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June 3, 2022

Tacoma Planning Commission
City of Tacoma
747 Market St # 345,
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: College Park Historic Special Review District

Dear Commissioners:

I have been asked by Jeffrey Ryan and the College Park Historic District Association to provide comments to the Planning Commission concerning the College Park Historic Special Review District (College Park HSRD), which is now before the Commission for review following its approval by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. I have background and long experience in land use and zoning matters, including involvement with several issues relating to application of historic preservation regulations.¹

In summary, the background facts, read in conjunction with the Tacoma Comprehensive Plan and other regulations, support a recommendation of approval of the College Park Historic District to the City Council.

BACKGROUND

The current proposal for landmark status designation at the City level is unusual because the College Park Historic District has been listed on both the National Register of Historic Places and the Washington State Heritage Register since 2017. The National Register listing is the highest honor a historic property can achieve and follows a rigorous process of application, justification and review.

Against this background, the College Park HSRD has been reviewed by the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) over a ten month period from May, 2021 to March, 2022. The LPC held fourteen meetings to discuss College Park, in addition to

¹I have practiced land use and environmental law since 1970 and am the co-author of the Zoning Chapter of the Washington State Bar Association’s Real Property Deskbook.
two public information sessions dedicated to the proposal. As indicated in the staff report, the historic designation of the District has enjoyed substantial support from the residents of the community and the public in general. The LPC’s final recommendation of approval of the College Park HSFD was issued on April 25, 2022.

In sum, the consistency of the College Park HSFD with historic standards is largely beyond question. As the matter comes before the Planning Commission, the emphasis of review now turns to consistency of the proposal with land use policies of the City and particularly consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. As will be shown below, the proposal is fully consistent with, and in fact, reinforces comprehensive plan goals and policies.

CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNITY

Any land use analysis of the College Park HSRD begins with an understanding of the character of the existing community.

The lots in the College Park community were laid out in the early 1900s and are mostly 5,000 square feet in size, largely consistent with the current R2 and R2 SDR zoning within the proposed district.

Another defining characteristic of the District is that alleys were included in the area’s original plats. These alleys are unusually wide, being an average of 20 feet. This allows for access, parking and servicing of lots (deliveries, garbage collection etc.) to the rear of the lot, not the front. Alleys are features encouraged in the existing zones, including R2 and R2 SDR. Thus the presentation of the College Park homes from the street does not include curb-cuts, driveways or views of garage doors common in newer residential developments. The wide alleys also mean that garbage pickup and utility services commonly take place in the back of the lots, keeping garage trucks and unsightly refuse containers from view in the street.

In addition, most houses in the District have at least partial second stories, many in the Bungalow style established before “ranch” style homes became popular in the 1950s and 1960s. This feature contributes to the efficient use of land by allowing maximum usable floor area on a modest footprint.

Further, the community has generous sidewalks and very wide parking strips. These features contribute to enhanced communications between neighbors in the area, more attractive streetscapes and increased safety for pedestrians.

Moreover, the home designs and architecture, while representative of their era of residential construction (1910 to 1940), vary from house to house and lot to lot. These homes’ features differ from more modern subdivisions that often present only three or four mostly similar designs throughout the community.
Finally, even a casual walk or drive through the community shows that upkeep and maintenance of properties is of high and consistent quality. As an example, parking strips are well maintained, watered and mowed. There are very few vacant homes or empty lots in the neighborhood. Long-time residents recall only one or two home demolitions in the last twenty years and there are few undeveloped lots.

Given the physical characteristics of the community, we now turn to whether the Tacoma Historic District designation is consistent with planning goals.

**CONSISTENCY WITH LAND USE PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT PRINCIPALS**

As a part of its responsibilities, the Planning Commission focuses on the following in its decision making:

3. In making a recommendation to the City Council, the Planning Commission shall consider the conformance or lack of conformance of the proposed designation with the Comprehensive Plan of the City

TMC 13.06.060.C.3.

To begin, we look at the planning goals of the Growth Management Act found at RCW 36.70A.020, which guide the development of local Comprehensive Plans. Two matters are of importance here. First, Goal 13 provides:

(13) Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures, that have historical or archaeological significance.

(Emphasis supplied).

Goal 4, dealing with housing, provides:

(4) Housing. Plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock

(Emphasis supplied).

The Goals of the GMA are in turn the guiding principals for the Tacoma Comprehensive Plan. The question is whether the establishment of the College Park HSFD is consistent with housing goals and policies.
Of course, the biggest issues regarding housing in Tacoma are affordability (Goal H-1) and equitable access to housing (Goal H-3).

In examining impacts of the College Park HSFD on these Comprehensive Plan Goals, it is first recognized that the College Park community is a very long established residential area that has two characteristics, mentioned above, that demonstrate consistency with the critical goals of the Comprehensive Plan. First, the lots in the community are routinely small compared to other residential neighborhoods, with most lots about 5,000 square feet, with a density of approximately 9 units to the acre. The area already has a very efficient use of land. Second, the homes in the area are comfortably family sized through second stories, which increases the gross living area per home compared to those with one story. Third, the Future Land Use Map for Tacoma continues to designate the entire College Park HSFD as continuing as single family through the life of the Comprehensive Plan.

With the comprehensive plan indicating the continued existence of the current single family residential zoning, what impacts will the College Park HSFD have on central Comprehensive Plan goals of affordability and equitable access to housing, now being discussed in the Home in Tacoma review? The short answer is the historic designation will have little impact on goals of affordable and accessible housing. The historic designation will only impact the visual appearance of the homes in the District from the street side and will not impact other zoning criteria (mentioned below). Importantly, the creation of the Historic District will not impact uses adjacent to the alleys in the community. We are aware that increases in housing density in single family areas are anticipated by use of detached or attached accessory dwelling units. The College Park community is better positioned for ADU or DADU development because access to such units will not have to come from the street, but will be available through the alley. But except in limited circumstances, the Historic District designation will not impact such development.

On a zoning level, the District already meets requirements of the Zoning code related to TMC 13.06.060 E. (Single, Two and Three-Family Dwelling Minimum Design Standards) and F. (Small Lot Single Family Residential Development Minimum Design standards), which are found in TMC 13.06.100, Building Design Standards. The community of the College Park HSRD includes features already in the required design standards, including:

- Covered entries
- Orientation toward the Street
- 15% of street facing facades are transparent.
- Vehicular access and garages placed off an alley.
- Facade variety already exists.
- Clear defined building entries facing the street.
- Primary rooflines for two story houses face the street.
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These are contributing features to the Historic District which would likely be preserved during review of any proposed alterations to the existing construction.

A final comment: The adoption of the College Park HSRD provides a unifying force within the neighborhood. Residents share a common identity and goals to preserve and protect not only residential values, but also the maintenance of historic character. These efforts will enforce strong community values with a shared and common identity.

In summary, the adoption of the College Park Historic District is fully consistent with both the Tacoma Comprehensive Plan and the zoning code.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on all appropriate factors, the Planning Commission should recommend the adoption of the College Park Historic District to the City Council. As the Planning Commission acts in an advisory basis to the Council, a recommendation of approval should be forwarded to the Council even if the Commission has questions or comments regarding the proposed Historic District. Final action on a matter of city-wide interest should be made by the Council following the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this comment.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]

J. Richard Aramburu

JRA: cc
cc: Jeff Ryan
College Park Historic District Association
Hello,

I am writing to voice my disapproval of the proposed College Park Historic District. For the record, I live in this neighborhood and own a home here.

This proposed district serves some existing homeowners to the detriment of everyone else. Barriers to development increase housing costs for many populations, including renters by decreasing the total number of rentable units in the supply, homeowners in the area who may not prioritize a particular aesthetic and will be forced to bear costs of supplemental reviews and stringent building requirements, and college students, who are the entire reason that "College Park" exists in the first place, by increasing their housing costs.

As a city we should increase density through more development, and make every neighborhood welcome to all people. This proposed Historic District moves us in the opposite direction and should not be adopted.

Thank you,
Philip Arbaugh
3602925587
Please reject the college park historic district.

This faux pass at a historical neighborhood creation is racist, anti-growth, attempt at modern day redlining and exclusionary zoning, through and through.

It’s counter to to the welcoming and inclusive ideals of our city. Please reject this vapid proposal.

Andrew Austin
3617 S 8th, Tacoma, WA
--
Sent in transit
To: Tacoma Planning Commission

Thank you for your invitation to attend the informational meeting and public hearing for the proposed College Park Historic District. I am unable to participate in either meeting so ask you to consider the following:

In keeping with goals of the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan--GOAL DD–12 Integrate and harmonize development with the natural environment and GOAL DD–13 Protect and preserve Tacoma’s historic and cultural character, I suggest that you move forward with adopting the historic designation for the proposed district.

Sharon Babcock
16 N Summit Road
Tacoma WA 98406
253-759-3627
Dear Tacoma Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my support of the college park historic district being adopted and recognized by the city. I was born and raised in the college park district, and decided to purchase a home 30 years later in the same district, to begin to raise my family.

The adoption of the College Park historic district is a way to honor the history of the city of Tacoma as well as the craftsmanship of historic homes including craftsman, 4-squares, and Tudor homes.

I’m a recent poll sent out by the landmarks commission 2021, itshows that a majority of people who live in the district support the historic district as being officially recognized and adopted by the city of Tacoma. These are the voices of the people that live within the boundaries.

The district encompasses a wide range and dense number of people who live within the boundary. According to the city census map as well as a recent study done by UW Tacoma, the district has one of the highest densities of people living per block as well as the highest percentage of non-white residents compared to other areas of Tacoma- central, west, and North. In addition, the district is sprawling in terms of types of housing offered and walkability of the neighborhood. When it comes to sustainability, historic preservation is one of the best ways to provide affordable housing.

After recent updates to the permitting process by Mr. Mckight, the process of applying for a permit is easy to follow and the fees and permits are not exorbitant. This review and application allows both owners who wish to make updates as
well as owners who wish to age in place, both voice and accessibility.

My husband and I both strongly support the college park district being adopted at the city level for these reasons. We urge the planning commission to approve this adoption as well.

Thank you,
Jenarae and Nicholas Bach

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Planning Commission members,

I write to say that I am firmly opposed to the proposed College Park Historic District.

I live within the area and find this proposal absolutely inequitable, regressive, and anti-community for a variety of reasons.

First, the city budget should be focused on programs that benefit those who are underrepresented and actually need help, rather than on landmark administrative costs to benefit a privileged bunch in the North End. Taxpayer funds should not be wasted on this vanity project.

Second, our neighborhood aesthetics are already protected by the National Historic Registry. We do not need more rules that favor the few and their property values and prevent the many from sustaining their community.

Third, this proposed historic district would put undue hardship on middle- or working-class and retired folks who love living here, have done so for years, and choose to upkeep or remodel their property within their means rather than move.

On my block alone within the last few years, 4 households have had work done on their property to be able to keep living here — dormer expansion, ADU, new siding, new windows, etc. These projects would be either disallowed or unaffordable under the new proposed district regulations. The changes made by these neighbors have not made their homes look bad. On the opposite, our community feels great pride of ownership. A big part of that is the sense of belonging to our neighborhood, something that would stop once necessary property updates are no longer permissible or affordable. This proposed district would force families like mine, who have been saving up to remodel and better accommodate growing children and aging parents, to relocate!

This is the opposite of an equitable and community-focused plan. Tacoma deserves better.

I love this neighborhood. I love my neighbors. And I say a big NO to the proposed College Park Historic District.

Jenny Bartoy
Tacoma Planning Commission,

Mayor Woodards and Tacoma City Council,

I write this letter to ask to you to DECLINE adding the area referred to as College Park as a historical district.

The Planning Commission should decline creating yet another historical district just as the Tacoma City Council declined creating a historical district on the West End.

The proposal is contrary to the agreed upon values of Tacoma.

I write this as a 24 year resident of the North End and the former chair of the North End Neighborhood Council.

**Hurts Affordable Housing Effort**

Requiring any significant infilling of this area would add significant costs and to add ADUs. DADUs, or new larger houses in the area. Most new housing in Tacoma is far larger than older house and can hold more people.

All developments or modifications to housing would have to go before the Landmarks Commission which can add many months to projects and thousands of extra dollars.

Reducing the ability for Tacoma to infill and add more units creates unnecessary scarcity and shortage of housing. This scarcity of housing causes prices to increase at a higher rate than they normally would and causing housing displacement at increased rate.

Violates Intention of Equity Index of City of Tacoma
The Equity Index in Tacoma was an expensive and long term analysis which sought to determine where the most opportunity there was in Tacoma:

"It is one of the primary tools that City staff, partners, and other decision makers use to help ensure they are making data-informed decisions to improve access to opportunity for all community members."

Designating a portion of North Tacoma a Historical District would erect yet another barrier for people to live in this area of town.

**Thwarts Efforts to Implement Home in Tacoma**

The new College Park would make infilling through the Home in Tacoma very difficult and expensive. The College Park effort is little more than an a NIMBLY effort to thwart any significant infilling in this area of Tacoma.

**Historical Preservation**

If there are houses that deserve to be protected, they can be placed on the historical registry. There is no need to place yet another whole section of the city in amber where adding more housing units is made far more expensive and difficult. There is no need to make this area of Tacoma so exclusive.

This area of North Tacoma is not significantly different than any other area of Tacoma. There are far larger more architecturally complex and historically significant areas of North Tacoma than this area. The entire reason for this proposal is to limit or slow housing infilling of any kind around UPS.

**Environmental Concerns**
College Park is right next to UPS. This is an area that SHOULD easily allow more density of housing so that students can live and walk to campus instead of requiring them to live remotely from campus and drive to work. Designating the area a Historical District would thwart these efforts. Most colleges around the country have high density housing around colleges. Instead of reducing barriers, this measure attempts to create more barriers.

Conclusion

The College Park proposal is purely an exclusionary NIMBY measure to thwart reasonable development and add much needed housing. This area will still be protected by the current zoning in the area.

Sincerely,

Erik Bjornson
North Tacoma
To Whom It May Concern:

I support the College Park Historic District Nomination. Please forward the Nomination onto the City Council.

Thank you! Respectfully, Roy Bond. 253 255 8878
For the 6/1 hearing.

From: Todd Bond <bndmgc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2022 10:10 PM
To: Landmarks <landmarks@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: College Park Historic District comment

I would like to ask the members of the Planning commission to approve the proposed College Park Historic District. This new District would bring a sense of community to this diverse collection of home styles. When people feel a sense of belonging, they tend to keep homes in better conditions, clean up garbage they did not create, and are more willing to help one another. This neighborhood is home to turn of the century homes, as well as 1920's, 30's, pre war, postwar, mid century, 60's, 70's etc. Including a Peanut butter and Candy manufacturing at North 8th between Junett and Cedar Streets. Please put your support behind this Historic District. Thank You Todd Bond 3008 N 8th St.
May 24, 2022

Tacoma Planning Commission  
747 Market Street, Room 349  
Tacoma, WA  98402

RE: College Park Historic District Nomination

Dear Members of the Tacoma Planning Commission,

On behalf of the Board of Historic Tacoma, I am pleased to write this letter of support for the listing of the National Register College Park Historic District on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, and to endorse its designation as a Historic Special Review District.

College Park represents a significant period of development in Tacoma both historically and architecturally. Its streetcar development pattern and modest, well-built homes perfectly reflect the optimism of mid-20th century Tacoma. The nomination is comprehensive and well executed. It has passed a high hurdle of review by the WA State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the National Park Service. Its listing on the National Register of Historic Places is a well-deserved honor.

This nomination comes before the Planning Commission backed by an impressive volunteer effort and years of preparation and outreach, as well as having the backing of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The support of the residents is well documented and speaks to the pride we all share in this legacy neighborhood. We urge you to take the most important step of local designation and ensure its continuing legacy.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Brooker,  
Board President
I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed College Park Historic District in Tacoma. I urge Planning Commission members to vote no on this proposal for the following reasons -

- our city is experiencing a significant crisis in housing, specifically the affordability and availability of homes. This proposal would exacerbate that problem.
- The homes in this proposed district are perfectly lovely, but I do not see any evidence of historical significance that would warrant this district.

Again, I urge the commission members to vote no on this proposal.

