

CALL TO ORDER:
March 23, 2016

Chair Curtis called the regular meeting of the Steilacoom Preservation and Review Board to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Town Hall.

ROLL CALL:

Present Chair Joan Curtis, Marianne Bull, Steve Gale, Michael Garza, Cindy Blair, and Roger Jackson. Staff in attendance was Town Historic Preservation Officer Jennifer Schreck.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Dr. Jackson moved to approve the minutes for October 28, 2015, second Ms. Bull. Motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1617 Lafayette Street

Chair Curtis asked if any board member had ex-part contact or any objection to any board members hearing the applications. Ms. Bull noted that she is associated with SHMA, the applicant, and she has been aware of the coming application but has not been privy to the details other than the roof is under consideration. Chair Bull is also associated with SHMA. Hearing no challenge to Ms. Bull and Chair Curtis to hearing the application, she then swore in those wishing to testify.

Staff presented the staff report.

Jack Brake, 86 Jackson Street, representing SHMA as Chair of the Bair. He thanked the PRB for the time to come before the PRB. He brought the representative for the roofing company and Mr. French Wetmore, Director of SHMA. He hoped the PRB had an opportunity to review the application asking to place a composition roof on the building. He stated that the life expectancy of a cedar roof is 1/2 of what a composition might be. The proposed roof is expected to last about 50 years and is cheaper than a cedar roof. The Museum Association, as a non-profit, tries to be careful with money and donations. They prefer not to spend money frivolously. He stated that if you look around at buildings around the Bair, most are composition. At least one has the style of shingle that they are proposing and they believe it will fit in well. The current roof is very dark cedar- started light and turned dark in short part of time. From a distance you can't tell it's bad until it starts to go bad. Their hope is to replace with composition so that it lasts longer and saves more money.

Mr. Gary Farmer, Washington Roofing Solutions LLC, introduced the Marlarkey product to try to resemble shake. This product has a 6" exposure leaving a 10" impression like cedar. They are thick and would reasonably expect it to last 50 years. Shake would last 25 years. Mr. Gale asked what

the price difference would be between composition and wood. It would be \$2,000 more for 1/2 the lifespan.

Chair Curtis asked if any houses in town have had this product.

Mr. Farmer noted the product is made in Portland and a good quality material in a sawtooth which more closely mimics shake. This product has a modified asphalt which is better quality for longer lasting. The other shingles lose granules as the oil dries out which makes it not last as long.

Mr. Brake noted that the roofing comes in different colors.

Ms. Bull noted the application discusses an underlayment. Is that something that would be used regardless of the roofing material. Mr. Farmer said it is something that goes under composition roof which is the highest level. If you install cedar you have to use a 30lb shake liner for underlayment which is required by code and not nearly as durable as the safeguard 30 which is hybrid material of felt and synthetic.

Mr. French Whetmore, 1610 Nisqually, Director of SHMA, his job is to summarize and look at the big picture. He noted this is a better product meeting a need with minimal impact. The roof is not in the best shape. The proposed change is cheaper to install and will last two times longer, better product, more durable liner, and better for fire protection. Mr. Whetmore stated, the problem is will this have an adverse impact. He stated his belief that it will change but not negatively because the new roof will look similar. They've already had changes to the roof. It's an improvement they need, the impact is minimal. The roof on it now is not the original roof. It has had a tin roof. Chair Curtis noted that per discussion with Jane Light it has always been cedar shake. Mr. Whetmore continued that the visual change will be minimal.

Staff noted that the issue before the PRB is a change to a character defining feature of the contributing building.

Mr. Brake noted that if you step outside and look at the buildings around the Bair you will not notice a significant difference from other roof forms.

Dr. Jackson asked the applicant if they had considered other materials. Mr. Brake noted that they did look at a couple of different composition

materials and cedar. Mr. Brake showed photos of enviro-shake another product that costs twice as much composition.

Dr. Jackson asked what kind of deliberation did the SHMA go through in proposing the change. How much heartburn did it cause to consider changing the character of one of the most important buildings in Town. Mr. Whetmore answered that it was a question of something better than the roof falling apart and desire for something stronger and longer lasting and a better cost. He didn't feel there was heartburn for it because they did not feel that it would change the appearance.

