



CLARK COUNTY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

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

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, August 4, 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:	Andy Gregg (Chair), Jan Bader (Vice Chair), Paige Alfuth, Julie Bohn, Morgan Frazier, Feli Garcia
Members Absent:	Greg Fuz
Staff Present:	Dan Sommerville (Clark County), Jenna Kay (Clark County), Jason Nortz (City of Vancouver), Mark Person (City of Vancouver)
Guests:	Tom Nishimura, Mike Hale, John Caton, Kim Noah (Port of Camas-Washougal), David Ripp (Port of Camas-Washougal)

1. Roll Call & Introductions:

Chair Gregg called the meeting to order at 6:05pm. Commission members and staff present introduced themselves.

2. Meeting Minutes:

- July 7, 2021 Meeting Minutes:
 - Commissioner Bader noted an error in the minutes where The Historic Trust attorney raised objection to participation of some Commission members in the demolition hearing, under the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. Commissioner Bader recalled that the Commission members identified by The Historic Trust were: Gregg, Fuz, and Bohn, however, Commissioner Garcia was included as well. Commissioner Bader stated that Commissioner Garcia should not have been included because she was absent for both June 2021 Commission meetings.
 - Commissioner Bader moved to approve the minutes with the correction as noted above; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Frazier. The minutes were approved unanimously, by voice vote.

3. Public Comment on any items not on the agenda.

- There were no public comments.

4. Public Hearing – Clark County Heritage Register Nomination Reba House, 6502 Montana Lane, Vancouver, WA

Chair Gregg opened the public hearing and asked if any members had any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest. No members identified any conflicts of interest.



Mark Person presented the Heritage Register Nomination staff report, including:

- The Reba House nomination came before the Commission previously in May 2021, and the nomination was not supported at that time. However, the commission recommended that the owner come back with an updated application.
- The revised application states the structure is an example of post-modern architecture (in the original application it was described as mid-century modern) and the application includes more information on the original owner and assumed architect/builder than the original application.
- The nomination application identified the criteria in 17.39.070 as applicable:
 - It embodies the distinctive architectural characteristics of a type, period, style, or method of design or construction, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
 - It is associated with the lives of persons significant in national, state, or local history. Staff recommended approval of the nomination

Questions of Staff:

- Commissioner Bader: Is there new build as part of the structure? The entire house is not from the original era when it was built?
 - Mark Person: Correct. Part of the structure was built in the 1980s or 90s.
 - Commissioner Alfuth: There was a deck that was original, and the smaller structure mimics the same roofline as the house. There was an addition inside the smaller structure that kept with the architectural integrity of the main house structure.

Applicant Presentation:

- The applicant chose not to present beyond staff's presentation.

Questions of Applicant:

- Commissioner Garcia: What changed since the last time we reviewed this nomination?
 - Mark Person: The classification on the original nomination was mid-century modern and what we heard at the May hearing was perhaps it wasn't mid-century modern and more of a post-modern structure. The major differences are the classification of the structure and much more detail on Mr. Reba, the original owner of the site.

Public Comments:

- There were no public comments.

Staff Response to Public Comments:

- N/A

Commission Deliberation:

- Commissioner Alfuth: I agree that this meets the review criteria. The application was put together nicely. I think the house fits the post-modern style in a unique way. It has the unique rooflines and I think the engineering skills are significant, specifically the floor

joists with true timbers. There's over a 50-ft ridge beam span and it has cool orientation. The application pointed out it's oriented true to north-south and opens up to Mt. St. Helens and beyond; an expansive view. It's over 50-years old. It embodies 1970s architecture and is associated with a significant person in history. Mr. Reba seems to have been a smart man and brought innovation to the world. The roof replacement and stainless steel frames helped bring longevity to the structure and looks good. I support this nomination and it left me wanting to know more about the history of this architect. The application said they tried to find the original plans for the building and were not successful, which was disappointing, but I support this nomination.

- Commissioner Frazier: I was excited to see this nomination. I don't think we have many representations of this architectural style and it's just hitting the 50-year mark. I read through the original and upgraded nomination and think the application went above and beyond telling us about Dr. Reba and his contributions to the scientific community. I support this nomination.
- Commissioner Bohn: I wanted to thank Mr. Nishimura for being patient and amplifying the application previously submitted. We were all in agreement at that time that it would be an excellent possibility to be on the Register. Thank you for doing the additional research we asked for. It's an architectural gem for our community. I appreciate the additional detail about the architecture significance to the time period and the owner, potential architect, and engineer. I support this nomination.

