

**KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES***

*November 18, 2021
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved XX/XX/2021)*

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

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Candace Tucker, Tanya Woo

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Steen, Jennifer Meisner

GUESTS: Chris Mailander, Sune Sandling, Clark Miller, Ingrid Krueger, Katie Pratt, Christina Bruning, Toni Miller

CALL TO ORDER: Lake called the meeting to order at 4:33pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made, and the Chair detailed the structure of the hearing. Commissioner Lemay recused herself from the Tukwila Landmarks Commission’s review of the Boeing Red Barn, stating that her architecture firm is involved in an unrelated project on the building. Chair Lake stated that herself and Commissioner Kralios attended a site visit with staff to view the interior of the Red Barn.

Convene TUKWILA LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Joan Hernandez (*absent*)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Chris Mailander, Sune Sandling, Clark Miller, Ingrid Krueger

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #21.13: Boeing Red Barn, 9404 E Marginal Way S.
– proposal to alter interior exhibit space in north and northeast rooms

Steen gave a brief staff report detailing the history of the building and the project proposal, reviewing the Red Barn’s relocation and restoration in the 1980s. She also detailed the standards criteria used in the Commission’s evaluation.

Lake asked if the applicant wished to speak on the project. Chris Mailander, Director of Exhibits for the Museum of Flight, introduced Museum staff Clark Miller and Sune Sandling and architect Ingrid Krueger. Mailander summarized the project, noting that the Museum had not had a temporary exhibit space for over 10 years. The areas the Museum has been using have light/UV infiltration issues, so the Museum has been limited in what they can display. They have been considering these two rooms in the Red Barn, primarily because the exhibits displayed there have been in place for a long while and the rooms don’t generally get high usage from visitors. Installing plywood sheathing and drywall over the open framing now in place would allow the Museum to have flexibility in that space and adequate control over light/UV infiltration, allowing

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

them to meet stringent climate requirements for temporary and traveling exhibits. He said they would be happy to answer any questions the Commissioners had.

Lake asked if the Commissioners had any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked for members of the DRC to report on their meeting. Commissioner Kralios discussed some of the questions that arose during their review, including the positioning of the new stud wall between the long northeast room and the main volume of the barn. The DRC concern was that the new wall would encompass and obscure the large wood posts, bracing and beams which are an important character-defining feature of the barn's exposed wood structure in the main volume. They requested an interior elevation drawing of the wall from the main space of the museum. The project architect, Ingrid Krueger, shared her screen to go over the drawing sheet. She noted that per the DRC discussion they adjusted the location of the proposed interior wall slightly north to better reveal the large historic structural elements. She also raised the question of the sheathing on the south side of the new wall, facing the main volume. The initial design called out wood shiplap.

Kralios followed up on the sheathing question, further explaining their discussion on whether wood shiplap or gypsum wallboard should be applied on that side to achieve both material compatibility and differentiation. He said they also discussed the importance of plywood sheathing in some areas to tie into the seismic upgrade to the building, noting that these alterations were reversible if necessary. Kralios said the DRC was in support of the proposal overall.

Lake opened the public comment period. Hearing no requests to speak, she asked if the Commissioners had any questions for applicants or staff. Commissioner Alsobrook said it was unclear if the plywood covering the windows would be painted on the outside face. Mailander said the glass was currently covered with opaque black vinyl to restrict light intrusion into the exhibit space. He said the vinyl coverings will be repaired as needed and will remain in place, so the plywood would not be visible from the outside. Kralios recalled that another element of the DRC discussion was the interior window trim, saying the DRC recommended the Museum retain and store the trim for reinstallation if the plywood sheathing was removed in the future.

Commissioner Blue asked for and received clarification regarding the current location of two single doors proposed to be salvaged and moved for use as a double door. Lake asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, she closed the public comment period and requested Commissioner deliberation.

