MEETING NOTES
Tuesday, June 4, 2019 - 6:00 p.m.
City Hall, 415 W. 6th St., Vancouver

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present:</th>
<th>Robert Hinds, and Michelle Kapitanovich, Sarah Fox, Andy Gregg, and Alex Gall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members Absent:</td>
<td>Sean Denniston and Roch Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Present:</td>
<td>Jacqui Kamp (Clark County) and Jan Bader (City of Vancouver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests:</td>
<td>Holly Chamberlain (The Historic Trust), Jean LaCrosse, Patience Stuart and Tim Wood (AECOM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

II. Approval of the Meeting Minutes from May 1, 2019. Gall made a motion to approve the minutes and Kapitanovich seconded. Meeting minutes were approved.

III. Old Business and Updates

I. Demolition Review Policy Analysis presentation: Patience Stuart and Tim Wood from AECOM presented the demolition review policy analysis for historic resources. Five Washington CLG jurisdictions were researched (Bainbridge, Bellingham, Port Townsend, Spokane, and Walla Walla) that have a demolition review program as well as comparable CLGs in the U.S. (Alameda, CA; Wilton, CT; Santa Monica, CA; and New Castle County, DE.

   o Demolition Review Considerations
      ▪ Demolition delay – provides review of proposed demolitions to assess historic significance; if significant, alternatives could be considered
      ▪ Demolition denial – for designated sites, like the Waiver of Certificate of Appropriateness
      ▪ Documentation – Plans, photographs, elevation drawings, etc.
- Evaluation – boards/commissions that review demolition proposals and determine if eligible for listing – some jurisdictions initiate landmark designation process
- Designation – if meets criteria for designation, it is designated
  - Recommendations
    - Age – 50 years is most common, 45 is common with Section 106
    - Location: Districts, Overlays, Main Streets (Ridgefield, Camas, Vancouver) include it in a demo checklist
    - Existing inventories, and/or registers (Dept. of Agriculture Century Farms)
    - Change to permit application forms
      - Include photos
      - Historic info
      - Tax/property records
      - Verification of overlays
      - Checkbox stating historic review required – separate historic review form for properties that meet limitations
      - Demo alternatives
  - Staff role
    - Enter info and photo in local inventory
    - Assess eligibility for CCHR
    - Request/conduct research to better understand significance
    - Enter info into WISAARD
    - Notify public/interested parties about demo proposal
    - Consult with DAHP
    - Include conditions for alternatives
  - SEPA – interpret SEPA language for historic resources if property has recognized historical significance
    - Designated local, state, or national
    - Resources previously identified as listed or eligible for listing
    - Review permits for all potentially historic properties to determine if property is historically significant and triggers SEPA (alternatives are then considered)
    - Consult with DAHP for comments on eligibility to Washington Heritage Register and/or NRHP
  - Consider demo delay and/or preservation initiatives
    - Consideration of adaptive reuse opportunities
    - Examination of alternative locations and property owners
    - Material salvage
    - Feasibility assessment to determine financial and/or structural need
    - Demolition denial

II. Nelson Farmhouse: Informal review of proposed renovation of the interior and exterior structure listed in the CCHR.
Jacqui stated that it is her interpretation that the interior work would not require review by the HPC as nothing is stated in the nomination pertaining to the interior of the building.

Architect presented to the HPC the proposed work for the structure, which includes interior and exterior work. The exterior work includes:

- Replacing non-original aluminum sliding and plate glass windows with wood reproductions either custom made to match original design or high-quality wood manufactured product to closely match original design.
- Construction of a small addition to the existing contemporary kitchen bay under the existing patio roof. Non-original door will be removed to accommodate addition. The porch and wood rail will replace the existing concrete steps and landing.

Sarah – the addition is not visible from the street – wood windows are preference, but would review other options- keeping it within the footprint of the existing roof, doesn’t make a big impact.

Robert – Echoes what Sarah stated - HPC looks at Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, if it isn’t contributing or visible, if alteration or demolition that was added later on in the history of the home and doesn’t affect the character of the property, then it is fair game - Don’t recreate or replicate original appearance, should be able to visually see what the original building is.

Michelle – take out aluminum to more historic size of window looks really nice – refer to Sean on window questions - the work being proposed is being done tastefully with a lot of effort and care, which is appreciative.

Andy – selection of Marvin windows is good – very energy efficient.

Matthew - aluminum clad wood or all wood. Argument would be that the clad windows will look better over time than wood.

Alex – striking balance between the sympathetic feel to it and not an exact replication

Matthew will bring more photographs and samples.

III. New Business – City of Vancouver to nominate the old library to the CCHR

IV. Old Business

- Cultural Resource Summit – Well received – different than other presentations - many people from government to people that do the same archaeological work and wondering what can be done - after listening to AECOM presentation, Alex would like to give his presentation to them.

- PBRS Update: Jacqui reviewed the historic categories for the proposed PBRS program to get final confirmation from the commission. The three categories are:
  - CCHR properties (including contributing buildings in historic districts and archaeologically significant sites) – 25 points (75% deduction)
  - Eligible properties (listed in the National, State registers) – 10 points (30% deduction)
  - Buffer to CCHR or eligible properties – 10 points (30% deduction)
  - Bonus points for public access
Commission was agreeable to these categories and point values and liked the idea of the bonus categories for public access opportunities (historic home tours).

- CCHM’s First Thursday schedule: Members are to review schedule and inform staff if they are available to attend and speak about the historic preservation program.
- New members: Two new members have been selected and will start in July.
- HP Code and Intergovernmental Agreements: With the update of the county code last year, the intergovernmental agreements had to be updated. The City of Vancouver is interested in changing the appointment process for members with the city appointing two and the county appointing five. This would require a code amendment to increase the number of members from five to seven and indicate the changes to the appointments by the City and County. The appeals section would also need to be modified to reflect what the appeals process would be for properties in one of the cities. Staff is reviewing this proposal with county council next week, June 12 to request the action. It will then go before the HPC, Planning Commission, and back to County Council.
- Neighborhood Council presentations:
  - June 10 – Neighborhood Association Council of Clark County – Sarah and Andy are presenting.
  - Oct. 9 or Nov. 13 – Vancouver Neighborhood Alliance – Alex volunteered to present at either. Another member could assist.

IV. Certificate of Appreciation for Sarah Fox and Robert Hinds

V. Public Comment: Jean LaCrosse attended the meeting to understand what the commission does and to learn more about historic preservation in Clark County.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m. Hinds moved to adjourn, Kapitanovich seconded.