Commissioner Alfuth made a motion to approve the nomination. Commissioner Bohn seconded the motion.

Commissioners voted by roll call:

- Bohn: Aye
- Fuz: Absent
- Garcia: Aye
- Alfuth: Aye
- Frazier: Aye
- Bader: Aye
- Gregg: Aye

5. **Public Hearing – Certificate of Appropriateness Improvements at the John Stanger House 9215 SE Evergreen Hwy, Vancouver, WA**

Chair Gregg opened the public hearing and asked if any members had any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest. No commission members identified conflicts of interest.

Mark Person presented the Certificate of Appropriateness staff report, including:

- The property is on the County Heritage Register and the National Register of Historic Places.
- The Stanger House is located off Evergreen Boulevard, within the Jane Weber Evergreen Arboretum. The applicant has requested approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for repairs and restoration of the Stanger House. Specifically, items to

be repaired or replaced include the siding and exterior trim, south porch, north porch, windows, exterior doors, kitchen floor, gutters, interior shiplap, house skirting, and chimney and fireplace repairs.

- The house is believed to be one of the oldest structures in the city and is starting to show its age.
- The criteria for improvements are based on the Secretary of Interior Standards of Rehabilitation. Staff findings per criteria are:
 1. No change to the property use is proposed.
 2. The existing materials will be repaired where feasible and replaced in kind where they cannot be salvaged. No removal or alteration of historic material is proposed as part of the repairs.
 3. No alterations that have no historical basis are proposed as part of these repairs.
 4. No new structures are proposed as part of this proposal.
 5. The historic materials of the building are proposed to be repaired where feasible and replaced in kind when they cannot be salvaged.
 6. Wherever feasible, the architectural features will be repaired rather than replaced.
 7. The proposal does not include any surface cleaning of the building.
 8. Minimal ground-disturbing actions are proposed with the application. The site is within a Level A area which is a high probability area for discovering archaeological resources. In the event that any item of archaeological interest is uncovered during the course of ground-disturbing action or activity, all ground disturbing activity shall immediately cease. The applicant shall immediately notify the city planning official and the Office of Archeological and Historic Preservation and have the site assessed by a qualified archaeologist.
 9. No alterations or additions are proposed.
 10. No additions to structures are proposed as part of the repairs.
- Staff received a call from a concerned person about recent work done by the old outhouse. Staff wanted to make sure archaeological care was taken with that endeavor. There is a condition of approval in the staff report regarding any land disturbing measures taken.
- Staff finds the application meets the criteria of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as conditioned and recommends approval.

Questions of Staff:

- Commissioner Alfuth: Has the City requested any samples to be used for the replacement?
 - Mark Person: Like a materials board? We like to see if that is possible. That is something the Commission could make as a condition of approval prior to the applicant receiving a building permit. You could propose that the Commission would like to see samples of materials to be replaced when they cannot be repaired.
- Commissioner Bohn: It seemed like there was some mention of potential alterations like the second floor door that used to have a staircase might get updated siding and a window would be placed there. Any thoughts or comments on that?

- Mark Person: That seemed on the line, but I can see how it could be considered a more significant alteration.
- Commissioner Alfuth: I had this question as well.
- Commissioner Bader: Is the applicant going to make a presentation on this one?
 - Mark Person: They are available to answer questions.

Applicant Presentation:

- The applicant chose not to present beyond staff's presentation.

Questions of Applicant:

- Commissioner Bohn: Thank you for the application. I appreciate the materials provided.
 - There's a shadow of the staircase on the exterior that I find interesting. Is it possible, or is there interest in maintaining that to demonstrate the history?
 - Mike Hale: We don't know when the stairwell was put in and it has been removed for 20 years and we can't find the door, which is why we tried to eliminate the stairwell. With painting, anything is possible. The issue we have had is with replacement of the siding and substructure where there is a lot of dry-rot. We are making our own siding for any replacement we need. With painting, it could be done. In reality, restoration would remove the siding and get back to the original vertical planks, however we don't have the funds to do it.
 - Is there a picture of the kitchen porch ceilings and why would you salvage south porch materials, move them to the north, and fully replace the southern porch?
 - Mike Hale: The substructure has a lot of dry rot and had to take down. Also, 70% of the roof was not salvageable, so we used 30% to repair holes on the north porch and purchased all new tongue and groove for the south porch.
 - Commissioner Bohn: It has already been done?
 - Mike Hale: Yes, we started this process with the application in February, and then we came to the summer season and we had to get started.
 - How large is the door on the second floor?
 - Mike Hale: The second-floor door is 32 inches wide. The French door opening is about 6 feet wide.
 - With the upstairs door replacement with a smaller window, does it make sense to replace it with a window that would match the footprint of the door?
 - Mike Hale: We could, but probably can't within the next two years due to the cost of a window of that size.
 - Was it always a French door? Is there any history about the doors that we know of?
 - Mike Hale: That side was all vertical plank siding originally. The doors aren't part of original, but when French doors were in vogue they were put in, but don't know exactly when.
 - Regarding the windows: Can you speak about the windows on the first floor? The application noted that most windows don't need repair on the first floor, but glass needs replacement. Is the glass broken?

