

## **MINUTES**

### **Cheney Historic Preservation Commission**

**March 1, 2007**

**Commissioners Attending:** Bettye Hull, Charlie Mutschler, Fred Lauritsen, Aimee Flinn and Chris Stewart.

**Commissioners Absent:** Nikki Gamon and Steve Emerson.

**Staff Attending:** Susan Beeman.

**Councilpersons Attending:** None.

**Call to Order:** Chairman Hull called the meeting to order at 5:13 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes:** Motion was made by Commissioner Stewart to approve the minutes from the February 1, 2007 regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission, as distributed. Seconded by Commissioner Lauritsen; motion carried unanimously.

**Citizen Participation:** Chairman Hull asked guests to introduce themselves, and welcomed Mr. Pat Kennedy; Marion Evenson; and Shawn King, Jim Moeller, Jerry Galm and Dan Turbeville from Eastern Washington University.

**Old Business: Kennedy House Local Register Listing.** Chairman Hull read the City Council resolution which adds the Kennedy House, 105 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, to the Cheney Register of Historic Places, and presented a bronze plaque and resolution to Mr. Kennedy.

**New Business: Hargreaves Hall Remodel Plans.** Marian Evenson of Madsen, Mitchell, Evenson & Conrad explained that her firm was hired by the University approximately a year and a half ago to design improvements to Hargreaves Hall. One of their goals has been to open up the third floor reading room, restoring its original configuration from some modifications done in 1966.

Ms. Evenson showed photographs of the original reading room and lobby, and explained how they intend to restore these spaces. In doing this, however, they have displaced 8 classrooms, and now they are looking at an addition onto the building to regain that classroom space. She described plans, which will include opening up the ceiling to reveal the original beams to a height of approximately 10'. First floor offices would then be enclosed with their own ceilings, separate from the ornate original ceiling. At present, there are not men's and women's restrooms on each floor; these would be added.

Ms. Evenson explained that the original second floor reading room would be restored to its original condition. They are attempting to design spaces to be as flexible as possible in this historic building. The building has changed from its original use as a library, to office space, to classrooms, with a number of different uses over the years.

Commissioner Flinn asked why they had decided to attach the new classrooms to the original Hargreaves, rather than making them a separate building. Ms. Evenson said that it had never been considered as a separate building, because it was intended to be part of the same project.

Commissioner Lauritsen noted that this building originally had a tile roof. Will this be restored, as well? Mr. Moeller said that it was a tile roof until the late 1960s, and then it was replaced with a composition roof. That roof was replaced within the last 3-4 years with a new composition roof which is rated for 50 years of service. They are not planning to restore the original tiles.

Commissioner Lauritsen asked about a museum which used to be located in the basement of Hargreaves Hall; has it been removed? Mr. Moeller explained that it had been dormant for a long time, and the exhibits and dioramas have been removed to storage in other areas. There are no plans for the museum to be returned to this building.

Chairman Hull asked for clarification on which side of the building would be considered the main entrance. Ms. Evenson explained that both the historic front of the building and the new entrance on the west side would be 'main' entrances. Student traffic patterns indicate the new side entry will probably have more use, but the original building entry will be retained.

Ms. Evenson showed slides of project interior space designs, and described changes which have been developed since the initial meeting with Dr. Arévalo was held about 3 weeks ago. She noted that the half-circle windows in the reading room will be opened back up, and the reading room will be restored to its original open configuration. Partitions will be inserted at either side of the room with solid material about half the way to the ceiling, and a glassed top to gain privacy. Connection to the new addition will be at the rear of the original building. Ms. Evenson noted that the entry and the roofline on the addition have been modified from the drawings which were sent to the Commission in their agenda packets. The glass area of the new addition is intended to keep the new addition from touching the historic building.

Commissioner Lauritsen asked if the marble would be left intact. Ms. Evenson said that it would, and that they are going to try to locate some materials which have been removed from the building. She said they expect to be able to match the original materials and fill in fairly easily.

Commissioner Mutschler noted that one of the concerns often raised with any historic building remodel is how this is going to fit with the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines. He wants to be sure these changes would not render the building ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Evenson said that she feels very confident that they have met all the guidelines. She noted that additions are allowed on historic buildings.

Mr. Moeller added that they had looked up the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties and cited the standard for special treatments for new additions:

“New additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed in the process of rehabilitation. New design should always be clearly differentiated so that the addition does not appear to be part of the historic resource.”

Mr. Moeller explained that they have been aiming their design solutions in that direction.

Commissioner Flinn commented that in terms of meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Restoration of Historic Properties, it appears that this does. She noted that the earlier entry design was out of scale, and it appears they have addressed that. She noted that the windows being similar but not exact duplicates of the originals, the similar roofline, and other features of the proposed new addition are distinct enough that you know it's not part of the original. She noted that the glass wall separating the new and old portions is becoming a popular way of distinguishing additions on historic buildings.

