

**CITY OF REDMOND
LANDMARK COMMISSION**

January 3, 2013

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Thomas Hitzroth (Chairperson—LHC), David Scott Meade (Chairperson—DRB), Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Arielle Crowder, Scott Waggoner, Kevin Sutton, Mike Nichols

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Miguel Llanos

STAFF PRESENT: Kim Dietz, Senior Planner, Redmond Planning Department; Lisa Singer, Redmond Public Works

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Landmark Commission is appointed by City Council to designate, provide additional incentives to, provide review of changes to, and provide expertise on archaeological and historic matters pertaining to properties qualifying for either a national, state or local register status.

LANDMARK COMMISSION

The meeting of the Landmark Commission was called to order by the Chairperson of the Commission, Thomas K. Hitzroth, at 7:00 p.m.

PROJECT REVIEW

Project: Preliminary Consultation for Certificate of Appropriateness for the Stone House

Description: Review landscape, street frontage, and front yard plan

Location: 16244 Cleveland Street

Applicant: City of Redmond

Staff Contact: Kim Dietz, 425-556-2415, kdietz@redmond.gov

Mr. Hitzroth welcomed the new members of the Commission. He clarified criterion A3, which supports the landmark designation of the Stone House, which refers to Findings C and D of the Findings of Fact and Decision from February 1, 2007. He said that the description of the boundaries and tax parcel are from Finding of Fact C. Finding of Fact D included the following: four mature deciduous trees at the front property line, a large holly tree immediately in the front of the house, and a pine tree at the rear all appear to date to the historic period. All other landscape materials, including but not limited to the picket fence, pavers, and plantings are non-historic. The other reference was to an additional outbuilding, which was described in the following way: this structure does not meet any of the designation criteria. By way of clarification, that is exactly as this point was worded in the Findings of Fact in 2007. However, the language says this building is as described in the registration form. The registration form devoted only twelve words to this, saying that behind the house is a 10-foot x 12-foot concrete block building, and the date of construction is unknown. Mr. Hitzroth was part of the Commission in 2007. That note came from a discussion contained in the meeting minutes from that time. The block building did not meet the criteria in the registration form because the registration form did not say anything about it.

Ms. Dietz gave the Commission some information about the Stone House frontage and front yard area. All exterior portions of the Stone House are involved in the landmark of the structure. The mature holly tree in the front yard is part of the designation, as Mr. Hitzroth mentioned, and a feature of significance. A mature pine tree to the rear of the house has had some maintenance work done to it, as it had grown into two segments. One of the two segments died. All of the land within the parcel boundaries is part of the features of significance. The boundaries are different than what the City thought them to be over the course of time, which brings to bear a clause that municipalities have had in place for older lots in which

public right of way was not needed. A property owner was allowed to occupy right of way until that area of land was needed.

The first visible part of the Stone House is actually in the City right of way. The property line runs in a similar manner to the adjacent parcels. Under the tree canopy is a fence and some property use, such as tables and landscaping, that is outside of the actual parcel. Ms. Dietz noted that some of the stone features of the Stone House, the elm trees on the property, and the white picket fence are all in the City right of way. Ms. Dietz said that Lisa Singer from Redmond Public Works would present some of the ideas the Cleveland streetscape has for this area. Ms. Dietz explained that the public ground outside of the Stone House would be part of the Cleveland streetscape. She asked for the Commission's input on the area inside the Stone House tax lot. She also wanted Commission input about some vegetation proposed to the west of the property in a new park under development. The goal is to have compatibility between the Stone House and the public ground.

Ms. Singer showed the Commission the Stone House's location related to the east edge of the future Downtown park site on the north side of Cleveland Street, where the City has a large capital improvement project ready for construction next summer. South of the Stone House, running east to west, is the Central Connector Trail currently under construction. The Stone House is on the west edge of the Downtown Historic Core. A lot of capital investment has been focused on the Downtown Core over the last few years, which Ms. Singer said presented an exciting opportunity to change the frontage of the Stone House. The Cleveland streetscape project will start in the summer of 2013 and will run for a year. It will raise the street level up so there is no difference in elevation between the sidewalk and the street. That should give the City some flexibility for public events and could help show the connection between the Central Connector Trail along Cleveland Street and into the historic area of Redmond. The hope is that as more people move downtown, the streets and businesses will become more active.

