

KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES*

*February 28, 2019
Tipping Floor Conference Room (#7255)
King Street Center, 201 S. Jackson
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 04/25/2019)*

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Poppi Handy, Chair; Caroline Lemay, Vice Chair; David Pilgrim, Cristy Lake, Amber Earley, Rebecca Ossa, Amy Blue

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Ella Moore

STAFF PRESENT: Jennifer Meisner, Sarah Steen

GUESTS: KC Roads Project Team: Tom Minichillo, Katie Merrell, Emily Davis, Ellen Brenden, Larry Jaramillo, Bob Milet, Trinh Trong, Susan Olive. Susan McRoy, resident of Baring.

CALL TO ORDER: Handy called the meeting to order at 4:30pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made.

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Handy asked for any changes/corrections to the January 24, 2019 meeting minutes. There were none.

Pilgrim/Lake moved to approve the January 24, 2019 minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 6-0 (Blue abstained as she was not present at that meeting).

OTHER BUSINESS: *Baring Bridge Remediation Project Update* – Tom Minichillo opened the Project Team briefing, stating the purpose was to update the commission on planning progress since their last presentation in October, 2018. Trinh Trong gave the main presentation on behalf of the KC Roads team, first detailing the alternatives analysis and public outreach activities. Trong visually showed the website developed for the project as well as the results of the community outreach survey sent out to gather public opinion on the bridge project. She then described the well-attended community open house held at the firehouse near the bridge.

Trong said after summarizing and considering all the public input gathered, and analyzing the team's developed criteria matrix, that King County has selected a preferred alternative for work on the Baring Bridge. There were two categories of evaluation – one for the bridge location and one for the bridge type. She reviewed the points system used in the criteria matrix. For the bridge location, there were two alternatives; to build a parallel bridge downstream, or build a new bridge in the existing location of the Baring Bridge. In all, there were four bridge types considered, which Trong visually reviewed with the Commission. Trong then stated that the selected alternative was to build a new steel truss bridge in the existing location of the historic wood Baring Bridge. The

*May include minutes for cities who have interlocal historic preservation agreements with King County.

next steps are to finish the bridge type/size/location report and move forward with the 30% design of the preferred alternative.

Handy asked for clarification that the preferred alternative was to remove the existing historic bridge and install a new bridge, Trong said yes, that was correct. Susan McRoy asked why a steel truss bridge was the type selected, Trong said the criteria scoring (outlined in her presentation) favored a steel truss type. Minichillo said the decision was being driven by a number of things, including the project expense, ongoing maintenance of the bridge, etc. McRoy said she was attending the meeting out of her concern that a stronger bridge will result in more logging traffic and additional development in the area. Ellen Brenden stated that any bridge chosen would be designed to current engineering load standards, up to a 20-ton truck, and they cannot design a bridge to a lower load standard. She also stated the current bridge can carry a 10-ton truck.

McRoy stated that Baring is a small town, and the community gems are the store and the bridge. She shared her concern that the loss of the bridge would impact the area and encourage unwanted development. Minichillo noted the plan was to construct a single lane bridge, with a pedestrian lane which could be converted later, because of current levels of traffic volume. Minichillo also noted that comments on logging and other community concerns have already been received and were included in the overall public comment summary.

Pilgrim asked if any part of the bridge could be salvaged and reused in the new bridge. Minichillo said there were no plans yet to do so, but the team has been in the project analysis phase and hadn't gone through any historic resource regulatory processes. Only the cables are from the 1930s bridge – most the wood structure is from the 1950s or later. Context sensitivity will be part of the design process. Pilgrim pointed out what had been done on the South Park Bridge, where its gears were used for interpretation on site. Minichillo said reusing materials on that bridge was written into the COA/Section 106 mitigation process, but added that they were metal, and so easier to use in a permanent outside exhibit than wood. But, he said, they hadn't proposed any mitigation yet for this project, and the commission will have a chance to weigh in on options during the COA hearing.

Handy asked for more detail on why a suspension bridge type was not selected. Minichillo answered that it would be twice as expensive; between 10 and 15 million dollars, potentially. There are no other small suspension bridges in the county. He said truss bridges are very common and appropriate in rural areas, since they are safe and easy to maintain. Pilgrim asked why the location was chosen – demolishing the existing historic bridge and building a new bridge on the existing alignment. Minichillo said that the private property take would be greater for a second bridge. Sightlines and alignment (safety) would be issues as the new bridge was tied into the two existing approach roads, especially given the space required between the bridges. Handy asked if there was community input on which alternative was preferred. Minichillo said yes, there was quite a bit of input. Roughly 50/50 split on building on the same alignment. Minichillo stated that there was a lot of contradictory answers – community members often wanted both a new bridge on the same alignment and the older bridge kept.

End of presentation

Election of Officers. Pilgrim/Lake moved to elect Handy as Chair for 2019. The motion passed 6-0 with Handy abstaining. Ossa/Lake moved to elect Lemay as Vice-Chair for 2019. The motion passed 6-0 with Lemay abstaining.

