

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Continuation of Closed-Record Appeal of Certificate of Appropriateness issued for Ronald School
DEPARTMENT: City Attorney
PRESENTED BY: Ian Sievers, City Attorney

BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

On February 28, 2011, the City Council commenced a closed-record appeal hearing of a Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the City of Shoreline Landmarks Commission for the Ronald School located at 749 N. 175th Street, Shoreline Washington. The hearing on March 7, 2011 is a continuance of the hearing commenced on February 28, 2011.

HEARING:

Under Shoreline rules of procedure for closed record appeals, the burden of proof is on the appellant Shoreline Preservation Society to establish that the decision of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission is not supported by the preponderance of the evidence. Under Rules and Procedures VI (6) the Landmarks Commission applies the following criteria for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness:

- A. The extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the specific features or characteristics specified in the latest of the preliminary determination of significance, if any, or the designation report;
- B. The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alteration of significant changes in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
- C. The extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, ordinance, regulation, code or ordinance;
- D. The extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change is necessary or appropriate to achieving for the owner or applicant a reasonable return on the site, improvement or object, taking into consideration factors specified in KCC.20.62.100, as adopted by reference

in SMC 15.20.025, and Part VII of these Rules and Procedures and the economic consequences of denial.

The action alternatives available to Council include:

1. Remand the proceeding to the Commission for reconsideration if an error of fact may exist in the record.
2. Modify or reverse the decision of the Commission if the decision is based on an error in judgment or conclusion.
3. Deny the appeal and sustain the decision of the Commission.

The Council enters findings of fact from the record and conclusions in support of its appeal decision and may adopt all or portions of the Commissions' findings and conclusions. To give the City Council a starting format to work with, the proposed Ordinance No. 597 reflects action alternative #3 and includes: (1) Adoption of Findings, Conclusions and Decision for the procedural matters raised, as well as the alternatives issue; (2) Adoption of the Landmarks Commission Findings of Fact; and (3) denial of the appeal. This ordinance should be reviewed by Council and changed as necessary to reflect different findings, conclusions and decision.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: None.

RECOMMENDATION

Continue the closed-record hearing and deliberate. Council should pass an Ordinance adopting findings, conclusions and a decision to accept, reject or modify the decision of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission.

Approved By: City Manager Ju City Attorney [Signature]

Exhibits:

1. Proposed Ordinance No 597
2. Landmarks Commission Findings of Fact and Decision

ORDINANCE NO. 597

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION REGARDING CRITERIA FOR ALTERNATIVES AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS AND APPROVING FINDINGS AND DECISION OF LANDMARKS COMMISSION TO APPROVE A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SCHOOL BUILDING AND RESTORE ELEMENTS OF RONALD SCHOOL, LOCATED AT 749 N. 175TH STREET AND DENYING THE APPEAL OF THE SHORELINE PRESERVATION SOCIETY

WHEREAS, on November 17, 2010, the City of Shoreline Landmarks Commission held an open record hearing to consider an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness ("COA") 1021 to construct a new school building and restore elements of Ronald School, located at 749 N. 175th Street in Shoreline, Washington; and

WHEREAS, on December 3, 2010, the Landmarks Commission issued its Findings and Decision approving COA 1021; and

WHEREAS, on January 7, 2011, the Shoreline Preservation Society filed an appeal of the COA 1021 with the City of Shoreline; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a closed record hearing on February 28, 2011, continued to March 7, 2011;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Procedural Findings, Conclusions and Decision. The Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Decision Regarding Criteria for Alternatives and Procedural Matters, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, are hereby ADOPTED.

Section 2. Certificate of Appropriateness Findings and Decision. The City of Shoreline Landmarks Commission's Findings of Fact and Decision to approve a certificate of appropriateness to construct a new school building and restore elements of Ronald School, located at 749 N. 175th Street, attached hereto as Exhibit 2, are hereby ADOPTED.

Section 3. Appeal Denied. The appeal filed by the Shoreline Preservation Society is hereby DENIED.

Section 4. Publication, Effective Date. This ordinance shall go into effect five days after passage and publication of the title as a summary of this ordinance.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON March 7, 2011.

