

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Megan Luce
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell
Caroline T. Swope, PhD.

Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: March 11, 2009

LPC 47/09

Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Building North, Room 16

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ross Buffington
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Kathryn Longwell
Megan Luce (arrived at 5:05 p.m.)
Mark McIntire
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell
Caroline T. Swope, PhD.

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook

Commission Members Excused: N/A

Others Present:

Brett Santhuff, MaryLou Toth, Doug Kiger, Aleta Benedicto,
Joe Buskirk, Loren Combs, Linda Cameron, William Cameron,
Jillan Chappell, John Chappell, Paul McKean

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusals – N/A

B. Approval of Minutes – N/A

2. NOMINATION – PRELIMINARY REVIEW

General procedural notes were given by Mr. Reuben McKnight as follows:

The property on the agenda was nominated to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, which follows procedures defined in TMC 13.07.050, and consists of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. The initial meeting would determine whether the property met the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity. If the Commission concluded that the age and integrity standards were met, then the Commission may move to have the nomination scheduled for a public hearing and comment period; during which, the public may enter comments into the record for consideration. Following the comment period, the Commission may deliberate on the nomination for up to 45 days before recommending to the City Council listing on the Register, or denying the nomination. Owner consent is not required for the Commission to recommend designation. The purpose of the meeting was to determine whether or not the property met the threshold criteria and should be scheduled for public testimony at a public hearing.

A. 539 Broadway (The Union Club)

Constructed between the years 1888 and 1890, The Union Club, was nominated under criteria A, B, C, E, and F in the Tacoma Municipal Code. The building is an early example of Colonial Revival architecture in Washington State, and of the work of architects Whidden and Lewis. The building retains its integrity conveying its association with the boom period in Tacoma in the late 1880s. The Union Club was a social and business club with the most influential men as members. The site is an important visual feature of the

City and is near other landmarks including The Old City Hall Historic District and The Elks Temple. The building's exterior addition was constructed in 1906. Alterations were made in 1924, and in 1936 the University and Union Clubs merged and remained in the building until 1985. Modifications have been made to the bay side and the unique massing and architectural details remain intact on the Broadway elevation.

The nomination was submitted by Historic Tacoma. The owner was not a sponsor of the nomination. Notice was sent to the owner on February 25, 2009, via certified and first class mail. At the time of the agenda mailing, no response had been received from the owner; however, Mr. McKnight indicated that there was owner representation in the audience.

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

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

The purpose of the preliminary meeting was to determine that the age and integrity standards were met. The building was first constructed in 1888 and 1890, with subsequent alterations, its massing and architectural details remained intact of the primary elevation. The Union Club building meets the threshold criteria for age and integrity. Staff recommended scheduling the nomination for public testimony at a hearing for April 22, 2009.

Chair McIntire inquired if Mr. Brett Santhuff, Vice-President of the Board for Historic Tacoma, wanted to share any further pertinent information regarding the nomination of the Union Club to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places. Mr. Santhuff introduced Ms. Marylou Toth, an interested neighbor of the Union Club, and he proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation to include a timeline of the Union Club, as well as historical photographs. He reported that on December 13, 1941, Eleanor Roosevelt was the guest of honor at a meeting held in the Universal/Union Club to strategize and support the war effort following the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Doug Kiger introduced himself as the attorney representing the owners, the Smith family. Also present was Ms. Aleta Benedicto, the real estate agent representing the owner.

Mr. Kiger reported that the owners were "surprised" that the property had been nominated without first having been informed and/or consulted of its emergence. He further stated that Mr. Smith had been ill and that the property had been on the market for quite some time. He indicated that the Smith family held a deep interest in the property and did not want to sell it to a buyer who would demolish the building. However, Mr. Kiger reported that the Smith family was not in support of the nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

Commissioner Fred King asked Mr. Kiger what difficulties the Smith family might endure if the nomination to the Register were to be approved. Mr. Kiger indicated that it (the nomination) would deter potential purchasers of the property. Ms. Benedicto further indicated the family's concerns regarding their obligations, what conditions would need to be met, etc. Chair McIntire responded that the application for the nomination specifically stated "to accept it, exactly as it is". Vice-Chair Ross Buffington stated that if there were to be any changes to the exterior of the building, then the Smith family would need to apply to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for design review.

Commissioner Phillip Hill stated that there were several organizations and private individuals who purchase historic buildings because of the tax incentives for being on the Register.