Following the officer election there was a brief discussion on committee organization and commissioner assignments. Pilgrim, Lemay, and Ossa (as an alternate for Handy) agreed to serve on the Design Review Committee.

Pilgrim also gave a brief report on Policy & Planning committee activities. He described an ongoing effort to encourage enforcement of the International Maintenance Code to manage issues with demolition by neglect. Pilgrim also noted that staff is working on implementing a recurring survey of existing landmarks, as well as trying to arrange for staff/commission notification of the sale of a landmarked property to enable outreach to new owners regarding restrictions and benefits. Lake, Blue, and Pilgrim agreed to serve on the P&P committee.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Meisner briefed the commission on the (then) upcoming Regional Preservation Workshop in Renton. Commissioners Blue and Earley are slated to go before the County Council Committee of the Whole for formal confirmation (they were automatically confirmed 30 days after appointment). Meisner also updated the commission on some legislation which was advanced to the County Council related to the Preservation Action Fund. The PAF is a revolving fund through 4Culture (administered in partnership with Historic Seattle, the WA Trust and King County). Historic Seattle needed to get permission to do projects outside of Seattle, which was approved by Seattle City Council, and now moves forward for approval by the County Council. A pending preservation project which this fund will impact is the Caretaker's Cottage associated with the Fall City Masonic Hall.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Pilgrim announced an upcoming training on quasi-judicial rules and procedures offered by City of Maple Valley in late March. Landmarks Commissioners are invited to attend.

ADJOURN

Convene KENT LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Nancy Simpson (*absent*)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: None

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: Bereiter House (COA #1904) – proposal to install new Kent Historical Museum signage. DRC recommends approval.

Steen presented a brief staff report on the location and history of the Bereiter House, and described the current proposal to install a new, larger museum sign on the south boundary of the property to capture more attention for the museum. Blue asked if the sign would be simpler, and what color it

would be. Steen answered it would be simpler, with only the name of the museum, and the color would remain blue. Handy asked if there were any additional questions or comment on the proposal. Hearing none, she called for a motion on the COA.

Blue/Lemay moved to ratify the agreement between the commission and applicant, and approve a COA for a new exterior museum sign on the Bereiter House as recommended by the DRC. The motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURN

Convene SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Rob Garwood

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Susan Karlsen (applicant); Tom Aron

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: Crawford Store (COA #1903) – retroactive COA application for multiple exterior alterations.

Steen presented a staff report on the history of the house and the retroactive COA application before the commission. The application is focused on exterior changes to the property undertaken over time without commission approval. Through photographs, Steen visually detailed alterations to the porch and porch openings, windows, chimneys, and entry door of the house. As a retroactive COA, the commission was charged with considering the impact of unapproved changes, and deciding what level of restoration, compatible replacements or mitigation actions would be most appropriate for the owner to undertake.

Referring to one of the photos, Handy asked when the second-story double-hung windows were altered (the ones wider than original double-hung windows). Steen answered sometime in the 1950s, before the property was designated. Earley asked if there was an addition on the second floor to the rear of the house, Steen answered yes, it was also built before the house was landmarked.

Pilgrim gave a report on the DRC review of this project. He said one outstanding issue was the enclosure of the southwest end of the porch. He also commented on the breakdown in process overall, questioning Shoreline city staff's role in the failure to notify the landmarks commission of proposed work. If a building permit was issued, KC commission staff should have been contacted. Blue asked if this current review happened because of unpermitted work being done on the property. Steen said, yes, in part. The city website has records for issued permits for mechanical, electrical and plumbing work, but city planning staff had told HPP staff that additional unpermitted work was being addressed. Steen also noted that the city did not contact KCHPP before issuing a framing permit in 2009. The property owner applied for and received a COA

(painting) in 2006, and applied for another COA in 2012 (façade alterations). The 2012 COA application was dropped by the property owner before it went through full review.

Lemay offered additional detail on the DRC review, also noting the enclosed porch section (thought to be a bathroom), and pointing out the sliding door on the west elevation could be replaced with something more compatible. The newer window installed next to the sliding door has non-compatible internal muntins.

Following the DRC report, Handy invited the applicant to present her proposal, noting there will be a public comment period immediately after. Susan Karlsen, owner/applicant, detailed her ownership history of the house. She said the Shoreline planners were relatively new when she bought the property (Shoreline incorporated in 1995). There have been issues related to commercial vs residential zoning, which led to the current situation involving an ADU permit. Karlsen knew her house was designated, but said she thought only the façade, color, and siding were protected. She said she felt she invested heavily repairing and maintaining in the building, and had done a lot of the work herself. Currently, she is preparing the house for sale.

