



CLARK COUNTY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

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

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021 – 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:	Sean Denniston (Chair), Andy Gregg (Vice-Chair), Feli Garcia, Greg Fuz, Michelle Kapitanovich, and Donald Trost
Members Absent:	Julie Bohn
Staff Present:	Jacqui Kamp (Clark County), Mark Person and Jason Nortz (City of Vancouver)
Guests:	Jon Contezac, AgWeatherNet (WSU-Mt. Vernon); Greg McGreevy (812 Main St)

- 1. Roll Call & Introductions:** Commission members introduced themselves.
- 2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes from Feb. 2, 2021.** Trost made a motion to approve the minutes and Gregg seconded. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.
- 3. Public Comment** on any items NOT on the agenda.

No public comments.

- 4. Public Hearing - HST2021-00001 Clark County Poor Farm (78th Street Heritage Farm) – Certificate of Appropriateness application for new proposed weather station and fence enclosure at the historic district site.**

Jacqui presented the staff report that included background information on the historic site; an overview of the proposal; and staff’s findings and recommendation, which included recommending approval of the application as submitted.

The applicant, Jon Contezac, meteorologist with AgWeatherNet from Washington State University-Mt. Vernon provided additional summary of the proposed work and shared weather data collected at the site. He also stated that there has been weather stations at the farm for over one hundred years.

The commission had the following questions and comments for the applicant:

- When will the existing weather station be removed? The applicant stated that it will be removed once the new one is built.



- Are any of the materials recyclable? The applicant stated that they will try and recycle much of the material as is possible for other research projects.
- Will there be a lot of maintenance needed? The applicant stated that he doesn't anticipate much.
- Is the tower mounted with the concrete footing? The applicant stated yes, they would excavate a hole 15"x15" for the cement.
- It looks like the fence examples are stakes pounded in the ground. The applicant stated that is correct.
- Is the proposal consistent with the Concept Plan? Staff stated that there is a Heritage Advisory Group that is tasked with approving activities at the farm which must be consistent with the Master Plan. Staff is unsure whether that review has happened, but the application was referred by a member of the group who referred the applicant to historic staff.
- Will there be any lighting? The applicant stated no.

The chair opened the floor to public comment.

- Gerald Macke with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration commented on the history of weather stations at the farm and how unique it is to be able to track the data over a long period of time.

The commission deliberated. Commissioner Trost stated he supports the staff's findings. Commissioner Denniston concurred stating further that the new weather station is in tune with the historic site with how long weather data recordings have been occurring on the farm. Further, the weather station and fence enclosure are very thin and are reversible.

Commissioner Kapitanovich made a motion to agree with staff's findings and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness and Commissioner Gregg seconded the motion. The CCHPC unanimously (6-0) approved the staff report and findings and application of Certificate of Appropriateness.

5. Heritage Overlay Review - 812 Main Street, Vancouver - Request for review and comment regarding façade improvements.

Mark Person presented the staff memo. e

Questions from HPC:

- Describe the differences what we saw before and what we are seeing now. The signage has been removed; the top canopy has been drawn back and is shallower; lower canopy is moved.

Presentation by applicant: Greg McGreevy, representative of the applicant stated they took the input provided by HPC and worked with city staff regarding some of the key features. We

recognized the sign band as out of place in the district, pulled it back, created an element to tie into the adjacent building.

There was a lot of comments on brick but the unfortunate reality is that the late 1800s building is gone. It was cut out for the mid-century modern design done by Hilborn, which is what is left to work with.

HPC questions:

- Signage – is there an idea of what future signage will be? It will probably be attached to the building per overlay intent. Probably align it above the windows on main or 9th horizontally. Most likely in the black wood.
- Were these designs constructed with an ideal tenant in mind? Previously, the lower was going to be separate from the upper level. That is still the way it is being marketed. The hope is to have a restaurant use on the bottom floor. There is exposed brick on the inside that can still be captured and would work well for a restaurant. Could be a lot of uses in the space.
- Was there any exploration of restoring the Day Hilborn design? Not to bring it back to its exact design. We want to add additional elements that honored the shape and lines and provided interest to the building itself.
- What Hillborn designs were kept? The three-block windows theme. In the 40s they shaved the front of the brick building off, so makes it difficult to reclaim.