Keith McGlashan, Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Scott Passey
City Clerk

Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication:
Effective Date:

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION REGARDING CRITERIA FOR
ALTERNATIVES AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

A. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Consideration of Alternatives

- a. Part VI.6.B of the Rules and Procedures of the City of Shoreline Landmarks Commission (hereafter "Rules") requires the Landmarks Commission to consider "the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alteration of significant changes in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant."
- b. During the November 17, 2010 open record hearing, the School District's architect, Bassetti Architects, presented alternatives that the School District had explored and why these alternatives were unreasonable. *Exhibit 92, page 2.* These alternatives were the same ones explored at the Landmarks Commission's Design Review Committee on September 9, 2010. *Exhibit 92, page 6; Exhibit 95, page 35-36.*
- c. During the open record hearing, the following alternatives proposed by architect Kate Krafft in a written comment were read and admitted into the record and considered by the Commission: (1) connecting the modern school facility at the west side of the current south elevation; (2) rehabilitating and preserving the exposed original south elevation of the original 1912 schoolhouse; and (3) locating the modern school facility further to the east and southeast of Ronald School.
- d. The Landmarks Commission considered these alternatives as well as specifically considering: (1) siting the proposed new building at an alternative location on-site; (2) demolishing the Landmarks; and (3) relocating the Landmarks to another parcel. *See Finding 5 and Finding 6 of the Landmarks Commission Findings of Fact and Decision.*

2. Notice

- a. The November 17, 2010 meeting was a special meeting of the Landmarks Commission.
- b. Part III.5.A of the Rules requires that notice of cancellation or rescheduling of a meeting shall be published not less than six days before the scheduled meeting and not less than six days before the changed meeting date. This rule does not apply to special meetings of the Landmarks Commission.

3. Appearance of Fairness, Conflict of Interest and Ex-Parte Contact

- a. Part I.2.C of the Rules states: "No Commissioner shall communicate with or attempt to influence any other Commissioner concerning any matter before the Commission, or which may reasonably be expected to come before the Commission, in which such Commissioner has a conflict of interest or a perceived conflict of interest.
- b. Nothing in the record reflects that Commissioner Day or Commissioner McCroskey have a conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest in this matter.
- c. Part I.3 of the Rules states: Commissioners must decide any quasi-judicial matters brought before the Commission only based on the public record and such things that they may properly take judicial notice. Commissioners should avoid all *ex parte* communications concerning any quasi-judicial proceeding.
- d. The prohibition on *ex parte* contacts during the pendency of quasi-judicial proceedings applies to contacts between a member of a decision-making body and opponents or proponents of the proposal subject to the proceeding. RCW 42.36.060 (Appearance of Fairness).
- e. Commissioner Day disclosed on the record that he and Commissioner McCroskey had a brief discussion prior to the hearing about comments received by the Landmarks Commission questioning whether any alternatives to the applicant's proposed design had been presented to the design review committee.

4. Shoreline Representative, Term Expiration, Attendance at Hearing and Quorum

- a. The Commission has two vacancies and currently consists of seven members.
- b. One of the seven Commissioners is Commissioner Vicki Stiles, appointed as a special member SMC 15.20.020(B). The special member is to "attend all meetings, and participate in and vote on all matters pertaining to the designation and protection of Landmarks, design review, and special valuation applicable to properties within the city." Rules, Part II.1. During the appeal hearing on February 28, 2010, appellant abandoned the argument that Commissioner Stiles is a necessary part of the quorum.
- c. The terms of two Commissioners, including the term of Commissioner Stiles, had expired.
- d. SMC 15.20.020(B) states that the term of a special member shall be for three-years and "shall serve until his or her successor is duly appointed and confirmed."
- e. KCC 20.62.030(B) states: "Appointments of regular meetings, except as provided in subsection C of this section, shall be made for a three-year term. Each regular member shall serve until his or her successor is duly appointed and confirmed."

- f. No successor to either expired Commissioner has been appointed and confirmed.
- g. The Landmarks Commission Rules states that “[a] majority of the currently appointed and confirmed members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.” Rules, Part III.3.
- h. Contrary to what is stated in the Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes, Commissioner Stiles was not in attendance at the meeting.
- i. In addition to Commissioner Stiles, two other Commissioners were not in attendance at the hearing.
- j. Prior to the hearing, Commissioner Stiles recused herself.
- k. Commissioner Rich was in attendance during the preliminary remarks of the hearing but subsequently recused himself and left the hearing. Commissioner Rich had no further participation in or attendance at the hearing for the COA.
- l. Appellants did not raise the issue of lack of a quorum as an appeal issue.

