

# **KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES\***

*July 25, 2019  
Kent City Council Chambers - City Hall  
220 4<sup>th</sup> Ave S.  
Kent, Washington  
(Approved 09/26/2019)*

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Poppi Handy, Chair; David Pilgrim, Amber Earley, Rebecca Ossa, Cristy Lake, Amy Blue, Ella Moore

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED:** Caroline Lemay

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jennifer Meisner, Sarah Steen, Todd Scott

**CALL TO ORDER:** Handy called the meeting to order at 5:00pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made. Commissioner Ella Moore recused herself from the Issaquah Landmarks Commission during its consideration of Providence Heights' designation status. Several Commissioners also disclosed that they attended a site visit to the Museum of Flight in advance of the hearing to review the history and design development of the Lunar Roving Vehicles with the Museum's Space Historian.

## **Convene KENT LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**SPECIAL COMMISSIONER:** Nancy Simpson

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Dana Ralph, Mayor; Michelle Wilmot, Economic Development Manager

**GUESTS:** Patty Sikora, Sonia Chavez, Juan Carlos Chavez, Harris & Mary Atkins, Erin Herringshaw, Kelly Maloney, Matt Slafka, David Ingram, Sean Smith, Linda & Richard Wilkinson, Eileen Lamphere, Sharon Bersaas, Kevin Grossman, Mary Batterson, Barbara McMichael, Alexia Dorsch, Patrick Michael, Barbara Smith, Jeff Middleton, Michael Lombardi, Maranda Palmer, Toni Troutner, Barb Smith, Gaila Gutierrez, Dave Kaplan, Garry Stewart, Brenda Fincher, Marcus Shelton, Tom Baines, Sarah Martin

## **PUBLIC HEARING: Lunar Roving Vehicles Community Landmark Nomination**

Steen presented a brief staff report on Kent's landmark designation process, outlining applicable codes and guidelines, the criteria under which the Lunar Roving Vehicles were being considered for designation, and the regulatory differences between a landmark and a community landmark.

Sarah Martin, preservation consultant and author of the Lunar Roving Vehicles (LRV) landmark nomination, gave a presentation on the history and development of the vehicles within Boeing's Space Center in Kent. She also explained the technical and cultural context of space exploration in 1960s/1970s America, detailing Boeing (and Kent's) involvement in and contributions to those efforts. Martin specifically noted the unconventionality of nominating the lunar rovers, given their

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

location on the moon's surface, pointing out that two other states have designated objects and structures on the moon within their state historic resource inventories. She concluded by relating the design and significance of the rovers directly to the designation criteria.

Handy asked if any Commissioners had questions for Martin. There were none. Steen noted for the record that the HPP office had received 20 letters of support for designation of the LRVs from various local community members and professionals around the region. Prior to opening the floor for public testimony, Handy recognized three audience members, all Boeing engineers who worked on the Lunar Roving Vehicle development program. Charlie Martin, Dennis McKillip, and Harris Atkins and their families were asked to stand, Handy thanked them for their work on the rovers. She then opened the hearing for public comment.

Public Testimony:

Sean Smith, resident of Covington, spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Dave Kaplan, Local Government Relations Manager for the Port of Seattle, spoke as a representative of the Port Commission in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Barb Smith, Executive Director of the Kent Downtown Partnership, noted the level of community interest and support for memorializing Kent's connection to the LRVs, detailing the project to install a replica of a rover in Kent's downtown park. She supports the designation of the LRVs.

Lisa Paulson, Kent resident and Boeing retiree, spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

David Ingram, Boeing retiree, noted that he had worked with the LRV battery design team in Missouri. He spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Marcus Shelton, U.S. Army veteran, spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Charlie Martin, Boeing retiree and engineer on team that developed the lunar rover, spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Kelly Maloney, President and CEO of Aerospace Futures Alliance and the Washington State Space Coalition, spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Juan Carlos Chavez, works for NASA programs at University of Washington, described the importance of recognizing engineering history to STEM students, notably those from diverse backgrounds. He spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Dana Ralph, Mayor of Kent, noted that the link between Kent and the LRVs is not as widely known locally as it should be. She spoke in support for the designation.

Mike Lombardi, corporate historian for the Boeing Company, spoke in support for the designation of the LRVs.

Alexia Dorsch, Kent resident and civil engineer, commented on the value of recognizing local historic engineering achievements for STEM students, and supports the designation of the LRVs.

