CITY OF REDMOND LANDMARK COMMISSION

October 4, 2012

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: David Scott Meade (Chairperson—DRB), Joe Palmquist, Craig

Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Thomas Hitzroth (Chairperson-LHC), Miguel

Llanos

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Lara Sirois, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Senior Planner; Gary Lee, Planner

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 7:03 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE LANDMARK COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 2ND, 2012. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

STATUS UPDATE

Project: Landmark Commission Rules, Procedures, and Heritage and Preservation Grant Program

Brochure

Description: Review documents and recommend amendments to City Council

Applicant: City of Redmond

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

Ms. Dietz said staff is trying to provide an update to several working documents that have been in play for several years now. That would include the rules, procedures, and the grant guidelines that the City uses. An interlocal agreement will be coming later, and at that point, the Commission will be able to make some minor amendments to the Regional Landmark Commission as it operates in Redmond.

The City is still in a process of exploring the Certified Local Government status that interlocal cities will take on by the end of this year. The updates to the rules and procedures proposed at this meeting are reflective of changes that have happened recently to the Zoning Code and Municipal Code. The procedures section will be housed in the Municipal Code. The rules will be housed with the City Clerk, which is consistent with all of Redmond's boards and commissions, as a way to streamline the Municipal and Zoning Codes. The grant program guide has the operating guidelines for the City-provided funding that is available for restoration and rehabilitation to property owners of landmark and potential landmark properties. This will go to the City Council. The guidelines are not in the Zoning Code, Municipal Code, or Comprehensive Plan, but are referred to in those sections.

Ms. Dietz first noted an amendment in the vacancies section. This is a minor change, refining how vacancies are treated and clarifying that they are within a calendar year. Mr. Hitzroth noted that a calendar year was used in this instance, but Section 4.10.050 talks about a twelve-month cycle. Ms. Dietz said she did not have a preference between those two choices, but it can be consistent with the general rule. Mr. Hitzroth said that consistency would be preferable. He asked for a distinction between 4.33.10.C2 and 4.33.20B2 in terms of reviewing applications for proposed removal of City landmarks.

Redmond Landmark Commission Minutes October 4, 2012 Page 2

One is by the Regional Commission, and the other is by the City Commission. Ms. Dietz said the difference was that Redmond has the sixteen sites that are on the Heritage List, while the County has the landmarks. The City Commission would have the authority to work with the Heritage List, whereas the Regional Commission would have the authority to work with the Landmarks list. Ms. Dietz said that point could be better clarified. Mr. Hitzroth said he would appreciate some clarification regarding the distinction between the two commissions, as both sides can be confused with this matter.

Ms. Dietz asked the Commission members present if she and Mr. Hitzroth should look at this section and clarify it outside of this meeting. Mr. Hitzroth said the distinction between the two Commissions might be clearer when the interlocal status agreement is reached later. Ms. Dietz said ironing out the difference between the Commissions would be best done in a City Landmark Commission meeting. Mr. Palmquist said the language is fairly clear, but the wording could be revised in 4.30.10.C2 about designation from regional landmarks. That should be as clear as the heritage resource register language in the other section. That would help determine which board has authority over which list.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SECTION 4.33.10.C2 AND 4.33.20.B2 WITH THE CONDITION THAT STAFF AND MR. HITZROTH WILL WORK OUT CHANGES TO THE LANGUAGE AS NOTED ABOVE. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

A definition issue was next presented by Ms. Dietz. Mr. Hitzroth wanted to clarify two definitions, which were from the Zoning Code. The terms *applicant* and *parties of record* were reviewed. The changes to definitions are to establish consistency across all the City's boards and commissions and the Code. The next section for review was Section 3, which involved changes regarding the absences of Chair and Vice-Chair and the process of resignation. The changes are minor, but the process has been clarified by which a chair is selected in the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Mr. Hitzroth asked about the resignation of a Chair or Vice-Chair, if they left before their terms expired. A person can be vacant from such a position for more than one reason. The Council could remove a commission member for cause, which is not a resignation. Mr. Hitzroth suggested language referring to a *vacancy* of the Chair or Vice-Chair. With 4D, in how commission members may inspect a site prior to a public hearing, Mr. Hitzroth asked why the words *subsequent to* were needed, unless there was a continuance of some kind. Mr. Palmquist noted that some issues can come up during a meeting, and wholesale changes can happen compared to what is given to the DRB ahead of time. Additionally, Mr. Meade noted that there is a limited list of historic properties. Subsequent visits could happen after a meeting to help inform a future meeting. He did not see a limitation in the language.