Thank you,
Jessica Brown

--

Jessica Brown

"Life moves pretty fast. If you don’t stop and look around once in awhile, you could miss it." - Ferris Bueller
Good Afternoon,

I am a homeowner inside the proposed College Park Historic District. We are opposed to this proposal. Besides following the building codes, as a homeowner, I have the right to decide how I want my house to look and how I wish to make improvements. The Historic Preservation has no right to tell me as the owner what to do. I purchased the property not them. They should keep their hands-off private property. My style is my own and I don't need to agree with their ideas. Historic Districts are ruining cities. There is no legit reason to keep houses stuck in the past. If they want to protect certain historic properties, they should purchase the properties themselves and not change them.

It's time for them to pound sand and leave our neighborhood alone.

Aaron Byers
3316 N. 19th. St.

Aaron R Byers, Director of Operations

First Presbyterian Church Tacoma

20 Tacoma Ave. S. TACOMA, WA 98402

(253) 272-3286 Ext 119 / abyers@fpctacoma.org

Caution: This email is both proprietary and confidential, and not intended for transmission to (or receipt by) any unauthorized person(s). If you believe that you have received this email in error, do not read any attachments. Instead, kindly reply to the sender stating that you have received the message in error. Then destroy it and any attachments. Thank you.
Please support the designation of the College Park state and national historic district as a city historic district.

The Planning Commission’s role in the process is to determine whether the proposed nomination is consistent with the city comprehensive plan. It is then up to the city council to determine if the nomination should be approved.

The College Park nomination is consistent with the comprehensive plan. Goal DD-1 states: “Design new development to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, aesthetic and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change.” Historic preservation is not about freezing a neighborhood in place or turning it into a museum. Rather it is about managing the change that will inevitably take place in a way that preserves the character of a building or neighborhood so that it continues to represent a part of the city’s history. The definition of “low-scale development” also recognizes that change may occur in historic neighborhoods: “Infill in historic districts is supported to expand housing options consistent with the low-scale designation but must be consistent with the neighborhood scale and defining features, and with policies discouraging demolition.”

Goal DD-13 specifically addresses historic resources: “Protect and preserve Tacoma’s historic and cultural character.” Designation of the College Park neighborhood as a city historic is a significant step in preserving and protecting the city’s historic and cultural character. The nomination is also consistent with and furthers policies DD-13-1, 2, 3, 5, 11, and 12.

Those of us who support historic preservation are particularly concerned about demolition. My neighborhood, the North Slope Historic District, was formed largely because of concerns about acquisition of old homes by developers who were demolishing those homes to build new apartment buildings. This had been encouraged by the City’s upzoning of the neighborhood to R4L. Since the neighborhood’s historic district designation and the city’s adoption of the more appropriate HRM-SRD zoning category, unnecessary demolitions have stopped, more homes have been restored, and more are owner-occupied. In addition to the loss of historic buildings, demolition of viable buildings results in unnecessary waste, use of greater resources to rebuild on those sites, and in the case of residential house, usually results in the replacement of more affordable housing with less affordable housing.

Just as the study of history can no longer be limited to the workings of wealthy, white males, historic preservation cannot be limited to only the “grand” buildings that they once inhabited or worked in. Our history must include the ordinary – the people who worked, ran businesses, and raised their families in Tacoma neighborhoods. Likewise, the city’s historic preservation efforts must include the residential neighborhoods that represent the time periods during which the city developed. College Park is one of those neighborhoods that is architecturally intact and represents a significant time in Tacoma’s development. Other neighborhoods will meet those criteria as well, and I hope that they too will be considered for historic preservation.

Please support the College Park historic district nomination.

Deborah L. Cade
908 North M St
Tacoma, WA 98403
We write in opposition of the proposed College Park Historic Review District.

We've lived in the Buckley's Addition/College Park area for over ten years. We love our 1905 house near the University of Puget Sound campus, and like so many others we appreciate a beautiful old Tacoma home being restored to its former glory.

But like literally every other neighborhood in Tacoma, College Park needs a lot more housing for everyone, and this proposal will do the opposite of that. Despite good intentions, historic districts make the development of new housing difficult or impossible, drive up the pricing of existing homes for both renters and buyers, further institutionalize redlining and other historic wrongs that kept people out of communities, and limit the property rights of homeowners.

At a time when the City is rightly focusing on equitably addressing the housing crisis, making our walkable neighborhood near transit and businesses and 6th Ave less accessible for housing development seems counterproductive and harmful.

Thank you,

Justin and Bess Camarata
To Whom It May Concern:

I support the College Park Historic District Nomination. Please forward the Nomination onto the City Council.

Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone
I live in the neighborhood near this district and think this would be a fabulous idea. There are many very charming houses in this district area. It is a hugely pleasant place to walk. I would like this area to be protected and preserved. Thank you.

Ann Clark
Hello Tacoma Planning commission,

My husband and I moved to Tacoma in 2000 and bought a bungalow craftsman home that was built in 1925. We love our home and neighbors! We moved here because we wanted to be a part of this unique city and the charm of the “North Slope Historic District” has.

We have raised our daughter here and she attended Stadium High School. Both my husband and I work in the area. Neighborhoods like this are an important part of families making lifelong friendships!

We appreciate the work you do and wanted to express to you the importance of maintaining this unique neighborhood where many families call their home!

Kindest regards,

Ruby

Ruby, Ron and Xia Collins
710 N M Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
For comment record, if not too late.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "tiobini@nventure.com" <tiobini@nventure.com>
Date: June 3, 2022 at 3:22:53 PM PDT
To: "McKnight, Reuben" <RMCKNIGH@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: College Park Historic District

Mr. McKnight,

My name is Perry Colombini and my wife and I reside at 3411 N. 18th St. We have lived here the past 41 years. We love our neighborhood. It's charm and character along with location make it, in our opinion, one of the most desirable locations to live within the city of Tacoma. We (spouse and I) are writing to let you know of our disapproval of the proposed "college park historic district". We have listened to the presentations and see no advantages to creating said district. In the 40 plus years we have lived in our home the charm and character that I spoke of has not changed. Why the need for this designation? Frankly in listening to the different presentations there has been more confusion than clarity. Different explanations have been given to similar questions. Why develop a process that is only going to create more bureaucratic red tape.

We see no benefit to the creation of the district, how it would enhance our neighborhood or the greater benefit to the city of Tacoma. We respectively request that the commission decline said request.

Thank you,
Perry Colombini

PS: this will add little value because unless they speak for themselves I'm sure you will give little weight. However, many of my neighbors who are not engaged in paying attention to this proposal have all voiced disapproval when hearing about it. I hope they speak up.
To the Tacoma Planning Commission,

Submitting my support for adding the College Park Historic Neighborhood to Tacoma Historic Districts. College Park has already met the rigorous inspection to receive the National and State of Washington historic designations. I have learned that this nomination has been applauded as the most seriously researched and documented package seen by many associated with Tacoma and State Historic Preservationists. Overwhelmingly voted in support by Tacoma’s Landmarks Commission, whose sole purpose is to understand what makes historic buildings significant to our City’s history.

The Planning Commission plays an important role in helping to support the policies established under the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan which includes Historic Preservation and establishing zoning regulations. I have listened to testimony that included Sr. Planner Elliott Barnett, who confirmed that the new Home in Tacoma zoning changes will not be affected through approval of College Park to become a historic district.

Have also learned that the University of Puget Sound does not take exception, what so ever, to the establishment of College Park to join Tacoma’s other historic districts.

I am proud of the efforts of past and current City citizens and City staff efforts to preserve our Tacoma's historic homes and buildings. When visitors come to Tacoma, they seek out learning about the people and industries that founded our heritage because it is unique and one of a kind.

Lastly, I hope the Planning Commission will assist our Historic Preservation staff to seek out other areas of Tacoma that mirror the same small and sturdy housing, created by early builders who designed and built homes to last for centuries.

I commend the efforts of Jeff Ryan who has spent his own personal time researching this time capsule of these homes. The City should appropriate additional funds for such historic neighborhoods as McKinley, Lincoln and others for similar research to be completed and allow passage to join formally Tacoma’s historic areas.

Lastly, there have been some who feel that managing historic districts is costly to the City. It is one of the most important services the City provides to connect our past, present and future through the buildings and people who call Tacoma home.

Jodi Cook
To the Planning Commission City of Tacoma,

I fully support the College Park National Historic District efforts in being named to the Tacoma Registry of Historic Places. I have supported their efforts the last two nominations for the Registry of Historic Places in Washington State and in the eyes of our Nation. I fully believe in the history of our city and preserving it. In your comments from the last Planning Zoom meeting, the chair made it sound like our neighborhood, the one which is presented by the College Park District, is full of wealthy people who have bought their way into this nomination. That could not be farther from the truth. All efforts have been through the neighbors who have gone door-to-door with petitions, researching the history and speaking to council members. All donating their time, not copious amounts of cash. Our neighborhood is comprised of working class citizens, college students and families. You should actually tour the College Park District and see for yourself. I feel that the chair and other members of your commission are bias toward us and our efforts to preserve our history. Our community is not against the expansion of Tacoma and instead of working against us, you should be working with us. Many cities have done just that. Please follow their example.

Sincerely,

Barbara Cordis-Lowe
1002 N Junett Street
Tacoma, WA 98406
To the Planning Commission

I have lived in the Northend since 1985. In 2003 we searched the Northend for a quiet well kept neighborhood. We looked at several properties in the College Park area. We looked in University Place as well. It was ultimately the charm and feel of the area that helped us decide to buy our home which we have now lived in for almost 20 years.

Our neighbors have changed, the landscaping has changed in many of the neighboring homes, but the character and appeal of our neighborhood has not. We haven't had any infill housing, nor any homes that have been demolished to only be replaced with tin sheds, you know what I am referring to—those structures with corrugated aluminum for siding. Protecting the lure of this area will in fact keep our property values in place and will continue to generate much needed tax money for our city. Keeping the historical significance of the area is important, because as I have witnessed, once one of these older homes is destroyed, it is not being replaced by a property that exudes the same feel as the early 1900's charm.

Please put me down as a strong supporter of the College Park addition, and allow our future generations to enjoy the history of our great city.

Rod Cory
3007 North 12th
A Contributing Property to the College Park Addition
I live in this proposed area and yes my house is old, and that is what it is. I am wondering what the Historical Societies agenda is and for whom it serves. There is actually no preserving the past, it is gone, I could see preserving certain buildings and maintaining the family character of the neighborhood. Seems to me the Historical Society is more about living in the past and ignoring the present.

I do not want archaic rules imposed on my house. WE, my wife Athena and I, are looking at developing an ADU on our property. 1) There is a very real housing shortage, especially affordable, safe, and human housing. 2) we will both be on social security soon and would also like the additional Income.

I will be honest. I am not a fan of the historical society. If some people want to have their Old House deemed historical, let them do it on an individual basis. As far as our neighborhood goes, it is lovely and I love living here. Let the Historical folks impose the ideas upon themselves. I really think there's some agenda lying underneath this proposal, and I can't think of what it would be, and this is a simple family neighborhood. Leave it be and let those who do not live here keep out of our lives. Thank you for your service to our city, It can't be easy.

With respect, Nic Daniel
P.S. See you at the zoom meetings.
Nomination of College Park to City of Tacoma’s Register of Historic Places

To: The Planning Commissioners
From: Felicity Devlin
Date: 5/31/22

I’m writing in support of the nomination of College Park to the City of Tacoma’s Register of Historic Places. Although I don’t live in that neighborhood, I appreciate the historic value of the district and believe it merits the designation. Both the Tacoma municipal code and the Comprehensive Plan explain at length why historic preservation is so valuable to our city. College Park is an historic asset that belongs to all Tacomans and should be preserved for future Tacoma residents.

College Park certainly meets the criteria required to receive the city’s designation. The district was built between the 1890s and 1960s, with much of the development occurring between 1910 and 1940. College Park thus has particular historic merit as an intact neighborhood that reflects the development of Tacoma. As the nomination states, the district provides examples of “the full range of residential architectural styles prevalent during Tacoma’s greatest period of growth.” And, unlike many neighborhoods, it has escaped widespread demolition and redevelopment and thus retains much of its historic fabric. The neighborhood was home to middle and working class residents involved in diverse occupations vital to the dynamism of the city. In sum, College Park helps tell the story of Tacoma and reflects the aspirations of its residents.

It is precisely because so much of the historic fabric remains intact that College Park warrants the strong protections that come from inclusion on the City’s register. The National Register may ensure that buildings of outstanding architectural or historic significance are given a demolition review; however, it does not safeguard buildings that, while they may not be architectural masterpieces, nevertheless contribute to the historic ambience and integrity of a neighborhood. Inclusion on the City of Tacoma’s register does provide demolition review to these contributing buildings, recognizing them as essential to the whole. Mechanisms to deter demolition will become increasingly valuable in areas like College Park. The homes in this neighborhood are smaller than the homes many contemporary buyers are seeking. These historic houses therefore face the threat of demolition to make way for single-family houses built on a grander scale.

There are additional environmental benefits to deterring demolition. The homes in College Park were constructed with robust natural materials and were built to last. Not only are they resilient but they’ve also paid off the energy taken to build them.

I agree with those on the Planning Commission who lament that it’s left to the hard work and expertise of individual Tacomans to ensure our diverse historic
neighborhoods and structures are protected. It does indeed take time and some expertise to draft a nomination to Tacoma’s Historic Register. And this does create barriers to ensuring the inclusion of all our historic assets that merit it. However, this is not an argument for denying College Park’s inclusion in the register. Historic preservation is not a zero sum game, with the preservation of one historic neighborhood shutting out the chances of another. And we shouldn’t level the playing field by contriving an equal lack of protection for all. Rather, the focus of the City should be to provide funds and assistance to areas that are currently under-represented. The aim should be to ensure we preserve all our historic buildings and neighborhoods.

Tacoma has been given the opportunity to provide historic designation to one important historic neighborhood. We should seize this chance while also continuing to promote preservation of historic assets across the city.

Thank you,

Felicity Devlin

(Staff note: Letter e-mailed from felicitydevlin@yahoo.com)
We live at 3403 North 18th Street, Tacoma. We are not in favor of establishing the proposed College Park Historic District.

Dave Douglas
d.b.douglas@comcast.net
253-759-2565 / 253-208-2277
Please recognize the College Park Historic District as a historic district within the city of Tacoma.

Best,

David Eichner, CPA
From:  
To:  
Subject: I support the College Park Historic District Nomination  
Date: Thursday, June 2, 2022 6:50:40 PM  

David Eichner, CPA  
1511 N Cedar  
Tacoma WA 98406
To Whom It May Concern:

I support the College Park Historic District Nomination. Please forward the Nomination onto the City Council.

Thank you!
For the 6/1 hearing.

From: Micheal Frank <thirdeye52@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 12:53 PM
To: Landmarks <landmarks@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: College Park Historic District comment

You need to make college park a historic district, to preserve these old homes.

Mike Frank
407 no. L st
Tacoma Wash 98403
Tacoma Planning Commission,

Having lived in Bothell, the moment we visited Tacoma's North End my wife & I instantly fell in love with the culture & architecture of the area. So much so that without knowing anyone in the area, we put our house on the market within 2 weeks of visiting North Tacoma for the first time. We were able to also find a home in the now College Park District as well shortly after.

We love the old homes, the neighborhoods, the quieter streets. It just "feels" like home all around us.

On the flip side I work in Seattle and have seen beautiful neighborhoods with historical significance filled with tear downs and modern homes popping up all over the place like a sore thumb. Not to mention the horrible traffic.

I greatly fear losing the neighborhood feel as it currently is for my children to grow up in. I simply don't trust contractors coming in and building multi-dwelling family housing units that will add to the neighborhoods. I just don't see how that kind of talent now days will match what the craftsmen from the 1910's, 20's and 30's had created, especially with the type of building materials that we now use.

**The BIGGEST reason we moved here- The historical feel of our neighborhood.** I gave up a longer commute for it. If it just turns into modern homes and apartments then I might have well just stayed in suburbia Bothell. The north end is special for a reason.

I greatly favor making College Park Historical District as part of the Tacoma Historical register.

Thank you,

Brian & Elisa Friske
3016 N 10th St
Tacoma, WA 98406
To Whom It May Concern:

As a Tacoma citizen living near the proposed Historic District, I oppose this neighborhood designation.

The burden to homeowners of design review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission far exceeds any benefit to homeowners.

I urge the planning commission to reject this proposed historic district.

Kind regards,
Lara Gabriel
Planning Commission,

I support the College Park Historic District nomination.

