



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
501 N. Anderson St., Ellensburg WA 98926**

MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS & DESIGN COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Date and Time: Tuesday, May 18, 2021, 5:45 p.m.
Place of Meeting: Remote Meeting via Zoom
Present: Members: Mollie Edson, Dorothy Stanley, Lathan Wedin, Amy McCoy, Megan West
Absent: Marty Blackson, Zane Kanyer
Others Present: Stacey Henderson, Senior Planner – Historic Preservation; Kirsten Sackett, Community Development Director; Members of the public – April Rohrbach, Darren Nelson, John Graf

Note: These are **Summary** Minutes *not* Verbatim Minutes

1. Call to order and roll call of members

Meeting called to order by Chairwoman Edson at 5:45 pm.

All in favor, motion passed.

2. Approval of the agenda

Commissioner Stanley made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted. Commissioner West seconded.

3. Approval of the minutes of the Meeting of May 4, 2021.

Commissioner West made a motion to approve the minutes of May 4, 2021 with one correction. Commissioner Stanley seconded.

All in favor, motion passed.

4. New Business

a. Public Hearing for Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed repainting of The Botany Shop storefront, and replacement of the storefront door, at 209 W. 3rd Ave., Parcel ID # 247033

Chairwoman Edson opened the public hearing and explained the procedures of the hearing. No issues were raised, and no one in the audience objected to the participation of any of the Commissioners.

Senior Planner Henderson stated that the applicant is proposing to repaint the storefront located at 209 W. 3rd Ave. The proposal is to repaint the front of the Botany Shop storefront and to replace the front door. The building is on the corner of Main and 3rd, the Shoudy Cadwell building. She displayed a photo of the existing storefront. It was built around 1889, in Italianate style and was built of brick masonry construction. The proposal is to paint it the color Lemon

Meringue – intended to match as close as possible to the trim and accent on the upper windows. For the record she added a different paint color as a new Exhibit to the record as D.1. This differs from the color that was included in the packet. She also displayed a rendering of the proposed replacement door. Henderson also displayed the other exhibits provided by the applicant, including other storefronts in the vicinity with similar design.

Edson asked if the applicant had anything to add. She did not. Edson opened the floor to testimony from the public, but there were no members of the public in attendance.

Chair Edson asked if the Commissioners had any questions. Commissioner Wedin asked for Henderson to again display the rendering of Exhibit B.4. Wedin wanted to know if the applicant was planning to paint the inside of the jams on the existing column. The applicant said that she was not actually intending to paint that specific portion, and it was a mistake on the rendering. She was only going to paint the actual trim around the windows. Wedin then asked if there was a width on the door. Henderson said there was not, but if the applicant received COA approval, they would then have to apply for a building permit. That permitting process would ensure the proper size on the door. There were no further questions. Edson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner West made a motion to accept the proposal with the Findings of Fact presented by staff, and to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with no conditions as recommended by Staff.

McCoy seconded. No discussion. **All in favor; motion passed.**

b. Public Hearing for Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the proposed reconstruction of a dormer and restoration of original dormer side walls, at 109 E. 10th Ave., (Parcel ID #08343)

Chairwoman Edson opened the public hearing and explained the procedures of the hearing. No issues were raised, and no one in the audience objected to the participation of any of the Commissioners.

Senior Planner Henderson stated that the applicant is proposing to make exterior modifications to the house located at 109 E. 10th Ave, which is located within the First Railroad Addition National Register and Local Landmark Districts. She displayed her screen to share the exhibits. The house was built in 1908 and has suffered some “remuddling” over the years through unfortunate renovations. She displayed some historic photos, along with photos of the current look. She then shared that the applicants are trying to restore the house back to its original design. The dormers were altered, porches were removed, the windows are not original and the siding is not original. In 2018, the applicants were approved to begin restoration and reconstruction, including adding an ADU and remodeling a barn. In this application today they are revising their original proposal to incorporate two changes.

They are proposing to remove the dormer on the front east corner, which is not original to the house, and which is not structurally sound. They would replace it with a more accurate dormer to the original plans. As they have been working they have been uncovering original elements. Henderson displayed the proposed drawings for the east and south elevations.

