



CLARK COUNTY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Public Service Center
1300 Franklin St., 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/historic

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, November 7, 2018 - 6:00 p.m.

Note: The audio recording equipment failed during this meeting and there is no audio recording available for this meeting.

These are summary, not verbatim, minutes.

Members Present:	Robert Hinds, Michelle Kapitanovich, Sean Denniston, Roch Manley, Sarah Fox and Andy Gregg
Members Absent:	Alex Gall
Staff Present:	Sharon Lumbantobing and Jenna Kay (Clark County); Mark Person (City of Vancouver)
Guests:	Heidi and Bruce Kramer; Holly Chamberlain

- I. **Roll Call & Introductions:** Commission members and staff introduced themselves.
- II. **Approval of the Meeting Minutes from October 3, 2018.** Manley moved to approve the minutes and Denniston seconded. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.
- III. **Special Valuation Review: Blair Building** (1801 Main St, Washougal, WA)

The property owners, Heidi and Bruce Kramer, submitted an application for the Special Valuation Tax Incentive Program for the Blair Building located at 1801 Main St, Washougal, WA. The Clark County Historic Preservation Commission has the responsibility of reviewing any property for eligibility for the Special Valuation Tax Incentive Program.

Under RCW 84.26.030 Special Valuation criteria, four criteria must be met for special valuation. The property must:

- 1) Be an historic property;



- 2) Fall within a class of historic property determined eligible for special valuation by the local legislative authority;
- 3) Be rehabilitated at a cost which meets the definition set forth in RCW 84.26.020(2), within twenty-four months prior to the application for special valuation. "Cost" means the actual cost of rehabilitation, which cost shall be at least twenty-five percent of the assessed valuation of the historic property, exclusive of the assessed value attributable to the land, prior to rehabilitation; and
- 4) Be protected by an agreement between the owner and the local review board as described in RCW 84.26.050(2). [1986 c 221 § 2; 1985 c 449 § 3.]”

Staff Findings:

- 1) **Finding:** The requirement that the historic property be listed on the National Register of Historic Places or local register has been met. The subject property is on the Clark County Heritage Register. It was listed on June 5, 2018.
- 2) **Finding:** The applicant has certified that rehabilitation improvements have been completed within 24 months of the date of application for special valuation. The applicant has submitted a total of \$246,089.75. The applicant submitted an application to the Clark County Department of Assessment in July 30, 2018. Given this submittal date, allowed costs begin on July 30, 2016. The Clark County Historic Preservation Commission, in its review of the expenditures and supporting documentation, may adjust the amount considered as qualified rehabilitation expenses.

REHABILITATION PERIOD:	July 30, 2016-July 30, 2018
SUBMITTED REHABILITATION COSTS:	\$246,089.75
STAFF DISALLOWED COSTS:	\$10,660*
ELIGIBLE REHABILITATION COSTS:	\$235,429.54

*Staff disallowed two invoices that were dated prior to July 30, 2016, invoices related to a trash structure located outside the building, and invoices related to a dumpster used during construction.

- 3) **Finding:** Costs deemed “allowed” in Exhibit 2: Description of Project Expenditures, meet the definition of “qualified rehabilitation expenses” in 26CFR1.48-12(c)¹
- 4) **Finding:** The rehabilitation work completed on the Blair Building appears to be in compliance with the Washington State Advisory Council's Standards for the Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Historic Properties in [WAC 254-20-100](#).
- 5) **Finding:** The value of the rehabilitation exceeds the twenty-five percent of the assessed value of the structure required by RCW 84.26. The Assessor has assessed the value of the building, exclusive of the land prior to rehabilitation at \$185,400.
- 6) **Finding:** No Special Valuation Agreement has been previously signed on the subject

property. A Special Valuation Agreement must be signed by the property owners and recorded with the Clark County Auditor's Office prior to the commission's approval being submitted to the Assessor's Office. The agreement stipulates that the applicants will comply with the requirements of RCW 84.26.050(2).

Staff recommends approval of the Special Valuation Tax Incentive for the Blair Building.

HPC Questions for Staff:

Hinds: We don't get a lot of these Special Valuation applications, and it's great when we do. Hinds thanked the Kramers for their efforts. When we have looked at it in the past, there has been some debate around applying the Secretary Standards for Rehabilitation. The question in the past with the American Legion Hall in Camas, was that there were a number of fixtures applied to the property that were not necessarily historic in appearance. My own interpretation is that things like fixtures and appliances don't apply. What about the cabinetry in the Blair Building? Should this be included?

