

**KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES***

*July 23, 2020
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 09/24/2020)*

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Caroline Lemay, Vice-Chair; Ella Moore, Rebecca Ossa, David Pilgrim, Amy Blue

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Poppi Handy, Amber Earley, Cristy Lake

STAFF PRESENT: Jennifer Meisner, Sarah Steen

GUESTS: Rick Scott, Denise Lathrop, Bob Tidball, Gracie & Donald Kramer, Michael O’Leary, Tanya Woo

CALL TO ORDER: Lemay called the meeting to order at 4:32pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made.

Convene KENMORE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Linda Ottmar (*absent*)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Michael O’Leary

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: New stand-alone utility shed, Kenmore Community Club, 7304 NE 175th Street, Kenmore (COA #20.12)

Steen gave a brief staff report on the Kenmore Community Club, detailing its history and current use as a community gathering space and outlining the proposal to install a new wood kit utility shed for additional tool and equipment storage space on site. She noted that leftover asphalt roofing material from a recent re-roofing of the club will be used on the shed.

Lemay asked if the applicants would like to speak about their project. Michael O’Leary, the applicant, stated he had nothing to add to the staff report but was present to answer any questions the commission had about the project.

Lemay opened the public comment period, asking if members of the public in attendance had any comment on the project. Hearing none, she closed the public comment period and requested the report from the DRC discussion. Pilgrim reported on the DRC, noting that the committee looked at the paint and roof color, ornamental options between the proposed shed kits and final location of the new shed, noting that the front location had been selected because the rear area of the club was actively used for events. They also discussed how the shed would be distinguished as new construction on the site, while blending in with the existing club building. Pilgrim noted matching

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

color and roof, with differentiated siding. Ossa concurred with Pilgrim's synopsis. Lemay asked if the foundation had been discussed. Pilgrim said the shed would be sitting on the existing parking lot and would not be breaking ground. Ossa noted it was reversible, with no impact on the historic building. Blue asked if they had selected the more ornamental kit of the two options presented in the application. Ossa and Pilgrim stated they recommended the simpler design in order to not draw visual attention to the shed. Blue clarified that the paint color would match the historic building.

Lemay asked if the commissioners had any additional questions. Hearing none, called for a motion.

Blue/Ossa moved to approve the application as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed 5-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN

Convene DES MOINES LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Morgan Hicks (*absent*)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Rick Scott, Denise Lathrop

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: Park amenities repairs and grounds improvements, Des Moines FieldHouse Park, 1000S 220th Street, Des Moines (COA #20.13)

Steen gave a brief staff report, detailing the location, history, and public use of the Des Moines FieldHouse Park. She noted that the proposed project focused on the grounds of the park rather than the fieldhouse itself, and included replacing a ballfield backstop, fencing, and utility shed, as well as installing an outfield drainage system and new drinking fountain. Steen also noted that the applicants had completed a cultural resource survey of the project areas which included ground disturbance, and no archaeological resources were found.

Lemay asked if the applicants would like to speak about their project. Rick Scott, recreation director for City of Des Moines, said that the staff report offered a good overview of the project at the park, and gave a brief background on planning and project development. He noted that water collection in the field areas was a particular ongoing problem on the site.

Lemay opened the public comment period asked if any member of the public in attendance wished to speak on the project. She then asked if there were any additional questions for staff or the applicant. Blue asked if the drinking fountain included a dog drinking fountain at its base. Scott replied that it did.

Hearing no additional questions or public comments, Lemay closed the public hearing portion and requested the report from the DRC. Pilgrim reported on the DRC, noting that they did look at the drinking fountain and how the water line would be run. Since the archaeology survey had been completed there was no lingering concern regarding below-ground resources. Another topic addressed at the DRC was the color of the utility shed, recommending it should match the historic grandstand so it wouldn't stand out. Ossa concurred with Pilgrim's synopsis of the discussion. She lauded the applicant's proactive cultural resources survey to ensure nothing important was disturbed. Lemay asked if the whole park property was fenced. Scott said it was mostly fenced in, but not entirely. Moore commented that the Field House was an impressive historic building.

