

KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES*

*November 19, 2020
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 12/17/2020)*

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

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: None

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Steen, Jennifer Meisner

GUESTS: Michael Johnson, Ashley Gould, Jeff Potter, Tim Ebley, Spencer Howard, Katie Pratt, Cate Lee, Janet Way, Bob Hubenthal, Lance Young, Vicki Stiles, Wendy DiPeso, Erling Ask, Kristin Ellison Oslin, Patty Hale, Candace Tucker

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

Convene KENT LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Nancy Simpson

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Michael Johnson

OTHER BUSINESS – Adoption of Mill Creek Historic District Guidelines

Steen gave a brief report on the background of the guidelines, describing how they were developed in 2016 as a collaboration between property owners in the historic district and KCHPP staff. The 2016 guidelines were never formally adopted, so as staff were preparing to put them forward for adoption by the KLC, the Policy & Planning Committee and the Design Review Committee reviewed the guidelines, making structural, language and regulatory revision recommendations.

As part of this revision process, staff spoke with members of the community who had been involved in the initial development of the guidelines. These community members felt strongly that the regulatory elements of the guidelines should only be changed through a public community meeting process, since that was how the guidelines were initially determined. Staff agreed to move forward with language and structural changes focused on clarity alone, leaving other elements as they were in 2016.

Michael Johnson, who served as the chair of the committee that developed the 2016 guidelines, talked about the two-year process involved in creating them. Johnson spoke on the committee's

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

intention to really focus regulatory controls on the façade of the houses in the district. He offered to answer any questions the commissioners may have.

Blue said her only comment as a member of the Policy & Planning Committee was that she thought that language should be inserted into the city code, referencing the guidelines and offering them legal backing for enforcement within the district. She offered to work with Special Commissioner Nancy Simpson on that effort. Pilgrim thought they were a valuable resource, and they were in good shape to adopt and formally reference.

Johnson said he thought the Mill Creek Historic District was the only residential district in King County. Meisner said yes it was. North Bend has a commercial historic district, and the town of Selleck was also a historic district, but Mill Creek was the only specifically residential one.

Handy asked if any other members of the public wished to speak on the guidelines. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Blue/Pilgrim moved to adopt the Mill Creek Historic District Guidelines as developed in 2016 and revised in 2020. The motion passed 9-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The KLC was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Handy asked for any changes/corrections to the September 24th meeting minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Blue/Moore moved to approve the September 24th meeting minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 6-0, with Lake and Handy abstaining.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS # 20.24: Restore habitat along Patterson Creek on associated pastureland – Englebert Matt Dairy Farm, 1818 Redmond Fall-City Road

Steen presented a brief staff report on the Matt Dairy Farm, describing its history and unusual configuration. She noted the .8-acre remnant pastureland was separated from the main farm cluster by a highway, which Matt used to cross every morning to graze his herd on the pasture. Steen showed the location of Patterson Creek, which runs through the southwest corner of the landmarked pasture and detailed the project proposal to restore fish habitat along roughly 140' of the creek within the parcel.

Handy asked if the applicant would like to speak on the project. Gould reiterated the goal of the project as restoration of fish habitat along the creek. Handy asked if members of the public wished to speak to the commission regarding the proposal. Wendy DiPeso, resident of Shoreline, said she

was thrilled to see this kind of habitat restoration work moving forward, in light of devastation caused by excessive development in other areas. Handy asked for other comment or questions. Earley asked if an archaeological survey had been completed on this portion of the project. Gould said yes, they have been coordinating with the King County archaeologist. Steen noted that a map of the survey shovel probes completed had been included in the commissioners' materials packets. Lemay said she thought the restoration was great, and had no issues with compatibility or impact, but she asked what the scope of the project involved. Gould said planting buffers were planned for a number of surrounding parcels, east, south and north of the Matt Farm parcel. Creating patchworks of habitat through working with property owners in the area. Handy asked what the change to the water temperature would be with the recreated habitat. Gould said she didn't have specific numbers, but it was a couple of degrees. As important was the leaf litter and plant detritus created for the fish.

Handy asked if there were any additional questions, or if the commission had more comments. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Blue/Lemay moved to approve CoA #20.24 as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed 8-0.

OTHER BUSINESS – Request to reconsider condition of approval requiring archaeological survey on CoA #20.21 (Olson Farm)

Steen gave a brief explanation of the recent Olson Farm/Community Church CoA. The commission approved the landscaping plan and design of a new maintenance building, with a condition that an archaeological survey be performed on areas of new ground disturbance. Steen explained the processes for appealing all or part of a decision, which include either filing a formal appeal to the Hearings Examiner or requesting the commission reconsider its decision. The applicant, Jeff Potter, decided to request the commission reconsider the condition for an archaeological survey attached to their CoA.

