner building. He commented that several ideas (e.g. South Sound Proud campaign, activities at the UW, etc.) were considered for the mural and presented sample photos of how the mural would look like, adding that a determinant for the success of the project was when people would take pictures with the mural as the background. He also mentioned that there would be markers on the sidewalk to guide people as

where to stand for pictures. Furthermore, the vinyl material would be removable without damaging the brick wall hosting it.

Vice-Chair Johnson asked about the ability of the vinyl to stick to the uneven surface and stated that he would prefer a matte finish if possible. Commissioner Hart inquired whether there would be any residual adhesive after removing the mural. Mr. Mauk clarified that it would be applied using a heat technology to conform the vinyl to the wall, not adhesive.

Commissioner Mortensen made a motion: *"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 1908 Pacific Ave., as submitted."*

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**b. 1122 N. K Street (North Slope Historic District) Deck railings**

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report as provided in the packet.

Duc Dang, the property owner, explained the changes and the proposed design for the railings.

Commissioner Hart questioned if the wood would be painted, to which Mr. Dang responded affirmatively. Commissioner Williams noted that the railings in the proposed design looked narrow in comparison to the historic railings, and suggested that the owner use a flat stock instead. Further discussion ensued. Overall, the Commission wanted to see a revised design with flat stock railings, chunkier bottom, and a re-alignment of the railing posts with the main floor pillars.

Commissioner Stewart made a motion: *"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission defer the application for 1122 N. K Street., pending revised changes that were discussed."*

Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**c. 100 S 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Bowes Building Wireless installation**

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report as provided in the packet.

Raquel Cardoza, LDC, Inc., explained that the historic building was significant to Verizon for its location and proximity to businesses and offices. To accommodate the growing population in the area, Verizon was looking to expand their coverage and capacity by installing new technologies including the 5G antennas. Ms. Cardoza presented visuals from different angles of how the building currently looked and how it would look like with the proposed changes. She also provided a progression of the previous proposals.

Commissioner Williams commented that the visual of the existing structure, which was missing from the presentation, was what the Commission would evaluate in perspective with the proposed design, not the rejected proposals.

Commissioner Hart asked why Verizon chose this building over other taller buildings nearby where the antennas would be less noticeable from street level. He added that he was familiar with the low level of density and activities in the area, which prompted him to question Verizon's selection of the building.

Commissioner Williams noted that Verizon also had a long-term lease on the building, and that he would not vote to approve the design because the massing was still too large.

In reference to the rectangular antennas seen from the southwest corner of the proposed design, Commissioner Hilsendeger inquired about the necessity for them to be so close to the front of the building. Ms. Cardoza explained that they were placed in a way so that the signal would cover targeted locations in the area such as the Fireman's park, Interstate 705, etc.

Ms. Hoogkamer indicated that the applicant had reduced the overall visual impact and moved the antennas away from the more prominent façade. She also noted that the information on density, frequency, technology and such was not part of the Standards guidelines for the Commission.

Referring back to the progression of the proposed designs, Chair Bartoy walked through the visuals from each side and pointed out that only one of the four views was improved, the remaining three had little changes from what had been originally proposed.

Ms. Cardoza stated that the steel framing had been eliminated and the antennas had been reduced both in quantity and height.

Commissioner Williams added that the two largest panels, which the Commission was concerned about, had not been addressed in any of the revised proposals.

Commissioner Sundstrom indicated that the Hearing Examiner's report largely discussed the south (**primary secondary**) elevation of the building, which was not included in the drawings but would be helpful to the Commission. And she reiterated the Hearing Examiner's request for Verizon to provide a lowered alternative design, specifically in reference to the visual impact of the south elevation.

Commissioner Hart additionally requested a plan of the existing equipment on the building and one for the proposed design.

Ms. Cardoza stated that she would bring the Commission's comments back to the engineer and see what else could be done.

Commissioner Hart made a motion: *"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission defer the application for 100 South 9th Street, pending the revisions discussed."*

Vice-Chair Johnson seconded the motion. It passed with seven votes in favor and one vote against by Commissioner Williams.

**d. 603 N. Ainsworth Ave (North Slope Historic District) Garage replacement**

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report as provided in the packet.

R4 Construction, gave an overview of the project and provided clarifying information to the Commission's questions.

Commissioner Mortensen made a motion: *"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for 603 N. Ainsworth Ave. including the demolition of the garage, as submitted."*

Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

The meeting recessed at 6:53 p.m. and resumed at 6:56 p.m. Commissioner Williams had been excused for the rest of the meeting.

**e. Seymour Conservatory (Individual Landmark) Rehabilitation**

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report as provided in the packet.

Commissioner Hilsendeger recused herself for she was on the Board of the Seymour Conservatory Foundation.

After introducing themselves, the applicants presented the current conditions of the conservatory and its proposed plan with renditions of what they would look like, adding that they were accounting for 20% replacement of the glass. The applicants also considered using fiber glass for the windows if that was agreeable to the Commission.

Ms. Hoogkamer noted that the conservatory was not an interior landmark; thus the Commission was not reviewing the interior, information provided was merely for context.

Regarding having the door wider on one side to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Commissioner Mortensen wanted to know if the option of having one large door had been considered. The applicants responded that it would be too wide and could lead to other issues. The Commission suggested adjusting the ratio of the two door panel to accentuate the intended size difference. The discussion continued surrounding the material for the window replacement.

Commissioner Mortensen made a motion: *"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the*

*application for the Seymour Conservatory with suggestion of widening the door and reducing the size of the sidelight.”*

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

Chair Bartoy asked for clarification on the motion, whether it was a suggestion to change the door or a requirement.

Commissioner Mortensen revised her motion: *“I would like to amend the motion that we require the resizing of the front door and that can be approved administratively.”*

Commissioner Hart seconded the amended motion. It passed unanimously.

## 5. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

### a. Amendments to the Guidelines, Bylaws, and Inventory

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report as provided in the packet and requested a motion to move forward with a public hearing.

Commissioner Cade pointed out that, in the ~~session~~ section about garages and accessory structures, it was not clear on how those terms were defined. Discussion ensued regarding the definition and application of the terms “garages,” “accessory structures,” and “detached accessory dwelling units,” which staff would check with Land Use definition and code.

Commissioner Stewart made a motion: *“I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission set a public hearing date for February 12, for the amendments to the Guidelines, Bylaws, and Inventory.”*

Commissioner Sundstrom seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

### b. Events & Activities Update

At the Heritage League Annual Meeting on February 1, Tamiko Nimura would be speaking about her work in Black and Japanese American History.

The next event would be the Trivia Night on March 18, for which staff was open to receive suggestions and input.

Commissioner Stewart indicated that on March 21, there would be a free workshop hosted by We Are History Keepers! at the Slavonian Hall from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., on how to preserve and display historic items.

The Sacred Spaces Tour, which traditionally had consisted of historic churches, would additionally feature Buddhist and Jewish temples this year. It would likely be an all-day event in March or April.

## 6. CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Bartoy updated the Commission that the Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee was compiling a list of underserved/underrepresented groups and individuals to increase representation and knowledge about their historic places. He asked for suggestions from the Commission.

Ms. Hoogkamer recommended reaching out to the Youth Commission to include youth in the effort.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:49 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: <http://www.cityoftacoma.org/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=67980>***