

**KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES\***

*January 28, 2021  
Zoom (Call-in) Conference  
Seattle, Washington  
(Approved 02/25/2020)*

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Cristy Lake, Chair; Caroline Lemay, Vice-Chair; Ella Moore, Amber Earley, Dean Kralios, Adam Alsobrook, Tanya Woo, Candace Tucker

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED:** Amy Blue

**STAFF PRESENT:** Sarah Steen, Jennifer Meisner

**GUESTS:** None

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

**Convene KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Lemay asked for any changes/corrections to the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Lake/Earley moved to approve the December meeting minutes of the King County Landmarks Commission. The motion passed 4-0, with newly appointed commissioners Kralios, Alsobrook, Woo and Tucker abstaining.

Election of Officers. Lemay/Earley moved to elect Lake as Chair for 2021. The motion passed 8-0 with Lake abstaining. Lake/Moore moved to elect Lemay as Vice-Chair for 2021. The motion passed 8-0 with Lemay abstaining.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT:** Meisner reported that this year's first Regional Training Workshop would be held on February 3<sup>rd</sup>, with updates from both KCHPP and 4Culture and a session on SEPA functions in cultural resource management. She also discussed the status of the Mukai Fruit Barreling Plant rehabilitation project on Vashon Island, noting that construction was underway but inferior soil conditions may delay some of the approved work elements. Meisner said that KCHPP had recently issued an RFP to hire a consultant to develop a mid-century residential multiple property document (MPD). A state CLG grant is funding the project. Finally, Meisner told commissioners there were a number of landmark nominations moving forward. Three of them (Fall City Hop Shed, Newcastle Cemetery, Redmond Hotel) are part of KCHPP's equity and inclusion focus – existing landmark nominations which are being researched and expanded to include significant people or communities omitted from the original documentation.

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

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None

**ADJOURN:** The KCLC was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

**Convene SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**SPECIAL COMMISSIONER:** Andy Galuska

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Cate Lee

**GUESTS:** Wendy DiPeso, Katie Pratt, Janet Way, Bob Hubenthal, Spencer Howard, Carrie Nelson, Vicki Stiles

**PUBLIC HEARING – (continuation) Nomination of Naval Hospital Chapel**

At the opening of the hearing, Commissioner Alsobrook disclosed that his employer, Willamette CRA, employs Northwest Vernacular as a subcontractor on two on-call contracts with King County. Both contracts were executed prior to Alsobrook's employment with WCRA, and Alsobrook stated he has had no involvement or interaction with Northwest Vernacular or the Naval Hospital Chapel nomination development.

Chair Lake ran through the public hearing meeting structure and order of procedure, noting that prior hearing testimony and submitted letters of comment were still included in the record and had been reviewed by all commissioners. Lake also revisited the issues that had resulted in the hearing being continued.

Steen gave a brief summary on the criteria considerations and general discussion from the Naval Hospital Chapel nomination hearing on November 19, 2020. She noted that the landmark boundaries and the inclusion of interior features were the two primary undecided elements of the November hearing.

Lake invited the applicant and the owner to speak on the nomination. Janet Way spoke as the project applicant, reiterating her support for the commission's deliberations, the historic significance of the Chapel, and her belief that the boundaries were well defined in the nomination. She thanked the commission for their attention and time. Spencer Howard and Katie Pratt, architectural historians with Northwest Vernacular and authors of the nomination draft, offered their PowerPoint presentation again on the location, history, and significance of the property and detailed how it met the criteria for designation.

Bob Hubenthal, representing the building owners DSHS (Washington State Department of Social and Health Services), clarified the ownership structure of the site and noted that DSHS has been a good steward of the Chapel for over 60 years. Hubenthal stated that when it was submitted for consideration at the November hearing, DSHS supported the landmark nomination, notably for the historic building's exterior. Though the nomination initially had DSHS support in general, at the November hearing Hubenthal requested the eastern boundaries be amended – moved west approximately 80 feet - to enable future parking expansion without necessitating an additional

layer of permit review. Hubenthal said that the nomination as presented in January's hearing includes the exterior features but does not address DSHS's request that the eastern boundary be shifted west, and also includes interior features. Neither the landmark boundaries as submitted nor the inclusion of interior features are supported by DSHS, and so Hubenthal rescinded his support for landmark designation. He stated that though DSHS currently has no plans to modify either the interior or exterior of the Chapel, he believes regulating interior features is an overreach, and is concerned that designating them may prohibit DSHS from adapting the building to a different use in the future. Hubenthal stated that if interior features were not included, and if the boundaries were modified as requested, DSHS would again support the designation of the Chapel.