5. SEPA

- a. The Landmarks Commission’s consideration of the certificate of appropriateness is limited to the criteria in Chapter 20.62 KCC, Chapter 15.20 SMC, and the Rules and Procedures of the City of Shoreline Landmarks Commission.
- b. Review and validity of a SEPA threshold determination is not part of the criteria for granting a certificate of appropriateness.
- c. The City Council’s appellate review is limited to whether the certificate of appropriateness was properly granted in compliance with Chapter 20.62 KCC, Chapter 15.20 SMC, and the Rules and Procedures of the City of Shoreline Landmarks Commission.

B. CONCLUSIONS

1. Consideration of Alternatives.

- a. Alternatives were presented to the Landmarks Commission at the September 9, 2010 Design Review Committee and at the November 7, 2010 open record hearing by the School District’s architect, Bassetti Architects and by architect Kate Kraff through her written comments. Kraff’s alternative, advocated by the appellant, was considered by the Commission.
- b. The Commission considered the proposed alternatives, specifically the alternatives of siting the proposed new building at other locations on site, demolishing the Landmarks, and relocating the Landmarks to another parcel.

- c. The Commission's consideration of alternatives complied with Criteria VI.6.B.

2. Notice

- a. The Commission did not violate Rule III.5.A by cancelling its October 14, 2010 special meeting without six days notice required by the Rule, as the Rule only applies to regular meetings, not special meetings.

3. Appearance of Fairness, Conflict of Interest and Ex Parte Contact

- a. Neither Commissioner Day nor Commissioner McCroskey have a conflict of interest in this matter and therefore no violation of Rule I.2.C occurred.
- b. No *ex parte* contacts occurred as the communication between two commissioners, Commissioner Day and Commissioner McCroskey, is not considered a contact between a member of a decision-making body and opponents or proponents of the proposal subject to the proceeding.

4. Shoreline Representative, Term Expiration and Attendance at Hearing

- a. The requirements in Rule II.1 outline the matters the special member is to participate in, and do not require that the special member's attendance as a part of the quorum. Once part of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission, Commissioner Stiles, as the special member, is responsible for compliance with the same rules as other members including the Appearance of Fairness rules regarding recusal for conflicts. Furthermore, appellant abandoned the argument that Commissioner Stiles was a necessary part of the quorum.
- b. Although two of the commissioners' terms had expired, both were still serving in their capacity as commissioners since no successor had been appointed and confirmed. See Parliamentary Questions and Answers III, National Association of Parliamentarians (1997), page 213-214.
- c. By common law rule, membership may be reduced by the two disqualified members, requiring a quorum of three members. Regardless of the applicability of the rule, since appellants failed to raise the quorum issue as an appeal issue, they have waived the issue and this matter is not properly before the City Council.

5. SEPA

- a. The criteria considered by the Landmarks Commission's for issuance of the certificate of appropriateness does not include review of a SEPA threshold determination.
- b. The City Council's appellate capacity is limited to review of the Landmarks Commission's issuance of a certificate of appropriateness, not review of the School District's SEPA threshold determination.

- c. SEPA appeals are governed by the School District's SEPA rules as lead agency. See Addendum E, District's Response Memorandum. The SEPA issues are not property before the City Council.

C. DECISION

As set forth in the findings of fact and conclusions, the Landmarks Commission properly considered alternatives and did not make any procedural errors in issuing its certificate of appropriateness.



King County

Office of Business Relations and Economic Development
Historic Preservation Program
400 Yesler Way, Suite 510 [MS: YES-EX-0510]
Seattle, WA 98104
206.296.8636 (v) 206.205.0719 (f)
www.kingcounty.gov/landmarks

EXHIBIT 2

CITY OF SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION Ronald School Certificate of Appropriateness No. 1021

PROPERTY: Ronald School
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 749 N. 175th Street, Shoreline, WA
OWNER: Shoreline School District
APPLICANT: Nancy Callery, Bassetti Architects

SUMMARY

The Shoreline Landmarks Commission (Commission) approves a certificate of appropriateness (COA) to construct a new school building and restore elements of Ronald School, a City of Shoreline landmark, located at 749 N. 175th Street in Shoreline, Washington.