The second proposal is to remove the side beams off of the dormers, then reconstruct the original, more vertical side walls on the dormers. They will put period molding and siding on the house. They also found some original 1908 siding that they intend to put back on the house.

The applicant John Graf said that he is excited about the project, and that the house was actually built in 1903, it was built in 1903 by Rick Rollinger who farmed everything behind the house. He did say that the dormer on the east side was not original, and explained some of the features that indicated that it was not original. He also has evidence that the side walls were also not original.

Chair Edson asked if the Commissioners had any questions. Commissioner Wedin asked if they knew anything about original paint colors or roofing. Graf said they have been working with historian David Wheeler, who gave them some paint chips to work off of. They went to Sherwin Williams to match up the color. They plan to use some classical contrasting colors. Regarding the roofing, they are going back to a cedar shake for some portions and charcoal gray heavy shingle roof for others. They also intend to put the swoop back into the roof. Wedin then asked more about the style of the home. Graf said it is technically French Mansard, which is a subcategory of Victorian.

Chair Edson had a question about where the wood shingles would be used. Graf said that the swoop sections would be wood. And the top portions of the roof would be shingle. Edson asked if there would be any other modifications that would require them to come back to the LDC. Graf said there should be no more changes.

Commissioner McCoy asked if we ever found out the original name of the house. Henderson responded that she had not yet found it. There were no more questions; Edson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner West made a motion to accept the proposal with the Findings of Fact presented by staff, and to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with no conditions as recommended by Staff:

Commissioner Wedin seconded. No discussion. **All in favor; motion passed.**

c. Public Hearing for Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to install a vinyl mural and construct a courtyard roof, behind the building at 416 N. Main St., (Parcel ID #286933)

Chairwoman Edson opened the public hearing and explained the procedures of the hearing. No issues were raised, and no one in the audience objected to the participation of any of the Commissioners.

Senior Planner Henderson stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a courtyard roof and install a vinyl mural on the building located at 416 N. Main Street. Planner Henderson described the location of this building and showed the location of the back courtyard. She displayed a photo of the brick wall where the mural would be located. She showed a rendering of the proposed courtyard roof, at 20 x 27 x 12. It would be a free-standing structure not connected to the building in any way. She displayed other exhibits provided by the applicant to depict the types of materials and look of the structure.

Regarding the mural, Stacey added Exhibit B.5. for the record, which displayed the actual artwork proposed as a mural. She did explain that murals have a different approval process as found in ECC 15.720. Murals have to first be reviewed by the Arts Commission which took place at the Arts Commission meeting of May 13. A recommendation of approval for either of two potential designs was approved, and the next steps is to obtain a COA from the LDC. Henderson read through more of the requirements specific to the approval process for murals.

Henderson explained that the mural is essentially a vinyl adhesive sticker. The applicant worked with City Staff to determine the best location for the mural. The vinyl is not very breathable, so the portion of the wall selected was the wall that has already been exposed on all sides and painted over. The mural is applied with heat and rollers and is repositionable and removable.

Henderson said that staff is recommending approval with conditions as outline in the staff report.

Chair Edson asked if the applicant had anything to add. Mr. Nelson said he is trying to enhance the back patio and create an experience that is memorable and comfortable year round. With the discussion of the mural, there was a lot of thought put into where to locate the mural. He asked if he could seek approval for either of the two murals to be used depending on which fits better in the space. Chair Edson noted that the Arts Commission had approved both and we can add it to our conditions.

Chair Edson asked if the Commissioners had any questions. Commissioner Wedin had questions about what the Commission is supposed to be looking at in approving a mural, is it just the vinyl or the content of the art? Henderson and Sackett provided more description on the steps of the approval process for murals. Wedin then asked about the membrane roof. He said he had concerns about the flashing, and Mr. Nelson said he was trying to give the appearance of black metal around the roof. The idea is to give the edge a metal cap to the roofing.

Commissioner West asked the applicant if he had experience with the removal of the adhesive mural. If it is added with heat, she wanted to know how to remove it. He has witnessed the application of a mural but not the removal. He assumes that heating it makes it pliable again so that it can come off again. It is designed for exterior use and it is rated for up to 7 years. Henderson said she did some research on this product, and it is her understanding is that is removed with heat. Chair Edson asked if they could include a condition that the maintenance plan include provisions for removal. Planner Henderson said that could be included.