Mr. Waggoner asked why the timing of the site visit was described at all, in that a visit is not required. Mr. Krueger asked if saying commission members are encouraged to make a site visit would be a good idea. Ms. Dietz summarized that the change would be that commission members are encouraged to inspect the site, with no reference to a timeframe. Mr. Palmquist noted that in Part B of Section 3, there was no resolution to what happens if the Chair and Vice-Chair are not present. Ms. Dietz had a suggestion from the Regional Committee, which states that the remaining members would elect a Chair for that particular meeting. Mr. Hitzroth and Mr. Palmquist agreed that such an addition should be made.

In the general procedures section, staff has proposed an addition to the frequency of meetings, stating that the Landmark Commission meets as needed. Public records have been clarified in this section, and there is the additional mention of a meeting with the City Council, so as to provide for that opportunity again in the future. The meeting with the Council is called for on an annual basis, but with the word should used, there is some flexibility on that matter if a meeting cannot happen in a given year. Mr. Hitzroth asked if the notation about the Secretary of the Interior standards should be in the definitions section. He said it would be a cosmetic change. Ms. Dietz agreed to review that.

Mr. Palmquist asked about Section 5C about time limitations of the meetings. That limitation is 9 P.M. for the Landmark Commission and 10 P.M. for the DRB. If there is a full slate for both boards, Mr. Palmquist suggested moving that timeframe to 8:30 P.M or 8:00 P.M. would help make sure people who show up for DRB do not have to sit too long. He would like to have at least equal time for both meetings. Mr. Krueger

Redmond Landmark Commission Minutes October 4, 2012 Page 3

suggested changing the language from *shall* to *should* to allow the Commission and Board members more flexibility regarding time. Mr. Palmquist said the members do have flexibility, in that they could vote to extend the time. Mr. Palmquist suggested a motion to move the meeting time limitation back to 8:00 P.M., which Mr. Krueger seconded, but no vote was taken.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. PALMQUIST TO ACCEPT THE RULES OF THE CITY OF REDMOND LANDMARK COMMISSION AS AMENDED IN THE NOTES ABOVE. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

Ms. Dietz moved on to grant guidelines, which has needed a lot of cleanup work. One issue is that the maximum of a grant is \$20,000. Requirements for matching have been clarified. So, when the grant is less than or equal to \$5,000, the match would not be required. That situation would involve a request for public access and maintenance, which would be done with an easement. The rings on the Odd Fellows Hall that the Landmark Commission has been reviewing, for example, will have two easements on the façade when the restoration of the rings is complete. If the grant is greater than \$5,000, there are some additional requirements. There will be a match, and the match will need to be greater than or equal to 25% of the grant. That match can include many things, such as services, equipment, and supplies, and not just cash. The expenses related to the grant, if documented and applicable, can be part of that match within one year. The cash match can be within five years. So, the match can occur well after the grant.

Ms. Dietz moved on to the section regarding the goal of the Landmark Commission, which has been clarified to say the Commission is lessening the impacts of demolition, a minor change. There are some changes regarding how a project is eligible and how a project applicant is encouraged to meet with staff. The benefit to meeting with staff is to determine if a project is eligible and to come up with a long-term plan for grant possibilities and the proper use of Secretary of Interior standards. That meeting could happen even before a grant form is filled out. Ms. Dietz said this has been a valuable method in the past.

Ms. Dietz next clarified several components of the applicant's allowed activities and the cost. There are not a lot of significant differences. There were no questions from the Landmark Commission members. Following that, Ms. Dietz addressed some changes to qualifications and project impact. She said, in working with applicants, she knows that there are documents that contractors can provide staff which would be sufficient to letting the City know their skill in achieving a final product. When that documentation is available, it would be good to have that information and put it in the public file. Mr. Llanos asked to change two references of *i.e.*, translated as *that is*, to *e.g.*, which is translated as *for example*.

Ms. Dietz moved on to a discussion of long-term maintenance of a property, which can involve the requirement of an easement. She wants the public to understand that people should maintain whatever is put in place. She said that receiving grant money is a public good, and that there would be a requirement for maintenance. The property owners need to buy in when a tenant is requesting a grant, and the owner needs to see the documentation regarding an easement on their property. Ms. Dietz wants to include some opportunity for property owners, in that there could be other issues regarding stewardship that the owner or tenant could provide to the community. There were no questions on this proposal.

