

KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES*

*September 23, 2021
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 11/18/2021)*

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Cristy Lake, Chair; Caroline Lemay, Vice-Chair, Amber Earley, Dean Kralios, Candace Tucker; Amy Blue, Tanya Woo (*late*)

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Adam Alsobrook

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Steen, Jennifer Meisner

GUESTS: Edie Nelson, Patty Hale, Lance Young, Kathleen Russel, Robert Hubenthal, Janet Way, Wendy DiPeso, Ruth Danner, Maralyn Chase, David Moehring, Joe Cristy, Carrie Nelson, George Danner, Liz Graybeal, Terri Anderson, Richard Ellison, Christina Bruning, Dianna*, Gwendine Norton

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

Convene NORTH BEND LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Kevin Burrows

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Liz Graybeal

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #21.11: McClellan Building – proposal to install new façade and sidewall signage

Steen gave a brief staff report detailing the history of the site and the project proposal. Liz Graybeal spoke on behalf of the applicant, reviewing the specifications outlined in the application. Lake asked if there was any public comment on the application. Hearing none, she asked if the commissioners had any questions for staff or the applicant. Hearing none, Lake asked if members of the DRC had any additional comment. Tucker said the staff report covered the application well and had no further concerns. Lake then asked for commissioner deliberation. Kralios stated that the colors were compatible, the paint layer already applied was reversible, and thought the project met Standard #9 as well as the NB sign guidelines. Blue agreed. Lake asked for a motion.

Blue/Kralios moved to approve CoA 21.11 as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed, 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The NBLC adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

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

Convene ISSAQUAH LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Todd Sargeant

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Christina Bruning

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #21.12: Hailstone Feed Store – proposal to install chain porch railing and rear mural lighting

Steen gave a brief staff report detailing the history of the site and the project proposal. Applicant Christina Bruning thanked the commissioners, saying she has been involved with the Hailstone Feed Store since the beginning of its rehabilitation. Bruning briefly talked about the reasoning behind the proposal and said she would be happy to answer any questions. Lake asked if there was any public comment on this project. Hearing none, she asked if members of the DRC would offer details about their discussion. Kralios said the DRC felt that the project was in keeping with Standard #9. The DRC discussed the changes to the porch and the chain detail, noting that the addition of the chain as a safety measure was appropriate and was a reversible solution. Kralios noted that the placement of the conduit had been discussed. Tucker agreed with Kralios' report. Lake asked if commissioners had any questions for applicant or staff. Hearing none, she closed the public comment period and invited commissioner discussion.

Sargeant noted that the selected light fixtures color was black, saying he felt that was an appropriate choice. Blue believes adding light fixtures to highlight the mural and deter vandalism is a reasonable project and stated she had no concerns with the project overall. Lemay and Earley concurred. Lake asked for a motion.

Sargeant/Lemay moved to approve the CoA 21.12 as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed, 8-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The ILC adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Convene SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Andy Galuska

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Szafran, Julie Ainsworth-Taylor

GUESTS: Edie Nelson, Patty Hale, Lance Young, Kathleen Russel, Robert Hubenthal, Janet Way, Wendy DiPeso, Ruth Danner, Maralyn Chase, David Moehring, Joe Cristy, Carrie Nelson, George Danner, Terri Anderson, Richard Ellison, Dianna*, Gwendine Norton

PUBLIC HEARING: Shoreline Naval Hospital Chapel – (Remanded) Request for Reconsideration. Applicant: WA State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)

Steen offered a summary background of the initial landmark nomination and subsequent public hearings related to the boundaries of the Naval Hospital Chapel in Shoreline. She explained the appeal of the April 22, 2021 Shoreline Landmarks Commission determination filed by the Shoreline Preservation Society to the Shoreline City Council, and the City Council's decision to remand the matter back to the commission on procedural grounds. Steen then presented DSHS Request for Reconsideration regarding the eastern boundary of the designated Chapel.

Lake asked if commissioners had any questions for staff before the applicant presents. Lake then invited DSHS to present on their Request. Bob Hubenthal, representing DSHS, introduced himself and described the Fircrest site as a whole as well as the Chapel site in particular. State agencies DSHS and DNR co-own the Chapel property. Hubenthal said that DSHS had operated on the Fircrest Campus for 60 years and noted that the legislature had recently approved a new nursing facility and residential treatment facility on the Fircrest Campus. Hubenthal then introduced Joe Cristy, their counsel from the State Attorney General's office, to speak on the application.

Cristy presented the Request for Reconsideration details for the commission. He stated that the DSHS withdraws its assertion that the commissioners were confused during the January 2021 hearing deliberations, stating that DSHS reconsideration request rests entirely on their contention that the impact to the character of the Chapel resulting from the removal the northeast section from the designated boundaries would be minimal.

Lake opened the public comment period, requesting that speakers please introduce themselves, restrict their comments to the application under consideration, and set a 3-minute limit per speaker. Lake called on those who had signed up to speak, encouraging others who wished to speak to sign up to do so in the chat feature.

Janet Way, representing the Shoreline Preservation Society, spoke in opposition to DSHS request to revise the eastern boundary of the Chapel landmark. Way said that just because the Chapel was not visible from the area under consideration does not mean that area was historically insignificant. She believes the Chapel and its surrounding forested site needs to be memorialized appropriately and disagreed with the contention that environmental concerns were beyond the scope of the landmarks commission.

Kathleen Russell, resident of Shoreline, spoke in opposition to DSHS request. She cited Captain Boone's vision for the Chapel site, saying the surrounding forest was integral to the original design and stated that removing tree cover was damaging to the environment.

Lance Young, resident of Shoreline, spoke in opposition to DSHS request. He commented on the lack of buffer areas on the north and west boundaries, noting that only the eastern boundary has been threatened. Young returned to SPS's arguments against allowing the request to move forward, requesting equal time to all parties. He said the Chapel was one of the most important properties in Shoreline and requested that the landmark boundaries remain intact.

Gwendine Norton spoke in support of DSHS request for reconsideration. She stated she had family in the Fircrest facility and had been active in seeking approval to expand the facilities on the campus. She supported protecting the Chapel but had concerns that maintaining the forest would impede future projects there.

Maralyn Chase, member of the Shoreline Preservation Society (SPS), requested the commission expand the landmark boundaries around the Chapel. The SPS believes the significance of the Chapel should be memorialized appropriately, with plaques installed celebrating Captain Boone and others. She is concerned that DSHS has not been acting in good faith as stewards.

Richard Ellison, Ecologist and Adjunct Professor of Environmental Science, spoke in opposition to DSHS request. He detailed the ecological properties of the site, requesting that the site be ecologically mapped, and conservation/restoration work be implemented. Ellison discussed “edge effects” of encroachment into the forested area, speaking to the deleterious effects of habitat loss.

Wendy DiPeso, member of SPS, spoke in opposition to DSHS request, connecting habitat/buffer erosion to a negative impact to the character of the Chapel building’s surroundings. She said the edge effect would travel upslope, eroding and destabilizing the foundation of the Chapel building. DiPeso noted that the entire campus was eligible for the National Register.

Patty Hale, resident of Shoreline, spoke in opposition to DSHS request. She believed there were other areas on the campus which could accommodate parking expansion, and this area isn’t necessary for parking use. She noted maintaining the landmark boundaries would not impede facility expansion.

Noting that there were no other members of the public on the list to speak, Lake opened the floor those wishing to make closing comments, requesting speakers keep their closing remarks to 1 minute.

Janet Way stated the AG lawyer’s argument that there were no buffers to the north and west was not relevant to the discussion over the eastern boundary. She believes the Chapel boundaries should remain in place to memorialize the veterans of WWII and the vision of Captain Boone.

Lance Young reiterated that studies of the campus by DSHS had not called for an additional parking lot near the Chapel. If a need should arise, DSHS could come before the commission to make the request. He thanked the commissioners for their work.

Richard Ellison reiterated the impacts of previous developments on the Chapel site. He suggested the creation of a drop off area as opposed to parking. He suggested doing a vegetative study. The forest is integral to the Chapel setting.

Terri Anderson addressed the parking comments, saying she has had difficulties finding parking on site when visiting family. She thinks the Chapel should be protected but understands the need for additional facility parking.

Wendy DiPeso said there is a master plan for the new facility, which includes a parking plan that wraps around the new building.

David Moehring said he was an architect and interested in the preservation of the site. He noted that the vegetation, trees, etc. were considered significant features under the nomination. He said the site was the location of a significant event and needs to be protected according to code.

Maralyn Chase commented on the preservation of the historic designation should include the best environmental management. She also noted that the nursing home facilities are also a concern, agreeing with Terri that more parking is needed. Chase doesn't believe the parking needs to cut into the Chapel site.

Patty Hale noted that the integrity of the Chapel forest is important for historic reasons and also for the current residents/users of the Fircrest facility. It is a respite for current clients.

Lake asked the owner/applicant for any closing comments. Cristy responded to some of the public testimony, noting that consideration for listing on the National Register was beyond the scope of the hearing. He commented he was unaware of concerns about steep slope erosion from the city and stated there was no current plan to expand parking near the Chapel. Cristy noted that areas outside of the local landmark boundary will still be regulated by state cultural resource regulations. He said that the exclusion of the northeast area will not have a negative impact on the setting of the Chapel, and reiterated DSHS request to revise the boundary.

Bob Hubenthal clarified the barriers placed near the path entryways were intended to close off the trail for safety reasons. He asserted DSHS's right to make decisions regarding maintenance. Hubenthal then spoke about the master plan for the campus.

Lake invited commissioners to ask questions of staff. Hearing none, she closed the public comment portion of the meeting and asked for commission deliberation.

Blue asked if a vote was required to approve the request for reconsideration prior to voting on the boundary change. Steen responded no. Tucker asked for clarification on the parameters of the boundary revision. Steen reviewed which specific elements of the eastern boundary were being considered. Blue then commented that having reviewed all prior and current meeting materials, and having visited the site earlier in the year, she believed the requested revision would not compromise the wooded setting around the Chapel itself, and that the significance of setting would be retained by the remaining forested area. Kralios mentioned the difficulty of setting this particular landmark boundary, reiterating that the change in topography and variation of landscape density are important in assessing what would impact the setting. He felt comfortable with revising the boundary, at it would still provide an adequate buffer to the landmark building and would support the integrity of the site. Lemay agreed with Kralios and Blue, stating that she believed the revised boundary would be sufficient to protect the integrity and character of the Chapel. She noted that issues of steep slope were beyond the scope of the commission but would be addressed under other permitting processes.

Galuska said that upon review of the materials for the hearing, he maintains his position that the forested southern portion (to be reincluded in the revised boundary) had more significance to the overall setting of the Chapel than the northern section proposed for exclusion. He agreed with Commissioners Lemay, Blue and Kralios. Earley noted that initially her vote had been "nay" on the proposal but having reviewed the materials and listened to the presentations, she believes the

exclusion if the northeast portion is an appropriate boundary revision. Woo stated that she maintained support for the original nomination boundary, which included the northern and southern sections. She believes both contribute to the setting and feeling of the Chapel and doesn't think that the commission should consider potential future uses of the site, as the owners could come before the commission to apply for a CoA.

Lake commented that having walked the site and reviewed all the prior meeting materials, she doesn't believe excluding the northeastern section would negatively impact the setting of the Chapel site and holds DSHS's request as reasonable. Blue stated that the environmental concerns and future potential development issues are not what was under consideration in the commission's review. She also responded to one of the public comments, clarifying that DSHS had withdrawn their assertion that the commissioners were confused, but had maintained their assertion that the January commission decision contained an error of fact, which formed the basis for reconsideration. Tucker echoed comments from other commissioners, noting she was not present at the earlier reconsideration hearing. However, after a thorough review of meeting records and listening to comments, she believed that the revision was appropriate.

Lake called for a motion.

Blue/Tucker moved to revise the boundaries of significance for the Naval Hospital Chapel as proposed by DSHS, incorporating the southern section and excluding the northeast section. The motion passed, 8-1.

PUBLIC COMMENT (*general*): None

ADJOURN: The SLC adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Meisner briefly reported on the reappointment process for Commissioners Earley and Lake. She then updated the commission on the status of a grant funded project to develop an MPD for mid-century modern residential resources to serve as a basis for future landmark nominations. Staff has requested an extension on the project and expect the next draft in November. Meisner advertised some upcoming conferences that may be of interest to the commission, including RevitalizeWA (Washington Trust) and PastForward (National Trust), noting that as national forum members commissioners can sign up free or at discounted rates. She said the next regional training workshop would take place the following week, with Tom Hitzroth presenting on research and mapping techniques. Blue and other commissioners praised Lake for her great work Chairing the commission.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The KCLC adjourned at 6:27 pm.