Handy asked if anyone else in the audience would like to speak on the designation. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Pilgrim opened internal commission deliberations with the comment on the comprehensiveness and high quality of the nomination form. He cited A1 and A3 as the criteria under consideration, noting both are supportable and that the LRVs' connection to Kent was clearly made. Moore stated that she wasn't aware of the connection between Kent and the lunar rovers before reading the nomination, and agreed with Pilgrim that the application was excellent and that designation was supportable. Blue added that she particularly appreciated the public comments regarding the recognition of legacy, and also supports approving the designation of the LRVs as a community landmark. Lake concurred the nomination meets the both criteria A1 and A3. Ossa supported her fellow commissioners' comments, agreeing that the nomination meets both criteria. Handy called for a motion on the designation.

Simpson/Pilgrim moved to approve the Lunar Roving Vehicles as a Kent Community Landmark under Criteria A1 and A3. Motion passed 8-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Nancy Simpson, president of the Greater Kent Historical Museum and Kent's Special Commissioner, commented on the numbers of visitors who come into the Museum unaware that the lunar rovers were built in Kent, and that Boeing played an important role in NASA's Apollo Programs of the 1960s and 1970s. She noted how important actions like designating the rovers are to educating communities on significant histories such as this.

Dana Ralph, Mayor of Kent, thanked the commission for their consideration and support, noting that the meeting was being held on the eve of the 48<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the launch of Apollo 15 (the first Apollo mission to include a lunar rover.)

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None

**ADJOURN**

**Convene NORTH BEND LANDMARKS COMMISSION** (6:08pm)

**SPECIAL COMMISSIONER:** Gardiner Vinnedge (*absent*)

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** None

**GUESTS:** None

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:** McClellan Building (COA #19.12) – proposal to install new wall-board signage

Steen presented a brief staff report on the location and history of the McClellan Building within North Bend's Historic Commercial District. She outlined the project proposal, displaying the proposed design of the commercial sign under consideration. Steen noted that typically commercial signage in the NBHCD are Type I projects, but that staff thought there were conflicts between the proposed design and the NBHCD sign guidelines, so the project was elevated to a Type II. Issues with the proposed color and cursive lettering were the primary concerns.

Handy noted that the applicant was not present, and opened the floor for public comment. Hearing none, she closed the public comment period. Pilgrim then reported on the discussions that took place at the Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting. He reiterated the conflict with the sign guidelines. The resolution proposed at the DRC meeting was for the sign design to better match the logo (color and artwork) of the business, which is allowable under North Bend's sign guidelines. Pilgrim stated that the DRC recommended denial of the design as initially proposed, and that the applicant said he was going get back in touch with staff after considering options. Steen said that using the logo design in signage was explicitly allowed under the guidelines, but that the applicant had not followed up with any additional information or direction on the existing COA application. The applicant's choice was to copy the logo exactly or alter the design lettering to better conform to the guidelines.

Moore asked if there was any signage on the building currently, Steen answered no. Moore noted that her daughter had an original sign off the building in her possession. Lake asked if staff had looked at historic signage on the building. Steen noted that there was some concern about referencing precedent over guidelines, as often the guidelines had not been followed in sign design within the district so using them as acceptable models was problematic. Lake and Moore said the historic sign being discussed was from the early era of the building. Lake suggested tabling the application to review the design of the historic sign.

Moore/Earley moved to table COA application #19.12, commercial signage for the Wildflower Bistro in North Bend, for 60 days. The motion passed 7-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ADJOURN**

### **Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Handy asked for any changes/corrections to the June 27, 2019 meeting minutes. Two corrections: Moore noted that she attended that meeting, but was not listed in attendance. Earley noted that she was not at the meeting but was listed in attendance.

Ossa/Moore moved to approve the June 27, 2019 minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 5-0, with Earley, Blue, Lake abstaining.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:** Smith-Baldwin House (COA #19.13) – proposal to install new wrought iron handrails on side entry stairs

Steen presented a brief staff report on the location and history of the house, detailing its current use as a vacation rental by the owner, Vashon Parks Department. The house is within a protected wetlands estuary, and has changed very little since its construction. Parks has had requests from repeat renters to add a rail to the side (kitchen) entry stairs for safety. Steen noted the applicant had updated the rail design – saying that according to the application, the rail design reviewed by the DRC was currently unavailable. She also pointed out that the applicant had proposed the addition of railing on one side of the entry stairs, and the DRC recommended installing a handrail on both sides of the stairs for safety and design symmetry.

Handy noted the applicant was not present, and opened the floor for public comment. Hearing none, she closed the public comment period and asked for commissioner comments and questions. Pilgrim said that the applicant had no issue with adding two rails instead of one. Moore noted there were other stairs leading into the house. Steen showed the façade, noting the side stairs are the most unobtrusive location for rail additions. Pilgrim said the DRC asked if the house was ADA accessible, and the applicant had said it was not.