Thanks,

M. Gregory

Sent using the mail.com mail app
Hello

I would like to stand in support of the College Park Historic District. We desperately need to protect historic neighborhoods and architecture and this is a crucial step.

Thank you

Jess Guatney
Tacoma resident
--
Jess Guatney
COMMENTS ON PROPOSED COLLEGE PARK HISTORIC DISTRICT
We vehemently disagree with the proposal. As neighbors of the district (we live just north of the area), we walk through the area frequently and have neither observed nor been informed of any unique or interesting history.

We believe that this proposal would raise costs for homeowners, at a time when housing costs are already high. This could lead to further gentrification, which limits racial diversity, at a time when we finally recognize that racial diversity is essential, as is the opportunity for people of color to be able to purchase homes and benefit from the equity involved.

We are concerned that this proposal could reduce diversity of housing at a time when Tacoma needs more diversity and density. Density is needed in order to bring more housing to our town, which is struggling to increase housing stock.

We believe that this proposal is a thinly veiled attempt to get around the Home in Tacoma proposal. With all its faults, Home in Tacoma is one way to increase housing options, which are badly needed for all the reasons listed above.

Please do not approve this misguided proposal.

Noel and Bill Hagens
3214 No. 27th Street
Tacoma 998407
Hello,

Thank you for the recent notifications regarding the upcoming hearing for College Park as a Historic District for Tacoma. Being able to review the documents that describe how this change would impact us as homeowners in the district was very helpful. We fully support this moving forward.

Sincerely,

Dan & Melissa Hager
3017 N 16th St
253.381.6843

Sent from my iPhone
From: Erik Hanberg <erikemery@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 1:52 PM
To: Landmarks <landmarks@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: college park historic district public comment

Hello,

I am writing with a public comment about the college park historic district. I do not support this designation for the neighborhood. If there are individual historic structures within the district that are representative of the period, I think it's appropriate for those homeowners to apply for the status. But I do not support the entire area becoming a historic district. It should be able to grow and change like any district in Tacoma. New buildings, duplexes, or other options included in the Home in Tacoma plan would be great here. It would help provide housing for UPS students and better Tacoma. I encourage you to decline this path.

Sincerely,

Erik Hanberg
Hello,

As a resident of the North End I ask you to not move forward with the creation of the College Park Historic District. Designating this area as a historic district will create more barriers to developing housing in Tacoma. We need housing more than we need to preserve the historic aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Thank you.

Thomas Irby

Feel free to respond to this email at your convenience. I don’t expect replies if you are outside of work hours, or on vacation.
To Whom It May Concern

Following are comments on the proposed College Park Historic Review District:

We have been residents of the proposed district since 2010. Since then we have improved our home several times:
* added a full bathroom upstairs
* remodeled the kitchen, including insulating it for the first time
* added solar panels that more than offset our home's electricity demand
* replaced several windows to improve their energy efficiency (each window replaced is in keeping with the home's mission style)
* finished the basement to make a legal bedroom for guests
* finished the backyard with a formal patio and garden

We are in favor of the proposed historic district with the following caveats:
* any review process should cover only the street side of the house, and not the other three sides (i.e., if someone wants to replace a window in the back with vinyl, then that should not be subject to review). This point was made by others as well, but it's not clear what the Commission intended.
* solar panels should be exempt from review. Tacoma has a climate plan which aims to be decarbonized by 2050. Solar panels fit into this plan, and also will help homeowners to replace their gas stoves with electric induction stoves, by off setting any increase in electricity demand.
* the process to review any application should have a clear timeline. We recommend that the review process not take longer than 30 days once a complete application has been submitted.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.

Christopher and Anne James
3115 N. 13th Street
98406
Dear Esteemed Planning Commissioners,

I'm writing to make sure you are considering the possible unintended consequences of this proposal. The establishment of the College Park Historic Review District seems to be an attempt by the wealthy white homeowners in this area to stymie the Commission and City's good work around allowing affordable multifamily housing through the Home In Tacoma.

While not an outright ban, this review district will put up enough barriers and red tape to make Home In Tacoma's vision of small-scale multiplex housing construction cost ineffective. And yet this is an area where Tacoma needs to be most encouraging to affordable multifamily housing, not only to serve the nearby student population but also because of the district's prime location near transit, schools, jobs, services, and walkable areas.

Please don't allow North End homeowners another method of blocking the less affluent from enjoying and living in one of the most desirable neighborhoods in the county. And don't allow for a process where aesthetics considerations overrule all other important City priorities.

Thank you,
Erik Jaszewski
Central Tacoma resident and renter
Apologize I am on the road and could only submit via a photo from my phone.

Jill Jensen
3002 N 13th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406
June 3, 2022

Tacoma Planning Commission
Tacoma, WA

To Planning Commission Members:

Please consider our request to approve the College Park Historic District in Tacoma.

As homeowners in this district since 2004, and the owners of two homes in said district, we have worked hard over the last 18 years to improve the structures and landscape of the properties we own. We have spent over $75,000 in improvements to our address at 3002 N. 13th St, always voted to support tax levies for school and city infrastructure improvements, participated in our local community events including cleanup efforts, served on our neighborhood council, initiated neighborhood block parties, welcomed new residents and worked hard to create a sense of community for all. Because of this, we have close relationships with those in the proposed district, and those people include folks from different countries, cultural backgrounds, sexual orientations, and the very fabric of our neighbors is what makes our district a wonderful place to call home.

In addition, we have maintained a rental property located at 2919 N 15th St. since 2004, housing students and families from all walks of life. We have welcomed Transgender, Lesbian, African American, New Zealand Maori, Chinese, Japanese, Caucasian, Lebanese, and people of numerous and varying faiths.

Our neighbors are not elitist, as has been asserted by some, nor exclusionary. My immediate neighbors include a family from East India, African Americans, several single women, a Lesbian and Gay couple. Everyone is welcome, attend our neighborhood functions and although red-lining may have been a problem in Tacoma's past, it is not a part of our district now that we have ever seen in our 18 years of living in our community. These assertions are hearsay and if they are not, should be proven with facts before labeled on the people who call our area home.

Here are the words of a local real estate agent who sells homes in this proposed district – notice the words he uses to describe his listings in the area, verbatim:

Property #1

“This pristine, updated craftsman home in the walkable ZUPS neighborhood is the best blend of old and new. Come home everyday to original woodwork and turn-of-the-century finishes ... On the historic register!”

“College Park is recognized on the national historic register... Overall, these are older stately homes, that range from primarily craftsman style to larger colonials.” Address 3220 N. 20th St, Tacoma, WA
Property #2

"Elegance personified! This lovingly-maintained craftsman in North Tacoma’s UPS neighborhood has all
the best of old and new. Enjoy vintage architectural appeal."

"The UPS neighborhood has it all: close to Proctor and 6th Ave... and a lot of classy old architecture. This
is a vibrant sense of place." Address 3115 N. 17th St., Tacoma, WA

The real estate agent who benefits from the architectural appeal of selling homes in the ‘historic district’
is our former City Council member Anders Ibsen, who also states in response to a comment to Justin
Camarata:

“It’s “affordable” for the owners who bought decades ago, paid off their mortgages, and enjoy $750,000
equity.” He has also referred to those who live in the North End of Tacoma as “elitists” who wear
“strings of pearls”. How is it possible to have this detest for people whose homes he is personally
profiting from? There is a palpable anger of some Planning Commission members who have disdain for
residents in the district and North End in general, and our hope is they can set aside their own personal
issues – whatever they may be – and make the decision to approve the Historic district on the City’s
criteria, rules, guidelines, and nomination’s merits - not that of their own feelings.

What will be gained by denying this Historic designation now? Will it guarantee red-lining will be
eliminated in the future across Tacoma? Will other Historic designations be denied because red-lining
happened decades ago in those areas? Why can’t we work to lift up all of Tacoma and save the very
thing that makes people want to move to our community - the very things Anders Ibsen describes to sell
his listed homes?

As a final request, we would specifically like a response to a comment made by Commissioner Anna
Peterson during the May 2022 meeting in which she said there were “numerous” errors in the
documentation of information submitted by Jeff Ryan. We are of course assuming that assertion of
errors were ones which would preclude the nomination from moving forward and not simple, non-
consequential ones. Please provide us with the information so that we are able to verify it for
authenticity.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Jensen

3002 N. 13th St
Tacoma, WA 98406
Hello Planning Commission,

I’d like to voice my opinion that the College Park neighborhood in Tacoma should be designated as an historic district. This area requires city assistance to enforce zoning use restrictions to single family homes only to maintain its historical integrity. Please preserve and protect this area as a valuable historical record of Tacoma architecture.

Thank you,
Kara Jensen
(206) 920-6131
3002 N 13th St, Tacoma, WA 98406
I currently live and own a home in the College Park boundary. I also own a rental house within the proposed district boundaries. As a citizen concerned with the importance of maintaining our community, I feel it's critical that steps are taken to assure our city doesn't fracture into an unrecognizable place. The look and feel of Tacoma neighborhoods is important to me, and I have significant investments in this particular neighborhood. This is a small step to historic preservation that's important to ALL of us. Just look at some of our neighbors to the north. I do not want Tacoma neighborhoods to look like West Seattle, Kirkland, or other communities who have lost their identity. I urge you to adopt the College Park Historic District as recommended by Landmark Preservation.

Robert Jensen
3002 N 13th and 2919 N 15th
Hello,

We are residents of the College Park district. My wife and I would like to **firmly reject** the proposal to establish the College Park Historical Special Review District.

We have many reasons for being against this proposal and designation, from issues with the organizers of the proposal, to all the missing details of such a proposal.

One of our biggest issues is quite simple, if we want to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars to enhance our absolutely nothing special property, how does a review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission help this already lengthy and cumbersome process?

Please, know your neighborhood before you start imposing more requirements on individual property owners investments.

Thank you,
Ken & Kendra Johnson
Madam Chair and commissioners,

The College Park nomination is before you with a majority of residents in favor of designating the neighborhood a community worth preserving. Preserving is an inaccurate description, protecting its integrity is more accurate. It will not be a museum but a living changing and alive ode to the people and spirit of the growth and hopes of our predecessors. Without some guidelines the character will rapidly change as investors see this area as a goldmine to exploit. Right now College Park seems stable but population pressure will entice development and major changes. Vote to approve so that this homogeneous area stays this way and not some visually jarring hodgepodge of mediocre buildings.

Thank you,

Roger Johnson

former LPC member

--
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Hello,

I am writing as a resident and home owner in the College Park district. I have overwhelming support for the designation of this district. My family lives in a vibrant district of historic homes that need this designation so that their beauty can be appreciated for the next century. Additionally, given that our neighborhood is already fairly dense compared to Tacoma as a whole, we are doing a great service to our community as Tacoma considers alternate density initiatives. We are proud to live within this district that has been designated as a historic Landmark neighborhood and would hope that our local planning department can recognize what a jewel of a district this is as well.

Thank you for your time.
All the best,
Katy Juranty
3010 North 19th Street
Hello,

I own a home located in the proposed College Park Historic District and I strongly oppose this. Creating this historic district doesn't support diversity, equity and inclusion. It's a bad look for this neighborhood. It's extremely disappointing to see this moving forward.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kohler
1208 N Cedar St.
Dear City of Tacoma,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed college park historic district. We live at 3309 N 19th Street in the proposed area. This proposal is harmful to efforts both to ensure affordable housing for and diversity and equity of our community. Please note that our house has been listed on maps submitted by proponents of the proposal as being in support of these plans. We are not.

Thank you for your consideration
Pamela Kohler (and Justin Pecott)
Hello,

YES, please preserve our neighborhood!!!
I have been a resident of this neighborhood since 1968 (I was 4 years old when my family moved into this house). I live on N 10th and Fife St which I HOPE will become a part of this protected Historical District.
It is extremely important to preserve this community as a single family home neighborhood. It is changing as I am witness to many apt complexes going up near 6th Ave and creeping into the N End; the proposed apt bldg. on N 8th and Oaks for example. This is NOT good or welcomed. My priority is the safety of this neighborhood for its children especially. Already the traffic has become of high concern with the cars speeding up and down 10th St as well as Fife, Oaks, Prospect, Pine, etc.
Then there is the history here. When my parents did some upgrading to our home in 1968-69, they found the signatures and date of those who built this house and when. I believe that these histories are what need to be respected and preserved and protected. The only way I see to do that is to keep our historic neighborhoods intact and protected.
Thank you for your time and concern from a Tacoma Native.

Cherie Larsen
I’m emailing my support of having the College Park area added to the historic special review district. It is more important than ever that planning be considerate and maintain integrity. Tacoma is a beautiful place to live because of the distinctive characteristics of homes that include the work of master craftsmen and architects.

Amanda Lecompte

Sent from iPhone, excuse the brevity
Liz Leske

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Hello,
I live two blocks from the proposed historic district at College Park. I do not agree with adding additional difficulties in zoning to this area. Housing prices are already rising far beyond the rate of inflation. This will make it even more difficult. Being next to a college campus, the area should be more compatible with multifamily housing in order for low income students to be able to afford to live next to their school. All this historic district would do is hinder the development of Tacoma in order to allow for a growing population.
Thank you,
Samuel Lindergren
Hi Reuben,

As a team member who worked over the last 12 months on the College Park Nomination, I thank you for the thoughtful and concise presentation you provided this evening. In addition, I appreciate the work you did and your fielding of questions from members of the Planning Commission. While I don't agree with every comment, I support the process.

Having said that, I was very offended by the Chair's comments at the end of the meeting. I feel that the Chair accused the Landmarks Commission of passing on a nomination that did not get adequately vetted. Her rant was nothing short of appalling.

Comments like, "It is not PC's Job [sic] to prove the viability of the nomination..." I don't understand the statement. Isn't that what the last 12 months were all about? Would the nomination not be in front of the Planning Commission had Landmarks not approved it to move forward? In the eyes of the Landmarks Commission, the nomination is viable - at least, that is what I am lead to believe.

She accused the author of the nomination (Jeff Ryan) of not correctly supporting his research. Everyone who has read the nomination knows that the 1200 pages in the nomination are well documented and researched. They include empirical evidence and data regarding the benefits of the nomination to the city and its residents, redlining (it was not prevalent in the boundaries of the College Park District), ADU development, etc.

As you know, nothing in the college park nomination is haphazard. The Chair's implication is insulting and, I believe, proves she has not read the nomination.

She even went as far as to say the nomination is not viable because the district is recognized nationally and by the state. This comment makes no sense. I can go on about how it is pretty challenging to get nominated nationally and by the state, but then I'd be walking into the weeds with the Chair. And, you already know how absurd the comment is.

For you and the Landmarks Commission, who worked diligently during these last 12 months, it is dumbfounding that the Chair felt so compelled to make such a loud pronouncement in front of the commission this evening. All before public hearings and due process as the city charter demands. Unfortunately, she has tainted this nomination, and I believe her actions could be grounds for the Chair to recuse herself from the nomination's public proceedings.

Long and short, I want you to know that our community greatly appreciates your efforts. I knocked on 500+ doors within the district last summer. As a result, I had over 300 discussions/conversations with my neighbors, and I can say that we are a diverse and exciting, and invested population. We care! Because of that experience, I remain optimistic about the nomination.
Please let me or anyone else helping with this nomination know if we can help you provide more evidence and support or documentation and data to the PC.

Thank you once again!

Tom Lowe
Real Estate Broker
Office: 206-569-8484
Mobile: 323-791-7705
tlowebroker@gmail.com
www.tomlowehomes.com
HomeSmart Real Estate Associates
To Whom It May Concern:

I support the College Park Historic District Nomination. Please forward the Nomination onto the City Council.

1002 N. Junett St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

Thank you!

Tom Lowe
Real Estate Broker
Office: 206-569-8484
Mobile: 323-791-7705
tlowebroker@gmail.com
www.tomlowehomes.com
HomeSmart Real Estate Associates
Planning Commission:

I strongly support the College Park National Historic District efforts in being named to the Tacoma Registry of Historic Places and the historic overlay district that it would create. As a lifelong resident of the South Sound, I feel it's critically important to celebrate what makes Tacoma such a beautiful, livable city. The proposed designation is appropriate because of our neighborhood's history and high number of existing homes which contributed to the National and State Historic designations, which it already enjoys.

Thank you,

Mike Malaier
College Park Resident
Hello,

I’m writing to express my concerns over the proposed College Park Historic District.

