



CLARK COUNTY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

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

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, December 5, 2018 6:00 pm

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.

These are summary, not verbatim, minutes.

Members Present:	Alex Gall, Michelle Kapitanovich, Sean Denniston, Roch Manley, Sarah Fox, and Andy Gregg
Members Absent:	Robert Hinds
Staff Present:	Sharon Lumbantobing and Jacqui Kamp (Clark County); Mark Person and Jan Bader (City of Vancouver)
Guests:	Holly Chamberlain, Lee Knottnerus, Brad Richardson

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

II. Approval of the Meeting Minutes from November 7, 2018.

Gregg offered amendments. Kapitanovich moved to approve the minutes with amendments and Manley seconded. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Public Hearing: Nomination to the Clark County Heritage Register – Ridgefield City Hall.

Lumbantobing gave a summary overview of the staff report. The HPC had no questions for staff. Fox invited the applicant’s representative to comment. Lee Knottnerus, Assistant City Manager for City of Ridgefield, stated that the City of Ridgefield wants to list the building on the CCHR. The City of Ridgefield was incorporated as a city in 1909, but has had inhabitants much longer than that, including the Chinook Indians. The city wants to maintain its small town atmosphere even as it continues to grow. Having the city hall building on the local register is important. They have worked very hard to retain the original materials on the interior and exterior of the city hall building.

HPC Questions for the applicant included:

- Are interior bank cabinets, counters and partitions are still in place? The interior furnishings are still intact; the vault and door are still intact and the front service counter is the original bank service counter.
- Who was the architect? The builder, Greeley, may have been the architect. There is no record of an architect.
- Will the city outgrow this building as a city hall? The city is already leasing space from the new school building to hold the city’s employees. The city will retain this building as a city hall as long as possible, and hope that it could become a museum at some point. One of the requirements of

the building owner is that it has to be used for a public purpose or it will revert back to the original owner.

The chair opened the floor to public comment. Brad Richardson, resident of Clark County, stated that he supports this nomination. This is a key site in the Clark County Historical Museum's historical walking tour and critical for the city of Ridgefield to maintain their historic downtown. Public hearing was closed.

The HPC deliberated:

- Given the exponential growth in Ridgefield, it's important to add historic buildings to the CCHR.
- Ridgefield residents really cherish their downtown and adding buildings to the CCHR is a point of pride.
- HPC members agreed with the staff report's findings.
- The nomination doesn't overly romanticize the building's architecture. It's a typical commercial building of its time and the nomination reflects that.
- The nomination was well written. Ridgefield could develop a long-term plan for when the museum could be developed and when other historic buildings in downtown Ridgefield could be listed on the CCHR.
- Ridgefield should consider a long-term plan to protect other historic buildings in its downtown core, including looking at the city's statutory requirements.

Denniston made a motion to approve the nomination. Gall seconded the motion. The CCHPC unanimously approved the nomination of the Ridgefield City Hall building to the Clark County Heritage Register.

IV. Courtesy Review: Spruce Divisions Storehouse (interior alterations) and Officer's Row (exterior maintenance)

Person gave a summary overview of the staff memo of Spruce Division Storehouse . It's in the Central Park Plan District and Historic Reserve Conservation Overlay. The applicant has initiated a 106 process for the sink installation. The plan is to have a sink and counter and two electrical outlets installed in the southwest corner.

Person gave a summary overview of the staff memo of Officer's Row. Replacement of a deteriorated porch is ongoing. This is also going through a Section 106; the process is completed and it has been approved by the National Park Service. The National Park Service (NPS) mills everything on site; they are handmade by NPS staff in a wood shop set up in the Post Hospital.

HPC and applicant comments:

- It is troubling to take an aggressive approach on a historic property when it may not be original to the building. Chamberlain stated that the renovation photos of Officer's Row show that a lot of pieces have been replaced. The building parts and what has been renovated over time have not been documented.
- It appears that no work on the building's pathology has been done to determine where the water is coming from. Chamberlain stated that the sprinklers are the prime suspect as well as the climate.
- Is there a plan to document which elements are being replaced during the current renovations in 2018. Chamberlain replied that the changes are now being documented.

- Bader stated that it would be easy to add the HPC as an interested party to Section 106 reviews for the site.

V. 2019 HPC Budget – Clark County Heritage Museum presentation

Brad Richardson, Exec Dir of the CCHM, thanked the HPC for sponsoring the 2018 Speaker Series. 375 people attended the talks this year and engaged with the county’s history through this program. The talks bring the museum’s collection alive and help people engage with the county’s past. Richardson provided an overview of some of the talks that were conducted over the past year. Richardson discussed the tentative calendar of the 2019 Speaker Series. Richardson made a request for a \$2,000 sponsorship from the HPC.

- Does CCHM videotape the speaker series? Two of the speakers in 2018 were recorded by CCTV. CCHM hopes to get a podcast set up in 2019 to start recording more of the speakers.

VI. Old Business and Updates

Review Draft Demolition letter:

The subcommittee met twice and drafted a letter to city councils, but there are still issues that need to be resolved. The subcommittee wants to have specific options to present to city councils. Clark County GIS has data on demolished structures and removes it from PIC/Maps Online. The goal is to capture that data and make it available for the public to view. The Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) was asked about what it would take for an Historic Property Inventory (HPI) to be filled out to their satisfaction prior to demolition. More discussion needs to happen with DAHP to reach a workable solution. The easiest option would be to include a checkbox for structures over 50 years old and photographs be taken. An electronic repository would be ideal for public accessibility and would include the built date, the scanned building cards, photos of the building, structural data.

The subcommittee is considering proposing an increase to the cost of demolition permits to cover the costs of recording. Some jurisdictions put a moratorium on demolition of buildings over a certain age. Some demolition permits require HPC review before they are approved. There are a lot of models but most are more intensive. There are not a lot of basic documentation models. The subcommittee will report back to the HPC with proposed options.

The Cultural Resource Summit in May 2019 will bring together cultural resource specialists, planners, and tribal groups. There is a call for papers and Gall suggested using the demolition topic for the summit.

Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs) Historic Categories:

Kamp gave an overview of the Historic Categories in the PBRs. Clark County is using King County’s PBRs as a model to build the system for the county. The subcommittee (Gall, Denniston, and Gregg) gave their input on the Historic Categories and now we are opening it to the HPC for input. Kamp explained that dollar values have not yet been assigned to the point rating system.

Regarding the first category, contributing buildings in a historic district should not get 5 points, but should be in the mid-range of the point system, such as a 2 or 3.

Regarding the second category (buffer), more work needs to be done to describe what is meant by buffer. This category is designed for historical landscapes and archaeological sites rather than historic buildings in urban settings. A buffer area is far less important than preserving views; perhaps you could get points for preserving views and viewsheds. King County has sample language for view corridors/view sheds. Clark County only has a few view corridors. The language could be written as a percentage, such as “the neighboring building obscures no more than 15% of the historic building”.

More information is needed about the landscape buffer. How many acres would need to be set aside to be a buffer to a historic property?

Buffers to archeological site should be a concentric ring around the site. Some developers will identify land as open space.

Because there is so much pressure to develop, the buffer should have a high value otherwise there is no other incentive for a property owner to set aside their land as a buffer.

What is the value we are trying to promote by having a buffer to a historic building? Need good examples of where this has had a benefit in a community, or drop buffer as a category.

The viewshed buffer (e.g., view from the public right of way) should have a 2-3 point level. The view corridor should have higher points than a view point.

Regarding the third category (eligible site), the county doesn't have specific criteria to establish “eligible” site. All we have is our 1999 Cultural Resources Inventory for some properties and it's not tied to code in terms of defining eligibility. Eligible properties could mean that “the properties have to be on a state or national register, and could be on the local register”. The word “eligible” and “national register” go together so often that it can be confusing; it would be better to use a different term than the word “eligible”. This category needs to be reworded. This category should receive a low point.

Regarding the bonus category, this wording might apply to resource restoration, like improving a salmon run or restoring cultural landscapes, like a Native American landscape, e.g., wapato. More detail is needed on this category.

Spokane County uses a very simple PBRs, while King County has a complex system. Perhaps the HPC wants to implement a simpler system in Clark County.

Regarding the second to last category (easements), the county can receive easements. The Columbia Land Trust is on the PBRs committee and they can receive easements.

Regarding the last category (Super Bonus), there is a concern about public access to archaeological sites, Native American cemeteries, native fishing sites, and rock art sites. Native peoples need to have access to these sites, but not the general public. It's hard to convince private property owners to incentivize them to give public access. This category could also be applied to the interior of a building, which is historically significant but which has no public access.

Update on 2019 HPG Grants: The county council approved the HPG recommendation for the 2019 HPG grants. Grant agreements were sent in the mail this week.

Update on interpretive panels: This line item (\$8,000) was not part of the recently approved county budget. The request will go into the supplemental budget in the spring.

The HPC meeting January is cancelled as no agenda items have been submitted.

Public Comment:

The Youth Heritage Project will be held in the second week of July. The preservewa.org website has more info.

Main Street and Revitalize WA joint conference is from March 24-27, 2019 in Seattle. Early bird registration is already open on the Main Street website. The cost is \$555 per person. Fox, Gall, Manley, and Denniston are interested in attending. Need to follow up with Hinds. Gregg and Kapitanovich are not interested. Staff will check the budget availability to see how many can be sponsored.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.