The Cleveland streetscape project runs from 161st to east of Leary Way, and the Stone House is just about in the middle of that project. The project will be moving away from a design that involves trees lining the street. Instead, pocket plazas will be developed in which pedestrians will encounter a surface feature and landscaping which will encourage more public activity. A crosswalk on the west edge will also lead a lot of pedestrians across Cleveland Street and into the east edge of the park along the frontage of the Stone House. Ms. Singer said this was a perfect opportunity to meld the changes happening Downtown into the changes happening at the Stone House. She has met with the owner's representative of the Stone House to come up with some ideas that would be consistent with the other pocket plazas along the Cleveland Street corridor. Specific materials have not been chosen yet, but they would be similar to the other plazas. Concrete stamped pavers are one possibility. Such pavers have a historical look, but Ms. Singer said the idea was to be respectful and not to recreate the historical look. Cobbles or other pavement materials might be used as well. The owner of the Stone House has expressed a desire to maintain a physical separation between the park and frontage area, in that there is a lot of walk-through traffic. Some seating may be provided in this area, as well. Several different walls, materials, fences, or plant material could be used.

Ms. Dietz noted that the owner of the Stone House is interested in replacing the holly tree on the site. His experience is that the holly tree sends up a lot of sprouts, which are difficult to find and dig out. Ms. Dietz showed the Commission some possible replacements for the tree, including some similar "cousins" to the holly species that would be suitable for Redmond's climate and soil. It is possible that the owner might want to replace the holly with a Japanese maple. He is asking for the Commission's approval on a replacement. Ms. Dietz reiterated that the holly tree is a historical feature of significance on the site. She also noted that the Stone House, as a café, does provide alcohol. Thus, a border of some sort around the café would need to be in place, per state liquor rules, between the outside dining area and the public realm. That could be accomplished in several ways. However, this may create a situation where outside dining and alcohol service occurs on the parcel itself, but would not be provided at some of the outdoor tables. Hedges and formal fences could also be used to enclose the dining area.

The owner of the Stone House likes the designs that have been presented to the Commission regarding the vegetation and surface treatments. He would like more time to think through these plans before the City indicates what its preference would be. Thus, Ms. Dietz is asking for very general feedback from the

Commission with regard to the overall concept and how to proceed with some of the changes related to the Cleveland streetscape. Mr. Hitzroth asked if the Commission would be asked for approval of a project or a recommendation. Ms. Dietz said she was looking for some advice, not an official approval. Based on the outcome of tonight's meeting, staff will start the application process for a Level II Certificate of Appropriateness and bring that back to the Commission through the standard process for approval. Ms. Singer added that the Cleveland streetscape project is finishing its design. The design concepts she has presented to the Commission for the public right of way in front of the Stone House will be selected in the next month, with construction set for this summer. Mr. Hitzroth added that the parcel of the Stone House needs to be considered closely. He asked for comments from the Commission.

Mr. Nichols asked about what was happening west of the Stone House. Ms. Singer noted that this was the area of the future Downtown park site. The plan is to begin the Cleveland streetscape project in the early summer of 2013. The parcels to the north of Stone House are on private land. The work to move the elm trees in front of Stone House would happen during the streetscape construction. A temporary sidewalk would be installed during the process. The owner of Stone House is looking for feedback as to how access might be gained from his site to the Downtown Park. Mr. Nichols thanked Ms. Singer for providing some context to the project, which he said made sense. He said did not see any issues with regard to the landscaping. Mr. Nichols said that the holly tree should be replaced with something of appropriate scale and feel, in his opinion. He asked if the fence separating the Stone House dining area from the public right of way would be along the property line of Stone House. Ms. Singer said that was still under consideration. Mr. Nichols said, ultimately, he would like to delineate the Stone House parcel as a historic site along the property line. He believed this would solve the issue of alcohol service. He liked what staff has presented and how the view to the Stone House was opened up from Cleveland Street.

Mr. Meade said this was a difficult situation, in that five historic trees could be eliminated. Mr. Hitzroth clarified that the elm trees, in particular, are not in the Stone House parcel and not in the jurisdiction of the Commission. He noted that these trees are not landmark trees, either. The issue of the elms was discussed in 2007, and the Commission at that time deferred the designation of the elms to the City. He believed that the Code indicated that a tree over 30 inches in diameter was considered a historic tree. Mr. Hitzroth said he understood the City had already made the decision to remove the elm trees. He said that they were a character-defining feature of the Stone House, but noted that the Commission cannot do anything about the decision to remove them. He suggested that when the Level II Certificate of Appropriateness application occurs, a complete photographic record should be made of the demolition of the trees. Mr. Meade asked if the City could use the trees in some way to benefit the City. Mr. Hitzroth said he did not see why that recommendation could not happen, in that the trees were an important part of the character of the building.