I believe the proponents of this district are less interested in preserving their history and are instead motivated by their desire to limit even the slightest densification of their neighborhood. Their houses are no more historically significant than my 1924 craftsman a few blocks away, regardless of their proximity to a college.

I urge you to reject the application for the College Park Historic District.

Thank you,

Matthew Mauer
To whom may be concerned:

I write in support of Historic Districts. Affordable housing and historic districts do not conflict. Often older homes are the single best repository of existing affordable housing.

I have lived in Western Europe for five years, and so I know it is fully possible to preserve culture in a building heritage and also having affordable housing. It is not an either/or proposition.

The problem is that while Tacoma has construction codes, it has zero design standards. So you were are faced with the reality of a building like this in a neighborhood of 100 year-old craftsman homes:

I have no objection to the number of units, especially as it is close to 6th Ave with public transit. But the tin can aesthetic is jarring and unnecessarily clashes with a 100+ year old neighborhood.

Historic neighborhoods are a limited option that exist in only two sections of the city, perhaps three with the new. That leaves 98% of the city that is more economically feasible for affordable housing.
Dear Chair Petersen and Planning Commission:

Home in Tacoma (HiT) commits to adopting policies that: (2.) Allow diverse (missing middle) housing types, such as duplexes, triplexes, cottage housing and small multifamily, in designated low-scale areas including most currently single-family neighborhoods; and (4.) Ensure new housing is well-designed and complements the scale of the neighborhood. Under the current HiT map of Low and Mid-scale, 89% of the College Park Historic District is designated Low scale, and 11% is designated Mid-scale (two half blocks along N. 8th and ~ 11 half blocks along N. 21st). However, other aspects of the HiT ordinance 28793 passed last December suggest that little Mid-scale will be possible in those areas since it states that Mid-scale development is to be “...harmonious with scale and residential patterns of the neighborhood through building height, scale, width, depth bulk and setbacks ...” and calls for design standards that “...provide smooth scale transitions by methods including matching low-scale height maximums where Mid-scale abuts or is across the street from Low-scale areas.” (Ordinance 28793, pgs. 2-8 to 2-9).

However, the College Park Historic District already contains 24 duplexes, 7 triplexes, 3 4-plexes, and 3 buildings with six or more units (2 of which are listed as contributing), which are 6% of its total buildings. Additionally, 73 or 13% of the College Park buildings are non-contributing or vacant lots where new buildings can be built. Nor does contributing status restrict density or use as shown by the many contributing houses in the North Slope Historic District that now contain multiple rental units. Currently 92 units of multi-family housing have been identified within the College Park district, though it is likely higher since the city does not track all ADUs. With available unit data, the College Park Historic District already has 9.3 dwelling units/acre, which is higher than many of Tacoma’s residential neighborhoods. Ordinance 28793 sets the density range for Low-scale at 10-25 dwelling units/acre. Moreover, historic districts in Tacoma comprise 1.6% of its area while View Sensitive Districts, which are far more restrictive and often have restrictive covenants, comprise 12% of Tacoma’s area.

The College Park Historic District has had no racially restrictive covenants, and none were ever sought. Although some have claimed that the area benefited from redlining, no evidence of that has been found. The early, racist FHA-backed loan program focused almost exclusively on new construction since it was created in part as a jobs program. Because Tacoma was largely built out by WWII, FHA’s impact is found primarily in the then-undeveloped areas near the city’s boundaries, mostly in east, northeast, west and southeast Tacoma. FHA also restricted its loans to small, simply designed houses and hence would not have been available for the older, larger, and more elaborate Craftsman and Tudor houses that make up most of College Park.

College Park’s historic significance and material integrity has already been evaluated Tacoma’s Landmarks Preservation Commission and recommended for inclusion on the city’s Register of Historic Places. The proposed historic district is clearly congruent with Tacoma’s Home in Tacoma, sustainability and environmental goals. As the SEPA Environmental Checklist (SEPA File Number: LU22-0086) on the College Park proposal tates: “The proposal is not anticipated to either drive new development or prevent new development from occurring. There is no anticipated impact to development density, which will continue to be controlled by underlying zoning.”

I support the designation of the proposed College Park Historic District to the city's Register of Landmark Places and urge you to vote likewise.

Sincerely,

Marshall McClintock
For 6/1 hearing

From: Jennifer McDonald <jen@vandonald.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 3:32 PM
To: Landmarks <landmarks@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: College Park Historic District

Dear Landmarks Commission,

Please accept this letter as support for Tacoma’s Landmarks Commission to accept the National Historic District ruling that was made in 2017 to recognize College Park as a Historic District just as Washington State recognized it with rigorous standards back in 2018. Elliot Barnes stated in a Home in Tacoma meeting that having a historic district accreditation does not jeopardize Home in Tacoma. Design standards within a historic district do not prevent new construction but require builders and designers to meet the neighborhood aesthetic. This is also something that HIT is looking to implement too. So when people say that accepting the National and State recognition of being a Historic District is a way of limiting growth in the community this is an incorrect conclusion. I want Tacoma to be in control of what our neighborhoods and city looks like and not in the hands of developers who are looking to make big profits with subpar construction design. We do not want to repeat the mistakes that were made in the 60’s and 70’s and we should protect the craftsmanship while increasing the amount of affordable not market rate housing.

Thank you for your consideration and thoughtful decision process.

Best,
Jen McDonald
Living in College Park since 2003
As residents who have OWNED and restored a 1926 Tudor in the proposed College Park Historic District for the last 25 years we enthusiastically support the city in making our neighborhood an official Historic District.

It is the will of the majority of homeowners in our neighborhood that we receive historic status.

We previously owned a home in Central Phoenix in a well-established historic neighborhood downtown. In Phoenix, one of the fastest growing, dense cities in the United States, there are 36 historic districts.

Somehow a city with rapid growth and development, has been able to preserve 36 separate neighborhoods within the city boundary in perpetuity. In fact, the city embraces the historic districts.

The argument that maintaining a historic building would price out a homeowner making them unable to "age in place" could be mitigated with a historic preservation fund if this even proves to be true.


There was a comment made that decisions would be based on what is good for Tacoma and not just for our neighborhood. This comment was loaded with political and personal agenda.

I recently visited my historic house in Central Phoenix which we purchased in 1990. The Willow neighborhood was virtually unchanged. However, I did not recognize the city that grew up around it. Apparently, Phoenix has found a way to preserve a few small blocks of history while still meeting the needs of an endlessly growing population.

Please make an impartial fact-based decision that represents the will of the majority of homeowners and rental residents of College Park.

Designate College Park a historic neighborhood.

Thank you,

William and Laura Meade
3116 N 12th Street
Hello,

We live within the proposed district and have been largely out of this discussion. I am a professor at UPS and I am finishing up my year long sabbatical in Spain. A friend just alerted me to the public hearing. While I appreciate the hybrid virtual/in-person meeting, it is after midnight Spanish time and we will not attend.

We have lived in our house since 2008 and have done much work to it, including an extended kitchen in 2009(?). It was critical to us that our addition be built in the period of our 1916 house. We bought the house because we love the Craftsman character and the neighborhood. We want it to continue being a beautiful neighborhood.

However, I am not sure how this proposal will do what it intends. I have not seen a compelling argument other than it might keep some houses from being demolished but that already seems to be somewhat protected. I do not wish for the charm of our 1916 house to hold us back from the needed efficiencies of the 21st century. We have been entertaining the idea to invest in solar panels. Would solar panel installation require additional review? If so, this is a short sighted objective and one that I can not support. I was saddened to read that window replacements would be up for additional review. We have replaced many of our windows with wood frame, double pane, low E windows. To have this increase in energy efficiency (as well as expensive authenticity of Anderson wood frames) bogged down with added review would again be short sighted. Or if the installation had to be with a specified contractor and I couldn't do it myself, this would make it financially impossible, make my home less efficient, and I would not support this plan.

This proposal allows the insides of the buildings to be gutted and to have any "authenticity" removed. Landscaping (or lack thereof) can be just as detrimental to aesthetics as exterior renovations. One house on my block is in need of repair. Will we start to mandate the upkeep of this house? The homeowner does not have the financial resources to do improvements. Will we want an HOA next?

In terms of equity and inclusion, I would guess that this area has an average home price of $700,000. I am not sure how an inclusion or equity discussion can be had at this price point. Also, it seems that there could be creative solutions to help a bit more density with dual family structures. I am not proposing tearing down Craftsman homes to make apartment buildings but there have to be some middle grounds. I hope we are not succumbing to NIMBY-ism.

While perhaps well intentioned, I am quite concerned about this proposal with environmental and social reasons.

Dan Morris-Burgard
I am writing in support of this district. Tacoma hasn't done enough to preserve its historic character. It makes it appear that the city doesn't value the things that make it unique and attractive, including its history. Forest Grove, OR has three historic neighborhoods and they market them as an attraction to their town.

Thank you.

Dawn Nanfito
To the Planning Commission, in support of the College Park Historic District overlay proposal:

“Why this area? What’s the appeal?” was one of several concerns raised at your May 4th meeting of the Tacoma Planning Commission. As a homeowner and 30 year resident I encourage you to Walk it, drive it, experience it. The College Park Historic District makes sense, it is sensibly sized and appropriately defined. It has a coherence, cohesiveness, it is harmonious, it is pleasant place. “A nice neighborhood” is a compliment we’ve heard many times from visitors in our 30 years of residency. You can get that sense just by glancing through the pictures in the national application. And if you sense something out of place, it is probably a non-contributing property, and it gives you a sense of how vulnerable a neighborhood can be to unmonitored changes.

At the North End Neighborhood Council May 2 meeting we heard a presentation on Tacoma’s planning department new staff facilitated Neighborhood Planning Project. At the risk of being misinterpreted, I can humorously project what future key findings will be:

McKinley study: “We don’t want a nuisance derelict abandoned school building attracting attention in the middle of our neighborhood anymore. We’d like it turned into a community center.”

Proctor study: “We don’t want any more unbuffered unmitigated high rise mixed use redevelopments enveloping and abutting our detached dwelling units. Furthermore, we want the abandoned electric substation turned into a community center before it becomes a nuisance.”

Tacoma needs more nice neighborhoods. These are difficult conversations to have: Talking about “districts” traditionally includes intentionally inclusive or exclusive or otherwise divisive language such as: “Boundaries, borders, edges, margins, buffers.” Even adding new lines to a map is misinterpreted as being racist. Housing, or lack thereof, also includes language making assumptions about the definitions of “family” and numbers of dwelling units. Even making a statement that there are plenty of other places in Tacoma that can support and absorb higher density residential uses sounds marginalizing or exclusive. As in: “Not in my backyard”

We support Home in Tacoma, and we support the College Park Historic District, and we don’t believe that supporting both is contradictory. Tacoma is a big place. College Park district is a small fraction of the area. Denying - or approving- this recommendation will not end the climate crisis or housing crisis. We don’t need to wait for the Neighborhood Planning Project to get around to us. We do need you.

The College Park Historic District overlay zone proposal comes before you after years of work following various processes, it is ready made, citizen led, with many residents and others in support saying we like it as it is; It comes with National and State recognition, and with the recommendation of the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation board and is forwarded to you after additional extensive work by staff. We strongly urge your approval and passage to the City Council.

Sincerely,
Robert Neal
I support the College Park Historic district nomination

Kathy Norgaard

Sent from my iPhone
June 1, 2022

c/o Chair Anna Petersen, Planning Commission
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street  
Tacoma, WA 98402

[sent via electronic mail]

Re: Proposed College Park Historic District

Dear Chair Anna Petersen and the Planning Commission for the City of Tacoma,

On behalf of the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, I am writing in support of local historic designation of the proposed College Park Historic District in Tacoma. The Washington Trust is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving the places that matter in Washington State. In accordance with our mission, we affirm that the proposed local historic district, as listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is congruent with the City of Tacoma’s Comprehensive Plan and Home in Tacoma goals as they relate to housing and sustainable development.

**Housing**

As adopted in Ordinance 28793 in December 2021, Phase 1 of the Home in Tacoma Project Packet commits to adopting policies that #2. Allow diverse (missing middle) housing types, such as duplexes, triplexes, cottage housing and small multifamily in designated low-scale areas including most currently single-family neighborhoods; and #4. Ensure new housing is well-designed and complements the scale of the neighborhood.

Of the 582 buildings within the proposed historic district boundary, there are 24 duplexes, 7 triplexes, 3 quadplexes, and 3 buildings with six or more units (2 of which are listed as contributing). Speaking to policy goal #2, this means that the missing middle housing that the City of Tacoma seeks is already found within the proposed district, in both historic and contemporary development patterns. Speaking to policy goal #4, given that historical designation does not restrict density or use beyond a property’s exterior aesthetic qualities, the application of a historic design review process and special valuation incentives that do come with historic designation can only further stimulate well-designed and complementary development when existing single-family structures are converted into multiplexes or new structures are built onto the 73 noncontributing or vacant lots.

On the other hand, without local protections, neighborhoods are dependent on the good will of developers and market opportunities to produce affordable and high-quality housing - when any of the 509 historic structures are planned for replacement.

**Sustainability**

In 2015, the Comprehensive Plan was approved setting a path for Tacoma’s long-term future, ensuring that growth happens in a beneficial, healthy, and sustainable way. Chapter 4: Environment + Watershed Health identifies five goals, two of which relate most to the propose historic district designation: (EN-1) Ensure that Tacoma’s built and natural environments function in complementary ways and are resilient to climate change and natural hazards.

While energy-efficient design and renewable materials in new construction generally “work as intended” on vacant lots and the urban sprawl to undeveloped lands, studies have shown that the same climate and environmental calculus do not yield the same results when compared to the demolition-and-replacement of typical historic structures. The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Preservation Green Lab concludes in their 2016 study that when comparing...
buildings of equivalent size and function, building reuse almost always offers environmental savings over
demolition and new construction for both carbon emissions of producing and transporting construction materials
and the substantial reduction of construction waste that goes into a landfill:

- It can take between 10 to 80 years for a new energy efficient building to overcome, through efficient
  operations, the climate change impacts created by its construction.
- Retrofitting, rather than demolishing and replacing, just 1% of the city of Portland [or similarly scale metro]'s
  office buildings and single-family homes over the next ten years would help to meet 15% of their county's
  total CO2 reduction targets over the next decade.
- The environmental benefits of reuse are maximized by minimizing the input of new construction materials. A
  2018 EPA report adds that “construction and demolition projects filled U.S. landfills with almost 145 million
  tons of waste” contributing on average a quarter of all landfill waste per year.
- Historic rehabilitation has a thirty-two-year track record of creating 2 million jobs and generating $90 billion
  in private investment. Studies show residential rehabilitation creates 50% more jobs than new construction.

Even with considerations of historic significance and material integrity aside, as already evaluated and recommended
for forwarding by the Landmarks Commission — the proposed College Park Historic District remains congruent with
the City of Tacoma and its Planning Commission’s pursuit for environmental equity, whether by providing and
protecting existing housing opportunities or following data-driven and proactive policies that address the climate
impacts of carbon emissions and landfill waste related to the built environment.

The Washington for Historic Preservations supports the proposed College Park Historic District and urges the Planning
Commission to move forward with its nomination process. We look forward to working with the City to show how
historic preservation can be wielded as a tool of equity for all members within Tacoma’s communities.

Sincerely,

Huy Pham

Huy Pham  Preservation Programs Director
To the Planning Commission,

I am writing to encourage you to vote against the proposed College Park Historic District for two key reasons.

1. Many comments in the [comment record](#) supporting the creation of the District specifically point out that the historical designation is desired in order to prevent additional housing density. Tacoma needs more housing, and this will block efforts to increase available housing. Proceeding with creating this additional Historic District appears to embed rather than eliminate historical inequity. Creating this district appears to be a thinly-veiled attempt to bypass the city-wide zoning rules.

2. Adding the proposed designation adds bureaucratic inefficiency to many home repair projects, and increases the cost of home maintenance. The Historic District designation would be less burdensome if the window replacement restrictions were less arduous than the requirements in North Slope District. Just because wood frame single pane windows were the only thing available back in the 19th century does not automatically mean that residents should not be allowed to install modern energy efficient windows.

Sincerely,
Mark Pigman
1006 S State St, Tacoma, WA 98405
To Whom It May Concern:

I support the College Park Historic District Nomination. I live on N Alder by UPS and I love the historic homes in our neighborhood. It is great to see an effort to preserve the character of this great neighborhood with the historic designation. It’s the right thing to do!