- Mike Hale: The bathroom window has plexiglass instead of glass and we would like to replace that with a full-size window. The others are small windows and there are holes in the glass or broken panes. We just want to replace the broken glass panes. On the second floor, a lot of the glass is broken out. Those were not floating glass and were installed at a later date.
 - Is the nomination based on 1820-1830s date or a later date?
 - Mike Hale: The property is on the register because 1) the structure is on the original property, and 2) John Stanger worked at the Fort Vancouver site as a millwright? I think those are the two things it's nominated on.
 - Is the replacement/restoration targeting a specific time period?
 - Mike Hale: My goal is to make it last 10-15 more years. It will have to be ongoing work. A lot of the siding is in really poor shape. This is a temporary fix. Trying to repair the dry rot and do what we can.
 - Item #5 mentions the door replacement. Are there any samples of what it will be replaced with?
 - Mike Hale: The doors have been cut down from some other doors. They're not full original doors. There is no vision for replacement doors yet.
 - Could you provide samples or images of the gutter choices?
 - Mike Hale: The v-shape gutter would be same as Fort Nisqually, which is the same time period of original construction of the Stanger House. It would be a wood trough style used around turn of the century. One sample is \$10/foot, so I won't provide a sample, but I can take a picture of it.
- Commissioner Garcia: No questions.
- Commissioner Bader:
 - It sounds like some of the scope of work you are proposing has already taken place so the Certificate of Appropriateness for those project is after-the-fact. For the scope you're proposing, how much has been completed?
 - Mike Hale: The only things done are the north and south kitchen porches. And we found out that the existing floors in the kitchen were good, so we tore up the linoleum and plywood on top and refinished the kitchen floors. It's mostly been cosmetic stuff on the inside so far. We are trying to get to the dry-rot on the outside.
 - Do we know when the current siding was installed?
 - Mike Hale: the current siding has square and round-headed nails. We think it was installed around the turn of the century
 - It sounds like the timing is based on funds as available, and this could be a multi-year project, triaging based on what's most pressing and as funding available.
 - Is the actual owner of the property a non-profit? Applicant: John is the Jane Weber Evergreen Arboretum president of the board. The organization is a 501c3 organization and received the property from the Clark College Foundation a couple of years ago. We're in the process of getting better organized and how to raise funds for this. We just recently were told we will get a small grant from a

foundation if we can match the funds; this funding will help pay for materials. All labor has been volunteered by Mike and his crew. The organization's board is committed in trying to restore the house as much as we can. It will require a lot of fundraising and we are trying to get the attention of people who are generous and want to make the house look like what it can be.

- The intent is to keep the historic look and not to make it something from the 1900s. It will take a lot of craftsmanship to make it look good.
- Morgan Frazier:
 - I feel like it would be in the best interest of the property if there was a better preservation plan for the restoration and in doing that, you could address some of the material questions. Without a plan, it's a matter of trust and work has already started which is a bit concerning. It is also a pre-contact archaeological site and I am concerned about any disturbance. Having a plan for the next 10-years or a vision of the organization would benefit the organization, community, and fundraising. I want to suggest to the applicant to create a master plan or preservation plan. I think there was an outhouse at one point too. I agree with some of previous questions.
 - I like the idea of the gutters, I have seen those done before and they seem appropriate.
- Paige Alfuth:
 - Is this planned to be open so the public can walk through it? Is that the end goal? Applicant: it is open to the public now. We call them guided tours, but they are not real formal. We had a recent function there, a 50th wedding anniversary where guests toured the house. It's still safe to go inside. What we're trying to do is make sure it doesn't deteriorate more. If there's concern about work already done, part of the reason for that was to prevent additional damage.
 - Have you thought about fundraising at the site? Applicant: yes. The board is just getting started on the long-range planning process for the house itself and the arboretum as a whole. Not sure how long it will take. Hoping by the end of the year will have something to work with.