Ms. Benedicto reported that the Smith family asked that the nomination process be suspended until after the sale of the property.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, find that the University/Union Club, at 539 Broadway, does meet the threshold criteria for both age and integrity for listing on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places, in accordance with TMC 13.07.04B(1); and that the Landmarks Preservation Commission will schedule a public hearing on this matter for April 22, 2009".

Motion: Buffington
Second: Hill
Motion: Carried (Commissioners House and Swope – recused)

Mr. McKnight stated that a formal notice for public testimony would be forthcoming; after which, the City Council would conduct its public hearing and allow further public testimony.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

A. OLD BUSINESS – 1406 North 7th Street – North Slope Historic District

Mr. McKnight delivered the staff report as follows: The Landmarks Preservation Commission reviewed and denied a retroactive application for design review for a vinyl window replacement at the above address on August 13, 2008. The applicant subsequently filed an appeal with the City Hearings Examiner, which was pending. On January 14, 2009, the owner's representative presented options for a negotiated remediation involving removal of the vinyl windows that had been installed, and partial or full re-installation of historically appropriate wood windows. A memorandum, correspondence from the owner's legal counselor to the Historic Preservation Officer, as well as correspondence from Mr. McKnight to the applicant's attorney, along with photographs of the original windows were furnished to the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

At that time, the Commission voted to accept what was referred to as "Option Two," which proposed the following:

Furnish and install 10 new Lindal wood windows and nine Tesco wood storm panels. Remove existing vinyl windows and install Lindal sash kits in double hung openings. If original sashes are salvageable, they will be re-installed in casement and fixed openings with Tesco wood storm panels on the exterior.

This was clarified to mean that the fixed or casement windows on the front elevation, totalling nine windows, would be re-installed with wood storm panels for thermal efficiency, and the sides and rear elevation windows would be new wood windows. The Commission further indicated that interior or exterior storm panels would be acceptable.

At that meeting, the Commission expressed concern over the definition of "salvageable" and whether this would be determined by the homeowner, the window installer, or a qualified window expert. Thus, the Commission instructed that staff would be contacted by the owner, should the owner determine that any of the windows could not be salvaged.

On February 12, 2009, the owner requested staff to make a site visit to examine the windows from the front elevation. The site visit took place on February 27, 2009.

The owner indicated that he did not believe that the windows could be feasibly salvaged for his home, and that he would like to install new wood windows on the front elevation, due to a number of factors:

- The existing windows are damaged and would require repair before re-installation.
- It was his understanding that salvaging the existing windows entailed re-installation with minimal repair.
- Because the window installation company, Sound Glass, does not do window repairs, another party would have to be retained to conduct this work, which would substantially elevate the cost of the project beyond that which had been agreed to by Sound Glass and the owner.
- The removal of the vinyl windows and installation of new wood windows was requiring a refinance of the house. Due to previous improvements, purchase price of the home, and the currently agreed to cost of the window replacement, there was not enough money available within the refinancing budget.
- The proposed new windows, being installed elsewhere in the home, are historically accurate and will restore the exterior appearance of the home.

Staff conducted the site visit and photographed the original windows. The following was observed:

- The existing windows, to varying degrees, will require repair before being installed.
- Typical damage includes: individual broken panes in the gridded lead windows, separation of sash rail and stile joints, structural degradation of the leadwork, and linear cracks in the grain along rails and stiles. Little rot was observed. In one case, the rail separation had also caused the lead channel to separate from the glazing.
- Staff determined that, based upon these observations, the original windows can be repaired.
- Staff also determined that the proposed window replacements, *per se*, appeared to fit the design guidelines and Secretary of the Interior's Standards for replacement materials.
- Secretary of the Interior's Standard, number 6 states:

Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- However, the preamble of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards states that, "the Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility." Likewise, the design guidelines for the North Slope direct the Commission to "be considerate of clearly documented cases of economic hardship or deprivation of the owner's reasonable use of the property."
- At issue for the Commission was whether this request for reconsideration, which proposed replacement with wood windows for the entire house, was acceptable - based upon application of the Standards and consideration of feasibility.
- Staff recommended to the owner that supporting documentation for costs and budget, as well as a sample of a new window, be presented to the Commission at the March 11, 2009, meeting.

Staff deferred making a recommendation regarding approval of the modified proposal. Mr. McKnight added that staff recommended that the Commission's discussion include strong consideration of the financial information being presented by the owner.

The owner's attorney, Mr. Loren Combs, clarified that after the Landmarks Preservation Commission selected Option Two as its preference for a solution, the owner learned that Sound Glass would not be able to comply with that option; therefore, it would necessitate that a professional restoration company perform the repairs to the windows, which would greatly increase the cost (approximately \$22,000) of that option.