Kapitanovich: Do the cabinets really come into play?

Staff Response: If the commission wants to remove certain line items, you can do that. The applicant submitted receipts that are way beyond the 25% of assessed value. They have submitted more than enough qualified rehabilitation expenses to meet the requirement.

The HPC deliberated.

Hinds: I propose removing the line items for the cabinetry because it does not conform to the Secretary Standards.

Denniston: I recommend removing the cabinetry line items for the sake of precedent, in case there is a Special Valuation case in the future where this could be an issue. I also have a question about the new flooring and recommend that we remove the flooring line items.

Manley: Should we also remove the mini-split HVACs? See line 57 and 58. Wouldn't a furnace be more appropriate?

Hinds: Arguably, you almost have to go ductless.

Denniston: Mini-split HVACs are a great solution, but there are other options.

Heidi and Bruce Kramer (project applicants) introduced themselves and thanked the CCHPC for their review of this application.

Denniston made a motion to approve the Special Valuation application with the removal of lines 57 and 58 (for the mini split HVAC) and removal of lines 68-73 (for cabinets). Kapitanovich seconded. The commission agreed with the staff findings and recommendations and unanimously approved the Special Valuation application for the Blair Building with Commission disallowed costs as indicated below:

REHABILITATION PERIOD:	July 30, 2016-July 30, 2018
SUBMITTED REHABILITATION COSTS:	\$246,089.75
STAFF DISALLOWED COSTS:	\$10,660*
ELIGIBLE REHABILITATION COSTS:	\$235,429.54
COMMISSION DISALLOWED COSTS:	\$23,525.51**
TOTAL REHABILITATION COSTS:	\$211,904.03

*Staff disallowed two invoices that were dated prior to July 30, 2016, invoices related to a trash structure located outside the building, and invoices related to a dumpster used during construction.

**Commission disallowed two invoices for HVAC related costs (\$9,507.22) and cabinets (\$14,018.29).

IV. Certificate of Appropriateness – Blair Building exterior staircase

Hinds opened the public hearing. Lumbantobing summarized the staff report.

The Blair Building located at 1801 Main Street, Washougal is listed on the Clark County Heritage Register. The property owners, Bruce and Heidi Kramer, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Remove the existing exterior wood staircase and roof, located on the eastern façade; and
2. Install new exterior staircase, with stair tread options that include steel or concrete, with a new roof to be made of standing seam metal over a steel frame.

The existing wooden exterior staircase, built in the 1990's, does not meet current code. It has a straight run and a 15 foot rise from ground level to the 2nd floor studios' entry door. It is the building's only egress from the second floor apartments and it is made of wood. It has a metal roof above the second floor landing. The proposed new exterior staircase would be free-standing steel frame staircase, with stair tread options constructed of steel or concrete, and it would wrap around the NE corner of the building. A straight run would extend the stairs too far into the parking lot. The new design creates an additional landing, and the rise and run meet current codes. The shed roof over the stairs would be constructed of standing seam metal over a steel frame.

The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation are used as Design Review Criteria in the staff report. In sum, the exterior wood staircase was constructed in the 1990s. It is the only egress to the upstairs studio apartments and the owners would like to bring them up to code as it is constructed of wood, does not have landing platforms, and has a steep rise and run that does not meet current city codes. The second floor apartments were an original use of the building, but primarily have been used as storage, except for one unit, since 1974. Providing access to them supports the effort to use the property for its originally intended purposes. The design and materials of the proposed exterior staircase do not visually stand out in appearance

from the historic building and the proposed design does not seek to create a staircase design from an earlier period of time. Staff finds the request compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards of Rehabilitation and is recommending approval of the staircase replacement.

HPC Questions for Staff:

Hinds: I have no questions. I had an opportunity to tour the building and discussed the staircase replacement. It's a clear case about safety and fire hazard.

Gregg: Were there any ADA considerations?

Manley: When there is an existing staircase where the rise and the run are not correct, there are a variety of good reasons to replace the staircase. The applicant seems to have made an effort to bring some similarity in appearance between the old and new stairs.

