

KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES*

*December 17, 2020
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 01/28/2020)*

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: Flo Lentz, David Haakenson, Kristen Haakenson, Kathy Lambert, Susan Boyle, Marissa Tsaniff, Tanya Woo, Candace Tucker, Holly Taylor, Dean Kralios

CALL TO ORDER: Handy called the meeting to order at 4:31pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made.

Convene MAPLE VALLEY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Linda Johnson

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Dave Johnson

GUESTS: Sarah Martin, Dick Peacock

PUBLIC HEARING – Nomination of W.D. Gibbon General Store

Steen gave a brief report on the nomination process, describing the requirements of preparing a nomination, the criteria of designation, and the responsibilities of the commission in making a determination. Since the commission is considering three nominations at this meeting, Steen's nomination process overview was general and intended to apply to all nominations in unincorporated King County and partner cities. Specific staff recommendations were available in the designation reports for each property. Commissioner Pilgrim recused himself from the Gibbon Store hearing, citing his involvement in the promotion and development of the Gibbon Store nomination.

Sarah Martin, architectural historian and author of the nomination draft, gave a presentation on the location and history of the property and how it met the criteria for designation. She noted that by her evaluation the Gibbon Store meets designation criteria A1, A2 and A3.

Handy thanked Martin for the presentation and asked if there was anyone from the Maple Valley Historical Society (MVHS) who wished to speak on the nomination. Dick Peacock, president of MVHS, spoke about the personal history and community importance of the men who had built and owned the Gibbon Store.

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

Linda Johnson, Maple Valley City Council member, stated she would be pleased to make the motion to designate the Gibbon Store for landmark status. Pilgrim commented that Martin did a wonderful job on the nomination form, saying everyone learned a great deal about the history of Maple Valley through the process.

Handy thanked those who spoke and opened the floor to public comment. Pilgrim introduced Dave Johnson who attended the meeting as representative for the City of Maple Valley (the property owners). Johnson said he had no comment other than to thank the commission for their consideration of the nomination. With no other member of the public interested in speaking, Handy asked if there were any questions for the owners/applicant from the commissioners. Blue asked if the two rooms added to the building during restoration were added to the interior or the exterior. Martin said they were interior. Handy then closed the public comment period and asked for commissioner discussion.

Moore asked if the designation includes interior features as well as exterior. Handy noted while the staff recommendation focused on the exterior, she thought discussion on interior features was warranted, notably the wood floor. Blue added the ceiling was original material as well, and Ossa added the open volume of the store should be considered for inclusion. Handy asked about the interior wall sheathing, whether there was a distinction between original and new material. Martin said the salvageable original sheathing had been consolidated on the west wall, but otherwise it wouldn't be possible to distinguish. Pilgrim said the new material was specially planed to match the historic. Moore asked about boarded up windows. Peacock said when times when the store was connected to other buildings, there were openings cut in the side façade. When the building was restored those openings were closed up.

Lemay said she was impressed with the care taken in the store's restoration, noting salvaging and reusing historic material is typically not the most cost-effective way to save a building. She noted the resulting high level of integrity given the quality of the restoration. Handy agreed.

Handy also asked about the boundaries – if specification beyond the footprint of the building was necessary to ensure inclusion the porch and overhanging roof. Ossa and Blue agreed with specifying they be included. Steen said she had intended them to be included as part of the footprint of the building in the staff recommendation. Additional discussion on potential interpretation issues continued, with commissioners agreeing specificity and clarity were preferable.

Lake noted that on other nominations when the footprint delineated the designation boundaries, an additional 5-foot buffer area was included. Handy didn't believe it was necessary in this case. Moore asked about the potential impact of utility hookups. Lemay said she didn't think they were an issue. Ossa asked about other historic buildings that had been moved – if it was typical for the boundaries to be limited to the footprint. Lemay asked if another building could be built close to the store without review if a buffer wasn't included. Ossa said anything touching the exterior would be subject to review. Moore said city setback regulations would apply. Earley said she thought the footprint was sufficient, especially since the integrity of location was lost when the building was moved, so location was not under consideration as significant. Blue also commented

that if the building had to be moved again in the future, any additional buffer areas wouldn't pose an issue.

Handy summarized what interior features were being considered for inclusion in the designation – wood floors, interior wood plank sheathing on the west wall, the open volume of the interior space, and the front porch with overhanging roof. Discussion continued clarifying the specific features to be included.

Handy asked if there was any more discussion on the proposed nomination. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Johnson/Blue moved to approve the designation of the W.D. Gibbon Store as a Maple Valley Historic Landmark with the following boundaries and features of significance: the boundaries of the landmark are the footprint of the building including the front porch and overhang; the features of significance include all exterior features as well as interior features including the wood floor, wood ceiling, wood planking on west wall, and the interior open volume. The motion passed 9-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The MVLC adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Handy asked for any changes/corrections to the October 22nd and November 19th meeting minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Pilgrim/Lemay moved to approve the October 22nd and November 19th meeting minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 8-0.