Blue noted that the 1916 spatial layout was called out as a feature of significance, but the temporary cloth and aluminum frame wall had divided the space for some time. She asked if replacing the temporary wall with a permanent wall would have an appreciable impact on the spatial layout. Steen stated that in the staff recommendation the standards had been met "in balance", meaning that there would be an impact to a significant feature, but not ultimately a destructive or irreversible impact, and that the change might help satisfy other criteria. Blue said she appreciated pushing the new wall to the north to better reveal the structural element and briefly touched on the covering of the windows. Lake said that the exposed framing in the Red Barn is a significant feature and applying plywood and drywall will alter the feel of the space, but acknowledged that installing a continuous surface with adequate light control is important for the continued use of that space for Museum exhibits.

Kralios said that the perceived volume of the space and the relationship of the spaces to one another won't be affected by this proposed change.

Hearing no further discussion, Lake asked for a motion.

Blue/Earley moved to approve CoA 21.13 for interior modifications to sections of the Red Barn as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed 5-0 with Commissioner Lemay recused.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The TLC adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Convene ISSAQUAH LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Todd Sargeant

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Christen Leeson

GUESTS: Christina Bruning, Katie Pratt

PUBLIC HEARING: Landmark Nomination of Coutts Garage Building

Steen gave a brief overview of the nomination process, noting that HPP staff architect Todd Scott had evaluated the property as eligible as A3 as well as A1. Katie Pratt, preservation consultant and nomination author, gave a presentation on the nomination, describing the history, development and significance of the Coutts Garage Building in Issaquah.

Commissioner Blue thanked Pratt for her presentation and asked for some clarification on the treatment of the façade sandstone when the garage was used as a health food store. Pratt said it looked in the photographs as if it had been painted or covered over. Sargeant said that in the 1980s the pilasters were covered with plywood and painted. Steen reported that the owner had come before the Commission a year or so ago to request feedback on the repair treatment of the alley wall, which had water issues and other deterioration. In response, the Commission recommended a solid finish, rather than exposed hardie plank or panel, and the owner complied by applying a stucco plaster finish to underlying hardie panel siding.

Chair Lake opened the floor to public comment. Hearing no comment, Lake closed the public comment portion of the hearing and asked if the Commissioners had any question for the applicant or staff. Commissioner Kralios asked if staff had any photos of the former conditions of the side and rear elevations of the garage. Steen displayed what King County had on file for the alley and rear elevations. Alsobrook asked what the period of significance for the garage is. Steen noted that King County doesn't include period of significance in their nomination forms, so aside from important build dates and the 40-year threshold, significance isn't attached to a specific time period. Commissioner Sargeant said he was surprised the garage had served as the Greyhound bus stop at one time. Lake mentioned that the Fritt's family, who ran the garage at some time, also had

a business in the Snoqualmie Valley. Sargeant asked if there were photos of the roof showing the clerestory, which is not visible from the street. Pratt said she was not able to access the roof during the site visit. Kralios asked if openings were added to the alley elevation. Steen said it was likely, since apartments were added to the rear of the building at some point but she didn't know when. Commissioner Lemay screen shared a google map view showing the clerestory windows on the roof. Alsobrook discussed what features of the exterior are significant, noting that the form of the garage is one of its character-defining features. Kralios asked if all the exterior features are significant, since there have been alterations over the years that have caused the building to lose integrity. He said he would call the garage a reasonably intact example. Alsobrook said the garage is eligible as a whole, inclusive of the changes that have been made to the building. The changes essentially show the history of development trends of commercial buildings over time. He noted it wasn't the best example of an intact 1920s commercial block, but it reflected significance in Issaquah because of the commercial trends of alteration over its lifetime. Lemay continued the discussion around the difference between criteria A1 and A3, saying that its significance related to overall historical patterns was clear, but said she was having issues with the architectural component of A3. Kralios agreed, asking if it really possessed integrity of design when so much of the original design, workmanship and material has been changed. Steen agreed the building was no longer readable as a garage but was actually still readable as a 1920s commercial block in Issaquah, because few if any still exist there. Lemay asked if they were only looking at Issaquah for A3. Steen said that Todd made his determination based on it being eligible as an Issaquah landmark.