Please forward the Nomination onto the City Council.

Thank you!
Cathy Reed
925 N Alder St
To members of Tacoma’s Planning Commission:

I live in the proposed College Park Historic District. My husband and I have lived here for 43 years in a home built by its owner in 1911.

We wholeheartedly support the College Park Historic District proposal.

We value the character of this neighborhood—its trees, its walkability, its historic homes, its proximity to the University of Puget Sound.

We hope the Planning Commission will review the application to see how thoroughly it’s been put together. We hope the Commission will see how it satisfies the requirements for a historic district as stated in the Municipal Code of Tacoma. The comments I heard at the meeting of May 4th seemed prejudiced against this project and that’s why I hope to see evidence of homework and familiarity with this particular proposal one month later.

It’s a grassroots effort by residents of the district. It could inspire other areas in Tacoma to launch their own grassroots efforts.

An "historic district” designation does not conflict with Home in Tacoma goals of more density. We already have density that comes from rentals to undergraduate and graduate students at UPS. So far this density has not ruined the character of the area. The design standards for a historic district would only ensure that new development has some compatible design with what is already here. That does not preclude density.

Please consider this proposal fairly.

Sincerely,

Gayle Rieber
2902 North 20th St
Tacoma 98406
Tacoma Planning Commission

I am writing in support of the proposed College Park Historic District. I live at 2902 N. 20th St. that is in the proposed district. My family has lived in this house since 1979.

We are interested in history because our house is history. The front door knocker says “Hammerbeck”; he was the builder and owner of the original house. He chopped down trees around here and brought them to a sawmill at Buckley Gulch. The house he built in 1911 still sits as he had built it at that time. We are sure Mr. Hammerbeck would be happy seeing his life remembered like this.

I have been following Jeff Ryan’s work on this project for over a year. I am impressed by the considerable amount of time he put into preapplication research. The work I saw was very sound and professional. I worked for almost 30 years in city planning and I still find these issues to be very interesting. I have seen comments questioning the caliber of this application; I would like to see this criticism put in written form or eliminated from any future reports.

I reviewed the application documents and feel that Jeff Ryan has satisfied the requirements leading to submission of this proposal.

John J. Rieber

2902 N. 20th. St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

jjrieber@gmail.com

253 752-6496

(Staff note: Letter submitted on 05/31/22)
City of Tacoma Planning Commission:

We write today to express our strong opposition to the proposed College Park Historic Special Review District. We appreciate very much this opportunity to express our views to the Planning Commission, and thank you for your hard work in reviewing the extensive nomination materials submitted and the recommendations from the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). Our home is listed as "historic contributing" in the nomination materials for the College Park Historic Special Review District. My husband and I bought our home in 1987 and have lived in it continuously for 35 years. I have listened with great interest to the LPC meetings since June 2021 when the proposed College Park Historic District was under discussion. In doing so, I have learned a good deal, not only about the proposal, but also about the complex, detailed, and meticulous work of the LPC Commissioners. We have a number of objections to the proposed College Park Historic District.

The City of Tacoma does not need another local historic district with LPC design review and new construction approval as primary features. The North Slope Historic District was created in 1994 and expanded in 1996 and 1999. The Wedge Neighborhood District was created in 2010. Therefore, it has been 12 years since the most recent approval of an historic district. Unfortunately, one way that the status quo is perpetuated is by using precedent to justify new action. Yes, these two historic districts exist, but no, the city does not need another one. Our concern is one of equity. The two current historic districts are in the North End, and the proposed College Park Historic District is also in this part of the city. There must be a number of neighborhoods throughout the city which could be considered for historic district status, but they may not have residents with the specialized expertise, time, and interest to pursue nomination. In our judgment, it would be a poor use of City of Tacoma resources to create additional historic districts. Historic preservation is important, but competing demands of affordable housing and infrastructure, for example, take priority in our view. Indeed, we need to take into account the world around us today. The LPC design review is laborious and adds time and expense to the renovation process of existing historic structures. (Until last night’s Planning Commission Public Hearing, I was unaware that there is a required fee in order for LPC to do design review. That is not right. We don’t want design review in the first place, and then we would have to pay for it.) I have further learned that typically property values increase for homes within an historic district. That can’t be what the City of Tacoma is seeking as affordable housing is a key goal going forward.

Historic individual landmarks deserve preservation by the city, and the LPC provides a strong mechanism to support such preservation. The proposed College Park Historic District, however, runs at cross-purposes with the overarching thrust of Home in Tacoma and the desires of a significant number of homeowners within the proposed boundaries. I have heard it stated that a potential College Park Historic District and Home in Tacoma can co-exist. OK. But should they? At best, the requirements of design review for an historic district require an additional “step” in the permitting process. Is it merely a step? In our judgment it is an unnecessary burden. In addition, I see that any infill building also needs LPC design review. Since our home is brick,
what type of materials are required for an ADU? Would an ADU even be allowed in our big backyard? If not, “not in my backyard” takes on a literal meaning.

In the 35 years that we have lived in Tacoma, the City has never had sufficient funds to undertake all that needs to be done. (Responding to the crisis of homelessness and supporting affordable housing are current cases in point.) City staff time spent working with LPC Commissioners to manage College Park is not where we want our tax dollars spent. Moreover, we note that “Tax incentives may be available for renovations to historic districts.” (From PowerPoint presentation at LPC meeting, August 11, 2021). That tax incentives may be available in the two current historic districts is one thing. We do not support adding another historic district. Issues of equity and diversity must be adequately addressed as you make your recommendation. The College Park Historic District would tax limited resources of the City.

I have read the information about the creation of historic districts and the model of the design review restrictions currently in place for the North Slope/Wedge. The list of restrictions is onerous. It is one thing for a homeowner to seek out a historic designation for their property; it is an entirely different matter to impose this designation on current owners whose property would fall under a newly designated historic district.

In listening to LPC meetings via Zoom since June 2021, typically, individual property owners or their architects present their designs for Commissioners’ review. It has been stated on several occasions by Commissioners that their role is not to prevent change but to "manage change." Instead, it is my perception that “managing” is closer to “controlling.” The LPC Commissioners seem very wary of exterior changes to the front face of properties. It has been stated that details of design review will be available at a later time. Details matter. Preference has been stated, for example, for replacing older windows with wooden windows instead of vinyl windows. A skylight on an upper floor on the street side of an historic home seems to raise concern for some LPC Commissioners. At least in my hearing, Commissioners have not decided how they view solar panels on front facing facades even if that façade is south-facing (as it is on our property). We object to needing to wonder about these kinds of questions. We and our neighbors have made good choices over the years in maintaining and improving our properties. Additional oversight is not warranted.

Finally, after a large number of hours spent reading through nomination materials, listening to LPC meetings, reading LPC documents, and now listening to Planning Commission meetings, I have come to some overarching conclusions as an engaged citizen who hopes to do right by people now and those who come after us. In the face of competing demands, those who champion historic preservation prioritize greatly the appearance of the street-facing side of the house. It’s about architecture and a particular aesthetic sense about what is pleasing and in accord with the past. I wonder how the architects, builders, and home owners of our 1932 house would react to this nomination. They built homes in this neighborhood to house families both then and into the future. The needs of the people mattered and the architecture served those needs, not the other way around. I worry today that our decisions will tie the hands of those who come after us as they adapt housing to the future needs of the community.

Moreover, I have wondered over these months what problem the College Park nomination was seeking to solve. I believe that at its core is a fear of future threats and a felt need to protect what people own. My husband I and do not share these fears. Instead, we see this historic designation
as fostering division between this neighborhood and adjoining neighborhoods and undercutting the shared sense that “We are Tacoma.” What an unnecessary process and a divisive one.

There are so many more pressing issues to be addressed in Tacoma at this time. We strongly urge the Planning Commission to deny this nomination. We conclude by thanking you again for your tireless work on behalf of the citizens of Tacoma.

Sincerely,

Patricia and George Roundy

(Staff note: Received via e-mail roundype@plu.edu)
Our family supports historic preservation!

Allie and Gabe Rucker
3112 n 13th st
Tacoma wa 98406
--
Sent from Gmail Mobile
May 3, 2022

Tacoma Planning Commission
Attn. Lihuang Wung
Planning and Development Services Department
747 Market Street Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: College Park Historic Special Review District, Review

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning Commission,

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to address the commission. We look forward to your review of our nomination based on the requirements as outlined in the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC). We would be happy to answer any questions that may arise and will be available at each meeting.

I address you today as a 25 year resident of the district, an Architect and the author of both the National Register Nomination and the nomination before you.

As you may be aware this is the one year anniversary of our submittal for review of this nomination for consideration by the City of Tacoma. During this past year the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission (TLPC) has reviewed in depth, the history, context, condition and age of the district. As a National Historic District, the highest honor a neighborhood can achieve, we were pleased the Landmarks Preservation Commission agreed with the State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation, Governor’s Council on Historic Preservation and the US Department of the Interiors in their review for the National Register listing and the TLPC’s recommendation that our district be listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

As part of the TLPC review process, per the TMC guidelines, the TLPC reviewed and assessed the level of support by the residents of the district under this nomination. We are happy to report their findings through their own independent survey process matched our own in showing Substantial Support for the listing, a Majority Support based on signed petitions, postcards and letters received through our volunteers outreach efforts. Copies of these supporting documents are included in your informational packet along with our nomination for your reference.

With the completion of the TLPC portion of the review process, we look forward to the second step in the process, the Tacoma Planning Commission’s (TPC) review of the district’s nomination and its conformance and support by the goals and policies of the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan. As you are aware the Comp. Plan has numerous goals and policies in support of creation and preservation of historic districts, historic neighborhoods and community building efforts. For example starting in the Urban Form Chapter, Goal UP-13 states “Promote the unique physical, social and cultural character Historic Residential Pattern Areas as integral to Tacoma’s sense of place” this is a level of support that can be found throughout the document. To aid in your review we have supplied a partial list of policy statements and goals as an attachment to this letter, to assist you in your efforts that we feel support our efforts. This list was previously
preparation as part of a TLPC discussion topic, many of these policies are the same policies that supported the creation of both the North Slope and the Wedge local historic districts. We are confident that you will find we meet the intent of the One Tacoma policies in order to add your recommendation on our way to the final step in the process, City Council review.

Historic preservation adds to the vibrancy of a community and there is a need to preserve and promote the qualities found within older neighborhoods of the city. Historic preservation efforts are an approach to good stewardship as well as environmental and cultural sensitivity in celebrating the rich history of our working and middle class neighborhoods. Neighborhoods of qualities of design and the workmanship of past generations encompasses many of the goals, policies and aspirations of both the One Tacoma comprehensive plan and Washington State environmental policy. This nomination is recognition of the valued history of a dense walkable residential neighborhood, with its mix of housing types and size, a community where the average age of the homes is almost a century at 98 years of age. A district that would be aided and enhanced by the limited design reviews that a listing would support. In recognition of our neighborhood goals, our small place within the city, we ask for your support in our efforts to be named to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and the historic overlay district that it would provide.

In conclusion, I feel the following statement sums up both our efforts and those of the City of Tacoma. It is a good framework for understanding the qualities of preserving our built heritage and the City of Tacoma’s support of those efforts.

“The City finds that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and continued use of landmarks, districts, and elements of historic, cultural, architectural, archeological, engineering, or geographic significance located within the City are required in the interests of the prosperity, civic pride, and ecological and general welfare of its citizens. The City further finds that the economic, cultural, and aesthetic standing of the City cannot be maintained or enhanced by disregarding the heritage of the City or by allowing the destruction or defacement of historic and cultural asset. The purpose of this section is to support these goals and provide regulatory procedures for historic preservation decision making bodies”

TMC section 13.05.040, Historic preservation land use decisions, statement of Purpose.

Going forward we welcome and encourage your questions. Our intent is for a collaborative approach during this review phase of the nomination process.

Sincerely,

Jeff Ryan, Architect
College Park Historic District Association
One Tacoma, Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policy’s:

The following policies and goals provide varying degrees of support for the proposal. A portion of this list was originally prepared by the city during last year’s discussions and approval by the City Council for revisions to lower building heights within View Sensitive overlay districts and have been added to the end of our list for reference. The VSD summary was provided to the TLPC earlier in the review process to demonstrate the council’s current thoughts on city policy and precedent in regard to special review districts but was not specifically discussed during the following meeting.

Supporting City Goals and Policy’s:

Policy UF–1.4 Direct the majority of growth and change to centers, corridors, and transit station areas, allowing the continuation of the general scale and characteristics of Tacoma’s residential areas

Policy UF–1.5 Strive for a built environment designed to provide a safe, healthful, and attractive environment for people of all ages and abilities

Policy UF–1.9 Encourage high quality design and development that demonstrates Tacoma’s leadership in the design of the built environment, commitment to a more equitable city, and ability to experiment and generate innovative design solutions

Policy UF–1.10 Leverage the power of the arts, culture and creativity to serve the community’s interest while driving growth in a way that builds character and quality of place.

Policy UF–1.11 Evaluate the impacts of land use decisions on the physical characteristics of neighborhoods and current residents, particularly underserved and under-represented communities.

Goal UF–13 * Promote the unique physical, social and cultural character Historic Residential Pattern Areas as integral to Tacoma’s sense of place.

Policy UF–13.2 Promote infill development within the residential pattern areas that respects the context of the area and contributes to the overall quality of design.

Pattern Area 3: Pre-War Compact

This is Tacoma’s most historic section of residential development, and also some of the densest neighborhoods in Tacoma, containing homes ranging from pre-1900 to the current era. The street grid is very well connected and blocks tend to be fairly short, supporting a highly walkable environment. This area has a variety of pre-zoning non-conforming lot sizes, prevalent alleyways, many large historic homes, and a mix of residential types and non-residential uses blended within the historic fabric.

Policy UF–13.18 Maintain and enhance the streetcar era pattern of street-oriented buildings.

Policy UF–13.19 Preserve the area’s urban fabric of compact blocks and highly interconnected grid of streets.
**Policy UF–13.21** Integrate new development into the districts’ historic development patterns.

**Policy UF–13.22** Continue the pattern of small, connected blocks and the regular lot patterns.

**Policy UF–13.24** Promote the retention of the existing tree canopy. Retain large, mature trees, except when they block views or pose a hazard.

**Policy UF–13.27** Preserve and expand historic street lighting along both arterial and neighborhood streets in historic districts.

**Policy UF–13.28** Encourage the conversion of electrical substations for recreational purposes if the sites are no longer needed for their intended purpose.

**Policy UF–13.29** Protect the residential integrity of the Wedge and North Slope neighborhoods

**GOAL DD–1** Design new development to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, aesthetic and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change.

**Policy DD–1.1** Encourage excellence in architecture, site design, and infrastructure and durability in building materials to enrich the appearance of a development’s surroundings.

**Policy DD–1.2** Promote site and building design that provides for a sense of continuity and order while allowing for creative expression.

**Policy DD–1.3** Design buildings and streetscape of a human scale to create a more inviting atmosphere for pedestrians.

**Policy DD–1.4** Consider development of a design review program to promote high quality design that supports community identity, a distinctive built environment, human-scale elements and amenities, resilient and durable materials, landscape enhancements, and other similar features.

**Policy DD–1.5** Encourage building and street designs that respect the unique built natural, historic, and cultural characteristics of Tacoma’s centers, corridors, historic residential pattern areas and open space corridors, described in the Urban Form chapter.

**Policy DD–1.6** Encourage the development of aesthetically sensitive and character-giving design features that are responsive to place and the cultures of communities

**Goal DD–1:** *Design new development to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, aesthetic and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change.*

**Policy DD–1.6:** *Encourage the development of aesthetically sensitive and character-giving design features that are responsive to place and the cultures of communities.*
Policy DD-1.7: Encourage residential infill development that complements the general scale, character, and natural landscapes features.

Policy DD-1.8 Enhance the pedestrian experience throughout Tacoma, through public and private development that creates accessible and attractive places for all those who walk and/or use wheelchairs or other mobility devices.

Policy DD-1.9 Encourage development, building and site design that promote active living.

Policy DD-1.10 Provide for public access to light and air by managing and shaping the height, and mass of buildings, while accommodating urban scale development.

Policy DD-1.11 Encourage building and site designs that limit reductions in privacy and solar access for residents and neighbors, while accommodating urban scale development.