Mr. Krueger asked how the City could use the trees. Mr. Meade said the wood from the elms could be harvested to create an interior feature, perhaps benches. He said he would not go on record to vote to take down the elms, but said if they were coming down, he would like to find ways to utilize the wood. He noted that there was a company in Redmond that can do such preservation work. He said the elm trees would be ideally suited for that type of use, perhaps being formed into a structure of sorts with some interpretative signs to explain the story of Cleveland Street. Mr. Hitzroth agreed with that idea.

Mr. Krueger asked about the material on the ground today between the future sidewalk and the front door of the Stone House. Ms. Dietz said that material could stay, and changing that would be the option of the owner of the Stone House. Because he is losing some of his front yard area to the public right of way, he would like to expand the rest of the area that he has, which will involve some surface treatment. The material in place today is a stamped concrete, almost like a raised cobble. One of the concrete paver types proposed by staff would be similar to the current material, but the new material could have a varied color scheme and a flat walking surface as opposed to a raised or cobbled surface. Other areas of Cleveland Street would have this new type of paver, as well. Mr. Hitzroth noted there was a dichotomy between maintaining the continuity of the new and matching materials with the old historic elements. He was under the impression that all new materials would go right up to the front of the building. He wanted to make sure the historicity of the Stone House was conveyed properly. He was concerned that people would consider the new design as a characteristic of the historic building. Mr. Hitzroth would support any type of paving that would maintain a continuity that showed that the Stone House is a historic structure.

Ms. Dietz asked if Mr. Hitzroth's concern was not to create a false sense of history, and at the same time, construct something compatible with the historic nature of the structure. Mr. Hitzroth agreed with that summary statement. Mr. Nichols said he understood the concern about fitting the design to the historic nature of the property. However, he said the challenge is that the Stone House is a residential structure in the middle of a commercial area. He said there may be a way to build, in the paving area, a band of cobbled stone to create an accent that would help make a connection to the Stone House. Mr. Hitzroth wanted to make sure people understood that the house is all that is historic. He would support a paver that would look more like a boardwalk. Mr. Meade asked if Redmond had boardwalks in the past. Mr. Hitzroth said there were board sidewalks. Mr. Meade said any of the paver choices presented by staff could be appropriate, with the goal that the house is the feature. He said he believed the plan was light on landscaping, as it is presented right now. He supported seeing a planter edge, perhaps a hedge in lieu of a fence or in tandem with a fence, to provide a softer border to the Stone House property.

Mr. Hitzroth said he agreed with the softer edge concept, but he would hate to see the Stone House become like the Perrigo House in Redmond. He noted that the Perrigo House is now a community landmark and does not qualify as a standard landmark because it has lost its context. It is a farmhouse and there is no context around it. He admitted that this was not an easy discussion about the Stone House. He noted that the holly tree was a big issue for him. In 2007, the Commission determined that the holly tree was historic. However, upon visiting the tree, it was noted that the tree was not more than 30 years old. It did not appear in the 1938 tax photo or any other photos. It was not part of the original landscape plan, but the Commission made it a feature of significance. The question now is how to handle this tree. He would prefer to see this tree replaced with a similar species. He pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior standards call for landscaping to be replaced with similar landscaping so as not to create a false sense of history.

Mr. Meade asked Ms. Dietz about the replacement tree and its size. Ms. Dietz said there was no City requirement for tree size. On some other properties, such as a National Historic Site, that might be needed, but in this case, starting with something small would be acceptable. She said the species of replacement trees proposed by staff would reach six to eight feet tall, which is not the current tree height of fifteen to twenty feet. Mr. Meade noted that the owner was interested in a Japanese maple, but said that it might be more appropriate to choose an evergreen tree similar to the holly in color. Mr. Hitzroth believed that would be appropriate.

Ms. Dietz said that if the Commission was comfortable with the vegetation palette outside of the tree selection, as well as the surface treatment choices, the staff would be working with the Stone House owner to determine a final preference and bring that forward with the Certificate of Appropriateness. She summarized that the preference of the Commission is to replace the holly with an in-kind tree. The owner had expressed a preference for a tree that was least holly-like. She noted that the fence mentioned earlier is not part of the historic features of significance, but some type of fence with historic character would be recommended. The owner may select from the styles provided by staff, but again, that decision would come back to the Commission as part of the Certificate of Appropriateness process. The fence would have to fit the character of the building. The Level II Certificate of Appropriateness would be directly related to the holly tree. The rest of the design would focus on fitting the context of the site. Mr. Hitzroth confirmed the three elm trees discussed earlier are not on the Stone House parcel.

