

**KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES***

*August 26, 2021
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 11/18/2021)*

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Cristy Lake, Chair; Caroline Lemay, Vice-Chair; Dean Kralios, Adam Alsobrook, Amy Blue, Tanya Woo, Amber Earley

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Candace Tucker

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Steen, Jennifer Meisner

GUESTS: Vanessa Chin, Jonathan Kesler

CALL TO ORDER: Lake called the meeting to order at 4:32pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made, and the Chair detailed the structure of the hearing.

Convene KENT LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Nancy Simpson (*absent*)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Jonathan Kesler

GUESTS: None

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #21.08: Mill Creek Historic District, Bereiter House, 855 East Smith Street – proposal to repaint exterior (house, carriage barn and shed) and repoint brick chimney

Steen gave a brief staff report detailing the history of the site and the project proposal, detailing the existing color scheme compared to the proposed exterior colors. Steen included a request that a condition be included that the Kent Parks Department consult with KCHPP staff regarding the selection of mortar for the chimney work.

Lake opened the public comment period. Jonathan Kesler, speaking on behalf of the City of Kent, expressed no concern with the project. Lake asked if the commissioners had questions for staff, hearing none, she then closed the public comment period and requested commissioner deliberation. Kralios stated he had a comment on the brick repointing, noting that contemporary masons sometimes use mechanical methods to remove old mortar. He requested that this method not be used on the vertical joints, as it can sheer off pieces of the historic brick.

Lemay asked if the applicants had offered any information on their plan for preparing the building for painting, indicating an interest in the prep being non-intrusive. Steen noted they hadn't included any preparation details, but that the CoA could include some direction on that point. Alsobrook noted that because of the irregular clinker brick used in the chimney, mechanical

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

methods of mortar removal should not be used for either the vertical or horizontal joints, as it could damage the irregular historic brick. He also noted that the mortar is currently tinted, so any replacement mortar should match the existing mortar tint. Alsobrook went on to strongly discourage the use of water blasting to remove existing paint, citing numerous issues with this method of paint removal, and requested that the surface be properly primed to accept the new paint layer. Kralios said painters are required to follow specific lead paint remediation protocols.

Kralios asked about the main entry door, noting it appeared stained. Steen said it was not included in the application. He also asked about the carriage barn trim detailing, if it was going to be all one color. Steen said that the body and trim colors of the house and carriage barn would match.

Blue asked for clarification on the chimney repointing methods, asking if staff should be consulted on all aspects. Steen suggested yes, as it would enable her to go out and work with the Parks masons on site. Lake asked for additional discussion. Hearing none, she requested a motion on the proposal.

Blue/Lemay moved to approve CoA 21.08 for exterior modifications as proposed with the following conditions: that parks staff consult with HPP staff regarding appropriate methods to repoint the historic chimney; and, that waterblasting not be employed to remove any existing paint. The motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The KLC adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #21.09: Reynolds Farm and Indian Agency, 16816 SE 384th Street, Auburn – proposal for Phase 1 elements of a stabilization/restoration project

Steen offered a staff report on the Phase 1 restoration plan for the Indian Agency Cabin, detailing the known history of the structure and site, as well as the current plans being developed by the Muckleshoot Tribe for its restoration and repurposing as an interpretive exhibit space. After reviewing details of the cabin restoration plan, Steen noted that the SOI treatment intended for this phase of the project is based on a Restoration based approach, which includes removing features of the cabin installed after the target period of significance (c.1910) when it was used as an Indian Agency.

Lake asked if there was any public comment on this project. Hearing none, she invited the commissioners to ask questions of staff. Blue asked about the small new addition to the rear of the building over the concrete slab, proposed to be connected to a reconstructed (historically accurate) shed roof. Blue noted that under the Restoration treatment guidelines, features that had not been on the structure historically should not be added. Steen said that Standard 10 (Restoration) was primarily aimed at adding historical features not part of the original design (i.e Disney). Alsobrook echoed Blue's concern with the new addition over the concrete slab. He has concerns about

potential archaeology on the site, so ground-disturbance should be limited as far as possible. He also noted that in this situation there is ample photographic documentation of the building, so following the documentation closely in restoration should be the approach.

Earley said she believed an archaeological assessment had been performed, and no features had been discovered. Steen said yes, a survey of the site had been completed, and the Tribe's cultural resources team were planning on having any ground disturbance monitored during the project. Lake asked if the existing rear shed roof extended over the concrete slab. Steen said that it did. Woo asked how the footings were proposed to be reinforced and asked if a geologic survey had been performed. Earley said that typically soils descriptions are included in the archaeological survey, but geologists are not usually involved. Woo said she saw this as two separate projects – one involved restoration of the cabin, the other was comprised of the new rear shed addition. Earley agreed that the new rear shed roof addition should be considered as part of another phase, not the restoration. Discussion continued around treatment methods and approaches. Alsobrook said the restoration work should adhere as closely as possible to the historic photos.

Alsobrook noted that the photos appeared to show both cedar shakes and sawn shingles. Steen agreed that it was difficult to discern from the 1910 photograph but given its age it is likely the cabin was initially roofed with cedar shake. Kralios asked if removing the chimney was part of the scope, Steen said yes. Kralios asked about interior roof rafters, if some would be replaced. Steen said that the proposal included retaining all sound historic material and replacing in-kind deteriorated material and/or later (not in-kind) replacement materials. Kralios also asked if there was a requirement to document what was being removed, Steen said yes, they would need to thoroughly photograph all aspects of the project.

Kralios asked about the plan for the window openings to prevent further deterioration. Steen said that a detailed window plan will be part of phase 2, and that the assumption is that the window openings will be covered until new window sash can be installed. Blue also asked about weather protection, noting that the new rear shed addition was intended to move the water runoff away from the concrete slab and pointing out that another solution would need to be proposed.

Alsobrook asked what features were known from the proposed 1890-1910 period of significance. Steen shared the application photographs. Blue said they can go ahead and condition the CoA to remove the small new shed addition. Lake asked if there would still be an issue with the shed addition if it clearly read as new. Earley stated that that should be considered under a separate CoA application. Meisner noted there wasn't enough information contained in the drawings to approve that addition in any case and suggested the archaeology survey be submitted in future CoA reviews. Earley agreed. Alsobrook said his concerns were based on the rarity of the resource, agreeing with Meisner that the new addition would need more design information to be considered. He noted the high standards the NPS used when restoring historic resource, relating them to the Restoration treatment approach in general.

Blue asked about the DRC's concern with the patina of old/new materials. Steen said that the question of comparative patina had come up in the DRC discussion, and the applicant had responded that because the old material wasn't treated, they were proposing to not treat the new material. Until the wood weathers, the raw cedar will appear very different than the old, but

eventually will weather to match the historic wood better than any chemical treatment they could apply to speed up the process.

Alsobrook and Kralios would prefer additional photographs and more detailed architectural drawings in the future. Lemay noted that the applicant is not an architect, and the expectation for detail drawings should be commensurate with their level of skill. Discussion continued regarding engineering requirements and permitting. Lake requested a motion.

Blue/Earley moved to approve CoA 21.09 for the Reynolds Indian Agency Cabin as proposed, with the exception that the proposed new shed addition on the north side be removed from the plans. The motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Meisner reported on currently expiring commissioner terms, noting that Ella Moore had elected to not continue in her role as commissioner past the end of her term, so staff was in the process of recruiting for a Heritage Organization representative. Meisner asked the commissioners to spread the word, saying some knowledge of east King County would be preferred. She also expressed her gratitude to Earley and Lake, who have agreed to serve on the commission for another term. Meisner also reported on the Shoreline Naval Hospital Chapel appeal process, reviewing the appeal to the Shoreline City Council filed by the Shoreline Preservation Society. She explained that the Council had remanded the matter back to the landmarks commission to re-hold DSHS's Request for Reconsideration, so it had been scheduled for the September SLC meeting. The landmark nomination is still in place, this remand only considers the requested boundary revision. Commissioners were encouraged to be well prepared for the hearing.

Meisner reported on her and Steen's attendance at the virtual Beyond Integrity conference, which had been developed out of 4Culture's Beyond Integrity working group, focusing on the evolution of preservation practice to address fundamental structural inequities. She felt the national conference was inspiring and worthwhile, presenting excellent and workable ideas on revising criteria, code amendments, etc. to be more inclusive. HPP staff and the PPC will be working on developing some implementable ideas to come forward to the commission in the coming year.

Meisner then shared photographs from the Neely Mansion volunteer window workshop, led by Steen. She described the accomplishments of the workshop and said that the highlight of the day was the use of Neely's old wood planer (displayed as an artifact in the museum) to shave down the parting beads for the window jambs. Lastly, Meisner mentioned an upcoming regional training workshop, which will feature Tom Hitzroth's ongoing work mapping historic Redmond, focusing on how to use plat maps and other historical documentation to understand landscape change.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The KCLC adjourned at 5:56 p.m.