Carrie Nelson, representing landowner DNR (Washington State Department of Natural Resource), also spoke in opposition to the designation as proposed. She noted that DNR did not attend the November hearing, but having reviewed the designation report and other meeting materials, DNR supports DSHS's current position on the nomination. She reiterated that the added layer of permitting regulation if the eastern boundary was approved as submitted is onerous. Nelson also has concerns about restrictions or review requirements with regard to landscape maintenance on DNR land within the boundaries.

Lake thanked the applicants and owners for their comments. She then opened the floor to public comment.

Wendy DiPeso, resident of Shoreline, asked for more information regarding the removal of hazardous trees. She then spoke about the importance of the setting and concerns about increasing development. She supports the nomination boundaries as submitted and asked how significant interior features would be maintained.

Victoria Stiles, Executive Director of the Shoreline Historical Museum, spoke on the historic significance of the Naval Hospital site overall. She is concerned aspects will be lost if it isn't designated properly.

Janet Way, applicant, stated that she had served on Shoreline City Council, noting that the city has jurisdiction over the removal of hazard trees if necessary. She read a paragraph ascribed to Captain Boone on the selection of the Chapel site setting. She believes the trees should be protected as well.

Steen addressed Nelson's concerns regarding landscape maintenance, noting that for routine landscape maintenance, including the removal of hazardous trees, there is no design review requirement. She then answered DiPeso's question describing standard preservation practice with designated interior features. Steen also noted that interior features were not included in the initial designation report, primarily because its relatively rare to designate interior features. Enforcement is difficult, generally, and interior designation can make adaptive reuse difficult. She stated there are circumstances where designating interior features is appropriate, which is the focus of discussion at this hearing.

Lake asked for any closing comments from applicants and owners.

Hubenthal said he was aware of the contribution of the trees to the setting but pointed to early photos of the site that showed limited trees around the Chapel when it was built. He reiterated there were no current plans to modify the Chapel, but if another use was developed it would be done thoughtfully. He said he didn't wish to burden his successors with the additional regulatory oversight resulting from interior designation. Hubenthal discussed a pending roof replacement project, outlining his understanding of the design review process and raising concerns that anyone could appeal a decision. Steen displayed the map Hubenthal submitted showing the requested eastern boundary revision. Hubenthal explained the reasoning behind the request, noting that the tree cover was not as thick near the eastern boundary.

Way rebutted Hubenthal's comments, stating that the section along the eastern boundary is forested and important to the integrity of the Chapel site. She maintained the landscape is strongly connected to the Chapel, and part of its original design.

Nelson stated that DNR as the landowner manages the land to preserve the trees and landscape. She noted that DSHS has to work through DNR for any action on the property, that the site was part of state land held in School Trust and DNR provides use of the property to DSHS at low cost but with oversight. No clear-cutting would be approved on the site. Nelson said the photos of the eastern boundary show parking development already, and recommended compromise allow for both preservation and continued use.

Lake asked if the commissioners had questions for the applicant or owners. Kralios said he was unclear how the landmark boundaries were determined. Lake noted that the boundaries located within a defined legal parcel were a bit part of the November discussion – how to best define them when the landmark boundary does not coincide with the legal boundaries of the parcel. Kralios said it then seemed like there was some flexibility with regard to boundaries. Kralios also said that in the nomination there was a 1937 aerial photo showing that the site was not historically heavily forested. Steen displayed historic aerial photos.

Moore asked for clarification on DSHS intentions for the Chapel. Hubenthal stated that the use of the building will continue as a Chapel and a gathering space. He said no specific plans were being developed to do anything different on the site. Nelson reiterated that there were no current plans to modify the site or the Chapel. She did note there was an ongoing need to examine ways to best serve their populations, so master plans are being considered. Nelson noted how much regulation is already imposed on the site, and Hubenthal's interest in not adding more is understandable. Clarification discussions continued on the potential future campus development, a potential need to expand parking and what state agencies are involved.

Alsobrook asked the representatives of the state agencies to speak to state historic preservation regulations, how designation would interact with Executive Order 05-05, and clarification on the period of significance, specifically related to the tree cover. Alsobrook also made a point of order, asking how the chat comments in zoom meetings are handled in the public record. Steen answered that while she doesn't yet have any specific legal direction on the matter, she is including all chat comments in the record of the hearing. Hubenthal responded to the 05-05 question, explaining that the order requires consultation with DAHP and affected Tribes on projects involving any property 50 years or older, or if ground-disturbance is involved. He described the consultation process.

