

**KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES***

*March 25, 2021
Zoom (Call-in) Conference
Seattle, Washington
(Approved 04/22/2021)*

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Cristy Lake, Chair; Ella Moore, Amber Earley, Dean Kralios, Adam Alsobrook, Amy Blue

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Caroline Lemay, Candace Tucker, Tanya Woo

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Steen, Todd Scott

GUESTS: None

CALL TO ORDER: Lake called the meeting to order at 4:34pm. Introductions of commissioners and staff were made, and the Chair detailed the structure of the hearing. At the opening of the hearing, Commissioner Alsobrook disclosed that he had a conversation with Brian Rich regarding the Woodinville School adaptive reuse preservation plan during its early development, but noted that their discussion did not pertain to the design revisions currently before the landmarks commission for consideration.

Convene AUBURN LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Greg Watson (*absent*)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Allison Hyde

GUESTS: None

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #21.04: Auburn Post Office, 20 Auburn Avenue – roof replacement/repair, alley and grounds development project

Steen presented a brief staff report outlining the proposed project at the Auburn Post Office. Project elements include repair/replacement of deteriorated flat roof sections, installation of string lights over an adjoining alley with custom shades and small exterior power outlet and placing a carved Muckleshoot Welcome Figure at the front of the building. She noted that this is an ongoing project to adaptively reuse the Auburn Post Office as the city's new arts and culture center.

Allison Hyde, the Arts Coordinator of the City of Auburn, spoke about the proposed project. She said the city was thrilled to be working with talented Muckleshoot artists on the Welcome Figure. She also noted that the light string installation was something the community had expressed a strong interest in, to help create a safe welcoming urban park-like space around the Arts & Culture Center.

Commissioner Kralios offered the DRC report on the application, noting that they had no concerns with the roof repair work, or the installation of the Welcome Figure planned for the flagpole base.

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

He said they asked questions about how the light strings were planning to be attached to the building and recommended the anchors for the light strings be placed in the mortar joints to minimize damage to historic fabric. The DRC recommended approval of the project.

Lake asked if any members of the public wished to speak. Hearing none, the public comment portion of the meeting was closed for commissioner deliberation. Blue and Earley said they had no questions about the project, and consider it to be pretty straightforward.

Blue/Earley moved to approve the project as proposed and recommended by the DRC. The motion passed 6-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The ALC was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Convene WOODINVILLE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Phyllis Keller

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: Jordan Kiel, Susan Conway, Philip Chrisofides

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #18.24 (amendment): Old Woodinville School, 13205 NE 175th Street – proposal to revise approved design of south elevation

Steen presented a brief staff report outlining the proposed design revisions on the south elevation at the Woodinville School. She described what had been previously approved by the landmarks commission in 2018 and detailed changes to the elevator bank design, the metal canopy cover, the south elevation entryways and a rooftop equipment zone.

Applicant Jordan Kiel with Bassetti Architects showcased their proposed design for the south elevation, offering the reasoning behind the requested changes.

Lake asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak on the project. Hearing none, she asked if commissioners had any additional questions of staff or the applicant. Lake closed the public comment portion of the meeting and requested commissioner deliberation.

Kralios gave an overview of the DRC discussion, noting he was the only commissioner reviewing the application (Tucker was absent, and Lemay had to recuse herself from the project review). Kralios stated he focused on the bulk and scale of the new elevator bank, believing it to be disproportionate to the overall design. Another comment was related to the metal canopy, initially designed to wrap around most of the south elevation entry doors. Kralios thought it presented too heavy a visual intrusion across the elevation. The final concern Kralios expressed at DRC was regarding the proposed new single-entry door to the east of the primary entry in the center of the

south elevation. He requested more information regarding the need to cut another door opening into that elevation.

Earley asked for Kralios's thoughts on the canopy revision presented by the applicants' current proposal (revised after taking DRC comments into account). Kralios thought the current option is the more sensitive approach, which breaks up the canopy between the central entry and the elevator foyer entry. He also wondered whether a glass canopy would help break up the heavy black line of the canopy, though they are difficult to maintain. Earley agreed that glass might help break up the heavy line and offer more visual access to the historic fabric. Alsobrook agreed that glass canopies are a significant maintenance problem and he doesn't support their use. Blue noted that Criterion B is specifically geared toward the reasonableness of applicant objectives and said the metal canopy meets that criteria. She appreciated the applicant's reasoning regarding the elevator bank as it relates to water runoff and saw no issue with the project overall.