Presentation by the applicant: Heidi and Bruce Kramer (project applicant) introduced themselves and thanked the CCHPC for their review of this application. Bruce Kramer said that he met most of the commissioners this week and talked about the stairs. For us, it's basically a safety issue for our tenants. We only have one stairway/point of egress and it's a wooden staircase. We are not required to replace it, but we thought it would be safer to change it to steel so would not burn in a fire. As Manley mentioned, the rise and run is wrong and is too steep. The new stairs will be less steep and include a landing.

Fox opened the discussion to public comment.

Holly Chamberlain stated that she thought it should be noted that the staircase will be on a subordinate façade and will not impact any of the very important brickwork.

Public comment was closed.

Kapitanovich made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness. Manley seconded the motion. The CCHPC unanimously approved the application of Certificate of Appropriateness with no conditions.

V. Public Hearing: Certificate of Appropriateness application for Ford Corner Dealership (aka Jorge's Tequila Factory at 204 W. Evergreen) :

Mark Person presented the staff report

The Ford Corner Dealership, located at 204 W Evergreen is on the Clark County Heritage Register. The applicant has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of a wooden treatment on the corner column of the building at Washington and Evergreen. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation are used as Design Review Criteria in the staff report. The proposed treatment would introduce a new material to the façade that is not reflective of the building's past or present (Finding 2). The proposal would also cover a portion of the brickwork at the corner of Washington and Evergreen (Finding 5). The proposed treatment would not destroy the significant historical, architectural or cultural aspects of the building, but it does cover a portion of the distinctive brick (Finding 9). Staff finds the request not compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards of Rehabilitation and is recommending denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

HPC Questions for Staff:

Hinds: Regarding Finding 9, if the wooden treatment is applied with tension rods, it does not necessarily destroy the building. It is more of an ornament. My question is why would it be considered an alteration? My question is why apply the application of the standards for rehabilitation? This could be something we discuss in deliberation. The building has already been repurposed.

Kapitanovich: Is the proposal just to apply the wood treatment for only one corner?

Staff Response: I did not get that message from the applicant that they wanted multiple coverings but I understand from last month's meeting that multiple coverings were discussed. This staff report and certificate of appropriateness is for one covering at the intersection of Evergreen and Washington.

Manley: Does the proposal from the applicant appear to be complete?

Staff Response: I requested that the applicant submit as much information as they could.

Denniston: My biggest question is whether this needs a Certificate of Appropriateness? Does this even fall within our purview? It doesn't seem like it does. The tension rod system they are proposing doesn't impact the building itself.

Hinds: Do we know what the building owner's opinion is on this? We know he told the business owner to bring it before the HPC.

Staff Response: I do not know, but he did sign the application as a form of consent.

Fox: The signed application form is consent.

The applicant was not present.

The chair opened the floor to public comment. There was no public comment.

The HPC deliberated and made the following findings:

- Hinds: It does not seem like this request is repurposing the building. Assuming the tension rod proposal is possible without damaging the building, I don't see an issue with it.
- Fox concurred with Hinds. The proposed treatment is temporary and won't harm the building. I would be supportive of this proposal. Maybe it shouldn't have come before us, but we have had things like signs under our consideration previously.
- Manley: This request is not much different than putting a shroud or banner in front of a building. The engineering side is not our purview, but I'm skeptical about the tension rod system.
- Gregg: Finding 2, 5 and 10 seem ok.
- Denniston: If this does not need a Certificate of Appropriateness, I don't think we should take action on it. Do we need clarification from the city attorney?
- Gregg: Restaurants come and go from the site.
- Denniston: Looking at the code section, I don't see how it applies because it is not changing the building.

- Fox: In Camas there was a historic building that the property owners decided to cover in wood siding that stayed on for years. The new owners finally removed it and uncovered a beautiful historic building. My point is that we might think of this differently if it was the entire frontage of the building.
- Kapitanovich: Previously, the applicant did express interest in doing these wood treatments on all of the building's columns. One column seems ok, but what if they go with five, it would cover more of the distinctive brick characteristics of the front facade.
- Fox: We should be very clear about what we are deciding.
- Hind: The code does include remodel language. If done on a substantial portion of the building, it could change the character and spirit of the building. As Fox said, we need to be very clear. Not a full rehabilitation, but does qualify as a remodel.
- Gregg: If the Certificate of Appropriateness is approved as the staff report is written, the applicants would need to come back for another Certificate of Appropriateness if they wanted to apply the wood treatment to more than one column.
- Denniston: I agree with Hinds that it falls under remodel and that they would need to come back for additional work. On another building, this may not be a big issue, but it is proposed to be placed on the most prominent part of the building and it does impact the building's historic character.