Lemay asked if the commissioners or members of the public had any additional questions, hearing none, she called for a motion.

Blue/Ossa moved to approve the application as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed 5-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Lemay asked for any changes/corrections to the June 25th meeting minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Ossa/Pilgrim moved to approve the June 25th minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 5-0.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: Exterior paint, Prescott-Harshman House. 33429 SE Redmond-Fall City Road, Fall City (COA #20.14)

Steen presented a brief staff report on the Prescott-Harshman house, detailing its location, the history and significance of its use and the adaptive reuse project currently underway. She detailed the present exterior paint layer, now deteriorated in places, and presented the paint colors the applicants were proposing.

Lemay noted that the applicant was not present, nor were any members of the public, so she requested the DRC report. Pilgrim stated the DRC thought the project proposal was straightforward. Ossa noted they had no issues with the color selections and would likely make the house look better. Lemay clarified where the colors proposed were going to be applied. Steen noted that the trim would be painted black to match the color of the existing columns, and the field color would be white. Sky blue would be painted on the front entry porch ceiling, which is a regional vernacular tradition. The porch flooring would remain gray.

Moore noted that the house has never been white. She asked if the color was an aspect of the landmark designation. Steen noted that there are no specific requirements in terms of paint color,

nor are owners required to restore to a particular color used historically. The only requirement is that new paint colors are determined compatible with the character of the historic building. Lemay said that paint color does not generally alter the character of the building and can be painted over easily, though there can be an issue if bare wood is painted. Moore noted that historically the sash was black, but not the trim generally, and she had an issue with both the window sash and surrounding trim being black because it would be visually imposing and weighty.

Pilgrim asked if Moore had a specific recommendation. Moore said she would prefer the sash and door be differentiated in color from the trim to maintain visual depth. Lemay made a distinction between subjective preference for a particular color and the recommendation to differentiate planes of a building in terms of color to maintain dimension and depth. Discussion continued about color differentiation on various elements of the house.

Lemay asked if the commissioners had any additional questions. Hearing none, she asked for a motion on the proposal.

Blue/Ossa moved to approve the project as proposed and recommended by the DRC with the following conditions: that the window sash and doors be painted (or retained as) a lighter tone than the black trim to maintain visual depth. The motion passed 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS: Fritt's Garage (Rogue Brewery Building), Issaquah. Steen presented background information on a current restoration/rehabilitation project in Issaquah and requested informal commissioner input on siding options. The owner is currently developing a landmark nomination and was interested to know the commissions thoughts before proceeding with re-siding an exterior alley-facing wall, now covered in failing stucco, with hardieplank. The commission offered their input on the appropriate approach to the project.

PUBLIC HEARING: Anthony Farm Landmark Nomination

Steen gave gave a presentation on the history of the Anthony Farm within the context of historical agricultural development in the White River Valley. She detailed the settlement, construction and ownership history of the farmstead, and noted design details in the various farm buildings on site as well as later alterations, renovations and use changes. She concluded by relating the significance of the Anthony Farm directly to the designation criteria. Steen also introduced both the former owner, Bob Tidball, and the current owners, Donald and Gracie Kramer, who were in attendance to speak in support of landmark designation.

Lemay asked if the former owners wished to speak on the nomination being considered. Gracie Kramer noted the importance of the historic farmstead in the community, and said she hoped the designation was successful. Bob Tidball said he'd be happy to answer any questions the commission had about the property. Lemay asked if there were any members of the public in attendance, and noting there were none, she asked for commissioner discussion on the designation.

Moore asked for clarification on the acreage included in the designation boundaries. Tidball said it would include 8 acres total – the 6.5-acre parcel of farmland and the 1.5-acre parcel containing the farm structures. Moore noted that the 6.5 acres was already included in the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP), which protected the acreage from development by restricting its use to agriculture.