Kralios asked if other commissioners wanted to weigh in on the additional entry door proposed for the south elevation. He thought the previously approved openings should be enough for that elevation. Kiel introduced the tenant, Philip Christofides, to explain the circulation needs for the restaurant planned for the space which necessitated an additional door to the east of the central entry. Christofides said they discovered some beautiful historic brick walls on the interior they wanted to keep, which required them to revise the planned circulation patterns in the interior space. The new door will separate public access from service access and is designed to match the width and location of a historic door opening (which would have been filled in and half below grade, as approved in the prior CoA.)

Lake noted the original doors were double doors and asked if there was a reason a single door with sidelights is planned instead. The applicants had no objection to making that opening a double door, except the width may be an issue with ADA code requirements. Alsobrook noted the new door looks like a public access door and should be without sidelight and transom as a reference to the historic doors and to remove less material. Blue concurred with the idea of minimizing the loss of historic material. Kralios agreed, saying the door should read as a service door and requesting the applicant retain and store any historic brick removed. Steen noted that half of the brick proposed for removal is not historic brick – it is infill approved by the previous CoA in a historic door opening now partially under grade. She also cautioned the commission on designing from the podium, stating that the standards addressing compatibility and encouraging material retention certainly apply, but redesigning proposals according to architectural preferences is not an aspect of commission deliberation. Kralios clarified that the brick above the concrete lintel was historic brick. Steen said it was. Christofides noted the service door description is related to a specific restaurant use, and patrons would likely use it as well in certain circumstances.

Blue returned to the criteria, looking at the reasonableness of the project as proposed. Lake said she is comfortable with the current proposal but would recommend the applicants consider a double door in that location. Alsobrook said he would not recommend a double door, as the applicant has already noted that width could be an issue in meeting ADA requirements. Lake rescinded her recommendation. Blue clarified the condition regarding the handling of the removed historic brick, which is to be stored and reused wherever feasible. Kralios showed a photo of the concrete lintel under discussion. Earley asked what height the lintel would be with the new doors, the applicant guessed about 3' from grade. Alsobrook noted the damage already done to the lintel,

which had been ground down, and suggested cutting it for the door opening and leaving remnants in place to indicate where it was historically. Earley suggested leaving that as a recommendation rather than a condition, to allow for potential construction issues. Kralios agreed. Blue said the lintel is not a particularly significant character-defining feature, so would agree with recommending the applicants just consider retaining remnant pieces. She also concurred with conditioning the approval to salvaging historic brick. Lake called for a motion.

Blue/Earley moved to approve amending CoA 18.24 to allow for design modifications to the south elevation of the Woodinville School as presented, including the applicant's preferred option for the canopy, with the condition that any removed historic brick be retained and repurposed. The motion passed 6-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The WLC was adjourned at 5:41 pm.

Convene NORTH BEND LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Gardiner Vinnedge

CITY STAFF PRESENT: None

GUESTS: None

OTHER BUSINESS: Special Tax Valuation Application – Glazier's Dry Goods/Volition Brewing, 112 W North Bend Way

Steen presented the staff report on the rehabilitation project on Glazier's Dry Goods building in the North Bend Historic District. She offered an overview of the Special Valuation Program, presented before, during and after photos of the work transforming the building into Volition Brewing, and reviewed each categorical expense for eligibility.

Craig Glazier, owner of the building, described his family's history in downtown North Bend, and offered more detail on each stage of the project. He narrated the history and project process for each photo included in the staff presentation, noting the building had been vacant for 26 years, after his uncle closed his store. Glazier was interested in creating a vibrant space to pull people downtown more consistently and partnered with Volition Brewing to shape the building and lot. He said they have had really positive community response to the new business, and it was one of his most fun he has ever had on a rehabilitation project.

Lake asked if any members of the public wished to speak. Hearing none, she asked if the commissioners had any questions for staff or the applicant. Steen asked if the commissioners had any questions or concerns regarding the list of expenses submitted. The general answer was no. Vinnedge commented that both he and the community were pretty excited about this project, and that the building is important both to the Glazier family and to downtown North Bend. He said to have it back in circulation was a big deal. Lake called for a motion.