Hinds made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, restricted to the placement of the wood treatment on one column as described in the staff report. Kapitanovich seconded the motion.

Fox, Hinds, Kapitanovich, Manley, and Gregg approved the application of Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the placement of the wood treatment is only on one column. Denniston voted nay.

VI. Public Hearing: Nomination to the Clark County Heritage Register - Kiggins Building (904 Main St., Vancouver)

Person read the staff report and findings.

- The Kiggins building is located at 904 Main St with Divine Consign as the current tenant.
- This is a nomination to include the building on the Clark County Heritage Register. The building is not currently on any register, but it is within the city's historic overlay district #2. The area contains a concentration of older buildings either entirely preserved in the architectural style of the early 1900s or having a significant key remaining characteristics of such style.
- The applicant has identified criteria 1 and 5 as significant regarding buildings associated with events of significance and persons of significance, respectively.
- Woolworth's prominence is the event of significance and Paul Kiggins is the person of historical significance.
- Staff has reviewed the criteria and finds it is at least 50 years old, has integrity of design, is significantly associated with the history of the community and meets additional Criteria 1 and 5.

- Staff recommends that the building be placed on the Clark County Heritage register.

Fox opened the floor for HPC questions of staff.

Denniston: I didn't quite understand the associated events.

Staff response: Woolworth's innovative sales and store style and its place along Main St. during that time is considered the prominent event. The association with Kiggins could be considered more important, but there is a lot of interesting information regarding Woolworth's.

Fox invited the applicant's representative to comment.

Holly Chamberlain: Regarding the history, it depends on the HPC interpretation. To me, it means in this case it was a long time downtown business that contributed to the mercantile scene. It's up to the commission on whether you consider this a broad pattern. This building would be a good example for a design charrette, something that took it back to its original appearance in case there are opportunities within the county (i.e. the Downtown Association), to change it over time. At this point, the alterations have happened over time and present other interesting educational opportunities.

No public was present to comment.

HPC Deliberation:

- Hinds: I don't see the connection of Woolworth being part of the broad patterns of history. There is enough biographical information regarding Kiggins that is supportive of it for the register.
- Manley: I'm hearing the connection with Kiggins but the description is largely about Woolworths. Kiggins was a developer, builder, Mayor, built many buildings and this was one of them. I'm having a hard time with the second criteria and not sure how to resolve that.
- Gregg: Did we establish what the building was used for before Woolworth?
- Chamberlain: A CC Store was one of the first occupants until the early 1930s. There was also a bookstore, then the northwest electric company came in, and then Woolworth's moved in from the 1930s to 1976.
- Denniston: I can agree with Criteria #5, but not #1. There could be an argument for #2, such as the style of big windows for retail establishments, but this is not included in the application. Since #5 is met so clearly, it seems like we should base our determination on that.
- Hinds: I agree that it is hard to support Criteria #1, but Criteria #5 is clearly met.
- Denniston: I don't want to discount the Woolworth's connection entirely.

Denniston made a motion to approve the nomination with the removal of criteria 1. Gregg seconded the motion.

Discussion of the motion: Manley stated that the nomination discusses the history but didn't put the pieces together. Gregg stated that this was not the first 5 and Dime store, but it was the first of the architectural example in downtown. If the applicant focused on the Mayor Kiggins connection, dime store architectural paradigm, it could be ok. There was discussion from Fox and Manley that criteria 1 was still valid and should not be removed.

The CCHPC approved the nomination of the Kiggins building to the Clark County Heritage Register by a 4-2 vote with criteria 1 removed.

VOTE: Fox-NAY, Manley-NAY, Hinds-AYE, Denniston-AYE, Gregg-AYE, Kapitanovich-AYE

Gregg: For the record, this type of architecture is called “dime store deco.”