Public Hearing: The Commission held a public hearing on a COA application for the Ronald School on November 17, 2010 at the Richmond Masonic Center, 753 N. 185th Street, Shoreline, Washington. Staff submitted the certificate of appropriateness application, supporting documentation, including the Design Review Committee recommendation, and staff recommendation to commissioners prior to the meeting. Vicki Stiles, the City's special member to the Commission, recused herself from the hearing due to conflict of interest because she is the Executive Director of the Shoreline Historical Museum (current tenant of the subject building). Commissioner Brian Rich recused himself from the hearing because he is employed by Bassetti Architects, the Applicant for this COA.

At the hearing, staff provided a brief summary of the proposal, followed by a presentation by the Applicant, Nancy Callery of Bassetti Architects, and a statement by Sue Walker, Superintendent of Shoreline School District. Ms. Callery said the project was necessary in order to meet the requirements of the school bond recently approved and to provide a replacement for Shorewood High School. She also provided details on the design of the proposed new building, its attachment to Ronald School, and the restoration of certain elements of the landmark building. She further described the alternatives which the School District considered prior to submitting the current proposal. Ms. Walker read a statement asking the Commission to approve the application.

Thirty-three people offered oral testimony. Of these, 17 spoke against approving the application and 16 spoke in favor of approving it. Nine of those who spoke against approval and one who

spoke in favor also submitted written statements at the hearing. One additional person submitted written testimony at the hearing in favor of approval. Prior to the hearing, written testimony was received from 29 people: fifteen opposed the project or said that more information was needed before a decision could be made (seven of these people also testified at the hearing); twelve were in favor of the project (five of them also testified at the hearing). In addition, one person commented on the SEPA process conducted by the school district and one commented on the conditional use permit for the school currently being considered by the City of Shoreline. Neither of these issues are admissible under the Commission's rules and regulations. Other exhibits were submitted prior to the hearing a list of which is contained in *Attachment A - List of Exhibits*.

The Commission's decision to approve the COA application was based on it meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, specifically Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10; Shoreline Municipal Code 15.20; and Criteria VL6.A-D of the Rules and Regulations of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission. See Design Review Committee Report (Exhibit No. 41) for discussion of applicable standards.

FINDINGS

The Commission found that the proposed project is in compliance with the above-noted standards and criteria. In making its decision, the Commission adopted the following specific findings:

1. Ronald School is significant under Criterion A1 for its association with the broad theme of education and under Criterion A3 as an excellent example of early 20th century school design, executed in a modest Classical Revival style. The period of significance is 1912-1951.
2. The features of significance include all exterior portions of the building, and all of the land area within the boundaries of the designated area. The boundaries extend to the parcel limits on the north and to a line 15 feet from the building on the east, south, and west sides.
3. The building was constructed as a schoolhouse, with classrooms and offices. For many years the building has housed the Shoreline Historical Museum. The proposed new use will again be education, but as part of a larger school complex, and with high school students being the primary focus.
4. School districts utilize building guidelines that recommend specific facilities and sizes for modern school campuses. The subject site is smaller than is recommended for contemporary high school facilities, and is two-thirds the size of the other high school in the district (Shorecrest).
5. Various site restrictions, including poor soils for construction, traffic levels in adjacent residential neighborhoods, and the need to continue using the adjacent high school buildings