Nelson said DNR also follows the executive order, and DNR has its own cultural resources division which reviews projects. DNR has a mandate to preserve historic features and sites. Hubenthal noted that DAHP is primarily concerned with historic exteriors but will sometimes address significant interior features as well. Pratt spoke to the period of significance, noting that King County landmark nomination forms do not include a period of significance, so the commission needs to define one. Howard followed up with explaining the landmark boundary was determined through analysis of the historic use of the site and development of the surrounding site, describing the features they reviewed.

Lemay asked for further clarification on the map included in the nomination and why the specific contributing site features were included. Howard explained how they concluded what pathways and circulation features should be included. Tucker asked if the parking lot dated to the construction of the Chapel. Howard said the location was originally used as a parking lot, but some alterations have been made. Steen displayed a map of the site showing included features. Howard added that topography was a consideration in defining the boundaries.

Lake asked if there were any remaining comments, hearing none she closed the public comment period and asked for commissioner discussion.

Earley commented there were two items under consideration – the boundaries and inclusion of interior features. Kralios suggested beginning with boundary definition, stating the reasoning behind boundary definition in the nomination made sense. He noted, however, that the topography slopes down to the parking lot, which is 10-15 feet below and likely visually obscured from the Chapel. That noted, he thought the boundary adjustment was reasonable and would have limited impact to the integrity and feeling of the Chapel, especially considering the intervening landscape buffer. Kralios thought that future development there wouldn't detract from the significance of the site or the experience of the Chapel.

Lemay said she understood the interest in reducing the regulatory burden but thought the discussion should concentrate on the merits of the landmark nomination itself. Creating a reasonable buffer around the building was the purpose, she said, and wondered if modifying the boundary would leave enough of one. She suggested DSHS could construct a building near the Chapel without review if that area was not included. Earley said the historic photos were helpful in showing the historic use of the existing parking area, so it doesn't seem unreasonable to include it within the boundary. While DSHS has been a good steward, that's no guarantee the future owners would be, and future projects would not be subject to design review if the boundary was amended, so Earley thought the boundary as proposed was appropriate.

Moore asked for photographs showing perspectives on site, from the Chapel to the parking area. Steen displayed photos from the nomination. Lemay thought the 80-foot eastern boundary shift to the west might be acceptable, since the photos show limited lines of sight from the Chapel. Lemay returned to the idea that the interior features of the building were important. Kralios argued that the north boundary of the Chapel is much closer to the building than the eastern boundary, and even with the reduction of 80 feet there remains 75-100 feet between the road and the Chapel to act as a buffer. Lemay reiterated her concern that they were chipping away at aspects of the landmark, and while the boundary reduction might be acceptable, leaving out the interior features would not be. Earley asked what was most important to the community, noting that as

preservationists the historic interior features might be considered important, but most of the discussion and community testimony had centered on the significance and value of the Chapel's exterior and surrounding setting.

Kralios cited the SOI Standards for Rehabilitation, reading Standard 1 and noting that the boundary still seemed somewhat arbitrary, and thought it needed further definition based on the contributing characteristics of the site. Tucker asked if the parking lot could be considered one of those features, part of the original design and integral to the overall story of the site. Tucker stated her concern about the parking lot not being included but noted there may be space on either side without contributing features. Moore asked Kralios to clarify his assertion that remaining buffer between the Chapel and the amended eastern boundary was adequate. Kralios reviewed his earlier comments and went on to say the site map shows how close the north roadway is to the Chapel in comparison.

Discussion continued on various options under consideration to define the boundaries while including contributing site features as outlined in the nomination. Woo asked if the owner's interest in reducing the regulatory burden was something the commission needed to consider. Lemay said no, it was not within the commission's purview. Woo noted that if designated, the commission was the only civilian board with a review mandate of projects on the site, and having nearby projects come before the commission for review would offer a good check and balance.

Meisner suggested a straw poll on the boundary definition, after which the discussion could move forward to the interior features. Kralios stated he felt comfortable with revising the boundary. Lemay thought the parking area and path to the Chapel should remain part of the designation, but other adjustments could be made. Moore and Woo supported the boundaries as defined in the nomination. Tucker supported a compromised boundary definition, which retained the parking lot and pathways as contributing features but adjusted the boundary to the south. After additional discussion, Galuska, Earley, Lake and Alsobrook agreed with Tucker.