PUBLIC HEARING – Nomination of the Angerer Farm Hay Barn Complex

Flo Lentz and Sarah Martin, architectural historians and authors of the nomination draft, gave a presentation on the location and history of the Angerer Farm, specifically speaking on the three associated historic agricultural structures under consideration. Lentz detailed how this complex of buildings had met the criteria for designation A1 and A3.

Handy thanked the presenters and asked if the owners would like to speak on the proposal. David Haakenson talked about his family's background on the farm and his support for landmark designation. He said the historic barn is the heart of the Jubilee (Angerer) Farm and wants it to continue to be functional and preserved. Handy thanked him for his comments. King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert said she was a barn nut and talked about her interest in and support for the Barn Again program throughout the County. Lambert said she remembered riding a tractor on the Jubilee Farm with David Haakenson's dad, noting the Jubilee is a beautiful farm.

Lambert strongly supports continued agriculture in the valley and is grateful for all the Haakenson's work preserving their barn for continued use.

Handy asked if there were any more members of the public who wished to comment or if commissioners had any questions of the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if staff had any additional comments or questions. Steen said that although she is typically cautious about designating interior features, on the Angerer Barn she thinks the open volume and exposed structure of its hay loft should be included as a significant feature of the property, and the staff recommendation should reflect that.

Handy then closed the public comment period and asked for commissioner deliberation. Earley mentioned she had been taking her son to the Jubilee Farm for years and shared some 2009/2019 photos of their site visits. Handy said that offered context to the place of the farm in the community, and that many in the room likely had been to the farm for an event. She then asked if there were any comments on features of significance. Pilgrim mentioned the ground floor historic stanchions. Commissioners reviewed photos of the stanchions in the main barn and the loafing shed, and other details of the main barn, loafing shed, and machine shed.

Lemay asked if the machine shed is included as one of the structures in the designation report. Handy replied that it is. Lemay noted that the machine shed is an open area structure, so she wondered how to clearly distinguish its exterior. She also noted the loafing shed has high degree of integrity, so the interior should also be considered significant. Ossa agreed. Handy said the interior volume of the loafing shed, along with that of the main barn's hay loft, is significant.

Discussion continued on the importance of clear and specific features of significance in designations. Moore brought up issues with requiring review for working structures which have been assembled informally and might require more structural work. Pilgrim said he thought the stanchions and volume of the main barn's hay loft were the most significant interior features. Moore agreed. Lemay said the advantage to designating significant interior features is not the expectation they were remain in place permanently, but that the owners would discuss projects with the commission before making changes.

Lake agreed with Lemay, noting the stanchions offer important contextual information. Ossa concurred, including the open volumes and support structure of the loafing shed as important. Haakenson commented that the stanchions in the loafing shed are different from the stanchions in the hay barn. The hay barn stanchions lock, holding the head as the animals fed, while the loafing shed stanchions just restricted their reach. They had different purposes, and those in the loafing shed were more casually used. Discussion continued regarding various interior features of the three structures.

Lemay asked if the machine shed should be included in the designation, and that she wondered if it should be designed only under A1. Lentz said they included it because it dates from the Angerer era, had an established purpose, and was an integral part of the surviving agricultural complex. Lake noted that stabilization funding would also be available if designated. Moore said the vertical plank siding is a notable feature. Discussion continued on how criteria A1 and A3 would apply to the different structures. Ossa stated that the buildings are nominated as a complex and were interrelated in their historic use. Separating the unit when applying criteria is problematic. Handy

pointed to the designation report reasoning for significance, that the machine shed represented a clear shift to mechanization concurrent with the specific forms and features of the other two structures from the same era. Blue agreed. Lake noted that historic farms of the Snoqualmie Valley were not grand architecturally, they were vernacular and utilitarian, and few survive because they tend to be overlooked. Meisner commented that the main question was whether they have enough integrity to convey their significance.

Pilgrim questioned the boundaries description. Blue said she had looked at that as well, but concluded they were well defined given an assumption the farm lanes around the grouping of structures would not change. Commissioners reviewed the photos and maps, discussing best options for clearly defining the boundaries.

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

Blue/Lake moved to approve the designation of the Angerer Farm Hay Barn Complex as a King County Landmark with the following boundaries and features of significance: designation boundaries shall be along the adjacent farm lanes as proposed in the designation report and shown in the site map included in the nomination form; the exteriors of the hay barn, loafing shed and machine shed; the stanchions and interior support structures of the hay barn and the loafing shed; and the interior open volumes of the loafing shed and the hay barn loft. The motion passed 8-0.