Policy DD-1.14 Encourage the continued use of alleys for parking access and expand their use as the location of accessory dwelling units and as multi-purpose community space.

Policy DD-4.1 * Preserve and enhance the quality, character and function of Tacoma’s residential neighborhoods.

Policy DD-4.2 Encourage more housing choices to accommodate a wider diversity of family sizes, incomes, and ages. Allow adaptive reuse of existing buildings and the creation of accessory dwelling units to serve the changing needs of a household over time

Policy DD-4.3 Encourage residential infill development that complements the general scale, character, and natural landscape features of neighborhoods. Consider building forms, scale, street frontage relationships, setbacks, open space patterns, and landscaping. Allow a range of architectural styles and expression, and respect existing entitlements

Policy DD-4.6 Promote the site layout of residential development where residential buildings face the street and parking and vehicular access is provided to the rear or side of buildings. Where multifamily developments are allowed in established neighborhoods, the layout of such developments should respect the established pattern of development, except where a change in context is desired per the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy DD-4.7: Emphasize the natural physical qualities of the neighborhood (for example, trees, marine view, and natural features) and the site in locating and developing residential areas, provided such development can be built without adversely impacting the natural areas. Where possible, development should be configured to utilize existing natural features as an amenity to development.

Policy DD-4.9 Promote multifamily residential building design that is compatible with the existing patterns of the area.
Policy DD–7.1 * Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings, especially those of historic or cultural significance, to conserve natural resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment.

Goal DD–13 * Protect and preserve Tacoma’s historic and cultural character.

Policy DD–13.1 * Encourage the protection and restoration of high-quality historic buildings and places that contribute to the distinctive character and history of Tacoma’s evolving urban environment.

Policy DD–13.2 Encourage development that fills in vacant and underutilized gaps within the established urban fabric, while preserving and complementing historic resources and neighborhood patterns.

Policy DD–13.3 Protect significant historic structures from demolition until opportunities can be provided for public comment, pursuit of alternatives to demolition, or actions that mitigate for the loss.

Policy DD–13.6 * Expand historic preservation inventories, regulations, and programs to encourage historic preservation in areas that are under-represented by current historic preservation efforts.

Policy DD–14.1 * Increase the opportunities for the public to provide placemaking in Neighborhoods and business districts to help reflect, define and celebrate distinct areas.

Policy DD–14.8 Leverage the creative talent of artists and designers to shape the identity of place, enliven a sense of belonging, and drive a compelling vision for the built environment.

Policy H–1.4 Support the maintenance and improvement of the existing housing stock and encourage the adaptation of the existing housing stock to accommodate the changing variety of household types.

Policy H–4.10 * Encourage development and preservation of small resource-efficient and affordable single family homes throughout the City.

Policy HP-2 Integrate Tacoma’s historic resources into community planning efforts.

Policy HP-26 Use zoning tools to promote historic preservation goals and support an overall heritage conservation system

The following policies and goals were originally prepared by the City of Tacoma during last year’s discussions of VSD modifications and approval by the City Council for revisions to lower building height standards within View Sensitive overlay districts. Demonstrate the council’s current thoughts on city policy and precedent in regard to special review district, although in a higher end neighborhood within the city then ours, the goals equally apply to historic districts as well. To avoid duplication we did not include any of the following in our previously listed city policies.
GOAL H–1 Promote access to high-quality affordable housing that accommodates Tacomans’ needs, preferences, and financial capabilities in terms of different types, tenures, density, sizes, costs, and locations.

GOAL H–2 Ensure equitable access to housing, making a special effort to remove disparities in housing access for people of color, low-income households, diverse household types, older adults, and households that include people with disabilities.

GOAL H–3 Promote safe, healthy housing that provides convenient access to jobs and to goods and services that meet daily needs. This housing is connected to the rest of the city and region by safe, convenient, affordable multimodal transportation.

GOAL H–4 Support adequate supply of affordable housing units to meet the needs of residents vulnerable to increasing housing costs.

GOAL H–5 Encourage access to resource efficient and high performance housing that is well integrated with its surroundings, for people of all abilities and income levels.
Good afternoon,

The attached screen shots are from the University of Washington Study and website I noted and provided to you during the Landmarks review, whether this site reach the commission was not clear. Since public comments during the review process were limited to only a few opportunities, I never had a chance to discuss this site or topic directly with the TPLC, Since the TPC process appears to restrict public comments to even a higher degree, please feel free to share this website and the screen shots with the TPC with your next up date.

While I was hoping this issue had been resolved during the TLPC review process, during the discussion of the districts history and merits, it appears to be a hot topic along with the issue of density in the last TPC. Since both issues are address in the UW study, I thought it best to screen shot the pages this time along with a link to the Website. Since the information is also not easily tracked by street address and due to the fact that our census block cover a wider area then just our district from Steele to Proctor and Sixth to N 21st. Including the Buckley Addition and homes west of the UPS, I have included a pdf as a Key Map to show our specific location within the city for your use.

Mapping Tacoma Race and Segregation (washington.edu)

As you will note our census block has considerably more residents for its size than surrounding blocks, one of the highest population areas of the city by census block regardless of the size. We also have a higher population of non-whites, then most of the North, West and parts of the Central area by population. Due to the population found within our block, our percentage of Non-Whites based on our larger population can be a bit miss leading, but have included that shot as well. I have submitted this data for general discussion purposes, we are not suggesting some predetermine level or percentage for either race or density, it simply shows that we are not as some have tried to paint us in the TLPC and now the TPC, we are not an affluent all white neighborhood trying somehow to protect our low density and spacious back yards. This is inaccurate and meant to deflect from our accomplishments and history. We are a historic neighborhood of homes with room to grow, but also way ahead of most of the city on the issue of density, walkability and a mix of housing types and choices.

As I have also noted our district has a history of non-white residents dating bay to the 1920’s but since that was not a prominent part of our history for a listing on the National Register or city register, it was not of note specifically during the writing of the nomination but can be found in some cases by the last names listed as residents of the each home over the years found within the nomination. This issue was not requested as part of the local nomination requirements outlined in the TMC. Likewise the Home In Tacoma plan was not in place when we submitted our nomination so we did not address that in our application or letter of introduction. And ass you have noted, our listing would not impact the Home in Tacoma project or density targets.

We nominated this district to honor the history our small part of Tacoma, to provide for a common place to address issues within our community in a public setting and to obtain the limited design review
process that a district listing would offer. We are seeking a fair review of our nomination based on the current city requirements noted in the TMC and we are fully supported by the current community goals and policies noted in the One in Tacoma Comp Plan. We would like the city to follow the same review standards in their review and focus on the approved process.

If you have any questions in regard to the information provided please let me now, also Professor James Gregory at the UW has responded to my email in regards my questions and his email is noted on the website.

Perhaps it would be best to simply supply the commission with the attached documents, I am not trying to start a debate over an issue that I feel is not part of our review, but rather a larger discussion of city policy outside the nomination review process at this point.

Sorry again for typos,

Jeff

Jeffrey J. Ryan, Architect
LEED AP, BD+C
Ryan Architecture
3017 North 13th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

v 253.759.0161
c 253.380.3197
Key Map – Location of College Park National Historic District
Univ. of Washington – Civil Rights & Labor History Consortium
Mapping Tacoma Race and Segregation (washington.edu)

- 97 -
The Code also states a 400 ft notification zone, it seem as if the city is cherry picking the requirements. If your using a 2,500 ft notification found in the area wide rezone portion of the code you should also follow the review procedure. There appears to be a conflict in the TMC and the city picked which path it wished to proceed. We request the review method of the area-wide rezone be used when it comes to oversight by our elected representative, as all the other AWR are allowed to follow.

Jeff

Jeffrey J. Ryan, Architect
LEED AP, BD+C
College Park Historic District Association
3017 North 13th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

v 253.759.0161
c 253.380.3197

Jeff, I will attempt to answer this question.

The answer is that the historic preservation code directs the Planning Commission to use its (Planning Commission’s) procedures for area-wide rezones, but also states that the Planning Commission’s actions are to either recommend approval of the district, approval with modifications, or deny the application (TMC 13.07.060.C).

So, the proposal will go to Council if recommended by the Planning Commission. If not, then it will not, unless appealed.

Reuben

Reuben M McKnight, MUP
(he/him/his)
Historic Preservation Officer
City of Tacoma Planning and Development Services Department
747 Market Street Room 345
Customer Survey
Please take a moment to complete this survey about your experience with our department. Your comments will be used to recognize employees for providing great customer service and it will also help us find opportunities to overcome challenges.

Want to learn more about Tacoma history? Check out our events page at www.cityoftacoma.org/hpevents.

From: Jeffrey J. Ryan <jjryan@harbornet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:18 AM
To: Wung, Lihuang <lwung@cityoftacoma.org>; sryan@harbornet.com
Cc: McKnight, Reuben <RMCKNIGH@cityoftacoma.org>; Rumbaugh, Sarah <SRumbaugh@cityoftacoma.org>; Hines, John <JHines1@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: RE: Public Notification of PC hearing.

Mr. Wung,

Thank you for the explanation. I have one additional question however, since you went with the notification requirements based on the area wide rezone requirements rather than the Landmark requirements. Will we be preceding to the Council for the final review regardless of the TPC recommendations, as is the case for an area wide rezone?

Thank you,

Jeff

Jeffrey J. Ryan, Architect
LEED AP, BD+C
College Park Historic District Association
3017 North 13th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

v 253.759.0161
c 253.380.3197

From: Wung, Lihuang [mailto:lwung@cityoftacoma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:10 AM
To: Jeffrey J. Ryan; sryan@harbornet.com
Cc: McKnight, Reuben; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Hines, John
Subject: RE: Public Notification of PC hearing.
Hi, Susan and Jeff:

Thank you for your emails (this one and the ones you sent to the Planning inbox). Reuben and I have looked into the various issues you brought up, and are providing the following responses:

1. The informational meeting date should have read “Thursday, May 26.” We apologize for the oversight. We will be sending a corrected notice. Please update your website accordingly.

2. The informational session is typical leading up to a public hearing. For this hearing, the mailing radius is 2500’ as required by code for areawide rezone (Tacoma Municipal Code 13.05.070.J.2). Because so many people have been added to this notice, the informational session is intended just to answer any questions people may have leading up to the hearing – in essence, a Q&A session similar to the ones done in August and September. There will be a brief staff presentation at the beginning before we open it up for questions. We will encourage interested attendees to be sure to submit their comments to the Commission or attend the hearing.

3. We have reviewed the mailing list used last Friday for the public notice. Working with our GIS staff, it appears that there is more than one recipient at your address (3017 N 13th) in parcel records. We believe that the City’s mailing utility likely addressed the notice to “Warnerhouse LLC” which uses the same taxpayer address. It still should have been received by you, but to ensure that you do receive notice we have added another entry into the mailing list as well (attached).

4. Regarding the 120-day review requirement, we are not aware of any mandatory timeline as such. The only 120-day timeline associated with the Planning Commission’s review process is that the Commission shall make determinations concerning proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments within 120 days of the close of the application period (TMC 13.02.070.E.4). Here, “determinations” mean whether the applications should be accepted and moved into the technical analysis phase. This 120-day requirement does not apply to the College Park Historic District proposal, because the proposal is not an application for Comprehensive Plan amendment and the Planning Commission is not making any determination as referenced here. What the Planning Commission is doing are as set forth in TMC 13.07.060.C.1, 13.07.060.C.3, 13.02.040.E, 13.02.040.J, 13.05.030.B.9.e, and 13.05.030.B.10, as cited in the cover memo for this subject on the Planning Commission’s agenda for May 4, 2022.

5. In terms of the number of notices distributed, for this public hearing, we are mailing the revised notice to 7,437 recipients on the mailing list (attached); for the 2022 Amendment public scoping hearing in June 2021, we mailed out 33,209 pieces; and for the 2020 Amendment public hearing in September 2019, we mailed out 11,000 pieces just for the VSD application.

If you have any further questions, please let us know. Thank you.

LiHUANG WUNG
Good morning,

We heard from many in the district that a letter, tri-fold, was received in the mail on Saturday announcing the Public Hearing for the district nomination on June 1\textsuperscript{st}. The Notice also mentioned a public meeting on Wednesday the 26\textsuperscript{th}, which we just corrected to Wednesday the 25\textsuperscript{th}, that unfortunately we knew nothing about. We have tried to keep the public informed regarding this nomination effort, by not receiving notification of meetings, now for the third time in this process, it is making that effort that much harder to achieve.

For our posting of the upcoming meetings, what is the agenda for the 25\textsuperscript{th}? We hope that this does not going to lower our attendance at the Public Hearing and attendance should still be taken as is expected of the public hearing itself.

When should we, as both a resident of the district and the applicant/author of the nomination, expect to receive our written public notice of the upcoming meetings? It was not in today’s mail as well. We would also like a copy of the mailing list for the Public notice for the Public Hearing as well.

Please let us know about the agenda for the info meeting so that we can post an accurate statement with the May 25\textsuperscript{th} date correction.

Thanks

Jeff

\textbf{Jeffrey J. Ryan, Architect}

LEED AP, BD+C

\textbf{College Park Historic District Association}

3017 North 13th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

v 253.759.0161
c 253.380.3197
June 3, 2022

Tacoma Planning Commission
Attn. Lihuang Wung
Planning and Development Services Department
747 Market Street Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: Support for the College Park Historic Special Review District, Planning Commission Public Hearing Comments.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the commission in support of our Nomination efforts. As the applicant we reaffirm our support for the nomination of College Park National Historic District to the Tacoma Register of historic places and the special review overlay district that it would create.

Since the issues of support for this nomination by the residents of the district and the historic status of the district has already been addressed in the first phase of the city’s review process, by the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission and their recommendation for the listing on the Tacoma Register, the focus of this letter will address the specific issues assigned to the Planning Commission for a Historic Special Review District.

For reference the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC), 13.07.060, C. 3, notes “In making a recommendation to the City Council, the Planning Commission shall consider the conformance or lack of conformance of the proposed designation with the Comprehensive Plan of the City”. Both the TMC and the Comprehensive Plan openly support the establishment of historic districts and the preservation of historic neighborhoods.

The Tacoma Municipal Code

The Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) in recognition of the importance of historic districts and neighborhoods makes specific reference to our city’s support in the opening statement, found in section covering the review of historic preservation land use decisions, TMC 13.05.040:

“The City finds that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and continued use of landmarks, districts, and elements of historic, cultural, architectural, archeological, engineering, or geographic significance located within the City are required in the interests of the prosperity, civic pride, and ecological and general welfare of its citizens. The City further finds that the economic, cultural, and aesthetic standing of the City cannot be maintained or enhanced by disregarding the heritage of the City or by allowing the destruction or defacement of historic and cultural asset. The purpose of this section is to support these goals and provide regulatory procedures for historic preservation decision making bodies”

Based on this statement alone the City of Tacoma clearly supports Historic Preservation and the management of historic and cultural assets within our community. As a district that has been
thoroughly reviewed by experts in the field of historic preservation and has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the State Heritage register and has earned the recommendation of the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission, a charter commission, the College Park National Historic District follows under the stated recommendations of section 13.05 of the TMC as a landmark district. This TMC statement also notes many of the benefits to the City of Tacoma in preserving our history and historic neighborhoods. The statement speaks to the benefits of preserving history in more neighborhoods within our city then just our own, a task the city should be actively pursuing in all parts of the city.

One in Tacoma, the Comprehensive Plan:

As a commission fluent in the policies and goals of the city’s Comprehensive Plan, you are aware of the numerous goals and policies in support of creation and preservation of historic districts, historic neighborhoods, community building efforts and the benefits to a community from the limited design review that a historic district would allow. To assist you in your efforts I have assembled a few for your consideration listed by Book and Chapter:

**URBAN FORM:**

**Book One**

The College Park District falls within the pattern area noted as Pre-War Compact

Pattern Area 3: Pre-War Compact

“This is Tacoma’s most historic section of residential development, and also some of the densest neighborhoods in Tacoma, containing homes ranging from pre-1900 to the current era. The street grid is very well connected and blocks tend to be fairly short, supporting a highly walkable environment. This area has a variety of pre-zoning non-conforming lot sizes, prevalent alleyways, many large historic homes, and a mix of residential types and non-residential uses blended within the historic fabric.”

**Goal UF-13:** “Promote the unique physical, social and cultural character Historic Residential Pattern Areas as integral to Tacoma’s sense of place”

Policy UF–13.2: “Promote infill development within the residential pattern areas that respects the context of the area and contributes to the overall quality of design.”