Mr. Joe Buskirk reported that Legacy Renovation provided a bid to restore/repair the six original wood windows in the front of the house, which would bring the total cost (Option 1) to \$49,623.97. Mr. Buskirk reported that the purchase price in September 2007 was \$346,000.00; total investment costs, to date, at \$409,877.82; and a recent appraisal of the home was \$365,000.00.

In an agreement with Sound Glass (Option 2), Mr. Buskirk indicated that they would install 19 windows in the sides and the rear of the house. The front of the house would have clear windows with leaded strips on the outside, which would match an original window – the difference being double-panes, rather than single-panes. He reported a savings of 44 percent in the cost of oil for heating the home since the double-pane windows were installed. He urged the Commission to consider approving Option 2, as described above, with a savings of over \$20,000.

Vice-Chair Buffington asked for clarification of the "new" Option 2 currently being presented. Mr. Buskirk indicated that previously, Option 2 included 10 windows in the back of the house being installed with the wood-wrapped storm windows, either interior or exterior.

Mr. Combs urged the Commission to take into account the Secretary of the Interior's direction that would allow consideration of the homeowner's financial circumstances.

Mr. McKnight indicated that when he spoke with the homeowner following the site visit, he had asked him for documentation of the financial numbers, as well as to provide additional material samples to the Commission. He stated that the only issue to be reconsidered was the front elevation windows. He added that the original windows could be salvageable, perhaps, by another homeowner. Mr. McKnight indicated that his observation and recommendation for the Commission would be that the proposed windows were suitable material replacement.

Mr. Combs reported that the homeowner was willing to donate the original windows to a suitable organization for restoration and conservation purposes.

Commissioner Pamela Sundell asked about the possibility of the homeowner gradually restoring and re-installing the original windows in the front elevation. Mr. Buskirk replied that he would be willing to keep the original windows on the property, in the event that the next homeowner had the funds to restore and re-install them.

Commissioner Kathryn Longwell agreed that the circumstances posed a financial hardship to the homeowner; however, it was their responsibility to have been aware of the guidelines associated with living in the North Slope Historic District, as well as in obtaining the necessary permits for window replacement in the City of Tacoma.

Commissioner King asked for clarification of the Commission's action, which would be to approve the substitution of new thermal pane windows with applied leading to the front elevation.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the request of the homeowner at 1406 North 7th Street, to use new wood sash with thermal pane glass, with an applied leading to match the original windows (Option 2) as presented".

Motion: King

Second: Hill

Vice-Chair Buffington offered an amendment to the motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, find that the replacement of existing historic windows that can be repaired (with the new windows), violates the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, number 6, which calls for historic features to be repaired, if at all possible; but that, in light of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards statement that the Commission can consider economic and technical feasibility as well, in addition to the North Slope Historic District guidelines, which states that clearly documented cases of economic hardship or deprivation of the owner's reasonable use of the property is an acceptable amelioration of the Standards – that Mr. Buskirk has taken the trouble to clearly document that there was a case of economic hardship".

The amendment was accepted by Commissioners King and Hill.

Commissioner Caroline Swope amended the motion:

"That the approval be conditioned upon the donation of the original windows to an appropriate restoration/supplier and direct the Historic Preservation Officer to assist with the location of such an organization, if needed".

The amendment was accepted by Commissioners King and Hill.

Commissioner Sundell offered the following amendment:

"To have the original front windows saved by the owner, to remain on the property".

Chair McIntire stated that he recognized conflict between the last two amendments. Commissioner Longwell suggested that Commissioner Swope rescind her amendment and restate to exclude the front windows, as

she agreed with Commissioner Sundell's amendment.

Chair McIntire called for a vote on the amended motion by Commissioner Swope with a show of hands. Five Commissioners voted to have the original windows donated to an appropriate restoration/supplier, as amended by Commissioner Swope. The amendment passed 5 to 4.

Chair McIntire called for a vote on the motion, as amended.

Motion: Carried, unanimously.

Commissioner Longwell asked the owner if the windows could be donated to the North Slope Historic District. Chair McIntire stated that the Historic Preservation Officer would assist with the donation of the original windows.

B. New Business – 615 North M Street

Ms. Tonie Cook delivered the staff report: Constructed in 1948, the home at 615 North M Street is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District.