Steen listed the interior features being considered for inclusion in the designation. Earley asked if there were other existing landmark designations which included interior features. Steen said yes, there are landmark barns in King County which included interior hay lofts in their designations. Steen also noted the Crawford Store, also in Shoreline, which had interior features included in the designation, but they had been removed by various owners over the years. Steen reiterated including interior features in landmark designations was not a common practice for a number of reasons. Lemay argued that while it may not be common for King County, it was common in Seattle and in other preservation circles. Adequate enforcement may be more of an issue with residential properties than with commercial or institutional buildings. She said it is hard to separate the interior features of the Chapel with its exterior design and purpose. Alsobrook agreed, stating the clearly relatable significance of the interior features to the overall resource. He said if the unique interior features were lost, the overall significance of the site would be compromised. Alsobrook then suggested limiting interior feature inclusion to the public spaces of the Chapel, including only the chancel and nave. Galuska commented that the interior features are intimately tied to the use of the building as a Chapel and wondered about the potential impact of use change in the future. He said the interior wood structural elements should be included.

Kralios agreed, citing SOI Standards 2 and 5, noting that the interior open volume is of paramount importance, as are the visible structural elements and interior woodwork in the chancel and nave. Tucker and Lake agreed with Alsobrook and Kralios. Lake stated that the interior features represent design and material associated with the era and use, removing them would negatively impact the association of the building.

Lake called for a motion on the proposal. Tucker moved to approve the nomination including all exterior features of the Chapel; interior features including scissor trusses, wood posts and trim, exposed wood purlins and roof sheathing, iron pendant light fixtures, interior cedar doors with chevron patterns and associated metal knobs and escutcheons, wall fiberboard, built-in cabinets with chevron patterned cedar doors, decorative chancel railing, wood wall screens enclosures at the chancel corners and the open volume; contributing site features include circulating paths, forested setting, south parking lot, and all land area within nominated boundaries shown on map with the following amendment: the south boundary line has been revised to exclude the area to the south of the contributing parking lot.

Clarification on motion process and what interior features to include continued. Lemay seconded the existing motion. Lake moved to amend the motion to add Criterion A1 for the Chapel's association with Seattle Naval Hospital during WWII and Criterion A3 as described in the designation report. Kralios moved to amend the motion to remove interior features in areas other than the nave and chancel, such as the wall fiberboard and the built-in cabinets. Discussion continued on how to clearly specify interior features. Kralios listed the interior features of the chancel and nave to be included: the scissor trusses, wood posts and trim, exposed wood purlins and roof decking, cedar doors with chevron patterns and associated hardware connect to the chancel and nave, decorative wood chancel railing and open volume of the space. Excluded are the fiberboard wall finishes and the built-in cabinets. Lemay includes the iron pendant light fixtures. Tucker includes the wood screen corner installations. Alsobrook noted it's unusual to have an historic interior space as intact as exists in the Chapel, which is why discussion and specification of the interior features is important. Steen stated that there needed to be a vote on the amendments to the original motion, then the commission can vote on the motion itself.

Earley defined the boundaries as proposed in the nomination and amended as follows: a boundary line extending from the northwestern edge of the contributing parking lot following the same angle leading to the road at the southern boundary defines what is excluded from the designation boundary south of the Chapel. A revised map reflecting the revision of the southern corner will be included in the Findings of Fact. Lake called for a vote on the amendment to the motion.

Lemay/Earley moved to approve the amendment to the original motion. Motion passed 9-0.

Earley/Moore moved to approve the designation of the Naval Hospital Chapel as a Shoreline Landmark under Criteria A1 and A3 with the following boundaries and features of significance: the boundaries of the landmark are those proposed by the applicant and amended to exclude an area south of the contributing parking lot which extends from the northwest corner of the contributing parking lot toward the southwest where it intersects with the road; the features of significance include all exterior features as well as interior features of the nave and chancel including scissor trusses, associated wood posts and trim, exposed wood purlins and roof decking, cedar doors with chevron pattern and metal knobs and escutcheons connected to nave and chancel,

decorative chancel railing, decorative wood corner screens, iron pendant lighting fixtures, and the open volume; site features include circulating paths to the south and east of the Chapel, the forested setting, and all of the land area within the nominated boundaries. The motion passed 9-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Way said she hoped this was a good sign for the future of historic properties in Shoreline. Hubenthal stated that the commission has taken an action opposed to the requests of the building owner, and that exemptions of a handful of interior features and the limited revision of the southern boundary are of no value to DSHS.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None

**ADJOURN:** The SLC adjourned at 7:33p.m.

DRAFT