Ms. Bull asked if a grant was applied. Mr. Whetmore said that there were not any grants applied because of timing. They had the funds to cover the project with the cost savings.

Ms. Bull asked Mr. Garza if wood buildings need to breathe, is that why the underlayment for cedar roof would be different and not allow this hybrid product? Mr. Brake noted that cedar shingles have skip sheathing with gaps between the 1x4s then lay plywood over the top. The sheathing would allow for breathing. The 30lb liner was probably to prevent use of 15lb liner. Ms. Bull asked if it might be a minimum requirement rather than specific.

Chair Curtis called for further questions. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing for deliberation among the PRB.

Ms. Bull noted the PRB goes by the design standards, while price is the primary factor for the applicants it is not a factor for the PRB in terms of reviewing applications. They PRB is more charged with reviewing the aesthetics and maintaining historic character. As a member of SHMA she can understand both sides of the issue. The roof is a character defining feature, and iconic building which rates it with the Orr home, the Wagon Shop, and Milt Davison's home, as such there is more of a requirement to maintain their character than some others in Town. When you get up close to the building you can tell that it is a wooden roof, from far away it is harder to tell. Up close you can tell it is a historic material which is important. The rear addition was allowed alternative materials for venting necessary for the restaurant. The side covered porch is a modern addition and the pitch could not sustain a wood shingle. There were reasons allowing change in material for those two areas. They also were not prominently visible. While money is tight for the non-profit the SHMA has the need

to maintain the buildings as close to original. There is no longer a fire-place, no fireworks allowed in town, which means there is less of a chance of sparks from above in terms of fire hazard.

If applied well, even if down to 20 years, that's enough time for SHMA to plan ahead and think about grants to offset costs to allow this kind of roof to be maintained. It's important for SHMA to maintain icons in the community as close to original as possible. While money can be an issue there's a way around that in applying for grants. It would be lovely to have a 50 year roof but the trade off is not what she wants to see.

Mr. Gale noted that he hates to see the shake roof go, the historic value of the original structure and responsibility to maintain historic character of the building. The people in town would likely be offended if changed because it is prominent.

Ms. Bull noted that with private homes the PRB does not require them to restore to historic materials or take away changes. This building hasn't had anything different so it's important to maintain the historic materials. If a building had composition the PRB wouldn't require them to go back to wood. Because it's been maintained it should continue to be used.

Ms. Bull moved deny the application for the proposed Lafayette Street Bair Drug and Hardware Building composition roof and that the in-kind replacement be perused and that more extensive research into the under layer through Jim Rayley or other means so that the best protection in the underlayment might be used with the in-kind replacement under the municipal code 5.2 and 5.5 original materials, and 5.41 and 5.42 replacement of roof materials and subject to the findings of fact and conclusions of law and conditions of approval as written. Second Mr. Gale. Motion passed.

OTHER BUSINESS:
ELECTIONS

Ms. Bull nominated Ms. Curtis for the position of Chair. Dr. Jackson seconded. Mr. Jackson nominated Ms. Bull for Vice-Chair. Mr. Garza seconded. Motion passed.

BOARD UPDATES

PRB requested contact be made with the contractor for 306 Main Street about leaving the windows open to the elements and demolition by neglect.

Ms. Bull noted her request that a draft of minutes be sent out shortly after the meeting rather than right before the next meeting.

Ms. Bull announced Historic Home Tour May 14, 2016 from 10am to 4pm. They're looking for docents in 2 shifts. Museum members have a \$5 discount. Tickets will be sold online and also onsite at the Bair Store. May 21 and May 22nd is the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Orr Home with lectures called the Fall and Rise of the Orr Home with a slide show, lecture and small group guided tours discussing the architecture rather than artifacts from the view of the house falling and being rebuilt. It will be a free event.

STAFF REPORT

Staff noted PRB reappointments.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Bull moved to adjourn at 7:30pm. Second Dr. Jackson. Motion passed.

NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled Preservation and Review Board Hearing is scheduled for April 28, 2016 at 6:30pm in Town Hall.

Joan Curtis
Chair, Preservation and Review Board