Public Comments:

- There were no public comments

Staff Response to Public Comments:

- N/A

Commission Deliberation:

- Jan Bader: it sounds like there's a long timeline on this and the work will move forward as funds are available. I'm not sure how many commissioners have been to the house and I would suggest we postpone a decision until our September meeting after we can tour the property.
- Paige Alfuth: I like idea of seeing the site. I think there are unanswered questions about how progress is being done.
- Julie Bohn: I would like that idea too and am curious if the applicant is open to that.

- Dan Sommerville: confirmed staff can coordinate a tour.

Commissioner Jan Bader made motion to table action on the certificate of appropriateness until after a site visit. Paige Alfuth seconded the motion.

Commissioners voted by roll call:

- Bohn: Aye
- Fuz: –
- Garcia: Aye
- Alfuth: Aye
- Frazier: Aye
- Bader: Aye
- Gregg: Aye

6. Committee updates/announcements

Committee assignments. Commission members to let Dan Sommerville know of interest in any of the following committees:

- Under-Represented communities committee
 - Lead by Feli Garcia
- Vancouver Heritage Overlay code committee
 - No one on it right now
- Providence Academy SEPA committee
 - Greg Fuz previously expressed interest
- River channel maintenance committee
 - Andy Gregg interested
- Grant review committee
 - Julie Bohn and Andy Gregg volunteered if short on volunteers. If others would like to participate, they don't need to be involved.
 - Jan Bader volunteered

7. Old Business and Updates

- **Rules and Procedures Update project**
 - The current HPC rules and procedures were adopted in 2008, with a few code amendments in 2009, 2018, 2019 and 2020.
 - Commissioners have expressed interest in improving the user-friendliness of the rules and procedures.
 - Work was done on an update in 2019-2020, but it was set aside at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.
 - Schedule: would probably take about 1.5 years to complete
 - Ask of commission: establish a rules and procedures update committee and identify members of that committee
 - Discussion:
 - Andy Gregg: a lot of public bodies have policy review as part of the regular meeting. Does it make any sense to include portions of the rules and procedures instead of putting the work on a small committee to do all of the work? Could we have a learn as we go component, to have established a sense of the rules and procedures for everyone.

- Jan Bader: are you envisioning staff would take the current rules and procedures and edit them and commissioners would talk about the proposed changes? Envisioning staff would take first cut and committee would review.
- Andy Gregg: if recurring agenda item, it would also show our continuing education to the people we serve. A lot of things operate as a mystery.
- Jan Bader: would we review sections at a time?
- Andy Gregg: if staff identified a section that's been updated or amended, they could bring it to us to review.
- Dan Sommerville: clarified that would have a section of draft changes at each meeting and in so doing, the whole commission would have a greater understanding of the rules and procedures and proposed changes by the end of 2022.
- Paige Alfuth: do you have an estimate of how many hours of volunteering this would require?
- Jan Bader: if move to Andy's model with staff doing the work and commission reviewing it, it should be far less demand on the commission than having a separate committee.
- Andy Gregg: moved to engage in historic preservation and procedures update project as a recurring agenda item in the timeframe presented by staff.
- Paige Alfuth: so instead of a committee, this would be a section of our meeting every month?
- Julie Bohn: when I first started, we had code revisions as part of our meetings and it worked well when sent out ahead of time and we could review before the meeting.
- Andy Gregg: confirmed motion dwindled.
- Dan Sommerville: summarized plan to have a standing meeting agenda item, section by section. No committee. Recurring project, not new business/old business. Will revisit time permitting.

- **Reminder: Training Opportunities**

Dan reviewed upcoming training opportunities. See slide deck for details.

- Julie Bohn: for the event with three locations, that's quite a distance. Guessing they're going over various projects in those areas. How realistic is it for someone to attend all three? Cost to get and stay there would be on the commissioners?
- Jan Bader: looking at the website, each of the three in-person days have a similar morning program and the afternoons are a local tour. Envisioning people could attend one of those.
- Jan Bader: can we all review the options and email Dan and Jacqui which ones we're interested in?
- Commission members will let Dan know which events they want to attend and Dan can follow-up with any event registration due dates.
- Julie Bohn moved to approve the budget to allow up to all 7 commissioners to attend all or any of the opportunities. (Up to \$1,555 to be spent on the proposed trainings.) Morgan Frazier seconded the motion.