Commissioner Flinn added that her main concern at this time was that the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation should have been included at the very beginning of the design process, going through the EZ Form process.

Ms. Evenson said that her partner has had conversations with Stephen Mathison about the project, but until this point, they did not really have anything to show him. She said that this is the end of the schematic design phase, and before they go into design development, now is the time to be sharing these ideas with him.

Commissioner Flinn asked if any ground-disturbing activity, other than construction, was going to go on, because that will need to be addressed through the state, as well.

Mr. Moeller said that the architect has been directed to complete those forms and submit them to the state office. He added that DAHP had told them they needed to reach the point where the schematic design had been approved by the University before DAHP would be able to review anything. When the president approves these latest revisions, they will be submitting them to the state.

Ms. Evenson said that they have done lots of research, and worked very hard at this project. She said she was aware of some of Dr. Galm's concerns, and would like to have him buy into the project. She noted that some of the bad ideas that were brought in to the building during the 1960s will be corrected.

Dr. Galm addressed the Commission and explained that he is entirely opposed to this project, and has asked Dr. Arévalo to kill the project, because what you are seeing is a result of a culture

of disregard for historic preservation on campus. He noted that this is the fourth building in the Historic District to be modified, and as with the others, the University's own procedures for dealing with historic buildings have not been followed. He served on the State Advisory Council for 8 years, and these modifications are not going to be acceptable in design review. We have been out of procedure on all three previous renovations; we have not done a HABS/HAER on any of them.

The extensive modifications to Hargreaves could easily cost us the district, with the kinds of modifications that already exist in the other district buildings. He does not want to see an additional building stuck onto the back side of Hargreaves Hall. This building deserves a restoration to its original condition, not a renovation. Hargreaves is a signature work of the architect, with contributing elements both interior and exterior. Glass walls, as proposed on the interior, will not meet design review standards. Dr. Galm said that he is asking the Commission to do the right thing, which is to say 'no' to these modifications. The district is too important to our community.

Dr. Galm said that he will be presenting his objections to the faculty senate, and working with the ASEWU, the historic preservation community, the National Trust, and the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation. He said that we teach historic preservation on our campus, and this project is out of sequence, out of procedure, out of process. He urged the Commission to go on record as opposing the modifications as proposed.

Dr. Galm challenged members of the Commission to walk through Showalter Hall, and see the sense of history that it conveys. Then go walk through Sutton Hall, and Monroe Hall, and Senior Hall, all of which could have been done better. We compromised on those projects, but what we got were compromised buildings, and now we are in danger of damaging the integrity of the district. It is time to do the right thing, and start the process over.

Dr. Turbeville said that he did not have a lot to add, except that he remembered sitting as a member of this Commission seven or eight years ago when the proposals came forward to modify the buildings in the historic district. As far as he is concerned, this Commission was sold a bill of goods. Those 'restorations' are a joke, and the Hargreaves project would be the last nail in the coffin. This is not what historic preservation is all about.

Dr. Turbeville said that he did not want to bring University politics into this, but they desperately need new classroom space and they are reluctant to go to the legislature and ask for a new building. He said that we do not need to rape Hargreaves Hall by adding this abortion onto the back of it and calling it classroom space.

This building is an American icon, patterned on the Boston Public Library, which was the classic design for libraries of this period. Dr. Turbeville visited the Boston Public Library several years ago, and was struck by what a marvelous building it is, what a genius the architect was, and how perfectly, over a century later, it still does the job for which it was designed. He said that he realizes we are not going to use Hargreaves for a library again, but to hack it up into offices is not a winning situation, either. If this project goes forward as presented, we are going to lose something very important to our campus.

Chairman Hull said that the Commission would now like to take time to consider the presentations thoughtfully.

Ms. Evenson added that she was involved in the early 1980s with the Spokesman-Review renovation. Prior to the renovation, the first floor was fabulous, but according to the UBC, it was a big chimney all the way through. The building could not have remained as it was, as a museum; the building needed to function as a modern newspaper building. To say that a building has to stay exactly the same in order to function is incorrect. And although changed, at least the building is still there.

Ms. Evenson stated that she is a founding member of the Friends of the Davenport. Other than the first floor, the Davenport is entirely different. They were just happy for it not to be torn down; although parts of the building are gone, part of it is still there. She said that the Boston Library is fabulous, and it is still a library. But Hargreaves Hall is not ever going to be large enough to be a library, and support today's functions. She stated that she is ecstatic about this project, and the opportunity to return portions of this historic building to its original glory.