Handy noted that the free-standing, anchor-bolted rail installations were reversible, and asked if bolt specs were known. Steen said the assumption was the bolts would be stainless steel (to be verified), so there shouldn't be issues with rust/expansion. Handy said in her experience anchor-bolted rails can become unstable, and if placed too close to the edge of the stairs may cause the bricks to spall. Ossa said she preferred the first design submitted by the applicant, without a lower curved bar. She noted the additional curved bar doesn't relate to the rest of the house design.

Handy mentioned attaching to the building may have less of an impact than anchor-bolting. Discussion of attachment options continued, exploring ways to cause less of an impact to the historic brick. Steen asked if the proposal should be tabled until the applicant came back with a better rail design and attachment approach. Handy said project approval could be conditioned to include an additional pre-installation staff review, with an eye to the installation having the least impact to the brick stairs as is feasible.

Blue/Lake moved to approve the proposal to install simple wrought-iron handrails on the side stairs, with the following conditions: the rail shall be installed with the least possible impact to the historic brick; the second rail design submitted is found to be not compatible so another must be selected; and that the final rail design shall be reviewed and approved by staff prior to installation. The motion passed 7-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ADJOURN**

**Convene ISSAQUAH LANDMARKS COMMISSION** (6:32pm)

**SPECIAL COMMISSIONER:** Todd Sargeant (*absent*)

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** None

**GUESTS:** Jessica Skelton, Ambika Doran, Troy Anderson

**PUBLIC HEARING: Termination of Landmark Designation, Providence Heights College**

Commissioner Moore recused herself from the landmark status consideration of Providence Heights College and left the podium. Steen opened the staff presentation by outlining the Issaquah preservation program agreement with King County, citing relevant ordinances regarding designation criteria and noting that termination of landmark status was extraordinarily rare for the county's HP program. She briefly described the property's history and design, and detailed the recent history of Providence Heights, including the complicated legal conflicts involving its 2017 landmark designation, commission decision appeal, various court decisions and subsequent demolition of all historic structures within the campus.

Steen clarified that the points under consideration by the commission were: one, the Superior Court order mandating that landmark regulations could not be applied to the campus while Churchome owned the property; and two, the question of whether the property continued to meet the criteria for designation (A1, A3, A5), since the buildings had been demolished. She reviewed the details of the criteria applied at the time Providence Heights was designated, noting after each that staff believed the criterion was no longer met now that the buildings were gone.

Handy asked Steen if the foundations of the buildings had been removed. Steen replied yes – photos supplied by the applicant showed nothing left but a vacant, open lot. Handy asked if any other commissioners had questions for staff. Hearing none, Handy invited the applicant to speak to the commission regarding their request for designation termination.

Ambika Doran, attorney for Plateau Campus (owned by Churchome,) spoke in support of the termination request, citing the Superior Court order that the regulations applicable under landmark designation could not be applied while Churchome owned the property.

Troy Anderson, a pastor for Churchome, described the difficulty resulting from the legal conflicts involved from the landmark designation, and the financial burdens incurred because of Churchome's inability to sell the property. He stated the property is now raw land, and the criteria for designation are no longer applicable. He asked the commission to remove the landmark designation.

Jessica Skelton, attorney for the Issaquah School District #411, (co-applicant in the termination request), distributed photos of the vacant lot and described the impetus for the school district to condemn and acquire the land in order to construct two new schools. She stated that the school district believes the landmark designation has impacted the value of the property, and that it has delayed the resolution of the eminent domain action undertaken by the school district to acquire the lot(s). Skelton discussed the criteria for designation, mentioning the nominations' inclusion of the woodlands in relationship to the buildings, but noting that none are met now that the property has been demolished. She also discussed the Superior Court order relating to the designation, and requested that the commission terminate the landmark designation.

Handy asked for confirmation that the foundations had been completely removed from the site. Skelton referred to the site photographs she distributed to the commissioners, pointing out the locations where the structures were located. Blue asked about Skelton's comment regarding the significance of the woodlands in connection to the buildings. Skelton said the nomination had noted the significance of the relationship of the woodlands to the structures as a design feature, but her point was that relationship, and the woodlands' significance, no longer existed without the buildings. She stated that typically when designated buildings are removed, the site doesn't retain integrity on its own.

Steen stated for the record that three letters had been submitted against termination of the landmark designation, and one in favor. Earley asked about the SEPA process that the demolition required, asking if a SEPA checklist was required before demolition permits were issued. Doran answered yes, the SEPA process was completed and a permit was issued. Earley asked more specifically about the question related to cultural resources, noting it didn't appear as if an archaeological survey on the site had been undertaken prior to demolition, or that there was an archaeologist on site during demolition to monitor for cultural resources. Doran said she did not believe there was any archaeological survey or monitoring done, and referred to the court order referencing the infringement of Churchome's constitutional rights by landmarking the property.