- while the new one is being constructed, necessitated siting the proposed new building at the north and east side of the site, in proximity to the landmark.
6. In addition to other locations on the site, additional alternatives were considered including the demolition of the landmark and the relocation of the landmark to another parcel.
 7. The proposed new building has a rhythmic pattern of fenestration that complements but does not replicate the rhythm of windows in the landmark.
 8. The proposed new building has a vocabulary of building base, body and cornice that complements but does not replicate the same vocabulary on the landmark.
 9. The proposed new building is composed of several components, with the components closest to the landmark consisting of more translucent elements, creating a subtle effect of separation between the new and old buildings. These components are also compatible in massing to the massing of the landmark but do not replicate the massing.
 10. Ronald School is located closer to the street than the proposed new building to the east. It is set back slightly from the front plane of the landmark and approximately 35 feet from the east (side) elevation to visually accentuate the landmark.
 11. A new building could be constructed to within 15 feet of the landmark on the east, south or west without having to obtain a COA.
 12. Non-historic driveways located on either side of Ronald School will be removed and replaced with landscaping and sidewalks, more in keeping with the original site.
 13. The proposed new building on the rear of Ronald School is two stories high, one story shorter than the landmark, creating a subtle effect of separation from it and emphasizing visual preference of the landmark.
 14. No historic materials that are designated features of significance will be removed. There will be a minor alteration of features on the rear of the building where the proposed new building will be attached. This alteration will include the removal of non-historic windows and the infilling of the window openings as required by building code for adequate fire separation.
 15. There will be minimal impact on spatial relationships, as the primary elevations of the building will be maintained, with only the addition of a new building at the rear. Currently the building is surrounded by a parking lot and driveways, both non-historic elements, and these will be removed.
 16. All distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques (features of significance) will be preserved. Some brickwork will be repointed to match the existing

mortar joints: Where the proposed new building is attached on the rear of the building, the existing exterior brickwork will be maintained and will be preserved within the envelope of the proposed new building.

17. Deteriorated woodwork and brickwork will be repaired. In cases where woodwork is too deteriorated to repair, replacement will match the historic woodwork based on physical and photographic evidence.

18. The existing windows are replacement windows and are approximately 40 years old. The proposed new replacements will replicate the original windows using historic photographs and physical evidence as guidance. They will match the originals in design, texture, visual qualities, and dimensions, and if budget allows, material. The windows will contain insulated glass panels, and will have a low-E coating, but this should not alter the visual quality.

19. Exterior brickwork will be cleaned using a low-pressure wash and mild detergent. These are common and acceptable methods for cleaning historic brick.

20. Only that portion of the proposed new building that is within the designated boundaries of the landmark can be reviewed by the Commission; thus review authority is limited to a 15 foot area extending from the landmark's south, east, and west elevations. However, for discussion purposes, the entire north portion of the proposed new building (that closest to the historic building) was considered in the evaluation.

21. The proposed new building does not destroy any historic features or spatial relationships. The windows at the rear of the landmark will be removed and infilled, but the windows themselves are not original. The west portion of the rear elevation has been re-sided with new material, and an elevator was added. These will be removed for attachment of the proposed new building. The spatial relationship at the front of the building, consisting of the setback from the street and the prominence at the end of Linden Avenue will not change. The spatial relationship to the east, historically consisting of open space but now containing a driveway, will be improved with the removal of the drive and an open courtyard between the historic building and the proposed new building. The spatial relationship to the west, now consisting of a driveway and open space, will also be improved by the removal of the driveway immediately adjacent to the historic building. This elevation would become more prominent, as it faces the entry for the new school.

22. The proposed new building is compatible with the existing because it has a base, body, and cornice arrangement much like the historic building, but with new materials. Final material selection has not been made, but will be reviewed with staff before construction begins. The proposed new building also has a symmetrical rhythm of window openings, but doesn't duplicate the landmark. The portions of the proposed new building immediately adjacent to the landmark are primarily glass, resulting in a visual separation of the proposed new building from the old and creating a focal point that visually emphasizes the landmark.

23. Floor heights for the proposed new building will match those of the old, thereby reinforcing the compatibility of window openings and cornice lines.
24. Massing and size of the proposed new building is compatible as well, with the new sections closest to the landmark being comparable in height and volume. The larger volumes of the proposed new building are set further back on the site to minimize visual competition with the landmark.
25. The proposed new building, as designed, has minimal impact on the visual and physical integrity of the landmark. If it were removed in the future, existing historic brick would remain intact and unimpaired. Where there was originally wood siding, new wood siding could be reinstalled. Existing window openings would also be intact and could be restored with new sashes.

MINUTES AND EXHIBITS

The minutes of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission public hearing of November 17, 2010 are on file in the King County Historic Preservation Program office, 400 Yesler Way, Suite 510, Seattle, Washington.