Chair Edson then asked about Exhibit B.4, displaying a rendering of the patio cover. She wanted to know the difference in height of the existing structure and the proposed patio cover. The applicant said there is a one-foot difference. It's designed to allow some daylight to pass through, but not intended to be drastically higher and change the look of the surroundings.

There were no more questions; Edson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner West made a motion to accept the proposal with the Findings of Fact presented by staff, and to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for either of two potential mural designs with three conditions as recommended by Staff:

1. The applicant shall only apply the mural to the gray concrete brick wall in the courtyard, avoiding disruption or damage to the red brick of the actual building.
2. The mural shall be installed per the guidelines of ECC 15.720.040(C), "Installation and Maintenance of All Approved Murals."
3. The applicant or building owner shall submit a maintenance plan for the mural, per ECC 15.720.040(B)(6), to the Community Development Dept. of the City of Ellensburg before the building permit is completed for the Courtyard Roof.

McCoy seconded. No discussion. **All in favor; motion passed.**

5. Old Business

None.

6. Citizen Comment

No one in the audience.

7. Staff Update/Discussion Items

Henderson said that the historic preservation recognition went well at City Council the previous night. City Council was impressed by it as well. Chair Edson said she was also really pleased with the presentation made.

There is a meeting scheduled for June 1, with two COA's on the agenda.

Henderson said that Mayor Tabb has been in discussion with her about historic murals. There are members of the community wanting to restore historic murals. Tabb had asked if there was money to fund this restoration efforts wondered about the idea of changing the existing historic preservation grants to be turned into a historic mural grant. She said she would bring the idea to the Commission for discussion. Henderson said they could also consider just incorporating the murals into the existing grant, as an option. Chair Edson said she knows that there is a lot of outcry to restore some of the murals. She wondered if the Arts Commission might also be able to provide funding towards murals. McCoy said she would not want to allocate all of the funding to just murals. She also knows that some of the historic murals have some interesting history themselves.

Director Sackett noted that this is an appropriate time of year to review the grant application. It was agreed that the next agenda would include discussion on the grant application, and at that time the Commission could also have further discussion on the concept of providing grants for historic murals.

Henderson also let the LDC know that she had submitted an application for a CLG grant from DAHP for the purpose of updating the First Railroad District. She hadn't brought the concept to the Commission prior to submittal, because she was under a deadline to get it submitted. In response to a question, she said that it has already been submitted, but presentations will take place in mid-June. Chair Edson asked if the Commission could view the application electronically. Planner Henderson will send a copy to the commission to review.

Director Sackett provided an update on the design of the downtown park. She said that in discussion with Parks & Recreation Director Brad Case, the soonest that the City would be able to hire a landscape architect (LA) would be September of 2022. He will include in the Scope of Work that the LA come before the LDC to gather input and answer questions about design. If they develop a working group we could also ensure that there is representation from the LDC. In addition, the members of the LDC could provide feedback through the community engagement process. And finally, staff would work with the Commission to determine the appropriate timing for bringing the design before the LDC for a COA.

8. Commission Representative Update

a. Ellensburg Downtown Association Update.

They had a successful planter watering day. The EDA bought the plants if the business owners would just take care of them through the summer. Last year they only got half of the planters taken care. This year they had all 65 planters adopted.

This year's Girls Night Out brought in \$25,000.00 in one night in a 4 hour period. They EDA has also brought on 3 new board members and they are planning a board member retreat for next month. With the change in leadership they are behind on budgeting and strategic planning, so they are looking to be more prepared for 2022. The new director Karen Green has been a great addition with a lot of outreach conducted out in the community.

b. Other updates

Edson asked that at a future meeting we add a discussion on the historic train depot. Wedin also said that Amy and Stacey did a great job at the Council meeting last night. The Commissioners are also pleased with all of the press in the newspaper during this historic preservation month.

9. Adjournment

Commissioner Wedin made a motion adjourn the meeting. Commissioner McCoy seconded. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 6:24 pm.