Policy UF–13.22: “Continue the pattern of small, connected blocks and the regular lot patterns.”

Policy UF–13.21: “Integrate new development into the districts’ historic development patterns.”
DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT:
Book One

Goal DD–1: “Design new development to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, aesthetic and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change.”

Policy DD–1.5: “Encourage building and street designs that respect the unique built natural, historic, and cultural characteristics of Tacoma’s centers, corridors, historic residential pattern areas and open space corridors, described in the Urban Form chapter.

Goal DD–1: “Design new development to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, aesthetic and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change.”

Policy DD–1.7: “Encourage residential infill development that complements the general scale, character, and natural landscapes features.”

Policy DD–1.10 “Provide for public access to light and air by managing and shaping the height, and mass of buildings, while accommodating urban scale development”

Policy DD–4.1: “Preserve and enhance the quality, character and function of Tacoma’s residential neighborhoods.”

Policy DD–7.1 Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings, especially those of historic or cultural significance, to conserve natural resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment.

Goal DD–13: “Protect and preserve Tacoma’s historic and cultural character.”

Policy DD–13.1: “Encourage the protection and restoration of high-quality historic buildings and places that contribute to the distinctive character and history of Tacoma’s evolving urban environment.

Policy DD–13.2 “Encourage development that fills in vacant and underutilized gaps within the established urban fabric, while preserving and complementing historic resources and neighborhood patterns”

Policy DD–13.3 “Protect significant historic structures from demolition until opportunities can be provided for public comment, pursuit of alternatives to demolition, or actions that mitigate for the loss.”

Policy DD–13.6 “Expand historic preservation inventories, regulations, and programs to encourage historic preservation in areas that are under-represented by current historic preservation efforts.”
Policy DD–14.1: “Increase the opportunities for the public to provide placemaking in Neighborhoods and business districts to help reflect, define and celebrate distinct areas.”

Policy DD–14.8: “Leverage the creative talent of artists and designers to shape the identity of place, enliven a sense of belonging, and drive a compelling vision for the built environment.”

HOUSING: Book One

Goal H–4: “Support adequate supply of affordable housing units to meet the needs of residents vulnerable to increasing housing costs.”

Policy H–4.10: “Encourage development and preservation of small resource-efficient and affordable single family homes throughout the City.”

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN: Book Two

Policy HP–2: “Integrate Tacoma’s historic resources into community planning efforts”

Policy HP–26 “Use zoning tools to promote historic preservation goals and support an overall heritage conservation system.”

While these are but a few of the supporting Goals and Policy’s found within the One in Tacoma, Comprehensive plan, I encourage you to review the stated goals and policies to find even more in support for our request. The supporting goals and policy’s presented are similar to those used during the review process for both the North Slope and Wedge neighborhoods and can be found within the recommendation for both districts. It is our hope to promote a community dialog thru the Landmark preservation meeting process to further a community based discussion on our shared goals and for public notification of actions within our neighborhood. As well as the limited design review process in place available to other historic districts.

Benefits to the City of Tacoma:

Historic preservation adds to the vibrancy of a community and there is a need to preserve and promote the qualities found within older neighborhoods of the city. Historic preservation efforts are an approach to good stewardship as well as environmental and cultural sensitively in celebrating the rich history of our working and middle class neighborhoods. Neighborhoods of quality design and the workmanship of past generations encompasses many of the goals, policies and aspirations shared by both the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan and Washington State environmental policy. This nomination is recognition of the valued history of a dense, walkable residential neighborhood, with its mix of housing types and size, a community where the average age of the homes is almost a century at 98 years of age. This district encompasses the aspirations of the “missing middle” noted in resent proposed changes to the Comp. Plan. It is a district that that would be aided and enhanced by the limited design reviews that a listing would support. In recognition of our neighborhood goals, our small place within the city, we ask
for your support in our efforts to be named to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places and the historic overlay district that it would provide.

The following are some of the key benefits for establishing any local historic districts. Each is supported by research and findings by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and research and studies by the PlaceEconomics, a national recognized planning firm specializing in the analysis of the economic impacts of historic preservation on communities throughout the U.S.

**Top Ten Benefits to a city by the creation of a Local Historic District.**

1. **COMMUNITY.** Local historic districts give communities a voice in their future. By participating in the designation process, citizens can help direct their communities’ path. Making these decisions together in a structured way for positive changes, supported by the community. It gives everyone the chance to be involved, a sense of empowerment and confidence within their neighborhood to get speak out on issue of concern.

   In addition historic districts provide social and psychological benefits. People living in historic districts enjoy the comfort of a human-scale environment (a mix of aesthetics and functionality that fit the average person's dimensions and capabilities); the opportunity to live and work in attractive surroundings; a recognizable and walkable neighborhood; and the galvanizing effect of community-based group action.

2. **ROOM TO GROW.** Historic districts are a tangible link to our past and a way to bring meaning to history and to people’s lives. They preserve the original character of buildings and streets within a city, while welcoming and managing growth and innovation within those spaces. They are a living, active record of communities and their residents.

   Currently only about 3% of the residential properties found within the city of Tacoma are listed as a National, State or Local historic district, only about 1% of the city’s residential area falls within a local district. That leaves 97% available currently outside of historic districts for new development. By comparison the city of Los Angeles has over 6% within a local historic district alone. Tacoma also has over 11% of its residential area within a View Sensitive overlay district and about an equal of developments within Home Owner Associations, each with more restrictions than local historic districts. At 3% historic districts and historic preservation is not a barrier to growth.

3. **AFFORDABLE.** While housing affordability is a serious problem throughout the country, the city’s historic overlay districts with its older, smaller, and multi-family buildings offer more affordability than new construction. Existing homes, older than 50 years of age, remain the most affordable housing choices in the nation. The College Park Historic district is also home to a number of existing multifamily housing units, ranging in size from 2 to 16 units, many of which are listed as contributing to the historic district and would be eligible for tax credits to aid in their renovation costs if a Local district were to be created. Many of the early
affordable housing projects in downtown Tacoma were only possible due to historic tax credits.

4 DESIGN. Local historic districts encourage better design quality. In this case, better design equals a greater sense of cohesiveness, more innovative use of materials, and greater public appeal—all of which are shown to occur more often within designated districts than non-designated ones. The limited design review afforded a local historic district would allow for better oversight of proposed alterations and new construction then is currently provide within the city of Tacoma and would promote higher design standards.

5 STABLE. Historic Districts are multi-generational communities for both home owners and renters alike. Properties within local historic districts appreciate at a steady rate with less spikes and valleys then non-designated neighborhoods. Findings on this point are consistent across the country. Moreover, recent analysis shows that historic districts are also less vulnerable to market volatility from interest rate fluctuations and economic downturns then new construction.

6 DIVERSE. Historic Neighborhoods have been shown on average to be more ethnically, racially, and income diversity. The issue of demographics has been a topic of discussion during this review process, based on a recent study by the University of Washington, our census block area shows that we are more ethnically diverse then the surrounding census blocks, both north and south of Sixth Ave., but not as diverse as the city as a whole. Currently our census block is listed as having over 25% of its population listed as non-white in the US census. As with the rest of the city the data also shows a continuing trend toward greater diversity over time. To meet the goal of his statement, however we need to add more local historic districts across the city, not less. Ours would only continue to push the needle in the correct direction toward more diversity and inclusion within our city.

7 DENSITY. The population and housing unit density of historic neighborhoods is generally greater than the city’s average. Historic neighborhoods in Tacoma represent the highest density of use within the city based on the mix of housing types, the small lot sizes and the smaller size of housing units. The current density found within College Park district is 9.3 units per acre, based on Pierce County records. The census block that contains College Park also has one of the highest population densities for its size found within the city, based on data from the University of Washington. We currently have a population that is much greater than the surrounding census blocks, both north and south of Sixth Avenue. A population size that the proximity of the University does not fully address. Historic districts and neighborhoods are good examples of both density and livability living side by side.

8 ECONOMIC DRIVER. Historic districts have a positive impact on the local economy through job creation and tourism.

Reuse and rehabilitation of older and historic buildings generate more jobs than new construction and boost the local economy. Protecting local historic districts can also enhance business recruitment potential. Vibrant commercial cores and
charming neighborhoods with character attract new business and quality industry. Companies continually relocate to communities that offer their workers a higher quality of life, which successful preservation programs and stable districts enhance.

An aesthetically cohesive and well-promoted historic district can be a community’s most important attraction. A recent study showed that 78% of all U.S. leisure travelers are cultural and/or heritage travelers who spent, on average, 50% more than non-cultural and heritage travelers, a clear benefit to the local economy.

9 COST-EFFECTIVE. Rehabilitation project costs are competitive with new construction, and incentives including the Mills Act, the Adaptive Reuse Ordinance, and the federal and state rehabilitation historic tax credits make preservation even more competitive. The addition of College Park to the local register of historic places would allow for tax credit opportunities for renovation projects that are currently not available and could lower the costs passed on to new owner and renters.

10 SUSTAINABLE. Older and historic buildings and neighborhoods are often inherently green and contribute to the city’s resiliency strategy. Local districts help the environment by encouraging communities to retain and use their existing resources in established neighborhoods. This reduces the need for cars, cuts back on pollution and congestion, and eliminates the needs for landfill waste.

Local districts are energy efficient. Many older buildings were designed with energy conservation in mind, taking advantage of natural light, cross-ventilation, and climate-appropriate materials. Preservation commissions are also increasingly improving their design guidelines to make it easier for historic building owners to use renewable-energy technologies.

Homes older than 50 years of age are inherently greener than new construction. In review of life cycle costs and benefits compared with new construction shows that it can take over 30 years for a new home to approach a comparison with older well maintained homes based on carbon footprint alone. The reason is found in energy used to manufacture and build a home and the years it takes to pay off those energy cost to the environment. This is referred to as embodied energy, the energy it took to build a structure. Older homes also store carbon within their building materials; this makes it challenging to compete with the sustainability of older structures. If an older home is demolished all that embodied energy is lost and the stored carbon ends up in landfill and released back into the environment. This makes retention and rehabilitation of old structures key to any environmental policy. Reuse takes the least amount of energy and materials to construct and is often built out of much more durable materials then new construction resulting in lower replacement costs over time. Sustainability starts with good stewardship of our existing built environment.

In conclusion, the nomination of the College Park National Historic District is supported by the residents, its documented history, the Tacoma Municipal Code & the Comprehensive Plan, and the many benefits it brings to the City of Tacoma as a whole. As noted by the Reuben McKnight
at the Public information meeting on May 26th, the nomination is supported by the city’s Comprehensive Plan; the listing on the National Register is an honor that requires a lot of hard work, research and review to accomplish and the nomination would have no impact on the Home in Tacoma project as it is currently proposed by the city.

We look forward to your review and hope that you support our community effort for listing on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. We are confident that you will find that we meet the intent of the One Tacoma policies in order to add your recommendation and move this nomination forward to its final step in the process a review by our elected representative, the Tacoma City Council.

Sincerely,

Jeff Ryan, Architect
LEED BD+C
Director, College Park Historic District Association
June 3, 2022

Tacoma Planning Commission
City of Tacoma

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Susan Ryan co-applicant for the College Park nomination. The initial idea for creating a Historic District goes back to the late 1990's. At that time we were regular readers of American Bungalow magazine. That magazine features stories about recognized historic districts and celebrating their creation and the houses. I have always seen it as being good stewards.

The houses of College Park may not seem so special or significant to some but they are significant when compared to development patterns that came after CP’s primary growth period and continue on today.

My son once had a school friend over to visit who grew up in a new home in North East Tacoma, born 1997. He had never been in an alley where you park your car and enter the house from the back. Nor had he even been in a basement. When he called his dad to pick him up he was trying to figure out directions to the alley as he didn’t know we had a street and front door out front. I found it quite fascinating, as this is the norm for me.

You have been given great power and privilege as Planning Commissioners. With this power your denial would prevent this nomination from ever reaching our elected officials. The hurdle put in place to appeal such denial is far too great for anyone to achieve. I find this fact to be quite troubling in a democratic society.

Historic Preservation for decades has been the target of negative narratives and campaign type slogans leading back to large developers. In more recent years a new approach to diminish Historic Districts and buildings has been to paint an unfavorable image of Historic Districts and the people that like them and want more. Disparaging remarks and unfounded claims with no facts to back any of these talking points up. It is only creating more division within a city that want’s to be one.

So with these comments I share with you, please keep an open mind and an open heart and view this nomination as a benefit to the city that may encourage others to think about their community and the built environment around them as a place for future generations, when we have limited resources.

Let’s keep it together with thoughtful oversight and good guidance from our Preservation Officer when modifications are needed.

It’s not about living in the past but curating best practices for the future.

Sincerely,

Susan Ryan
College Park National HD

(Staff note: Received via e-mail sryan@harbornet.com)
Hello City of Tacoma,

I proudly support the College Park Historic nomination.

Our beautiful diversified neighborhood will be a long lived oasis of historic Tacoma homes. This will benefit the neighborhood and the city.

Thanks for your time,
Christy Scerra

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

I would like to state my opposition to the creation of a historic review overlay for this small neighborhood. I know the area well, know many people who live in it and do not see that the area has any need/justification for special protection.

I do appreciate good architecture in general, and the quality of the homes in this area. Because the homes have been maintained and loved throughout the years is a testament to the neighborhood, and the ability of homeowners to afford the upkeep. I do not see any threat to that continuing in the future. People make bad remodel decisions everywhere (from my perspective) and I wish they could be stopped throughout the city if it was possible.

Historic designation would make it more onerous for the few properties that are not being kept up to be improved. I have worked on a house, and looked at others in the North Slope, and the regulations that are meant for protecting historic structures can be in conflict with doing wise things to homes that happen to be in the neighborhood and need significant changes.

I would like to make sure that time does not stop in this neighborhood, and that new styles of architecture are not allowed. The homes that are neglected may be best torn down and rebuilt, certainly it can be more affordable. I did see one developer, craftsmen-ish house that was recently built in the neighborhood. I am not in favor of them in any neighborhood, but I don't see that we can make them go away, and I would prefer to see contemporary homes to compliment the older ones.

I also do not see that the designation is compatible with the goals for Home in Tacoma. Unlike the North Slope neighborhood, the homes in College park are generally on modest lots, and are 1 1/2 to stories max. Many are bungalows that are not going to be candidates for the creation of duplexes/triplexes. Creating any additional will run into regulations such as the location of entries or the need to move windows which not be allowed will and will make the conversions very difficult, if at all possible.

I see only added expense to home owners, uncertainty in permitting, and rising house values in an area that already is highly valued.

Jill

Jill Sousa
jill@jillsousaarchitect.com
253.468.9662
Hello,

I'm writing in support of the college park historic district. I believe the recognition of this area as a historical district will ensure neighborhood architectural character is preserved for future generations. This neighborhood has a unique history that deserves to be protected.

Thank you,

Andre St Hilaire
Public Comments re: College Park Historical Designation

Planning Commissioners:

I listened to the oral comments at the June 1st Planning Commission meeting, and respected all views.

However, in this case, it seems clear that the proposal before you meets all requirements under current code to be approved for Historic Designation -and- at the very least, should be moved forward for City Council review.

... with one addition: I suggest that you recommend buildings with landmark designation do not have to pay fees more than any others. It makes no sense that historical designation would be penalized with costly-required reviews. Those should be free of charge and as an incentive (not hinderance) for preserving a historic structure/neighborhood. That addition would appease a number of those who spoke of that concern.

Also, a historic designation will still allow for infilling (ADUs, cottage units fitting in between current existing structures), but will ensure special structures will be preserved.

As mentioned in my oral comments, I live in South Tacoma which has just as many deserving homes and potential historic districts (which I appreciated some commissioners noting); however, that doesn’t make College Park any less deserving and I fully support its approval.

In response to commissioners’ concerns of historic districts near colleges, some of my fondest memories were walking through those lovely historic neighborhoods on my way to campus. Even though I didn’t live in those blocks, I aspired to one day and wanted them preserved; meanwhile those beautiful areas were potentially accessible to me just by their existence.

If an area experienced redlining in the past, that isn’t a reason to destroy what currently makes it desirable for all people now.

And it’s not a stretch to connect that such a designation essentially does preserve tree canopy by default; historic districts which retain existing structures, undisturbed soil with mature trees are being environmentally responsible and sustainable.