VII. Other business:

1. Update on the Quinn Building. Person stated that the applicant met with the city a few weeks ago and staff requested that they return to the HPC. The applicant stated that they have met the requirement of consulting with the HPC and is declining to return to the HPC for a second consultation.
2. Historic Promotions Grants committee update.
 - Lumbantobing stated that eight grant applications were received, totaling \$81,818. The goal of the committee is to award \$50,000 in grants. The subcommittee is recommending that six grants be awarded.
 - Kapitanovich, Manley, and Hinds (who were all on the subcommittee with Pat Jollota) provided an overview of each grant recommendation. Hinds went through the criteria on the scoring matrix.
 - i. Shuttle Bus for Historic Tours – requested \$30,000, recommending \$19,867
 - ii. Photographic Digitization – requested and recommending \$7,400
 - iii. Plankhouse and Objects Organization, Protection, and Storage – requested and recommending \$8,473. The application included very specific explanations of who would do the work.
 - iv. Docent and Guided Walk Program - requested and recommending \$4,000. Leveraging \$3,300 in other funds.
 - v. You are Here Map Signs - requested and recommending \$8,625
 - vi. Purchase of TV and DVD player and electric upgrades – requested \$4,445 and recommending \$1,635.

The subcommittee struggled with this one because the proposal was regarding the need for AV equipment for updating displays but also some additional electrical work. Since it wasn't all tied directly into the purpose of the grant, the subcommittee is recommending less than the full amount. When staff asked the applicant if they would be able to use the \$1,635 for the TV/DVD, the applicant stated that they would prefer to use the funds for electrical upgrades, and not the TV/DVD player.

Fox stated that it sounds like NCHM has a safety issue and would be willing to fund the electrical upgrades.

Kapitanovich said that the TV and DVD tied directly to the guidelines and that the subcommittee tried to stick to the guidelines. The other electrical work wasn't tied as directly to the guidelines.

Hinds: For me, it was the way the grant was written. The applicant wrote about TV/DVD and displays, and the other electrical issues didn't seem like an immediate safety issue based on the application and photos.

Denniston stated that they are located in the northern part of the county, which would address geographic distribution of the grants, but would like to be clear about whether this request for electrical work fits under the grant criteria.

Manley: Do we risk establishing a precedent where an applicant presents one request, but then after receiving proposed funding information, the application requests something else be included? Do we have enough information in their grant application for this request to be defensible?

Fox stated that the grant application forms don't say "in case of partial funding, please prioritize your requests".

Kapitanovich: The application does say the electrical upgrades would improve building safety.

Fox: We have a history with the applicants, which do not always have the strongest applications. It seems ok to help applicants provide more detail when we follow-up. We have also said, come back next year with more information.

Fox: sounds like everyone is comfortable with the proposal for the North Clark Historical Museum funds to be used for their electrical needs.

Manley stated that two additional projects were not recommended for grant funds because they did not meet the selection criteria.

Fox: requested follow-up with those applicants to help them better develop their proposals in the future.

Gregg moved to accept the grant awards as recommended by the subcommittee as amended with the North Clark Historical Museum funds going to electrical improvements (item #6). Denniston seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business:

1. Jan 2 falls on the first Wednesday in January. Does the HPC want to leave it on Jan 2, reschedule the meeting to Jan 9, or cancel the Jan meeting?

Fox stated her preference to postpone the meeting until Jan 9.

Gregg stated his preference to keep meeting on Jan 2.

Staff does not yet know if there are any agenda items for January. We will know in early Dec.

Fox made a motion to move the meeting to January 9 if there is business on the agenda.

Hinds seconded motion.

Discussion: Manley has no conflict with Jan 9, but sees Andy's issue with sticking to the schedule. He thinks the HPC will be able to function even if one member is absent.

Denniston stated it would be good to identify scheduling issues earlier.

Hinds stated that there will always will be conflicts.

Gregg would like to make a note that meeting on schedule was a significant point in his interview and feels his candidacy may not have been approved if he had not been available to attend the HPC meetings held the first Wednesday of every month. Interviewers were concerned about his availability and subsequently staff assured him during the orientation that meetings would be held the first week of every month, we should stick to that schedule. Gregg stated that he made travel arrangements to be available the first Wednesday of every month. Gregg stated that he would support not having a meeting in January at all.

The HPC voted to hold the meeting on Jan 9, if there is business on the agenda.

Vote: Fox, Hinds, Gregg, Kapitanovich, Manley, and Denniston voted “aye”.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.