DECISION OF THE CLARK COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

TO: Clark County General Services, Owner and Interested Parties

FROM: Robert Hinds, Chair
Clark County Historic Preservation Commission

DATE: May 19, 2015

FILE: HST 2015-00002 Clark County Poor Farm (a.k.a. 78th Street Heritage Farm) – Design Review: Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed new parking area Pursuant to CCC 40.250.030.

NOTICE TO PARTIES OF RECORD
CASE No. HST 2015-00002, Clark County Poor Farm Certificate of Appropriateness review – Clark County General Services, Owner/Applicant

The attached decision of the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission will become final and conclusive unless a written appeal therefrom is filed with the Clark County Board of Councilors, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington, 98666 no later than 5:00 p.m. on June 2, 2015 (14 calendar days after written notice of the decision is mailed).

All appeals must be written and must contain the case number designated by the County and the name of the applicant, the name and signature of each petitioner for the appeal and a statement showing that each petitioner is entitled to file the appeal as an interested party in accordance with CCC 40.510.030(H); the specific aspect(s) of the decision being appealed, the reasons why each aspect is in error as a matter of fact or law, and the evidence relied on to prove the error.

The Board of County Councilors shall hear appeals of decisions on the record, including all materials received in evidence at any previous stage of the review, an audio or audiovisual tape of the prior hearing(s) or transcript of the hearing(s) certified as accurate and complete, the final order being appealed, and argument by the parties. No new evidence will be accepted.

*The Board of County Councilors may either decide the appeal at the designated meeting or continue the matter to a limited hearing for receipt of oral argument. If so continued, the Board shall designate the parties or their representatives to present argument, and the permissible length thereof, in a manner calculated to afford a fair hearing of the issues specified by the Council. At the conclusion of its public meeting or limited hearing for receipt of oral legal argument, the Board may affirm, reverse, modify or remand an appealed decision.

The case file is available for review at 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, WA between 8:00 am and 5:00 PM M-F. Contact Jacqui Kamp, (360) 397-2280, ext. 4913.
Delivered on: May 19, 2015
EXHIBIT I
HST 2015-00002, Clark County Poor Farm Certificate of Appropriateness application packet

PARTIES OF RECORD
May 5, 2015 Public Hearing

Clark County General Services
c/o Laura Pedersen
1300 Franklin Street, Suite 650
Vancouver, WA 98666

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES
Lisa Schmidt
Email: GetMarketingMatters@gmail.com
BEFORE THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OF CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

HST 2015-00002 – Clark County Poor Farm
1919 NE 78th Street, Vancouver, Washington
Design Review for Certificate of Appropriateness

Regarding an application by Clark County General Services for design review for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a proposed new parking area located at 1919 NE 78th Street, Vancouver, Washington. (Assessor Parcel #148084000)

I. SUMMARY

1. The Clark County Poor Farm (a.k.a. 78th Street Heritage Farm) is located at 1919 NE 78th Street, Vancouver (Tax Assessor Parcel # 148084000). The owner is proposing the construction of a new parking area on the west side of the main administration building.

2. Comprehensive Plan/ Zoning Designations: Public Facility/R1-6 (Highway 99 Overlay), Clark County

3. On May 5, 2015, at a duly advertised public hearing, the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission voted unanimously to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for a new parking area west of the administration building that includes only the paving and landscaping elements (not lighting or signage).

II. HEARING AND RECORD

1) The Clark County Historic Preservation Commission received testimony at the public hearing on this application May 5, 2015. A record of that testimony is included herein as Exhibit I (Parties of Record) and Exhibit II (Recorded Proceedings). These exhibits are filed at the Clark County Department of Community Planning, 1300 Franklin St., Vancouver, WA.

2) At the hearing, Jacqui Kamp, County Planner III, summarized the Clark County Department of Community Planning Staff Report and Recommendation to the Historic Preservation Commission dated April 15, 2015. Pictures of the site and the site plan are included in the case file.
   a. Staff noted that the site is listed on both the National Register and Clark County Heritage Register in 2013.
   b. The site had gone through a very extensive public involvement process to develop a concept design and master plan for the site. The whole point is to educate the public on sustainable agriculture practices, to learn about history and use it as an outdoor classroom for a lot of purposes. One of the elements of the master plan is for additional parking for the site.
c. Staff noted that the applicant is applying for a certificate of appropriateness for a 28,500 square feet parking area on the west side of the Administration building. The area is currently used as an informal parking area.
d. The application states that the parking lot will be designed to be an interpretive facility showing different Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices for paving and stormwater runoff. The county has received a grant from Clean Water for the project.

3) Staff recommended approval of the certificate of appropriateness based on the findings utilizing the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation for those applicable criteria.

4) The Clark County Historic Preservation voted unanimously to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the paving and landscaping of the parking lot proposal.

II. TESTIMONY

1. The staff reviewed the report, HST 2014-00002.
2. Commissioner Fox asked about the signage that is mentioned in the narrative and if it was part of the proposal.
3. Laura Pedersen, applicant, stated that there will be one interpretive sign that will explain the low impact development’s paving, pervious concrete and grasscrete. The sign has not been designed yet. She will bring the designs back to the HPC once they are developed.
4. Commissioner Fox stated that she would hope that the sign would not detract from the landscape and the historic site.
5. Kamp stated that once the signs are designed, it will be reviewed by the HPC.
6. Commissioner McKedy asked about the lighting plans mentioned in the application.
7. Pedersen stated there will be parking lot lighting – pole lighting. Commissioner McKedy asked if it will be period style lighting. Pedersen stated that there are lighting requirements per code.
8. Commissioner Manley asked about the landscaping details.
9. Pedersen presented a larger landscape site plan to the commission. She went over some of the details of the plan.
10. Commissioner Hinds stated that once the parking lot goes in the landscape will change. He can see the trees in the landscaping plan and asked if they were evergreen or deciduous. Pedersen stated there are both. His concern was mitigating the impact of the parking lot view from the street. Try and maintain the degree of greenery so the parking lot paving wouldn’t be as visible. Pedersen indicated how there will be some landscape that will screen. She also mentioned that there will be grasscrete, not just black top.
11. Commissioner Manley asked whether there was a maintenance plan. Pedersen stated that there was and that they were also looking into a vacuum. A vacuum is used to help keep the pervious surfaces from getting clogged.
12. Pedersen stated that they’ve been working on this project for 5 years. This will be an improvement as it will add some height and interest with adding colors with the changing of leaves and blooming flowering trees.
13. There was discussion among the commission and Pedersen on specific type of blooming flowers. Pedersen stated that the plants/trees are also subject to change depending on when construction starts. They are planning for the fall after the Harvest Fun Days, so the choices will depend on what’s available at the nursery at that time.
14. Lisa Schmidt, a neighbor of the site stated that she loves all that goes on at the site. It is a large activity center for the Hazel Dell area. She stated that the front of the site is still much like a farm and there isn't much lighting. She can see the lights of the baseball field down off St. Johns Road from her house. She questions why you need to light the area when no one is really there at night. Do you really need the lights? Regarding the landscape, she wants to encourage native plantings. Also, continue keeping the neighbors aware and marketing of things happening on the farm. She stated that this site is going to be much more valuable than can be imagined today. She's never seen anyone there at night.

15. Commissioner McKedy asked Schmidt if she thought the lighting would be a detriment to her property. Schmidt didn't think so, but she is worried that lighting may encourage activities that could have unintended consequences.

16. Pedersen stated that WSU does have evening classes at the site so there are night time activities.

17. Commissioner Manley asked about the gate. Pedersen stated that it is inoperable. Manley asked about the hours. Pedersen stated that they are normal business hours. Manley stated that maybe the lighting could be automated for when the site is being used for night.

18. Commissioner McKedy asked if some blooming flowers could be planted flanking either side of the entrance. Pedersen stated that the entrance will be widened. Schmidt asked if the fence was being removed. Pedersen stated that the fence is staying.

19. Commissioner Gall asked if she had heard from other neighbors. Schmidt said she had spoken with her neighbors and they are ok with the proposal.

III. DISCUSSION

1. Fox made a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the application with the caveat that it is only for the paving and landscaping. Applicant needs to return for another certificate of appropriateness for lighting and signage. Gall seconded the motion. All were in favor.

IV. FINDINGS

The CCHPC deliberated on May 5, 2015 and made the following findings:

1. Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the parking area paving and landscaping at the Clark County Poor Farm (a.k.a. 78th Street Heritage Farm).

V. MOTION

Fox made a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the application with the caveat that it is only for the paving and landscaping. Applicants need to return for another certificate of appropriateness for lighting and signage. Gall seconded the motion.
VOTE: Fox-AYE, Gall- AYE, McKedy-AYE, Manley-AYE, Hinds-AYE

IV. DECISION/CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

The Clark County Historic Preservation Commission approved the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the parking area paving and landscaping only. The lighting and signage will come before the commission when those elements have been developed.

List of Exhibits as Amended at Public Hearing (new or amended exhibits are bolded)

I. Parties of Record
II. Audio recorded Proceedings dated May 5, 2015

A. Staff Report
B. Design Review – Certificate of Appropriateness application packet
C. Clark County Heritage Register nomination
Clark County Historic Preservation Commission
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
EVALUATION
December 1, 2009

NAME OF OBJECT: Clark County Poor Farm (a.k.a. 78th St, Heritage Farm) HISTORIC INVENTORY

ADDRESS: 1919 NE 78th Street

Vancouver, Washington

OWNER: Clark County General Services

APPLICANT: Laura Pedersen

LIST OF FEATURES SIGNIFICANT TO DESIGNATION: Administration building, detached garage and milk house, bunk house, hog barn, machine shed, poor farm cemetery

OBSERVATION FROM SITE VISIT: Area is currently grass field used for parking

PROPOSED CHANGES TO PROPERTY: Construction of parking area

EVALUATION:

1. The Historic Preservation Commission decided to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed parking area paving and landscaping only.

2. ____ APPROVE. ISSUE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.
   X APPROVE. ISSUE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS WITH CONDITIONS.
   ____ DENIAL

Motion by Fox, seconded by Gall to:

Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for a new parking area west of the administration building with conditions that the signage and lighting plans come before them for a certificate of appropriateness when the plans are ready.

Motion carried.

Robert Hinds, Chairperson,
Clark County Historic Preservation Commission