



MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, June 5, 2018 - 6:00 p.m.

These are summary, not verbatim, minutes. Audio recordings are available on the Historic Preservation Commission’s page at www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/historic-preservation-commission.

Members Present:	Robert Hinds, Sarah Fox, Sean Denniston, Alex Gall, and Robert Heaney
Members Absent:	Mark Pelletier and Roch Manley
Staff Present:	Jacqui Kamp and Sharon Lumbantobing (Clark County); Jan Bader and Mark Person (City of Vancouver)
Guests:	Holly Chamberlain (Blair Building), Dan Spencer and Mike Wright (Clark County), Eric Lanciault (CCHM), Bruce and Heidi Kramer (Blair Building)

Roll Call & Introductions: Commission members and staff introduced themselves.

Approval of the Meeting Minutes from May 1, 2018. Denniston moved to approve the minutes with minor edits and Fox seconded. Meeting minutes were approved.

Public Hearing: Nomination to CCHR – Blair Building, 1801 Main St, Washougal, WA:

Lumbantobing read the staff report and findings. Fox shared that she had previously toured the building inside and out on a tour with Nick Vann, DAHP, a few years ago. Denniston asked how the listing fits criteria 1. Chamberlain responded that it depends on how “broad patterns of national, state, or local history” is defined and stated that it relates to the family’s contribution to the commercial aspects. Chamberlain stated that criteria 1 can be removed from the nomination if the commission does not feel it is explained clearly. Gall stated that he assumed broad development applied to the commercial aspect of the development. Lumbantobing stated that she thought the broad patterns of local history related to the significance of it being the last remaining meat market (single item store) masonry building before the era of grocery stores came into the area.

Hinds and Denniston stated that the nomination was well written and documented and accepted the rationale presented for the inclusion of criteria 1.



Gall asked why the 1968 end date was used for the period of significance. Chamberlain stated that in 1968 the building was still a rare example of a remaining brick building. She stated that one could shorten the period of significance, but that 1968 covers the architectural period of significance.

Chamberlain stated that the building's architect is not known. The microfiche of the 1925 local newspaper is missing from the Camas-Washougal archive. Denniston stated that there might not have been an architect; it might be mason-designed.

Hinds opened the discussion to public comment.

Chamberlain suggested that people go visit the building. It's a modest building, but a lovely example of a masonry building with a lot of architectural detail. Chamberlain shared that the current owners had planned to remove some of the original windows during its renovation, but after attending a workshop on historic windows, they decided to preserve the windows.

Public comment was closed.

Fox made a motion to approve the nomination. Heaney seconded. The Commission members voted unanimously to approve the nomination of the Blair Building to the Clark County Heritage Register.

New Business Items:

- 1. Lewisville Park (CCHR):** Request for feedback on proposal for maintenance buildings. Dan Spencer stated that significant dry rot was found under the flooring that has spread to the walls. There is no foundation. The county Parks Department would like to tear it down and replace it with a modular unit as the building is beyond repair. The park is on the national and local register, but the maintenance buildings are not listed as contributing buildings, but are noted as compatible, on the nomination.

Gall stated that placing the modular buildings on the same site but might not be a good idea and stated that leaving the historic building as is but shutting it down might be a hazard as it will continue to deteriorate.

Fox suggested that the siting of the modular unit should be in a location that doesn't detract from the remaining historic buildings and has a concern about placing modular units on the site of the original historic buildings.

Denniston stated that choosing a path that is going to get to an end result that is compatible with the park is the main objective, which might include removing the building.

Wright stated that the amount of rot has exceeded the financial viability of repairing the building. One option would be to tear it down and rebuild on the same building footprint, and choose exterior materials that blend into the rest of the park. During that period, there would need to be temporary modular buildings for staff to work in.

Denniston stated that the new building does not have to be exactly like the original; it just needs to be compatible. Denniston agreed that the new building needs to be designed and built to suit the current purposes.

Wright asked what options are available to redesign the new buildings, such as can they use a metal roof that blends in in terms of color? Shake roofs are a maintenance challenge in a forested area. These are the kinds of questions that will need input from the HPC.

Hinds asked if there are other modular buildings in the park. Wright replied that there are none.

Wright estimated that a modular building would be a third of the cost of new construction. Wright stated that modular buildings could be sited carefully and have landscape screening.

Wright asked what would the Parks Department be allowed to do and what design requirements would there be? Denniston stated that the HPC is willing to assist to provide design input and that it would be difficult to make a modular building compatible with the landscape, but it's not impossible. Heaney stated that he is focused on where the modular is located and what it looks like.

Gall requested that the building be photo documented for posterity before it is demolished.

Wright stated that one of the maintenance buildings which shares a wall with the damaged maintenance building will remain.

Hinds stated that the HPC agrees that modular solutions are on the table.

Wright will report back to the Parks Department and they will determine how to proceed based on the input from the HPC and based on the budget availability. Wright reiterated that what he heard today is that the Parks Department needs to come back to the HPC with ideas and pictorials, and discuss where it will be located, how it would be viewed from the main entrance area to ensure compatibility with the historic park landscape. The current location is near the park's main entrance and highly visible. The modular should be screened so it's not noticeable.

Denniston stated that the HPC's suggestions are not regulatory requirements, but are a good idea to protect the integrity of the park. Hinds stated that the building's location at the highly visible main entrance is a concern and asked Wright to consider the location of the modular placement carefully. The existing building is 30 ft x 15 ft.