- Bohn: Aye
- Fuz: —
- Garcia: Aye
- Alfuth: Aye

- Frazier: Aye
- Bader: Aye
- Gregg: Aye

8. New Business

- **Pre-Application Conference – Parkersville Landing Site**

Property Owner presentation:

- Request for feedback on certificate of appropriateness eligibility for the Parkersville Landing site.
- The applicant showed the location of the site and its historical significance commemorating the Chinook people, the homestead of David C. Paker, and later stewarded by the Van Vleet family.
- The site is on the National and Washington state registers
- The applicant described how the site is currently used and designed with recreational elements, a popular location for events, and having insufficient parking during peak season.
- The port is undertaking a waterfront development, to be completed in 2024. There will be more competition for parking as the site is further utilized.
- Recent state legislation allows tax increment financing as a tool that can be used for public benefit. Public infrastructure is encouraged. The Port is striving to use that tool to finance a parking structure and address the parking issues.
- Part of the proposed parking structure would be on the Parkersville Landing Site, where there is currently a gravel parking lot.
- The location is not further to the east, to avoid building on top of gas lines.
- The applicant reviewed the Secretary of the Interior's Standards of rehabilitation and how the proposal would meet those. See presentation slides for details.

Commission feedback:

- Morgan Frazier: has the Port taken into consideration the Bonneville House viewshed into its design? The property is adjacent to this other historic property. Applicant: We have not. Is there a distance from the house that needs to be considered? Morgan Frazier: if there's something that will block a view and the view is important, that is what you would want to consider. Applicant: absolutely, we can do that. We are finding out about all kinds of ideas as we get into the project.
- Paige Alfuth: is the top part of the structure going to be open or covered? If there is a roof, what's the probability of using a green roof to minimize warming effects? Applicant: there is lots of discussion with the waterfront development regarding sustainability. Most likely, for cost, would keep the parking structure top open.
- Julie Bohn: my only concern about where it is the archaeological potential once digging begins. If you were to come forward with a formal request, maybe you could share more research to address how you would mitigate if you do find any archaeological artifacts.
- Jan Bader: working with DAHP, they're going to require an inadvertent find plan and that will cover the project. It looks like a good project. The only concern is the archaeological piece. I appreciate you coming for feedback before you submit your certificate for appropriateness. It's really good to get input ahead of time. It can provide a better application and can prevent us from saying no later. Applicant: thanks, we got a lot of help from Dan guiding us through the process.

- Julie Bohn: you went through the Secretary of Interior standards and it gave me the impression that it doesn't apply because there's no structure in place and begs the question if you have to address them all. The landscape piece seems most relevant, and the view. It's more of a landscape perspective and how it will be reshaped. Applicant: because of the current use, do you have any feedback on how you would be looking at the landscape itself? Julie Bohn: the information you provided was good. I'm curious about how to apply the standards to this particular proposal.
- Morgan Frazier: when comes to archaeological component, where you are planning to put the garage, it's actually two historical sites up there in your green area. In the past, you've worked with archaeologists and DAHP, and you might consider a treatment plan when you dig. You will hit archaeological materials. You also might want to think about outreach to the Chinook and Cowlitz. If you do the pre-work, it will save you the hassle in the end. You have a good project and could design it to maximize parking and enhance the landscape.
- Andy Gregg: HPC glad to work with other government organizations and be of service.
- Applicant: what's the next step? Dan Sommerville: you could seek additional feedback or could submit your application for a certificate of appropriateness. Staff glad to be a reference.

9. Good of the Order

- Andy Gregg thanked Dan and Jenna for help with meeting support and thanked fellow commissioners. In wake of last month's meeting, he was pleased with how well they conducted themselves in the face of opposition.
- Morgan Frazier: the idea of adding the 90-day provision to the end of the application and getting the feedback from the community, it really was important to me and made me feel like our work was valued and warranted.
- Julie Bohn: welcomed the three new commissioners, thanked them for sticking with us and for the contributions already provided. Asked about the status of hybrid meetings. Dan Sommerville: at this time the County Council delayed the start of their hybrid meetings until September. The Community Planning department is following the Council's lead and will keep the group updated.

10. Adjournment

Commissioner Paige motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Julie Bohn. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 8:27 pm.