The City supports phasing, but the grant in a phasing process would only be provided to the work that is yet to be performed. It would not be retroactive. There is a new section about emergency conditions, such as when a property is damaged by a storm or accident. The idea is to get the structure stabilized as quickly as possible. There is an element of risk, but the City can consider grant money for that property to be used to cover the expenses of that restoration. The risk is that the cost might be too great and the grant money might not be able to cover it all, or that it may not be preferred to cover that. It would be good for the property owner to come in right away, but there is a clause in the language that provides for a rainy day scenario. Mr. Palmquist confirmed that the property owner would do the repairs, but would be reimbursed later. Ms. Dietz said this would be only for the cost associated in the repairs.

Mr. Llanos asked a general question about the grant guidelines and if there was any way to streamline the forms an applicant has to fill out regarding landmarks. Ms. Dietz said staff is able to help fill out an application, and that form is not as detailed as the grant language the Commission is reviewing. There

Redmond Landmark Commission Minutes October 4, 2012 Page 4

are some required components, such as a contact list, and the requirements are similar for typical permits. Some of those are consistent across the board for any type of application, and those have indeed been streamlined over time. Mr. Llanos asked if these guidelines were available to property owners, or if there was something else they would see first. Ms. Dietz said a property owner would talk with her first, at which information would be provided again. She would follow up with a meeting to make sure the documentation is done correctly. She has not had any feedback from property owners that the documentation is too much, but she could review that question with the City's permit counter.

Mr. Llanos asked the other Commission members if there was too much information requested from property owners. Mr. Palmquist said he did not have a problem with it, in that the property owner would be getting the benefit of grant money for the time they have to spend. Mr. Hitzroth said there is some information property owners simply have to have. Mr. Llanos was concerned that, for smaller grants, people would not apply. Mr. Hitzroth and Mr. Meade noted that staff assistance could help guide that decision. Mr. Hitzroth added that the rules should be the same for every grant. Mr. Llanos asked if the grant the Commission was reviewing was the same as the Community Treasures Fund, and if that should be referred to in the text. Ms. Dietz said that is simply the fund name. She wanted to simplify the name to be the Heritage Grant Program. Before, it was the Heritage Restoration and Preservation Grant Program. Mr. Llanos approved the more concise language used.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE HERITAGE GRANT PROGRAM DOCUMENT AS AMENDED BY COMMISSIONERS IN THE DISCUSSION ABOVE. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

Mr. Hitzroth thanked Ms. Dietz for her work on this project, which is very complex. Ms. Dietz shared two more items, including a discussion of Redmond's historic school bell. The plaza near the Public Safety Building has had some recent chalk graffiti on the sidewalk and on the bell. This has prompted a new discussion over where to place the bell. Artech has suggested a structure to put the bell on that would be mobile, protective, yet open to visual access. Ms. Dietz would like to start this conversation with the Commission. Ms. Dietz has been able to get the chalk off with water. Some Simple Green will remove the other chalk, and Artech does not believe the chalk would be very damaging.

Regarding the Odd Fellows rings, Ms. Dietz noted that they have been stripped and the wood has been restored. They have been painted and will be layered with paint and a sealant. Roger Waterhouse from Artech, a wood specialist, is working on these rings. The plan is to have the rings installed on the morning of October 19th, depending on weather. The original color was hard to determine, but there were some layers of gold and red, white, and blue paint as well. The red, white, and blue colors are consistent with the Odd Fellows as an institution, but there are also some gold colors used in some IOOF chapters. After researching with Odd Fellows offices across the state, Ms. Dietz confirmed that the rings are typically red, white, and blue, regardless of whether it is an operating Odd Fellows institution or not, but they can be gold. Staff was amenable to having the colors returned to gold, due to the fact that gold was the most recent color and that the building is not an operating Odd Fellows office. Mr. Hitzroth will be on site to make sure the rings are mounted properly. In 1936, he noted that the rings were hung upside down.

Mr. Krueger asked about the joint meeting between the Landmark Commission and the City Council, which he was not able to attend. Mr. Hitzroth noted that there was a video that Mr. Krueger could review.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDE	D BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE
MEETING AT 7:53 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).	

MINUTES APPROVED ON	RECORDING SECRETARY