Sargeant asked if building shape and volume were part of A3 or A1. Steen said that the building has to have some visually accessible elements of integrity for either. Sargeant noted that the unique shape and single-story volume were still evident and should be included as significant. Alsobrook said that since there is no associated period of significance, all the alterations made before the 40-year threshold could be considered significant. Blue agreed. She then asked if the entire land area around the building should be included, saying that the building took up most of the land area. Steen said setting the boundaries as the parcel was standard but agreed that the land area itself wasn't a significant feature. Discussion continued on what features were significant and what was known about them.

Kralios commented that general consensus supported criterion A1, but there was still some question regarding A3. Steen suggested voting on the criteria separately if there was no consensus. Kralios asked that when it's nominated as a landmark, does it matter under what criteria it was nominated. Lemay responded that emphasis of review under future CoA projects could be impacted by what criteria the landmark was designated under. Sargeant asked for clarification that if someone in the future wanted to put back the original canopy, they would be allowed to. Kralios said that shouldn't be an issue. Blue asked again how important the specific criteria for future reviews. Steen said that the standards used to review projects would be the same for both, but some additional nuanced weight would be given depending on what criteria the landmark was considered significant under. Meisner followed up, saying that the most important thing to consider when reviewing an alteration is whether it would impact the building's ability to convey its significance. Under A3, design reviews would be looking closely at the architecture, where there might be a little more latitude for certain changes under A1. Alsobrook said that the garage has existed close to its current form longer than it did in its original configuration. The building can convey its significance as an unusual building that made the transition from an auto concern to

a retail space. Alsobrook supports A1 and A3, since the architectural design of the building as it exists now is directly related to its change in purpose. Lemay said that her interpretation of A3 indicates a significant piece of architecture in Issaquah. If there are no other buildings of this type in Issaquah that are significant under architecture, and this is the best example of its type, then yes, it is significant under A3. Alsobrook responded that there is the potential to introduce an elitism in assessing architecture under a strict interpretation. He said the garage is essentially vernacular, and a good example of its type because of its developmental changes. Lemay concurred. Lake noted it was a rare example of a commercial block type in Issaquah.

Kralios brought up issues with past nominations missing important underrepresented communities or contextual information, asking if all bases had been covered in the research. Pratt said that the research had been as complete as it could be at this point. Steen commented that Kralios point was a good one, which should be raised when considering nominations. Kralios said he didn't intend to question Pratt's research, but believes bringing up this point of past oversight is important. Blue agreed. Lake asked for a motion.

Sargeant/Blue moved to approve designation of the Coutts Garage as an Issaquah Landmark under criteria A1 and A3 with the following features and boundaries of significance: all exterior features of the building and all land area within the parcel boundaries. The motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

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

Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Lake asked for any changes/corrections to the August 26th and September 23rd meeting minutes. Alsobrook corrected the attendance list for the September meeting, as he was listed as both present and absent. Lake called for a motion.

Kralios/Lemay moved to approve the August 26, 2021 meeting minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 6-0.

Blue/Kralios moved to approve the corrected September 23, 2021 meeting minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 5-0, with Commissioner Alsobrook abstaining.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Meisner reported on the 2021 Spellman Awards preparation, saying that video production was underway, and it was coming together smoothly. She is hoping the awards air before the end of the year. She also alerted the Commission that the HPP office has received a designation termination request for the site of the demolished Pacific Coast Coal Company Administration Building. The Commission approved the building's demolition in 2016, and the new owners are following up to remove the designation of the site. Meisner said there may be some public interest in the hearing, asking that if community

members reach out to Commissioners that they refer them to the HPP office. Blue asked what the future use of the site will be. Meisner said it was planned as a future asphalt plant. Meisner said she appreciated the depth of the Commissioner's discussion about the criteria involved in landmark designation and wished everyone a happy holiday.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The KCLC adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

DRAFT