Commissioner Lauritsen asked if we are gaining two classrooms in total. Ms. Evenson said there are four classrooms on the third floor, and two classrooms on the second floor, for a total of six. The proposed addition would contain eight classrooms.

Commissioner Lauritsen asked if a separate building was placed in the parking lot, would that be preferable to an addition onto Hargreaves from Dr. Galm and Dr. Turbeville's standpoint? Dr. Galm said that it would be much preferred that the new portion not be attached to the historic structure.

Chairman Hull agreed, and stated that while she understands what they are trying to do, all that glass does not maintain the sense of the historic core of the university. Now, when you walk down the core of campus, you see the modern, not the historic.

Ms. Evenson said that the original building will still face the historic district, the President's House, and Showalter. The back side of the building will face Tawanka, Isle Hall, and Patterson. With the addition, the classrooms can share all the 'services' of the original building, which would not be economically possible in a new building. The service area would be oversized for Hargreaves alone, without an addition.

Chairman Hull asked if there was a way to modify the exterior without all the modern glass; that is what just screams at you.

Ms. Evenson said that the idea of the glass actually makes it so the existing building is visible; you can still see it through the glass.

Dr. Galm said that our former president used to say, "It's a vision thing." We have an opportunity to restore this building. We have an opportunity to put this addition for classrooms on Cheney Hall, or the Computer Science Building, or the PUB, but this addition is incompatible

with historic building renovations in its entirety. A restored Hargreaves could fulfill a different function; we just need to have a different vision. Maybe the classrooms could be added somewhere else; maybe this in space in the great hall could be restored for a different function. But people are being moved out of their spaces in this building right now, under the assumption that this renovation is going ahead, regardless. We are completely out of sequence; we haven't afforded the community any opportunity to comment. It is a frustration that we keep coming into this process halfway through.

Ms. Evenson asked what exactly is the problem with Senior Hall. Commissioner Flinn said that the building was gutted. Ms. Evenson noted that it went from a residential use to a classrooms.

Dr. Galm said that the back side of the building is a prime example of what you do not do in historic preservation. These are principles that are taught on the university campus, but the University is not following them.

Mr. Moeller said that in looking at the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines, they do not say that register listing requires a building or district to be frozen in time and that no changes may be made. He felt Dr. Galm was drawing a line and saying that every aspect of the building needs to be protected.

Dr. Galm disagreed, but said that in this instance, the changes proposed are so substantial that he believes we will lose the historic district designation if they are completed. He said that he will be asking the State Advisory Council to come take a look. He has already had them look at Senior Hall and Monroe Hall, and he knows what they are going to say. They feel that we have already gone too far and compromised too much; we have lost too much integrity in these buildings, and the district designation is in danger.

Dr. Galm said that this is part of the disconnect on the campus, that we teach these principles, but we are not following them. You would think that something as important as the maintenance of this district would have garnered more attention by now. This is the fourth time in a row that procedures have not been followed. If this had been an issue of lead paint, or asbestos abatement, someone would have lost their job by now.

Dr. Galm said that this is not about taking classroom space away from the University. It is about preserving the district, about a change of vision which develops a different use for this building.

Mr. King said that unfortunately we won't get funding from the State for this kind of project.

Dr. Galm suggested that we won't know if we don't try, and that we currently have two champions of historic preservation in Olympia, Christine Gregoire and Lisa Brown. He feels that we need to make the effort to find funding for restoration, and not for renovation. We need to use our tools and resources to promote restoration.

Ms. Evenson reiterated that she is certain that they have followed the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines in developing these designs.

Commissioner Flinn noted that Ms. Evenson had used the Davenport as an example, and pointed out that while it is a wonderful piece of restoration work, they did not get NPS certification for tax credits because of the gutting of the upper floors, and the loss of the Pennington wing. She noted that this is a National Register district, which is purely an honorary designation. There are no restrictions unless state or federal funding is involved. This Commission does not have jurisdiction over the project. However, she urged Ms. Evenson to begin consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding the specifics, because it has definitely reached the point where their input will be essential.

Ms. Evenson said that Sue Lani Madsen had that conversation with Stephen Mathison, who requested this level of schematic before he began any sort of review.

Chairman Hull noted that a lot of the Guidelines can be left to personal interpretation on the vision. She suggested that if the changes are made to Hargreaves as proposed, and considering the changes which have already been made to the other buildings, if the district nomination were to be considered today, the effect of all of these changes together would make approval of the district questionable, in her opinion. There is a certain amount of preservation, and a certain amount of restoration, but it is getting to be a matter of community opinion and how people are seeing it.

Ms. Evenson added that Hargreaves is deteriorating. You have money in your hands right now, to fix it. This is just an addition. The addition could be ripped off in 50 years, and the historic building will still be there, restored and intact. It won't be torn down, or so far gone that it can't be fixed. You have the money in your hands right now, and the ability to support this project and see that it is restored to its original grandeur. If you stop this project, you may never get it back again.

Dr. Galm said thank heavens that the people who run St. John's Cathedral and Notre Dame don't think that way. This is an argument that we trot out every time we want to get a building done fast, because 'we've got the money right now.' But if we had gone through design review right from the start – which includes the selection of the architect – we would not be here today.

Mr. Moeller asked who they were supposed to have contacted at the beginning. Dr. Galm said that Steve Emerson was appointed to that position years ago, and has never been contacted with regard to the renovations of these historic district buildings. The University's own procedures say that when anything is done within the historic district, you're supposed to notify the preservation community at the very beginning of the process. Every building that has a grant in it, located within that historic district, has a commitment to follow and pursue appropriate guidelines pertaining to historic preservation.

Mr. Moeller said that they did select the architect based in part on their past experience with renovations.

Chairman Hull thanked the guests for their comments, and noted that anything the Commission said at this point would be a preliminary opinion, and that they would like some time to consider the presentations that were given.

Commissioner Stewart thanked Dr. Galm and Dr. Turbeville for coming to the meeting, and stated that their passion for preservation is noted by all. Passion is always worthy and appreciated, and passion is what changes things and gets things done.

Commissioner Stewart also thanked Ms. Evenson, Mr. King and Mr. Moeller for coming, and for their presentations. She stated that Ms. Evenson's passion for her work is also noteworthy.

Chairman Hull added that restoration of that reading room, alone, would be a wonderful contribution to the district.

NOTE: Dr. Galm, Dr. Turbeville, Mr. Evenson, Mr. King and Mr. Moeller left at 6:25 p.m.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Mutschler suggested that it would be very helpful to have some representatives from DAHP involved in this conversation. He noted that the renovations to the Red Barn were approached much more appropriately, as they brought the plan to the Historic Preservation Commission early in the process, when comments were received in time to have an effect on the project. The reason there is so much ire on the part of the faculty members is that the process has not worked on any of the buildings in the core of the campus. It is like coming in at the middle of the movie.

Commissioner Stewart said that it is fairly serious if the district listing is in jeopardy because of the improvements which have already taken place. As she walks around campus, she notes that the buildings are beginning to take on a similar look, marrying the new to the old as was done at the Computer Science Building with the new Engineering Building, and as with Senior Hall. She recognizes that getting the building dollars is a very competitive situation, and can see both sides of the issue. If the passion expressed here serves to make people more aware of the issues, then a lot of good will come to historic preservation.

Chairman Hull agreed, and said that passion won't show up on the accounting sheets, and that just doesn't meld very well. But if you were trying to make that into a historic district right now, and what has been proposed were already done to Hargreaves Hall, would that become a historic district? She does not think so. So we are slowly but surely eating it away.

Commissioner Mutschler said that he would really like to have the input from DAHP, because they deal with these issues on a daily basis. Their recognition of what the Secretary of the Interior will or will not accept is much better. Having said that, reading the Secretary's Guidelines, it seems they are fuzzy enough that you can make a good argument, if you are in Mr. Moeller's shoes, that they are compliant with the Guidelines.

Commissioner Flinn agreed, and said that was the point she was trying to make about the Davenport. The renovations did not meet the NPS standards to the point that they qualified for tax credits.

Commissioner Mutschler noted that Dr. Arévalo has an accounting background, and he is trying to make the best possible use of taxpayer dollars, and that is not an unreasonable objective. The problem is in trying to balance that with the concept of how you protect historic resources. What has hurt is the tendency of the University to involve the preservation community quite late in the process.

Discussion continued.

Chairman Hull asked Ms. Beeman to summarize the discussion and list areas of concern, and to contact DAHP for their comments on the proposal. We will offer a letter of opinion on the proposed Hargreaves project, but would like to hear from DAHP before we finalize that document.

Ms. Beeman said that in general, she was hearing that the Commission feels the proposed renovations would have a negative effect on the integrity of Hargreaves Hall, and by extension, on the National Register Historic District.

Chairman Hull said that was correct, and not necessarily because of the Hargreaves renovations alone, but because of the cumulative effect of this, along with the rest of the district building modifications which have already occurred.

Chairman Mutschler suggested that there are really two issues here: one is the end result, that that we would like to see buildings preserved and restored. The other issue is process, and if the process had been followed from the beginning, this would not have become such a contentious issue.

Ms. Beeman will contact DAHP and will distribute their comments to the Commission when they become available.

**Commissioner Reports:** None.

**Staff Reports:** None.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, Chairman Hull adjourned the meeting at 6:59 p.m.

**Approved:**

---

Bettye Hull, Chairman

---

Susan Beeman, Secretary