PUBLIC HEARING – Nomination of the Weiss Store, Vashon

Susan Boyle, historical architect and author of the nomination draft, and Marissa Tsaniff of the Vashon Historical Society, gave a presentation on the location and history of Vashon Island's Weiss Store, detailing how the brick commercial building meets designation criteria A1 and A3.

Handy thanked the presenters and asked if there were any members of the public that wished to speak. She then asked if the commissioners had any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, Handy closed the public comment period and moved into commission deliberations.

Pilgrim asked if the covering ivy (vines) on the south wall was to be considered a significant exterior feature. Blue thought they should be, since they're shown on the wall in the 1938 photo. Pilgrim asked if there were any plans for further rehabilitation. Boyle said the owner has been working with current tenants to rehab the first floor, and he had plans to repair some of the masonry. She thought a canopy might be planned in the future. Moore asked if the designation would cover newer exterior work done on the building. Boyle explained some of the background of previous exterior alterations, noting that they were on secondary facades and didn't impact the integrity or historic character in her opinion. Lemay stated that the landmark would cover the entire exterior of the building as it is currently. Blue followed up noting that if a project came before the commission involving any non-historic elements, they can evaluate it against the building character as a whole.

Pilgrim clarified that the boundaries would be the parcel. Boyle said yes, the north side area which reads as a parking lot is shared with the neighboring property. The site plan shows the actual

property line. Handy asked what impact a currently in progress project on the parcel would have on the designation process. Boyle said the construction project underway on the property site includes a concrete retaining wall which includes an ADA access ramp, and owners are planning on paving an area for a patio and installing a firepit. Steen stated that design review regulations apply when the designation is approved. Any projects ongoing (but not completed) at the time of designation would need to go through the CoA process. Lemay asked if the owners had approved building permits already for the site construction, could they continue the construction project without commission review. Lemay thought that CoAs were part of the building permit process, leaving some question if permits were already issued. Steen said they were different processes, and design review regulations would come into effect for anything not yet completed at the time of designation. She noted that CoAs can be required in cases when building permits were not. Handy agreed. Boyle noted that the owners had been in contact with HPP staff and were aware of the regulatory process. Handy asked if the construction can be approved in the designation. Steen suggested the commission could allow the in-progress construction project to be approved as a Type I CoA. Handy asked if the commissioners would be comfortable with approving the work be reviewed as a Type I, or if the commission would prefer to leave it a Type II. Blue said there needed to be some clarity on what portions of the project were “underway.”

Pilgrim asked what would be involved in the staff review. Steen said staff would review the project as it does any Type I CoA application. Boyle described what she knew of the construction project so far. Some of the details were mentioned by the owner in passing, she said. Discussion continued on how to implement regulatory reviews for projects underway at the time of designation. Steen suggested separating out the action for project reviews from the designation itself – that the commission have a separate motion to approve Type I review level for construction projects which were in progress at the time of designation. In this case, limited to the north side yard property improvements underway in December 2020. Discussion continued on the issue of building permits. Meisner commented that if the project isn’t currently permitted, HPP staff can refer it to the King County Department of Local Services to check if permits are required. Commissioners indicated they felt comfortable with the proposed solution.

Handy asked for any additional comments or discussion from commissioners, then called for a motion.

Blue/Pilgrim moved to approve the designation of the Weiss Store as a King County Landmark with the boundaries and features of significance as described in the staff report including: the creeping vines on the south façade of the building. The motion passed 8-0.

Handy requested a motion on site construction project review requirements.

Blue/Lake moved to require construction projects within the designated boundaries of the Weiss Store which are underway at the time of its designation be approved as a Type I CoA. Motion passed 8-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER’S REPORT: Meisner reported on the Vashon Hardware Store had a new owner, and the new owner resolved the outstanding CoA violation. The

new owner applied for a mechanical permit from King County's Department of Local Services (DLS) and DLS worked with HPP staff to ensure prior permit violations were resolved before new county permits were issued. Inappropriate wood siding on the building façade has been removed and the plaster siding restored. Meisner also reported that the Barn Again heritage barn program is closing out this year. The program launched in 2016, funding 18 projects totaling just under \$500K. 4Culture will take over the program in the coming years. She also stated that the four new landmarks commissioner appointments had been approved by the Executive's office and were moving forward to the County Council. Meisner closed with huge appreciation for and gratitude to the three departing commissioners. Rebecca Ossa and Dave Pilgrim were both appointed in 2014, serving two full terms on the commission. Rebecca's expertise on the implementation of SOI standards has been invaluable; Dave's high level of organization and preparedness and his perspective always served to improve the quality of design review. Poppi Handy, appointed in 2012, was one of the longest serving commissioners, and has been an exceptional Chair, offering her insight and expertise in architectural design and materials to applicants and commissioners alike. A celebration will be planned when everyone can gather in person again.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The KCLC was adjourned at 7:17 pm.