Blue/Vinnedge moved to approve the eligible rehabilitation costs for the Glazier's Dry Goods building Special Valuation application as submitted, with a total amount of \$423,904. The motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURN: The NBLC was adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Convene SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER: Andy Galuska

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Cate Lee

GUESTS: Wendy DiPeso, Janet Way, Bob Hubenthal, Carrie Nelson, Vicki Stiles, Kenneth Hong, Steve Zenke, Lance Young, Richard Ellison, Patty Hale

PUBLIC HEARING – Request for Reconsideration, Naval Hospital Chapel landmark boundary decision

Chair Lake stated the reason for the hearing was to review a Request for Reconsideration of the eastern boundary of the Naval Hospital Chapel designation submitted by the building owner, DSHS. Lake outlined the public hearing meeting structure and order of procedure.

Steen gave a presentation on the background of the nomination process with regards to the Chapel and the legal framework for the Request for Reconsideration as part of the appeals process. She offered a description of the argument put forward by DSHS to justify reconsideration of the commission's decision and redraw the boundary. She then showed site photos keyed to a map and aerial photos with relevant measurements of the site and delineated what is within the commission's purview to consider at this hearing.

Lake invited the owner/applicant to present their argument for reconsideration of the eastern boundary of the designated site. Bob Hubenthal with DSHS thanked the commission. He then described the commission's discussion at prior hearings related to DSHS' interest in potentially developing an area north of and adjacent to the existing lower parking lot. He believes the initial intention of the commission in crafting a compromise on the eastern boundary was to exclude the north section to accommodate the DSHS' future plans, and the discussion became confused and excluded the southern section instead. Hubenthal introduced Kenneth Hong, with the Washington State Attorney General's Office, to speak on behalf of DSHS about the reconsideration request.

Hong detailed DSHS position with regard to the reconsideration request, noting the request was based on inconsistencies in the commissioner's discussion at the January meeting. He walked through specific comments made by commissioners during the deliberation period included in the request based on his analysis of the audio record of the hearing.

Lake thanked the applicants, then opened the floor to public comment, requesting those who wished to speak to please use the raised hand feature in the Zoom platform.

Janet Way, on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Society who put forward the Naval Hospital Chapel nomination, spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary of the landmark site. They support the commission's decision at the January hearing, and believe the designation should be determined based on what is important for the landmark and not the future plans of the owner. Way referenced recent tree cutting on the Chapel site. She said the 60' wide northern section now under consideration for removal from the landmark boundaries contains important native forest growth.

Steve Zenke, with TreePac, spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary, citing the importance of the habitat on the Chapel landmark site. He believes the landscape which includes Pacific Madrone, Western Red Cedar and Douglas Fir, was in place at the time of the Chapel's construction and makes the site unique, and he believes it should be protected. He noted there are other areas that DSHS could expand parking.

Lance Young spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary. Young said the commission recognized the importance of setting to the feeling of the Chapel in its designation. He contends that maintaining the landmark designation over this part of the site would allow for additional outside review of any development there in the future. There are other parking lots on the campus which are often not fully utilized.

Victoria Stiles, Executive Director of the Shoreline Historical Museum, spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary. She noted that forested setting is an important part of the Chapel's significance. Stiles attended the January hearing, and while agreeing that there was some confusion during the commission's deliberation, contends that the commissioners were careful and thorough in their deliberation and final decision.

Richard Ellison spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary. He contends the plants within the site are unique, particularly the young and healthy Pacific Madrones, and the area DSHS wishes to remove is acting as a buffer protecting the trees and landscape closer to the Chapel. He believes the whole Chapel area's habitat should be restored.

Wendy DiPeso spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary. She noted there was some confusion during the commissioner deliberation, but believes the commission made the right choice in defining the site how they did. The northern area being reconsidered is much closer to the Chapel, and she believes a parking lot there would be visible from the Chapel building. She asked what the priorities are with this site, and reiterated that if the boundaries remain as designated, DSHS can go through the design review process if/when they need additional parking on the campus. DiPeso also contends that DSHS cherry-picked the commissioner's comments at the January hearing to make their argument for reconsideration. She also referenced the recent tree cutting on the site.

Maralyn Chase, a local resident, spoke in opposition to revising the eastern boundary. She contends that possible future development is not a strong argument for excluding a portion of the

site. She agrees with comments made by other members of the public on the importance of the trees to the character of the Chapel site.