Potter reiterated the points he had outlined in a letter submitted to the commission in advance of the meeting, noting that this CoA was itself satisfying a condition of an earlier CoA, The applicants believe the archaeology condition is not appropriate as it had not come up as an issue in numerous other permit reviews, including master plan reviews by the landmarks commission, and that the site had undergone massive regrading for its previous use as a golf course. Earlier CoA approvals included grading on the site, which was approved without an archaeological component.

Handy asked if anyone from the public would like to speak on this matter. Hearing none, she asked if commissioners had any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she closed public comment and moved into commission deliberations.

Pilgrim said the archaeological requirement had been discussed at the Policy & Planning Committee meeting. Pilgrim noted that he had not been in favor of attaching the condition because of the extent of earlier grading on the site for its use as a golf course. He said one option they'd discussed was having an Inadvertent Discovery Plan on hand as an alternative to a full survey, and asked commissioner/archaeologist Earley to explain the plan in more detail. Earley stated that she

maintained that a survey was warranted on the site, despite the previous permit approvals. Archaeology as a discipline improves its practice regularly. She said an IDP was put in place when a survey is not an option, and it outlines the steps project managers would take in the event archaeological features are discovered during the course of work. Earley said she doesn't prefer IDPs to actual survey work, because the workers lack the professional training necessary to identify significant features. She said the county likely has a template the applicants could use. Lemay asked Earley if the site was graded so extensively, why she believes archaeological features could still be discovered undisturbed. Earley said not enough detail on what areas have been altered is available, parts of the landscape may not have been graded, so there still might be undiscovered features in areas of the site. Pilgrim stated he was in the area when the site was regraded, and said the regrading was extensive, ten feet or more on the berms. He doesn't believe a full survey for the landscaping plan isn't warranted because of the prior work.

Blue asked Potter if they could incorporate an IDP on their project. Potter said they hadn't considered it yet and wasn't familiar with it yet. But he noted it does seem feasible. Handy said she had worked with them before, and they aren't onerous, though the work would cease if something is found. Earley said most projects don't have an archaeologist on call.

Blue and Lemay said having an IDP seems like an appropriate alternative. Moore asked if any of the current site under consideration for change had not been included in the golf course. Potter explained the scope of the site and ownership history, most of the northern portion wetlands, and most of the southern portion site now being altered was involved in the golf course regrading.

Ossa encouraged the use of an IDP, as those in the field need to understand the impacts of discovery and necessity of stopping work if something is found. Lake asked Earley for more detail on how archaeology has improved its practice over the years. Earley briefly went through some aspects of the evolution of the field. She reiterated that mass grading doesn't always eliminate sites and features. Having an IDP is good in terms of knowing what to do with an obvious discovery, but not good at identifying features that may be more subtle.

Handy asked for any additional comments or discussion from commissioners and asked for a straw poll for using an IDP as an alternative to a full survey. Handy asked for a motion to adjust the condition of the earlier CoA approval.

Blue/Pilgrim moved to remove the condition for an archaeological survey on CoA #20.21 and replace it with a condition that the applicants develop an Inadvertent Discovery Plan prior to commencing ground disturbing work. The motion passed 7-1.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Meisner reported that the first ever virtual John D. Spellman Awards will be broadcast on December 2nd. A save the date and the YouTube link will be sent out in advance. KCTV did a wonderful job on producing the program. Meisner also reported that the appointment packet for the four new commissioners has gone forward to the Executive for approval, before moving to the County Council for final approval. December will be the last meeting for Handy, Pilgrim, and Ossa.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The KCLC was adjourned at 5:29 pm.

Convene SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Andy Galuska

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Cate Lee, Senior Planner

GUESTS: Spencer Howard, Katie Pratt, Janet Way, Bob Hubenthal, Lance Young, Vicki Stiles, Wendy DiPeso, Erling Ask, Kristin Ellison Oslin, Patty Hale

PUBLIC HEARING – Shoreline Naval Hospital Chapel Nomination Application

Steen gave a short presentation on the designation process in general, then introduced the nomination applicants who presented on the Shoreline Naval Hospital Chapel.

Janet Way, from the Shoreline Preservation Society, spoke on SPS interest in the site and their role in hiring consultants to develop a nomination application. Spencer Howard and Katie Pratt, nomination authors, presented the architectural features and use history of the Naval Hospital Chapel within the larger hospital campus, the site's historical significance, and how the chapel building meets the criteria for designation as a Shoreline Landmark. Janet Way followed their presentation with a short video tour of the chapel and the surrounding wooded site.

Bob Hubenthal, representing the building owners Washington State DSHS, spoke in support of the designation. Hubenthal requested an amendment of the boundary line along the eastern edge of the grounds, to reduce the grounds under regulation and allow for more project flexibility if additional parking is required in that area as part of future development. Lemay asked Steen to show the map Bob submitted to clarify details of his boundary amendment request. Hubenthal noted that DSHS owns the chapel building, but DNR owns the land. Steen stated that staff had met with DNR representatives about the nomination, and DNR was notified of the designation hearing.

Handy asked if there was any public comment on the nomination.

Lance Young, resident of Shoreline, spoke in support of the designation, particularly noting the natural setting surrounding the chapel. He suggested a compromise on amending the eastern boundary – rather than following the right-of-way, to carve out the area needed for future parking in advance.

Vicki Stiles, resident of Shoreline and member of the Shoreline Historical Museum, spoke in support of the nomination. She supported Young's recommendation on amending the eastern boundary.

Wendy DiPeso, resident of Shoreline, spoke in support of the nomination. She also noted her support for setting the designation boundaries as presented in the nomination, for the retention of reflective green space surrounding the chapel as an integral element of its original design.

Erling Ask, resident of Shoreline, spoke in support of the nomination.

Reverend Kristin Ellison Oslin, Chaplain at Fircrest, spoke in support of the nomination. She stated she didn't have any specific concerns amending the eastern boundary, as she doesn't believe it would impact the feeling of the chapel itself.

Patty Hale, resident of Shoreline and the neighboring Ridgecrest neighborhood, spoke in support of the nomination. She said the chapel was the last historic building left from the historic Naval Hospital campus.

Janet Way, of the Shoreline Preservation Society, commented that Shoreline doesn't have many protected landmarks. She noted that hospital staff and patients planted the surrounding landscape. She pointed out the connection between the Fircrest Tuberculosis Hospital development and the current Covid-19 pandemic underway. Way also supports maintaining the boundary lines as presented in the nomination.

Additional discussion on clarifying significant features within nomination boundaries, including a memorial garden not included within the designation. General comment on importance of the forest buffer and the ambiguous western boundary line through the trees.

Handy asked if any other members of the public wished to speak. Hearing none, she called for commissioner deliberation.

Handy noted the commission has had issues in the past with CoA project review on properties with unclear boundaries. Lake and Ossa concurred, saying the boundary should be visually tied to landscape features. Moore suggested a survey might be necessary. Handy said the eastern property boundary could be amended, but the surrounding trees are an important feature of the site. Lemay stated that interior features should also be included in the designation, specifically the interior woodwork and the volume of the space. She said she thought the north, east, and south boundaries aligned with the streets are clear and should be approved as presented. Future projects remain feasible and could come through the commission for approval. She thought that given the importance of the landscape buffer the commission should have the opportunity to review project impact. Lemay concurred that a straight line drawn on a map, which is presently the western boundary, would be difficult to work with on future project reviews.

Handy asked if there was any historical justification for the western boundary as it was drawn in the nomination application. Ossa asked about using established visual landscape features to clarify the boundary lines. Moore concurred both with having clear boundaries, potentially determined by a survey, and with Lemay's point about including significant interior features. Discussion continued regarding clarifying boundaries and interior features.

Handy stated that while there was general agreement on the significance and eligibility of the building and site, the boundary lines and inclusion of interior features should be clarified before the nomination application is approved. Other commissioners agreed.

Meisner suggested being clearer on the type of survey being requested. Generally, they are used to establish property lines, and can be expensive. She recommended tabling the nomination as opposed to conditioning the approval, to iron out some of these issues. Handy agreed.

Lemay and Ossa suggested pushing the western boundary farther west to the next road. Earley noted that Howard could mark the boundaries as GIS points on a map, which she said is a common practice in archaeological sites that do not adhere to visible landscape markers or parcel lines. Handy and Ossa agreed with this approach. Meisner also cautioned against expanding the boundaries when the landowner isn't present at the hearing and the public comment period has been closed. Handy suggested tabling the consideration to better define the boundaries. Earley said with the use of GIS markers, the boundaries as defined in the nomination make sense, and that it shouldn't be onerous for the applicants to come back before the commission for future projects.

Galuska thought lat/long GIS points drawn on a map might not be clear enough to establish the boundaries. He suggested using a "distance from" existing structure determination, since ground surveys could be different from GIS points. Earley said she has found UTM's more accurate and easier than lat/long, and more accurate than measuring distance from an object, since they are points in space measured by satellites. Galuska asked if a survey would be needed, Earley said no, the existing maps against satellite measurements are accurate enough.

Handy asked if more features needed discussion. Pilgrim said Lemay had captured interior features. Meisner recommended being very clear on defining interior features to not impede the functionality of the chapel building. The staff report laid out significant interior features. Moore noted the application called out the interior woodwork. Discussion continued on what specific interior features should be included in the designation.

Steen noted that the owner has not had the opportunity to review interior features as significant and hadn't considered whether they supported designating them. Lemay and Pilgrim thought that many of the interior elements were significant, so the owner should have the opportunity to review a list. Blue clarified what aspects need to be clarified before continuing the nomination application. Handy asked if the commission was ready to call a motion to table the nomination application.

Blue/Earley moved to table consideration of landmark designation for the Naval Hospital Chapel under Criterion A1 and A3 for final determination at a future commission hearing, as details regarding designation boundaries and significant interior features are further defined. The motion passed 8-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.