Mr. Meade asked for more specifics on the replacement for the holly tree. Ms. Dietz said it would be a purple-leaf false holly. Mr. Hitzroth noted that the three trees on the west side of the building should also convey the nature of the historical character of the building. Ms. Singer noted that a Master Plan process for the park adjacent to the Stone House may end up removing the trees Mr. Hitzroth is discussing. Ms. Singer asked if anything other than three trees would be compatible as alternate plantings. Mr. Krueger said he would defer to the owner of the Stone House and what would work best for him in the interim. A concern was also mentioned that obscuring the Stone House with trees would not be the best choice, in that the building is a historic, nice piece of architecture. Mr. Hitzroth added that there is no historic evidence that there were trees in this area at the time the building was constructed. He noted, however, that there is only one other structure that is similar to Stone House in King County. He wanted to make

sure the Commission members were good stewards of this development. He appreciated the owner's care of the Stone House building.

Mr. Waggoner said, regarding the historic context of the building, that the type of trees is not the issue. Rather, it is how the trees are replaced and how they create a sense of boundary or enclosure. He noted that the trees were a renewable resource, and in the future, whatever is planted might be brought down again. Mr. Waggoner noted that the pavers leading up to the Stone House would be an effective way to create a historical sense of place and also a public realm. Mr. Krueger appreciated Mr. Waggoner's comments and said no matter what is developed, the historical elements and the public realm should be compatible. He supported Mr. Waggoner's idea of some crossover between the public realm and the historical elements, such that there is not a firm border between the two spaces. Mr. Hitzroth liked that idea, but cautioned again that the design should not create something that was never on the historical site to start with. That could contribute towards a loss of historical context.

Mr. Meade asked about the landscape plan and if it was still evolving. Ms. Dietz said that it was. He asked if there was a way to match the pattern of the trees that are on the site now in the front landscaping area and also pick up four trees that might be compatible with the new design. Ms. Dietz noted that these trees would be in the public right of way. Ms. Singer noted that planners have looked at doing something similar, but the location of the current trees is in the pedestrian walkway. Mr. Meade clarified that where the new plan shows two trees in a planter strip he would like to see four trees. Ms. Singer said that could be considered, but noted that with a crosswalk in that area, a certain amount of sight distance would be needed for pedestrians and cars to see each other. That is why the trees are pushed further east. However, if the trees have a smaller eventual growth size, they could be placed closer together.

Ms. Crowder thanked staff for the presentation and said that it was exciting to see how this space would be activated for pedestrians and could also bring more attention to the Stone House. Ms. Singer asked about the trees and the Commission's idea to replicate the current look of the site by adding more trees. She asked if four trees could be added in two clumps of two. Mr. Meade said any overture toward what is on the site currently would be appreciated, which could mean trees or other vertical features. He was hoping to make a landmark edge of some sort to the site. Mr. Hitzroth said there might be an opportunity for an interpretive sign in this area. Mr. Meade said that he was not in favor of beautiful signs replacing beautiful trees, but he said an artistic rendering of such an interpretive sign could work. He would rather see something in the ground plane, perhaps a brass paver with a photographic representation of the historic site, rather than a vertical sign. Ms. Singer asked for the Commission's feedback about adding some words in the pavement as an expression of the design. Mr. Meade said that would be appropriate at the Stone House site. He said that adding historical elements to the paving would be a way to capture some lost history and also bring an interactive, yet passive touchstone of education to the area. Staff thanked the Commission members for their input.

Ms. Dietz noted that Resolution 1380 has worked its way through the process, including the edits made by the Commission at its last meeting, regarding the Landmark Commission rules. Previously, those rules were in the Community Development Guide. Now, the rules sit with the City Clerk's office. If the rules need to be updated again, the Commission would work through another process with the City Clerk and potentially the City Council. Ms. Dietz said the newly edited rules should carry the Commission for quite a few years, in that the updates were very thorough. Mr. Hitzroth thanked Ms. Singer for coming to this meeting. He also thanked Ms. Trapp for her work in completing the meeting minutes and documenting the proceedings of the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:04 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (8-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY