

From: [J Corso](#)
To: [Landmarks](#)
Subject: Support College Park
Date: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 9:38:27 AM

Dear LPC,

Once again, I express my support for the College Park nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

Given your vote to send the previous version of the nomination to the Planning Commission, I hope the commission will be able to quickly debate the merits of this improved version and vote to forward it to the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Geoff Corso
701 N J St, Tacoma

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Patricia Roundy](#)
To: [Landmarks](#)
Subject: LPC meeting 6/28/23
Date: Monday, June 26, 2023 5:36:34 PM
Attachments: [College Park Historic Special Review District June 2023.docx](#)

Landmarks Preservation Commission,

We write today regarding agenda item 5. A. College Park Historic District resubmittal. Our word document is attached. Thank you for your service to our community.

Kind regards,

Patricia and George Roundy

June 26, 2023

Landmarks Preservation Commissioners:

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the College Park Historic District resubmittal. My husband and I have written to you in the past to oppose the creation of the College Park Historic Special Review District Overlay Zone. Our home is listed as a contributing structure in the nomination materials. We bought our home in 1987 and have lived in it continuously for 36 years. We write today to urge you to decline to review the College Park proposal again.

We concur with the findings of the Planning Commission to deny the College Park Historic Special Review District application. Quoting from their letter of November 2, 2022 to deny the creation of this historic district, "The commission finds that the proposed historic district is not compatible with housing goals for the City, including Home in Tacoma, and could have a countering effect on efforts to increase housing supply and reduce barriers." We further agree that "The commission finds that the proposal is not consistent with City policies regarding diversity, equity and inclusion; specifically, that the proposal does not support the City's efforts to achieve equitable outcomes citywide."

I have carefully re-read the initial decision of the Landmarks Commission on April 13, 2022 and the decision on November 2, 2022 of the Planning Commission to deny. We urge you to decline to review this proposal again. The Landmarks Commission did an exhaustive review. Then the Planning Commission did their own exhaustive review. Please allow the decisions of Planning to guide your decision at this time. During your review, I listened as you asked good questions of each other about the interplay of your decisions with Planning's decisions and how historic preservation districts aligned (or not) with the City's larger zoning decisions, including Home in Tacoma. The Planning Commission has given their response.

The resubmitted proposal is essentially the same as the one previously submitted. I read carefully the new supplemental information especially the section on "Design Review." We have a south-facing brick home. It is now recommended that buildings "which face south should not be restricted in the use of solar power," but stipulations remain on windows and any ramp added to the building would still require design review by the Landmarks Commission. As the Planning Commission noted in their letter of November 2, 2022, "...the historic district design review requirements could complicate efforts by community members to install alternative energy sources, such as solar panels, and other green infrastructure, as well as retrofitting poorly insulated homes." They also note "The Commission finds that the proposed district will create some burden for affected members of the community resulting from the fees and the process of going through design review." We agree.

At the May 31, 2023 Landmarks meeting, it was noted that the Commission is not obligated to reconsider this proposal. Since the resubmitted College Park proposal is essentially the same as the proposal you considered during 2021-2022, and given the November 22, 2022 Planning Commission's decision to deny the College Park proposal, we urge you to decline to review this proposal.

Sincerely,

Patricia and George Roundy

From: [Matt Temmel](#)
To: [Landmarks](#)
Subject: LPC Meeting 6/28/23 -- College Park issue
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 11:35:26 AM

Dear Chair Bartoy, other LPC commissioners, and director McKnight,

At tonight's meeting, I hope you will defer further consideration of the College Park historic district re-submittal—basically option 3 in the meeting materials.

I'm sure you have read the recent TNT column by Matt Driscoll about the need to re-think the historic preservation issues and make appropriate changes in city law. The City Council has enacted a resolution about a moratorium, and that does seem like the best course. There is no point in reviewing the CP application again now that the City Council, by a 6-0 vote, has said we need to re-think the issues and revise the current law.

Personally, I think the city should protect historic **buildings**, but it is harder to understand the need to protect entire districts. I have owned a house in the proposed CP district since 1983, and I've walked or biked every street in the area. The overall look is now better than ever, I would say, and that has taken place without the area being a locally-designated historic district.

So, Yes, let's protect buildings, but let's think again about the need to protect entire districts. The current criteria about historic districts are not well aligned with Home in Tacoma nor with the state legislation passed earlier this year. Thank you.

Matt Temmel