Carrie Nelson, representing DNR (landowner), addressed the public comments related to trees recently cut on the site, stating they were identified as hazard trees by DNR foresters. Trees are not removed arbitrarily by DNR, and those which were cut down were left in place to contribute to the habitat of the site. Nelson also noted DNR's support of DSHS request for reconsideration, though they did not sign on as one of the applicants in the request.

Lake asked if any other members of the public wished to speak. Hearing none, she asked if there were any closing comments by members of the public who had spoken.

Steve Zenke said he disagreed with Nelson's characterization of the trees removed as hazardous. He also said the issue is encroachment into the area surrounding the Chapel which he believes would affect the character of the historic site. DSHS could come before the commission with any future development plans.

Lance Young reiterated his support for the original designation decision. He thinks a more environmentally conscious solution would be more appropriate.

Janet Way reiterated her support for the boundaries as designated, reciting a Joni Mitchell quote. She said the commission made a brave decision that is worth defending. The forest is protecting the Chapel and the environment as a whole.

Wendy DiPeso said they are trying to protect a sanctuary created for people who had experienced war. She said the commission carefully considered significant features in their deliberation and encourages the commission to take a stand to maintain the designation boundaries.

Richard Ellison said if a section was removed from the protected site, they would not have the opportunity to develop a restoration plan for the area.

Lake thanked the public for their comments and invited the applicants to make closing comments.

Bob Hubenthal noted that DSHS has been a good steward of the Chapel over the last 60 years. He found it unusual the commission would proceed with a landmark designation over the objections of the property owners and appreciates the commission's efforts to find a middle ground at the January hearing. DSHS submitted the request for reconsideration based on inconsistencies during that deliberation, and he believes what was discussed in terms of the eastern boundary was not what was ultimately approved. A compromise was intended, he contends, but the end result was of no value to DSHS.

Kenneth Hong also spoke, noting the issue up for consideration at this hearing is whether the deliberations and the end result were consistent. He suggested the commission review the discussion details, saying it's clear there was some confusion during the commission deliberation.

Chair Lake invited the commissioners to ask questions of staff or the applicant.

Commissioner Blue thanked members of the public for their comments and reminded the public that the commission's authority does not extend to habitat protection or include environmental considerations in decisions. From a legal standpoint it would be inappropriate for the commission to consider environmental concerns in its decision-making beyond associated historic setting. Blue said the commission's role is to evaluate the extent to which the proposed boundary change would actually compromise the forest setting of the Chapel itself.

Blue then reported on her site visit, noting commissioners and staff spent a good amount of time walking the site to assess impacts of a boundary revision on the setting from the perspective of the Chapel building. She said they paid specific attention to how removing trees from the lower north section, an area which already had a number of downed trees, would affect the canopy as viewed from the Chapel. Blue thought the buffer would not be overly compromised by the removal of the northern section. She says the setting near the Chapel maintains its intended feeling of serenity as there are still a significant number of trees between the Chapel and the road which will remain. In her opinion, revising the boundaries would not compromise the integrity of the site.

Lake asked Steen to display the site visit photographs. Lake narrated her observations through the site views, specifically noting the visual distance between the revised boundary and the Chapel. Earley asked if the commissioners who visited the site reviewed the southern sections proposed to be re-included in the boundary. Lake said not specifically, noting it was forested. Blue stated it was farther from the Chapel building, and they were focused on looking at the northern boundary change in relation to the Chapel. Steen showed photos of the section south of the lower parking lot, explaining how the road curves up toward the Chapel bounding the site. Lake said the northern section was flatter than she expected and the steep hill to the south starts at the 60' line (the existing parking lot.) Steen further explained the topography of the site through site photos. Blue also noted that the flat northern area is less forested in general, especially near the existing parking lot. She thought the topography would help protect the viewshed from the Chapel.

Lake closed the public comment section and opened commissioner deliberation. Earley said it seemed like the issues under discussion included whether revising the boundary impacts the historic setting and whether the decision made by the commission at the January hearing was based on incorrect information or misunderstanding. With regard to the January decision, Earley believes that by the time the motion was made all commissioners understood pretty clearly that the northern was being included and the southern portion excluded. She said that while the discussion itself had some points of confusion; at the end of deliberation she was clear about what she was voting for in terms of the final boundary determination.