Public comment: None

HPC discussion:

- Feli: much better design
- Michelle: appreciate the applicant going back and taking another look. I appreciate the design more than we saw before. I do wish that the things that could happen to the building in the 1940s and 1950s didn't happen with the brick work and windows, but it happened, and this is what we have to work with. I'm glad the big sign is gone. This is more tasteful design and appreciate the applicant going back and revising.
- Greg: Appreciate the effort to take a fresh look at this. I agree that it is a much better fit for the immediate area and incorporate the comments that we made. Appreciate the effort to keep elements of the interior of the building – beautiful exterior façade and features that will remind people of what the building looked like when you walk inside.
- Sean: Day Hilborn's design is a local adaptation of modernism and this is a fully post-modern building. It is a nice design and respects its context more now. It has a few throwbacks but that is not preservation and not required by the ordinance. This is not a restoration of Hilborn's design, therefore criteria is clearly laid out in code. Talks about windows; prominent cornice; a whole list of design criteria of what the building needs to have to meet the criteria of the code. Opinions don't matter. The code has criteria. When I look through criteria A-I, it doesn't meet the criteria. That needs to be the basis for the review. Does it meet the criteria in the code and I don't think it does, as nice as the

design may be. The ones that define the major stylistic requirements, the cornice and window configuration we aren't seeing here. It isn't a restoration, it is an alteration and the code has clear requirements for that.

- Sean: *read from the code on the criteria listed for alterations*
- Feli: I really love this building. Shopped as a kid. Fun to go the back way to go shopping. Ultimately the intent design was to have a restaurant and I can see the restaurant there. If the upper level was retail/clothing, I could still see the Spanky's that I remember there.
- Michelle: Mark, what is your response to the windows and cornices to help us understand your viewpoint. Staff relies on group to provide expertise feedback; some of those elements I can see and some may be harder to apply or explain why they can't be possible. What elements are you able to incorporate and if you can't, why not. That is probably how we will look at the application for review.
- Greg: Seems to me that our role is to provide conceptual input to project and not do a detailed architectural design review as that is a staff level function. I think some points made by the chair are important for staff to look at when they do their review. Those issues are fine tuning of this existing design. There are vertical window elements and it is a matter of degree, i.e. is there enough, looking at issues of depth and of recesses being sufficient. Those are not typically what we would get involved in but more staff level review with conversations with the architect. I think we identify what we want staff to focus on in their review and try to fine tune them so they are closer to conformance with the overlay requirements.
- Andy: The proposal is at least the fourth iteration of this building's life. It first was State Theater. Those theatrical elements are still in place. Then we see the second iteration for commercial/retail. The Day Hilborn modification of 1948, the building has been substantially changed from a movie theater/vaudeville house to a clothing store. The fourth iteration was Spanky's apparel. Now we are in position to approve a fifth look and I propose the look of building has changed substantially and now it will have a new life. Since we haven't really paid homage to the intermediary steps, and it is not on the register, how is this not appropriate when the building has gone through so many iterations throughout the years.
- Don: I think this is a nice building, an improvement to the area; and don't think we should question the intent and design of the architect. I'm ok with this design.
- Sean: The code doesn't require a restoration. Alterations are allowable. Important piece is that the code criteria that we have are the same criteria that protect all the buildings, regardless of how important they are. When those requirements don't get enforced, it makes it more difficult to enforce it on the more important buildings. It is important that the code requirements as written are consistently and legitimately enforced. If the requirements aren't right, we change them, we shouldn't not enforce it.

Recommendation:

Michelle moved, with a friendly amendment by Sean: The commission does not recommend approval or denial but ask the city to pay special attention to the code requirements for alterations including the windows and cornices and forward all HPC comments.

All were in favor (6-0).

Committee updates/announcements

- SEPA committee update: No update as the SEPA has not been released.
 - Vancouver Heritage Overlay Code committee update: No update.
 - Underrepresented communities update: Feli provided a brief update of the committee stating she is wanting to understand the bigger picture of the issues facing these groups. She has a meeting scheduled with the NACCP to introduce herself and the HPC.
-

Old Business

- 2022 CLG Grant Decision: Don made a motion to apply for the Unreinforced Masonry project for the CLG Grant. Greg seconded. Greg and Sean volunteered to assist Jacqui with preparing the application. Jacqui will email them the last version of the application to review.
 - Mid-Century Modern Survey list: Jacqui provided a summary of Michael Houser's comments on the survey list so far, specifically to look for new sites to survey. Sean suggested that if we need help in filling out the list that we have typologies that could highlight specific examples, such as WWII cottages and Prairie Ranch types which get to the period of time identified in the RFP. They aren't necessarily "mid-century modern", but "mid-century trends". He talked about areas along Evergreen Boulevard and Uptown Village in Vancouver regarding some of the commercial trends –such as classic main street storefronts adapted, based on mid-century (not modern) technological and architectural trends.
-

New Business

- 2021 Budget review and approval: Staff presented the list of memberships and sponsorships for the commission to decide. Andy made a motion to approve the memberships and sponsorships as highlighted. Greg seconded. All were in favor.
- Washington School for the Blind (NRHP), 2214 E. 13th St., Vancouver – Opportunity to comment on demolition proposal for a non-contributing building located at the school's campus. The commission had no feedback. Don made a motion to not forward a comment on to the city. Andy seconded. All were in favor.

Adjournment

This meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.