Handy thanked the applicant, and reiterated that the breakdown in communication between Shoreline city staff, the property owner and the landmarks commission was unfortunate. Tom Aron, friend of the applicant, spoke in support Karlsen's comments on the property. He said when Karlsen bought the building she hadn't known it was a historic landmark, and that the language regarding facades (the specification of designated areas) was confusing, leading the owner to believe only actions impacting the front of the building were restricted. Karlsen detailed the deterioration of the windows as a reason why she replaced the ones she had. Aron also noted that a contractor had built the porch enclosure/addition, and Karlsen had assumed he'd obtained any required permits to do the work.

Handy asked if any other member of the public wished to speak on this proposal. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing portion of the commission meeting.

Garwood asked when and why the chimneys were removed. Karlsen stated that she did not remove the chimneys herself, they were gone when she bought the house. Lake noted that the reference photo (c2000) showing the chimneys in place could feasibly have been taken just before Karlsen bought the building. Garwood said the addition was a problem. Pilgrim agreed. Steen said the property was landmarked in 1985, and the c2000 photo under discussion was taken as part of a King County landmark survey. Steen also clarified the permitting timeline. The 2012 COA, which the owner dropped before completing the design review process, was for work on the front façade. Some of the work applied for, but not reviewed, was completed anyway.

Garwood asked how many bathrooms this house needs to have. Meisner pointed out that in the commission's guidelines there is language addressing the importance of keeping historic buildings in productive use. She noted that while these changes were made without approval, installing a bathroom is an effort to make a space habitable and keep the building usable, which should be a factor in the commission's deliberations. Additional discussion on bathrooms followed.

Steen reiterated that the focus of the commission in considering a retroactive COA is to establish reasonable corrections or mitigation actions for unapproved alterations to the building, and commented that the addition may not be the best starting point for that effort. Ossa asked what elevations of the building are most visible. Steen said the north (front) and west elevations.

Handy asked for more commission discussion on what would be reasonable mitigation actions, agreeing that removing the addition did not seem to qualify as reasonable. Pilgrim mentioned the sliding glass door on the west elevation. Steen visually reviewed some of the changes to the west elevation, including when doors and windows were installed or filled in.

Pilgrim brought up the question of whether issuing a COA means approval of all alterations undertaken up to that point. Steen noted that this was brought up as a problem in the DRC meeting as well, restating the question as “are we tacitly approving all changes if we don’t address all the changes in the COA” and put it to the commission for discussion. Handy thought the commission should be clear on its approval or disapproval of each change in the record, pointing out that this retroactive project review is setting precedent with the city of Shoreline. Mitigation requirements for property owners will result from the lack of regulatory process follow through.

Ossa proposed developing a list of mitigation elements, specifically noting the highly visible windows on the first and second story (north and west elevations), and the sliding doors. Steen said that any conditions imposed by the commission become a requirement of the city permit, and changes addressed could be divided into recommendations (shoulds) and conditions (musts). Additional discussion on architectural details followed.

Ossa suggested installing a muntin across the (north elevation) second story corner window, and replacing the sliding window (west elevation) because it interrupts the orientation pattern of the historic fenestration. Pilgrim agreed, saying replacing the sliding window should be a recommendation. Handy clarified that applying the muntins across the west elevation second-story picture windows would be a condition, replacing the sliding window with a double-hung window would be a recommendation.

Meisner asked about altered elements on the ground floor. Discussion focused on the sliding door and adjoining window with non-compatible flat internal muntins. The owner had stated those were installed to bring light into the downstairs room. Meisner asked if a French (swing) door would be more compatible in place of the sliding door. Garwood stated that the commission could require the owners to restore the ground floor openings to the condition in which they found it. Steen noted that both historic doors (entry and porch), which were either filled in or replaced, were $\frac{3}{4}$ or full-light swing doors that could model a compatible pattern for replacing the sliding doors.

Based on an earlier site visit, Steen offered the opinion that that ground-floor space is relatively dark, and a second opening leading to the porch makes sense from a circulation standpoint. Handy noted that was probably why the second door was originally there (removed when the southwest end of the porch was enclosed). Additional discussion on addressing the ground floor openings followed.

Pilgrim and Earley recommended replacing the ground floor fixed window next to the sliding door with one without internal muntins. Handy pointed out the door and window lines are still there, and thought the ground floor openings should remain the dimensions they currently are while the windows and doors are switched out for more compatible types.

The commission reviewed the applicability of SOI Standards 2, 9 and 10 as reflected in the recommendations and conditions as discussed by the commission for the record (outlined in the issued COA). The commission did not recommend the removal of the porch enclosure/addition, but noted for the record that the alteration was not an approved change.

Blue moved to approve a retroactive Type II COA for exterior modifications to the Crawford Store, subject to mitigation conditions and recommendations as determined by the Commission at this meeting, recognizing the Commission's formal disagreement with the appropriateness of enclosing the southwest portion of the porch, and including specific reference to applicable Landmarks standards and criteria. Motion seconded by Lemay. Discussion followed addressing each of the relevant standards and criteria to be addressed in the COA. Motion passed 8-0.

ADJOURN: The meeting was adjourned at 7:00pm.