Tidball said yes, but the 1.5-acre parcel was not included in that program. Moore asked what would happen if the 6.5-acre parcel was sold. Tidball said the land doesn't automatically leave the FPP if sold, but if future owners wanted to remove it from the FPP, they'd have to pay back taxes to do so. Moore asked if enrollment in the program was perpetual, Tidball said it was.

Pilgrim asked if FPP included any restrictions on the buildings. Tidball said no – buildings could be maintained, but no new ones constructed. Historic buildings had no protections under FPP and could be demolished. General agreement that the entire farmstead, including farmland, should be included in designation. Pilgrim then asked if there were any outbuildings which would not be included. Steen answered yes and noted the more modern additions to the farmstead would be considered non-contributing. There was some discussion on whether this was a district or an individual landmark with multiple interrelated buildings. There was also some discussion on the period of significance, and whether it should be extended to cover all structures up to the 40-year threshold. Tidball offered more specific history and construction information on some of the various farm buildings on site.

Ossa asked if any archaeology work had been performed on the farmstead. Staff noted that it may come up in the future, but the focus at this point was the designation of the farmstead rather than any planned future work on the site. Pilgrim asked how many additions had been put on the primary house. Tidball responded there had been a few to the rear of the house. Pilgrim also asked the Kramers what the long-term plans were for the property. Gracie discussed some of the options they had been considering for the farmstead. Steen noted that staff had recommended including some interior elements in the designation, specifically spatial arrangement and interior woodwork. Including them was part of the commission's discussion on significant elements.

Moore said that the designation should be limited to the exterior if extensive interior modifications were planned. Gracie said that their intentions were to maintain the historically significant elements on the interior and supported including them in the designation. Lemay also noted that whatever elements are recognized as significant will be included during future design reviews.

Blue asked about what landscape elements may be included in the designation. Steen said that the hardscape and landscape arrangement could be included but had some lingering questions on the historic plantings. Lemay said some trees can be protected under code. Moore asked if this was within city boundaries or county jurisdiction and was answered that the property is in unincorporated King County.

Lemay asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, she closed the public comment period and called for commissioner discussion. Blue revisited including landscape elements. Ossa noted that this property's significance is tied to the landscape. Moore agreed, stating that the concrete work and plantings were significant to the unique story of the farmstead. Steen noted that many of the plantings were purposefully designed, but she wasn't certain how much of the greenery could be protected by designation. Pilgrim returned to code as a protective factor for certain significant trees. Ossa said that replacement should mirror anything proposed for removal.

Lemay summarized the boundaries and features of significance to be identified and called for a motion on the designation of the Anthony Farm.

Blue/Moore moved to approve landmark designation for the Anthony Farm under Criterion A1 and A3, with the following boundaries and features of significance: the 8-acre historic farmstead; all exterior portions of the farmhouse, bungalow, hay barn, milkhouse, bay shed, garage, shop and pumphouse; interior spatial arrangement and remaining interior woodwork of farmhouse; historic concretework on site including circular driveway, connecting paths, pond and curb wall; significant natural landscape arrangement and design features; and all of the land area within boundaries (for new construction). The motion passed 5-0.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Meisner reported that there was an all-staff Director's Department meeting on the rationale for permanent telecommuting, making clear that the goal was to continue to provide excellent service to constituents without laying off staff. There are no staff layoffs planned for our division. Eventually we will be able to meet again in person, but this change allows us the ability to maintain staff levels as we move forward. Additional information will be offered as it comes in. Meisner also offered a last call for the NAPC Form registration grant, which would cover the registration fee for any commissioners interested in attending. The Forum sessions are broken up into hour-long segments to make attendance easy, so she encourages commissioners to attend if they can. She also thanked the commissioners for their thoughtful discussion on the landmark designation for the Anthony Farm, which was a long time in coming.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The meeting was adjourned at 6:49 pm.