The proposal was to construct a new rear detached carport. The new carport will be "L" shaped structure with overall dimensions of 20 feet in width, 23 feet long, 9' 4 ½ inches in height with a 4 in 12 pitch roof. The carport is proposed to have 6 X 8 posts in concrete pads without exterior wall and a shingle roof. Building and Land-Use Services would require the posts to be 8 X 8.

North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines will be considered including the following:

1. Height. Goal: Balance the overall height of new construction with that of nearby structures. In the rehabilitation of existing buildings, the present height of the structure should remain intact. New buildings should step down to be comparable in height to adjacent structures.
2. Scale. Goal: Relate the size and proportion of new buildings to those of the neighborhood. Scale refers to a building's comparative relationship to neighboring structures, and its fit within the district. Building facades should be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings, and maintain a comparable setback from the property line to adjacent buildings, as permitted by applicable zoning regulations. Scale is also determined by the proportions of the architectural elements within the composition of the individual building facades. Window and door proportions (including the design of sash and frames), floor heights, floor shapes, roof shapes and pitches, and other elements of the building exterior should relate to the scale of the neighborhood.
5. Roof Shapes and Materials. Goal: Utilize traditional roof shapes, pitches, and compatible finish materials on all new structures, porches, additions, and detached outbuildings wherever such elements are visible from the street. Maintain the present roof pitches of existing pivotal, primary, and secondary buildings where such elements are visible from the street. Typically, the existing, historic buildings in the neighborhood either have gable roofs with the slopes of the roofs between 5:12 to 12:12 or more, and with the pitch oriented either parallel to or perpendicular to the public right-of-way, or have hipped roofs with roof slopes somewhat lower. Most roofs also have architectural details, such as cross gables, dormers, and/or widow's walks to break up the large sloped planes of the roof. Wide roof overhangs, decorative eaves or brackets, and cornices can be creatively used to enhance the appearance of the roof.
6. Exterior Materials. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope Neighborhood were sided with shingles, or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco-covered structures were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials did not fit the character of the neighborhood. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.
9. Parking. Goal: Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Most early houses provided space for storing various means of transportation, from horses and carriages to automobiles; however, these structures were nearly always entered from the alley rather than from

the street. Setting garages and carport structures back from the front of the building reduces their visual importance.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards will be considered including the following:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Staff analysis:

1. The home on the property is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it is a brick home constructed in 1948. As part of the North Slope Historic District, it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building including new construction per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. The new carport is proposed on the rear of the property as a detached structure, which will be minimally visible from the alley. The structure will allow entry from the alley, which appeared to meet the North Slope Historic District Guideline number 9, *Parking, specifically for, "Minimize views of parking and garages from the public right-of-way. Setting garages and carport structures back from the front of the building reduces their visual importance"*.
4. The proposed new carport structure is less than 10 feet in height, which meets North Slope Historic District Guideline number 1 for Height, specifically for "*...New buildings should step down to be comparable in height to adjacent structures*".
5. The footprint of the proposed new carport is smaller than the size of the existing garage which is located across from the proposed new structure. The carport proposal appears to meet the North Slope Historic District Guideline number 2, Scale, for "*relate the size and proportion of new buildings to those of the neighborhood. Scale refers to a building's comparative relationship to neighboring structures, and its fit within the district...*".
6. The proposed gable roof with a 4:12 roof pitch does not meet the North Slope Historic District Guideline number 5 for Roof Shapes and Materials with the goal of "*...between 5:12 to 12:12...*". However, the proposed building is not the primary structure on the property and it is located on the rear of the property which reduces its visibility from the rear alley.
7. The materials proposed for the new carport are wood post, shingle roof, and plywood which appear to be compatible with traditional materials in the Historic District and meets North Slope Historic District Guideline number 6, Exterior Materials, specifically for, "*...New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood...*".
8. The proposal is new construction of a rear detached carport structure, which will not destroy historic property, the scale and proportion and massing will protect the integrity of the property and its environment, which meets Secretary of Interior's Standard number 9 for, "*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*".

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings; and recommended approval.

Commissioner Sundell inquired as to the purpose of the carport. Mr. Cameron responded that the carport would accommodate his third vehicle. The Commissioner further inquired as to the purpose of the L shape. The homeowner stated that the L shape would help accommodate storage purposes, such as the lawnmower, etc.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, reject the application, as presented, finding that it did not meet the North Slope Historic District Guideline number 6; specifically, that new structures be similar to those typically found in the neighborhood; nor did it meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards number 9, which states (in part) that new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. Further, that the open carport was not compatible with the other structures in the neighborhood".