The following exhibits were entered into the record: See *Attachment A - List of Exhibits*.

DECISION

At its November 17, 2010 meeting the Commission unanimously approved a certificate of appropriateness as recommended by the Design Review Committee and staff, including the conditions described in the DRC Report (see Exhibit No. 41), to construct a new school building and restore historic elements of Ronald School.

SHORELINE LANDMARKS COMMISSION


Lauren McCroskey, Chair

12-3-10
Date

TRANSMITTED this 3rd day of December, 2010 to the following parties and interested persons:

Nancy Callery, Bassetti Architects
Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects
Sue Walker, Shoreline School District

Paul Cohen, City of Shoreline
Bob Ferguson, King County Councilmember
Travis Alley, King County Council Staff

Jennifer Altena
Dean L. Barth
Kate Bauman, GG Architects
John Behrens
Boni Biery
Wes Brandon
Beth Burkell
Kathy Carrow, Shorewood PTSA
Raymond S. Collins
Loren Day
Amy Daybert, Enterprise News
Linda Delgado
Wendy DiPesa
Bill Dunbar
Debi Ehrlichman
Ann Erickson
Alfred Frates, Jr.
Tanya Frates
Karen Frazier
Suzanne Gillette
Julio and June Gomez
Jeff Greene, GG Architects
Judy Griegel
Suzanne Gugger
Kathy Hall
Marcia Harris, Shoreline School District
Lois Harrison
Diane Hettrick, Shoreline Area News
Michelle Hickman
O. Richard Hill, McCullough Hill Law Firm
Lisa Hirohata
Leanne S. Hofford
Julie Houff
Ken Howe
Jocelyn Hudson
Mike Jacobs
Carole Johanson
Steve Kelleff
Sue Kienast, Bothell Historical Society
Kate Krafft, Krafft & Krafft Architects
Sharon Leitner
Flo Lentz, 4Culture

Sarah Lovejoy
Dale Lydin
Zelma McCart
David S. Mann
Lisa Mannery
Afia Christine Menke
Aaron Miller
Geneva F. Norton
Maren Norton
Paul Par Notwood
Angela Nouwens
Margie Olson
Helen M. Oltman
Virginia M. Paulsen
Suzanne Pardee
Elaine Phelps
Richard Potter
Teri Potter
Christie Quigley
Robert L. Ransom
Henry Reed, Shoreline Historical Museum
Connie Sarison
Gary Schalliol
Keith Scully
Shoreline Historical Museum, c/o Vicki Stiles
Shoreline Preservation Society, c/o Janet Way
Roger Smith
Linda Stein
Amy Stensrud
Dave and Marianne Stephens
Jan Stewart
Sigrid Strom
Lisa Surowiec
Les Tonkin, Tonkin/Hoynes/Lokan Architects
Neal Vonada
Janet Way
Vicki Westberg
David Wilson
Linda Wilson
Ken Winnick
Sarah-Ann and Vance Woodfield
Jean Wren

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR RECONSIDER

Appeal. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission issuing or denying in whole or in part, a Type II or III Certificate of Appropriateness may, within 35 calendar days of mailing of notice of the action, appeal the decision to the Shoreline City Council. Written notice of appeal shall be filed with the Historic Preservation officer and the City Clerk and shall be accompanied by a statement setting forth the grounds of the appeal, supporting documents and argument. (RCG 20.62.110 A, as adopted by reference in SMC 15.20.025.)

Reconsideration. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Shoreline Landmarks Commission issuing or denying, in whole or in part, a Certificate of Appropriateness may, within 20 calendar days of mailing of notice of the decision, petition the Commission for reconsideration on the grounds the decision was based on 1) error or omissions of fact; or, 2) that new information bearing on the decision, and not reasonably available to the Commission at the time of the decision, is available. The written petition shall be filed with the Historic Preservation Officer and shall be accompanied by 1) a statement setting forth the grounds for the petition; and, 2)

Findings of Fact and Decision
Ronald School COA No. 1021
December 3, 2010
Page 7 of 7

any supporting documents. Within 70 calendar days of a petition for reconsideration, the Commission shall review the record, and may, at its discretion, render a revised decision. The Commission may, at its discretion, hold another public hearing on the matter.