With “Home in Tacoma” rezoning, we do need some protected areas, and when “Home in Tacoma” was being sold to us, we were told that historic designation is the method to keep vintage houses in historic context instead of becoming isolated between contemporary buildings. This will be proof of follow-through on that.

I did find it odd, in previous meetings, for some to suggest that those who purchased homes in a pleasant neighborhood shouldn’t expect for it to stay that way, yet others suggesting that less desirable areas could expect to get even worse. I say both of those residential areas are deserving of preserving what’s good, in addition to improving them.
So, it is very possible to preserve College Park, while also developing density. That’s the point of city planning. Due to Home in Tacoma’s broad rezoning, though, these historic districts are even more important to preserve, and College Park is deserving of your approval.

Thank you,
Heidi Stephens
Thursday, May 26, 2022

City of Tacoma Planning Commission
Via Email: planning@cityoftacoma.org

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am writing today concerning the proposed College Park Historic District in North Tacoma.

My spouse and I very much support the designation for our historic neighborhood. We are among more than 55% of our district’s residents who endorse this nomination.

We have lived at our home on North 19th Street (between Alder and Cedar) for six years. We searched for many months before finding just the right home following our relocation from California. We chose the North End because of its rich history and proximity to my mother-in-law’s home in Rusting.

Contrary to what’s been said about our neighborhood by some opponents of the designation, we are not an affluent, white neighborhood trying to protect our low density and spacious backyards. (In fact, at least on our block, no one has a large backyard.)

This description is inaccurate and is meant to detract from our neighborhood’s accomplishments and history. Our district has a history of non-white residents dating back to the 1920s, as noted in a University of Washington study (https://depts.washington.edu/labhist/maps-race-tacoma.shtml).

The Landmarks Preservation Commission spent nearly a year reviewing the nomination. Ultimately, that group approved the designation moving forward with only one dissenting vote. It’s time for the Planning Commission to also endorse the
The neighborhood should not wait any longer.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

James Alexander (Alex) Strautman
3106 N. 19th Street
Tacoma, WA 98406
Home Phone: 253-328-7001
I would like to submit a comment of my support of the College Park Historic District. I believe this will be very beneficial to our community and future generations in the Tacoma area.

Chris Stubel
Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I have owned a house in the district since 1983, and thus may have longer experience in the district than anyone else who has testified. I value history, and love the area. The area has done just fine without being designated an historic district, and I don’t see the need for that designation now. I agree with the testimony given on June 1 that the proposal is “a solution in search of a problem.” It is hard to see that creation of an historic district, with local design review, is necessary for the continued prosperity of the College Park area, and harder to see how it would protect, benefit, or enhance the entire city.

That is a very brief summary. I hope you will read my full page and a half (attached as a pdf file). Thank you.

Matt Temmel
June 3, 2022

To: Planning Commission, City of Tacoma

From: Matt Temmel

Re: What is the need for College Park historical district?

Ever since College Park was proposed last year as an historic district that would require additional design review at the local level, I have tried to accommodate my friends and acquaintances who fervently support the proposal. I have a Ph.D. in history, know architectural issues, and take good care of my house at 2909 North 19th St. It is hard to say “No” to people who so strongly advocate for things that I value. However, after listening to the testimony and discussion at the Landmarks Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission, I want to speak clearly. There is no need for an historic district.

In September 1981 I rented the house on North 19th Street, bought it two years later, and thus have about forty years’ experience with the proposed district. The house has been remodeled and enlarged twice since 1981. It is now better than ever, and remains compatible with the original Craftsman design (1910).

I can remember what the College Park area looked like in 1981, with its vintage houses, good trees, and overall wonderful environment. The area is not very large. I have walked, jogged, and biked every street in the district. Riding my bike, I ask myself how the houses compare to what I first saw in 1981. Well, pretty much the same! There are no “bad areas” in the district, and very few apartment buildings. Not much has changed since 1981—except of course the streets have more potholes, but the houses look really good. There is no practical threat of demolishing old houses, in order to build apartments or to build mega-mansions that hog the property lines. Or at least the threat of those things is no greater in College Park than in other parts of Tacoma.

Let’s be clear. The College Park district is NOT comparable to the nearby North Slope district. My understanding is that North Slope became an historic district in the 1990s, after many old houses on North K, North J, and other streets were knocked down during previous decades to build apartments. There is no such large-scale threat in College Park. First, the single-family houses in College Park are newer and generally in much better shape than the older houses in the North Slope. Second, designation as a local historical district would make it harder to get a demolition permit, but why should College Park have that additional protection and not other parts of Tacoma? From a city-wide perspective, it is hard to see how creating another historic district makes sense. It would make more sense to designate the entire city as one big historic district!

I testified to the Landmarks Preservation Commission that I was willing to support the proposed College Park historic district if the Commission’s authority for design review were limited to “street side” of the property. My main concern is the hugely higher cost of replacing old single-pane windows in an historic district. And so I compromised with myself and said, OK, let’s have historically-compatible windows on the street side, but let the homeowner decide on the other sides. Maybe that is the way to go, but it’s also
reasonable to believe that homeowners themselves can make appropriate decisions. After all, homeowners are the ones paying the bill. And there are no property tax breaks for homeowners who replace windows and doors, because those costs, high as they are, do not meet the threshold specified in the law (25% of the assessed property value).

Listening to the public testimony to the Planning Commission on June 1, I was particularly impressed by the comments of one man (sorry, I missed his name) who focused on placement of Electric Vehicle charging stations, heat pumps, and solar panels. Apparently, under existing code, those matters in historic districts come under the purview of the Landmarks Commission. I really wonder why the Landmarks Commission should have any authority at all on such matters—the best placement of charging stations, heat pumps, and solar panels should be a matter of function, not aesthetics.

In conclusion, I want to say that the proposal for another historic district is, as another person testified on June 1, “a solution in search of a problem.” It is hard to see that creation of an historic district, with local design review, is necessary for the continued prosperity of the College Park area, and even harder to see how it would protect, benefit, or enhance the entire city.

Thank you very much.
March 20, 2022

1911 N Union Ave

Tacoma, WA 98406

As a resident of such a beautiful neighborhood rich in history and community, I support the College Park Historic District nomination.

I grew up in England where its towns and villages tell a story of lives before. This is something you never miss until its gone. My heart aches with how our cities and towns are being torn down and rebuilt without design standards preserving the historic qualities of its neighborhoods.

College Park Historic District nomination is not about stopping growth, we love and support the growth of our community, many of the larger homes have renovated the insides of the house to support such growth. It’s about preserving the historic qualities. Important aesthetics like building height and setbacks can and will destroy the beautiful homes that have such important historic elements.

Over 55% of our community support College Park Historic District me being one of them. Please keep the history of this neighborhood and let it continue to be one of the most beautiful areas in Washington.

Sincerely,

Karen Tracy, MA
Karen Tracy Coaching

Karen Tracy
253-394-2007
Dear Planning Commissioners,

It is important to note that the Tacoma Municipal Code states:

“The City finds that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and continued use of landmarks, districts, and elements of historic, cultural, architectural, archeological, engineering, or geographic significance located within the City are required in the interests of the prosperity, civic pride, and ecological and general welfare of its citizens. “

And—
“...The City further finds that the economic, cultural, and aesthetic standing of the City cannot be maintained or enhanced by disregarding the heritage of the City or by allowing the destruction or defacement of historic and cultural assets.”

With this being part of our TMC, how is it possible that Tacoma has such a puny list of residential historic districts?

Hilltop needs 4 or 5. East side needs 8 or 10 and South Tacoma many, many. Fern Hill, McKinley Ave District, Railroad District. Drive out Pacific Ave. and go a couple of blocks to the left and right, from 38th out to at least 84th and there are wonderful historic districts all around. There should be 6 or 7 from this location.

We should go to work and place many more residential districts on the Tacoma Register. Tacoma should have 25 to 30 districts. We have the inventory, we just need to do the work.

As the first step I urge you to support placing College Park Historic District on the Tacoma Historic Register. It takes a lot of time to do the research to form an historic district. We should honor the author and the home owners for this work.

But we should not stop here. There are more districts that must be documented and added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. Our future needs our support today. You only regret what you tear down!

Please Support Placing College Park Historic District on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. The home-owners living there support this application. They deserve to have it!

Sincerely,

Jay Turner
817 North J St.
Tacoma, WA 98403
Dear Commissioners,

There is one thing about the City Historic District Ordinance that I think is important for you all to know and consider in your deliberations: The City Ordinance requires that homes in the district maintain the architecture that was inherent in the original building’s exterior - often built more than 100 years ago. Of course, the use of modern materials is often necessary, but the requirement is to make it look the same. Simple — just make it look the same. Not the inside - just the outside.

The majority of citizens of Tacoma who live in College Park have chosen to make this neighborhood an historic district. They did it with the knowledge that they agree to keep the architecture as near as they can to the original. So, please listen to them and pass the proposal on to the City Council.

I have been reading about preservation - and I live in a residential historic district in Tacoma - and find that there are many prominent Americans who have made great, short statements that point out the beauty of historic preservation; below are three of my favorites.

1. “How will we know it’s us without our past?” — John Steinbeck

2. “The Congress finds and declares that:
(a) the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage;
(b) the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life an development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people.”
— Preamble to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

3. “We are only the trustees for those who come after us.” — William Morris

Thank you for your service to all Tacoma’s citizens.

Sincerely,

Julie S. Turner
817 North J St.
Tacoma, WA 98403
College Park is more than suitable to be designated as a Historic District and should be accepted as such without reservation.

Ruth Tweeten
North Slope Historic District
TO: Lihuang Wung, Senior Planner  
City of Tacoma – Planning & Development Services

FROM: David Ullman  
3103 North 13th Street, Tacoma 98406

Dear Sir...

I have no doubt that you and the Planning Commission will receive many letters from folks supporting the nomination of the College Park District for inclusion in the Tacoma Historic Registry.

Some of those letters will tell you and the Planning Commission reason after reason why the writer believes the district deserves inclusion. Others will cite the city's charter and all sort of statutes, etc. Some will appeal to what they believe to be the Planning commission's better nature. Some folks will argue a point-of-view based in all sorts of emotional but relevant criteria.

My letter will not be one of those.

The way I see it is simple. If, by now, the Planning Commission doesn't know, appreciate and understand the value and history of the College Park District to the city of Tacoma... I fear that there's little I can do to inform and persuade the commission that "Historic Districts" contribute mightily to Tacoma's character and lifestyle (all of which is a cornerstone for growth)...and to the pride of Tacoma's residents.

There are men and women "out there" who are far more knowledgeable about historic preservation than I am. These are people really worth listening to. And so, let me offer the following:

"There may have been a time when preservation was about saving an old building here and there, but those days are gone. Preservation is in the business of saving communities and the values they embody."

Richard Moe, Former President  
National Trust For Historic Preservation

With all respect and good wishes...

David Ullman

Staff note: Mr. Ullman's email: 1onedeu1@gmail.com
1115 N. Cedar St.

Tacoma, WA 98406

To the Tacoma Planning Commission:
I am writing in support of both the College Park National Historic District in being named to the Tacoma Registry of Historic Places and the historic overlay district that it would create. I feel that preserving the integrity of the neighborhood allows for both maintenance of those elements which make it a desirable place to live and the enhancement of effective mixed use. Parameters can both maintain the organic and eclectic nature of the neighborhood and allow for creative use of existing buildings as multifamily or extended family without overbuilding. Based on the number of existing homes which contributed to the National and State Historic, we believe that the designation of our neighborhood as city Historic District is appropriate. It is also aligned with the City’s goal of creating family friendly areas that can accommodate higher density while maintaining human-scale architecture and essential green space. I strongly support the College Park National Historic District in being named to the Tacoma Registry of Historic Places.

Sincerely,
Ann Welton, annlabrum@nventure.com
To: City of Tacoma Planning Commission

Re: College Park Historic Review District

“Nostalgia is not what it used to be.” – Yogi Berra

I am opposed to the proposed College Park Historic District. The creation of the historic district will further segregate Tacoma by race and income, which is a bad thing. The costs of adding new regulations to this neighborhood outweigh the benefits.

The city should boost housing supply by making it easier for property owners to modify their property to build more housing, make energy efficiency upgrades, and basically do as they please without navigating a new layer of bureaucracy.

The Commission found that “generally, the socioeconomic status of neighborhoods with historic districts increases following designation” (page 6 of recommendations packet). In other words, preserving the “character” of this neighborhood would add to the wealth of current neighborhood homeowners to the exclusion of non-residents.

The Commission also predicted “no significant change” in racial or ethnic composition following historic district designation. In other words, the neighborhood would cement itself as one of the least diverse in the city (https://depts.washington.edu/labhist/maps-race-tacoma.shtml).

The Commission acknowledges these realities but thinks the district is still a good idea. I disagree. The City of Tacoma does not need to spend our tax dollars on additional layers of preservation.

While the creation of the district would not on paper exempt the neighborhood from the zoning changes brought forward by Home in Tacoma, the new restrictions would in effect push meaningful development, along with lower-income residents, to other neighborhoods. The public comment record reveals this is the goal of many supporters of the proposal.

The building inventory and research that went into this proposal is remarkable work. And we can all appreciate good craftsmanship and architectural history. But the neighborhood is not a museum. There is a housing crisis in Tacoma right now. That should be priority number one.

It seems like this proposal is set to move forward. I can only ask that the city consider my concerns when the next group of homeowners requests that their domain be protected from change.

Respectfully,

Ethan Whitener, renter, 1116 N. Steele St.
Dear Planning committing,

My name is Harrison Wiener and I am a homeowner on N 19th in the proposed College Park Historical district.

I received a letter informing me about the upcoming hearing and would like to share my comments. I personally do not like, nor support this measure and I sincerely hope that this measure is voted down.

There are a number of reasons why I am against this, but to summarize:

1. It is a direct subversion of the new city-wide zoning laws that were recently enacted.
2. It will artificially increase housing prices which therefore increases the barrier to entry for many different socio-economic groups; and being a person of color, this really resonates with me.
3. It makes it harder, if not impossible to make changes to the house that make it more environmentally friendly.
4. It enables people who have lived in the area for a generation to reap the benefits of making changes that made their house more livable, thus passing down the cost to mine and future generations of residents.

I am aiming to keep the points brief, but I would be happy to expand on each of those points if wanted or needed.

My wife and I have lived in North Tacoma for 6 years and as homeowners for 2 and a half years. We also know that the region as a whole is drastically low on available housing - not to mention affordable housing - and we feel a civic responsibility to speak up against these archaic practices that will keep our City from growing and, by default, prevent our community from welcoming diverse populations and becoming more inclusive.

Thank you for your time.

--
Thank you,
- Harrison Wiener
3008 N19th St. Tacoma WA 98406
C: 678-613-6432
I do not support the College Park neighborhood proposed designation as a Historic District for the following reasons:

Adding a Historic designation and Design Review to any neighborhood will increase the cost of repairs, additions or alterations. This is in conflict with Tacoma's AHAS. Unnecessary regulatory hurdles create barriers to people at many income levels.

The stated Design Guidelines intent is to ensure compatibility of new construction with the existing District. This is another way of saying that buildings with current styling should not be built next to or in a district with buildings constructed in a previous era. If this regulation were enacted city-wide, the result would be cheaply constructed homes made to look like historic structures everywhere because building a historically detailed home is cost-prohibitive in today's market.

Limiting the height of new structures further exacerbates the housing shortage that Tacoma is and will continue to face as more people move to this city. Allowing structures to have varying heights not only creates variety, it also houses more people.

Regulating the roof shape of new structures to look like existing homes does not allow the City's neighborhoods to evolve and change over time.

Mandating that new structures use similar exterior materials as existing homes also penalizes those who've arrived in Tacoma later than those who arrived earlier. Cities with exciting neighborhoods welcome a mix of architectural styles, materials and finishes,

Regulating window design, material and patterns to include muntins or grids is out of date with contemporary homes.

When we compare architecture to many other industries, for instance fashion, product design or car design, and place a 1908 Model T next to a 2022 Tesla, they look nothing alike and yet share the road just the same.

"Our greatest responsibility is not to be pencils of the past"  Robert Serling, playwright and television producer

John Wolters
architect

John Wolters
206.371.5152

WC STUDIO
architects

www.wc-studio.com
(Staff note: Attachment to John Wolters' e-mail)