Heaney stated that the lifecycle costs of the modular building should be considered. Heaney agreed and said that a light wood frame box with a truss roof is the least expensive option and you can control the materials and the pitch of the roof and it will last for many years beyond the life span of a modular building.

Kamp reiterated that the Parks Department can either come back to request feedback from the HPC on design proposals. The final design will require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the HPC that is reviewed in a public hearing.

2. Carnegie Library – Clark County Historical Museum Request for Feedback on Stair

Proposal: Eric Lanciault, architect, stated that the library is 118 years old and the concrete stairs appear to be original. The stairs are a potential hazard and do not meet current code minimums for rise and run. The door swings out and there is less than a foot before the step goes down. He has been asked to redesign the stairs to make them compliant with current codes. There is a rear door that is ADA accessible, so there is no need to provide a ramp on the front stairs for ADA accessibility. He has designed three options for consideration.

Option A leaves the existing stairs in place and superimposes an easily removable, but permanently anchored, metal stair assembly. Option B takes the same concept but uses a concrete stair over the existing stair. Option C is to remove the existing stair and completely replace it. The plinths on the side with the light fixtures are the defining features of the original stairs.

The width of the new stairs in Options A and B would have to be narrower to preserve the plinths and most people would think it looks dissonant. Option C would remove the existing plinth and create a new identical plinth, but it would be taller. The accessibility standards require handrails and guardrails, which is a lot of metal that would be in front of the building, which were never there previously. Neither option is perfect.

Fox stated that Option A did not seem like the right option; it feels different entering a historic building on metal stairs. Fox stated that Option B or C could look good and it might depend on financial considerations. Fox leans towards Option B to retain more of the character of the existing stairs.

Denniston leans towards Option C because all the options are temporary solutions and Option C better preserves the character of the building. Every part of the building has a life cycle, and concrete has a lifecycle of 75 years. There might not be a good reason to extend the life cycle of the existing stairs. The form of the stairs is what's important and Option C preserves the form of the stairs the best. Denniston's only concern is that the original number of steps is 13, but the new stairs only have 12 steps. There might be some significance to the number 13. Lanciault stated that 13 steps could be designed for the front to preserve the original number of stairs. Lanciault stated that the question of veracity is important. Since we don't know why the 13 steps were original, why would we retain 13 steps.

Heaney agreed that Options A and B strip the context of the design decision and intent, and does some violence to the building, while Option C better preserves the original stair design.

Hinds stated that Option B does preserve some of the original design and materials by not moving the plinths. Hinds understands the argument behind Option C but still prefers Option B.

Gall asked if the current stairs are original. Lanciault believes that they are original.

Denniston stated that if you put new stairs on top of the existing stairs, you will do more harm to the original stairs than reconstructing the stairs in a different way. Heaney stated that we are creating history by the decision we make today about the stairs. Denniston stated that the type of salt used to de-ice the stairs impacts the longevity of the stairs.

Bader asked if there is consideration to change the door to swing in rather than out. Lanciault stated he thinks the code will not allow the doors to swing in.

Denniston stated the concrete spalling deterioration on the stairs is going to continue, so if you put stairs on top of the original stairs, you will have to come back in 15 years to repair the stairs again.

Bader asked about the status of the HVAC design. Lanciault said they are still evaluating cost options. Bader hoped that the HVAC design and stair design could come back to the HPC at the same time, if possible. Bader stated that we have one opportunity to do this right and cost is not the only factor.

Denniston stated that Option B or C would likely be the best cost option. The HPC agrees that Option A is off the table and Option B is not well loved, but is not off the table. Lanciault will bring a photo shopped picture to show the HPC what the options would look like when they consider the final proposal.

- 3. HPC Meeting Date and Location Change:** Proposed amendment to HPC Rules and Procedures to change meeting date and location (hearing to be scheduled for July 11). Kamp stated that the HPC bylaws have to be amended to change the date and location and the HPC needs to vote on this in a public hearing on July 11.

Old Business Items:

- 1. Midcentury Modern Architecture lecture proposal:** Kamp said that the Clark County Historic Museum offered to host this lecture. The lecture will be in September; date to be determined. DAHP will address midcentury modern specifically, but also discuss other architectural styles as well. Bader suggested the old Vancouver library building is a midcentury building that could possibly host this meeting. Kamp will explore this option.
- 2. Upcoming HPC Chair Elections:** Kamp stated that HPC members should submit to staff a letter of interest by June 27 with a brief bio and stating their interest in being a chair or vice chair.
- 3. New HPC vacancy:** Mark Pelletier has some medical issues and has to step down from the HPC and his position will need to be filled. The HPC needs to decide how they want to fill the position either by drawing on the existing applicant pool or readvertizing the position. The HPC forwarded three names for two existing positions. Bader will ask if the council wants one or two candidates and will get back to the HPC.
- 4.** Alex Gall mentioned that the Proebstel house is going to be demolished soon. Gall is concerned about building's being demolished without any documentation. Gall will provide an update soon on the proposed code change.
- 5.** HPC members should mark their calendars for the Sept 25 CLG training at the Tacoma Arts Building. Hinds will be giving his Jefferson Davis Memorial presentation.

Rob Heaney recognition: Hinds recognized Rob Heaney's service to the HPC and presented him with a certificate of appreciation.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.