Blue said she wasn't in the January meeting, but after weighing the impact of the boundary change on the Chapel, she said she would approve a boundary change. Kralios and Earley clarified that Blue would be comfortable revising the boundary as requested, and Blue said she was. Earley said she would like to have more information on the southern section, to assess whether it should be re-included. Blue said that when touring the site, they had discussed whether continuing the 60' line south (following the top line of the lower parking lot) would actually impact the site. Lake said that the southern forested section is not at all visible from the Chapel site and is only seen from the road on the hill. Earley asked Steen to display the requested boundary. Steen also clarified that the reason she didn't photograph the southern section during their site visit is because they were

focusing on impact to the Chapel, and she didn't believe the southern section would have a significant direct impact on the Chapel building either way.

Kralios recalled that the initial request from DSHS was a straight line through the site (along the top line of the lower parking lot.) He went on to say that at the January hearing he had pointed out that the Chapel sits 15-20' higher topographically, that its removed both horizontally and vertically from the lower area around the existing parking lot. It had a decent buffer around it already. He said that landscape was a difficult issue because of its potential transience, so he believes vegetation is less critical than the actual land area around the Chapel. Lake noted that a consistent issue with this nomination has been that there are no clearly defined boundaries to the site.

Blue asked the commission in general if they believed excluding the northern section would impact the setting of the Chapel. Alsobrook said he wanted clear coordinates from the site plan read into the record as part of the motion so there is no lingering doubt on the boundaries. Alsobrook took issue with the applicants' assertion that he did not understand what was being voted on at the January hearing, and has decided to abstain from voting on the matter due to negative feelings toward the applicant for what Alsobrook perceives to be a personal attack on him.

Moore recalled that a clear boundary delineation was requested in the November hearing. Earley said yes it was, so coordinates were included in the landmark designation map at the January hearing, but not read in as part of the motion. Earley said that based on the photographs, she believes removing the 60' northern section would cause enough of a difference in the forested area to impact the Chapel. Moore agreed.

Kralios asked staff if development occurred adjacent to the site, would that come before the landmarks commission or KCHPP staff. Steen said that if the development was outside the designated boundaries, it would not come before her or the commission for review. Todd Scott said any Section 106 review goes to City of Shoreline, and King County staff only comments if asked to by the city. Earley noted that not every action would fall under Section 106 cultural resource review anyway. Scott said that in the end the Chapel and its context is the focus, so the question before the commission is to determine what the critical area is around the Chapel that is necessary to maintain its context.

Lake said she also clearly understood what she was voting on at the January hearing. But having walked the site, she doesn't feel that removing the flat section would change the feeling of the Chapel. Scott noted that Fircrest is a large, evolving campus, and additional development is to be expected. Kralios said that given the proximity of the Chapel to the north, development there would have a greater impact on the Chapel than it would in the area below it, especially with the elevation distance. He thinks the remaining buffer is enough to support a boundary revision.

Discussion continued on what coordinates had been submitted and how to include them in a motion. Steen reminded the commission that a motion can be made, discussed and voted on, even if there were competing views on the appropriate approach. Kralios asked for the revised boundary map to be displayed. Alsobrook reviewed each coordinate on the map. Discussion continued on

how to clearly record the eastern boundary, with agreement that a final coordinated map would be needed to approve the boundary revision.

Galuska said he thought removing area under consideration would have little impact on the context of the Chapel but asked for clarification on what parameters the commission was using to make a determination. He asked if they were limited to only assessing the reconsideration request – in effect determining the earlier decision was a mistake – or could they revise the boundary based on their general understanding of its impact to the Chapel context. Earley clarified his question. Steen answered that unlike for appeals before a Hearings Examiner, both elements were part of the commission deliberation in this hearing, and the commission could move on both or each as separate considerations.

Blue stated that before the commission can make an effective motion, they will need an exact map (with GPS coordinates) which clearly defines the final boundaries. Discussion continued on what coordinates were included in previous maps.

Scott said one option was for the commission to approve a preliminary determination on the revised boundary, then schedule a final approval after DSHS submits a map keyed with lat/long and UTM coordinates. That way the applicants and public will have a sense of where the commission is heading on its determination and leave only an approval hearing necessary to finalize the designation. Discussion continued on how best to approach managing a clear preliminary determination with later approval.

Blue/Kralios moves to approve a preliminary determination to revise the eastern landmark boundary of the Naval Hospital Chapel [to exclude the northeast portion and include the southeast portion] as proposed by DSHS at today's meeting, with a stipulation that DSHS provide a clear map with coordinates included for final approval at the April 22nd landmarks commission meeting. The motion passes 4-2, with one abstention.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

ADJOURN: The SLC adjourned at 8:01 p.m.