Earley clarified that the SEPA checklist is not specifically related or limited to the landmark designation, but that the SEPA process targets cultural resources that may have been on the property before the structures were built, such as pre-contact resources. Skelton said the property had not been designated under criterion 4 [National Register criterion D] for archaeological information. Steen reiterated what Earley had stated, that SEPA was a completely separate process from either the National Register or the King County landmark designation processes. Skelton then said she believed the SEPA process was not relevant to this commission's consideration of designation termination.

Earley said she was asking about whether appropriate processes had been followed related to cultural resources because the site had been designated as a landmark, and that any archaeology that is potentially there is important. Typically the SEPA process is what is used to identify and assess cultural resources on a site, and in this case, it appears no action was taken to do so.

Anderson asked whether this was part of the landmark designation. Earley said that the property was landmarked as a whole, not just the buildings. Handy agreed, noting the designation covered all of the three legal parcels. Anderson stated that Churchome had complied with all required processes, including SEPA, and that additional archaeological assessments weren't called for or completed.

Lake asked about the eminent domain action the school district was taking. Skelton said the school district was obligated to pay fair market value for the property under eminent domain, and the district's position was that the designation impacted the value of the property. Additional discussion around requirements of eminent domain and the applicability of landmark designation regulations once Churchome no longer owns the property.

Handy asked if there were any other questions for the applicants. Blue asked about the site itself, especially considering its importance in terms of women's education, if the school district has

discussed some sort of memorialization. Skelton said that it had been brought up, and they were open to ideas. Mainly the school district wanted to move forward in building schools on the site.

Handy thanked the applicants then opened the floor for public comment. Hearing none, Handy closed the public hearing portion and asked for commission deliberation. Ossa said it seemed clear there were no architectural resources remaining on site, so going by NPS bulletin #15 and recommendations in the staff report concerning the aspects of integrity, she supported terminating the designation. There is nothing still there relatable to the thresholds of integrity.

Lake noted that the court vacated the designation, so she thought the decision automatically terminated the landmark status of the campus. Handy disagreed, saying the decision only applied as long as Churchome owned the property, a distinction which was at the core of the Superior Court order. Steen said the whole designation termination process had been occupying a kind of grey area – that the designation couldn't be enforced as long as Churchome owns the property, and the Issaquah School District doesn't want the encumbrance of a landmark designation which would take effect when Churchome relinquishes ownership. According to our landmarks ordinance, however, a public hearing must be held to generate or terminate a designation. Therefore, the current owner Churchome, has requested this public hearing to terminate the landmark designation (which cannot be applied to them,) for the incoming property owner, the Issaquah School District.

Blue reiterated that the designation is vacated only as long as Churchome owns the property, and the court order does not vacate the designation permanently for any other reason. She agreed, however, that because the buildings are gone, the site no longer meets the designation criteria and it's appropriate to delist it. Earley also agreed that the current vacant lot does not convey the history for which the property is landmarked, but strongly urged the applicants to complete an archaeological survey before new construction, to ensure any extant pre-contact history on the site is identified and assessed. Handy asked staff if it was possible to condition the termination to require a survey, staff answered no. The commission can't enforce any conditions or requirements on the current owner because of the court order, and once the designation is terminated the commission has no authority to require actions of any kind. The commission could recommend appropriate actions, however. Ossa said she supported Earley's point regarding the archaeological survey, and suggested the applicants consider cultural resources moving forward.

Pilgrim said the site still held some significance, even without the buildings, but that he would support terminating the designation. He strongly recommended the school district incorporate interpretive signage in their design, to communicate the importance of that site to the area's history.

Handy said the point made in the nomination that the site was a respite for women who came to the area, most notably for its incorporation of the surrounding woodlands and landscape into the campus design, was a strong element of its overall significance. She believed the landscape as a feature, as related to the spirituality of the nuns, retains its significance despite the loss of the buildings. Blue asked if Handy could make a recommendation concerning the retention of the surrounding landscape. Handy said if the designation was terminated, there are no tools left to compel the new owners to keep the significant landscape features.



Handy asked if there was any additional discussion. Hearing none, she asked for a motion.

Steen said staff would draft a letter clearly outlining the commission's recommendations. Pilgrim mentioned the Tahoma High School as a good model for interpreting local history. Blue agreed.

Blue/Pilgrim moved to terminate the landmark designation for Providence Heights Campus, with the following recommendations: that an archaeological survey be performed prior to development of the site; that the district give consideration to the historical significance of the wooded area when designing the campus of the new school(s); and that the school district install interpretive signage commemorating the site's history and significance. Motion passed 5-1.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ADJOURN:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:15pm.