Motion: Buffington
Second: Sundell
Motion: Failed

There was a new motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, accept the owner's request to construct a carport at 615 North M Street".

Motion: Hill
Second: King

Commissioner King offered an amendment to require that the roof slope be 5:12, rather than 4:12.

Motion: Carried – Two nays

3. BOARD BRIEFINGS

A. 1221 North Steele – North Slope Historic District – New Construction

The property at 1221 North Steele is currently a vacant corner lot at the northern boundary within the North Slope Historic District. The proposal was to construct a new single-family residence. The owners and architect presented the proposal to the Architectural Review Committee on February 18, 2009. A variance was required due to the dimensions and size of the lot and; as a condition of the building permit, design review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The owners requested a briefing to the full Commission for additional feedback.

The ARC had discussed compatibility of a new modern design within the Historic District addressing height, massing, scale, window design details, cladding (stucco and lapsiding), roof form, garage, driveway and curbcuts, and sense of entry, as well as sustainability.

Mr. Paul McKean presented the project using PowerPoint. Updated concept graphics were presented at the March 11, 2009, Commission meeting. Mr. McKean highlighted the sustainable systems of the design, to include rainwater collection for graywater and irrigation and 3 kw photovoltaic array for energy.

The property owner, Mr. John Chappell, indicated that energy conservation was the main focus of the project.

Commissioner Longwell stated that she had been in contact with approximately 20 North Slope Historic District members regarding the proposed project. She said that the North Slope Historic District Board had written a formal letter to the City's Building and Land-Use Department to ask that the variance they are seeking be denied. Mrs. Chappell indicated that she was aware that the neighbors were upset about the project; however, "the Commission is the authority, not the neighbors", she said.

Vice-Chair Buffington specifically objected to the roof shape and the addition of a curbcut. Commissioner Sundell applauded the use of an infill space, but cautioned about the safety/visibility relative to a sub-grade garage. Mr. McKnight stated that the design guidelines provided that if the circumstances were unique to the lot, or there was no alley access, the object was to minimize the visual impact of parking on the primary

facades of the building. Under the District Standards that Public Works regulates, new curbcuts are not acceptable, except where the Landmarks Preservation Commission finds that there was not an alternative.

Chair McIntire indicated that he was in favor of the building; however, the two unresolved issues were the roof pitch and the rhythm of openings. He stated that the curbcut issue was of less importance.

Commissioner Imad Al Janabi opined that whatever will be constructed in 2009/2010 would reflect itself for its time. He further stated that he would like some guidance from the North Slope Historic District guidelines that stated the property owner cannot build a modern design.

Mr. McKnight stated that the ARC previously provided some feedback regarding the scaling and massing issues were compatible with the surrounding buildings; however, the roof form and fenestration pattern had not been resolved. He asked that the Commission address those unresolved issues to benefit the property owners.

Commissioner Sundell inquired if the use of different materials would give the building less of a commercial appearance. Commissioner Swope stated that the use of stucco on the lower portion of the building gave it a commercial appearance.

Commissioner Megan Luce indicated that because the property was a corner lot, the structure would be more visible.

Mr. McKnight explained the process of proceeding with the current project, to include the appeals process for any interested parties.

Commissioner Hill inquired about the appropriateness of a "straw vote" to better determine the Commission's opinion regarding the proposed project. Chair McIntire stated that a "straw vote" would likely help to advise the applicant. Six Commissioners voted in favor of the proposal; three Commissioners voted against the proposal; and there was one abstention. Several Commissioners expressed that, while they indicated that they would vote for the proposal if it were proposed for action at this meeting, that they also had significant concerns regarding the applicability of the design guidelines to certain aspects of the project design. Additional information or changes to design in the future could result in voting results different than the straw vote.

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. 2009 Work Items

Mr. McKnight reported that the City Council requested that the Landmarks Preservation Commission review the current Place Naming Policy, adopted in 1989, and make recommendations for its improvement; as well as to make recommendations regarding certain areas of the Code that are in need of being amended. Staff recommended that the Commission establish a Policy Committee for 2009 to review these and related issues.

- i. **Place Naming Policy**
- ii. **Code Amendments Overview**

There was a motion to establish a Policy Committee:

Motion: King
Second: Buffington
Motion: Carried

Chair McIntire offered his participation on the Committee. Commissioners Sundell and Longwell also agreed to be on the Committee.

B. Preservation Month Update

- i. Awards Nominations**
- ii. Activities**

This item was held over to the next Commission meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer