



proud past, promising future

**CLARK COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Meeting Held: June 6, 2017

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Member Present: | Robert Hinds, Shell McKedy , Sean Denniston, Rob Heaney, Sarah Fox, Alex Gall |
| Members Excused: | Roch Manley |
| Staff Present: | Jacqui Kamp (Clark County); Jan Bader, Jon Wagner |
| Volunteers: | None |
| Guests: | Michelle Kapitanovich, Lisa Bayautet, Robin Summers, Aaron Wiliod, Mike True, Greta Sutton |

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

II. Approval of Minutes:

Shell made a motion to approve the minutes with the minor corrections. Sarah seconded. All were in favor.

III. Heritage Overlay Review(s) (Jon Wagner)

House of Providence (The Academy) 400 E. Evergreen Blvd.:

Representatives from the Trust gave the HPC and guests a quick tour of the Academy building and the campus, including the Laundry and Boiler buildings and the boiler smokestack (proposed for demolition). Returning back to the meeting room, the commission began the review.

Jon Wagner, Planner with the City of Vancouver provided a brief overview of the type of review (Heritage Overlay review) and the request to demolish and remove the Laundry and Boiler Buildings, Boiler Smokestack, and the El Presidente Restaurant. Jon stated that there would most likely be a request for the HABS/HAER documentation to be completed. Jessica, a historic developer consultant hired by the applicant went over the project. She stated there were 3 challenging issues:

1. Condition of the building (failing bricks, open trenches, machinery, etc.)
2. Restoration (change of use with seismic upgrade; building a wood building inside the masonry frame; ADA compliance)
3. Long and skinny size of building

The reasons for demolition of the Laundry and Boiler Buildings and smokestack are due to the extensive deterioration and safety issues. To make them code-compliant they would have to be substantially reconstructed at a high cost of \$420/sf to \$665/sf. The disparity between the cost to reconstruct and the value of the buildings is financially infeasible. The reason for the demolition of the restaurant building is that it does not contribute to the historic significance of the site and was built in a location that obstructs the view of the building and detracts from the Academy's significance.

Discussion from HPC:

- Sarah asked about the condition of the smokestack as the application material stated that it wasn't in that bad of shape. Jessica stated it poses a risk to those walking around
- Shell mentioned the smokestack near Chapman School in Portland that was saved
- Jessica explained that it has to do with the owner's level of risk they are comfortable with
- Aaron, the developer for the site stated that they could not take down the boiler room without taking down the smokestack. Multi-family is proposed for this area of the site.
- Sean stated that the smokestack is a landmark and is significant and asked if they've done an economic analysis. He strongly encourages limited demolition of all the buildings except for the restaurant. He suggests minimal demolition if possible until they examine all creative options.
- Alex asked about level of documentation. It was requested that HABS/HAER level be considered.
- After considerable discussion, the final recommendation from the HPC was for the applicant to research creative opportunities for the laundry and boiler buildings and, most importantly, the smokestack.

IV. Old Business and Updates:

- **List of National Register buildings for potential plaques:** Sean suggested that the HPC use a scoring matrix with categories such as:
 - Accessible to public
 - Geographic representation
 - Lack of attention
 - Already has plaque

Jacqui will coordinate with Sean to put together the matrix for the HPC members to use and score prior to the next meeting.

- **County Poor Farm Cemetery Fence update and proposal feedback request:** Jacqui provided an overview of the Poor Farm cemetery Historical Promotion Grant award to remove the chain link fence that dissects the cemetery and install a new split rail fence that fully encloses the cemetery. During a public meeting with interested property owners, there was interest in considering corner markers for the cemetery and no fence. The county wants to provide security of the farm with a perimeter fence. The public meeting had mixed viewpoints on either moving the chain link fence to the eastern boundary of the cemetery or the western boundary (the property line). The county would like feedback from the HPC on what would be most appropriate for the historic site prior to submitting an application for Certificate of Appropriateness.

Questions/Discussion:

- Sarah Fox: Why does the county need to keep the cyclone fence? Jacqui responded that they need it for security to protect the research and other agricultural activities on the farm.
- Alex Gall: It makes sense to keep the connection of the poor farm and cemetery open and have the cyclone fencing along the parcel line to the west. The cyclone fencing is around the whole parcel already. Don't we want people to have access from the farm to the cemetery? Jacqui stated that is part of the Master Plan to have an interpretive trail and the cemetery would be part of the trail. A cyclone fence between the farm and the cemetery would not serve that purpose.
- Sarah Fox: It is also inconsistent with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, which advised not to do any digging. It would require more archaeological work.
- Alex: These cemeteries can be notorious for having burials outside of the plat. Did the remote sensing show or go beyond the cemetery plat. Jacqui stated that they most likely went a bit outside the plat, but used the plat as where the cemetery was planned to be. The report would have to be reviewed again to answer what their exact area they used for the work. That information can be

provided. Alex stated that moving the fence to an area that may also have burials can open a can of worms on the archaeological side.

- Sarah: I agree. I would recommend that they do not put the fence back up. Jacqui stated that the county needs the fence for security and explained that it does go around the entire property except for the cemetery piece.
- Alex: Moving the fence to the cemetery boundary, the western boundary would be more feasible.
- Robert: This will come before the commission. The county wanted to see if the HPC had a preference on the fence style for its appropriateness to the historic site for these two styles. The two styles are the split rail or corner markers.
- Sean: Any pretend historic style fence will be inappropriate and will create a false sense of historicity. Whatever they choose needs to clearly not be historic. So, either these split rail examples or other rustic, or old timey fence would be inappropriate. Corner markers are great and are easy to differentiate. They don't confuse. A modern fence that is sensitive to the area would be ok, but you have the excavation issue.
- Robert: Good point as that applies to building additions but can be used here
- Sean: It is the same as preserving a cultural landscape. It is important to consider that.
- Sarah: The issue I have with the corner markers is whether you can clearly see to each corner if vegetation is in the way. Maybe periodic boulders along the boundary.
- Sean: A vegetation boundary may be worth considering. You have the digging issue though.
- Robert: I agree with Sean and that anything that is faux history would be inappropriate.
- Sean: It would have been different if it was a reconstruction of what was there.
- Something sympathetic to its surrounding.
- Rob: The split rail fence has been around for 100 or more years. The zigzag is common in a sheep fence. I don't think I have seen a cemetery with a zig zag split style fence, so maybe the argument would work to use that.
- Lisa Bayautet: My historic research has shown that these cemeteries would be rolling open hills and picturesque.

V. **New Business and Announcements:**

- **Hillborn archive update:** Robert provided an update to the HPC about the archives at WSU and the idea of putting together an exhibit somewhere in the county of some of the drawings. It was suggested that we narrow down to those of the most significant and pair photos with the description. There was also discussion on digitizing the materials.
- **RevitalizeWA debrief:** Sarah, Shell and Robert attended and provided the commission with the highlights of their trip which included teaching kids historic preservation; taking pictures of properties before they are gone; and about downtown Ellensburg's renaissance due to in part to using the Main Street approach which includes the importance of historic preservation.
- **2018 Historical Promotion Grant:** Jacqui informed the HPC that it looks like there is enough in the fund to have a grant program next year. She will be asking the commission in August/September for volunteers to participate as grant application reviewers.
- **Section 106 – Cedar Village-Barn:** Jacqui provided a brief overview of the review and development of a Memorandum of Agreement for the demolition of a barn that is eligible for the National Register. Alex is also consulting on the project. Sharon has been participating on the conference calls to stay updated on the mitigation plans. We will keep the HPC posted to its progress.

VI. **Public Comment:**

- Robin Summers asked if the Academy campus was on the National Register. It is however the Historic Preservation Commission doesn't have review authority over National Register properties,

only Clark County Heritage Register properties. Sean explained that there are benefits for NR properties, but the only thing that can be done if something occurs to the building is to have it taken off the National Register list and you lose the benefits. What they are proposing would not take it off the register.

- Lisa Bayautet: Applauds the efforts of this and the communication regarding the farm. Tried to involve myself in what is going on. There is a lot going on out there. I advocate for keeping the cemetery open. And I want to make three points. First, the security issues going on at the farm, do not parlay to the outer areas. I would suggest strongly, I believe the neighborhood has done a large part in nothing happening there. I know there are no gravestones there but the neighborhood has contributed to mowing and trimming. With the split rail fence I would have a hard time getting my mower over it and there is also a concern with fire as there are a lot of fireworks in the area. I don't believe my subdivision should have been built knowing the cemetery was there. I like the idea of the four corner markers. If you look at the National Park standards they are open and rolling and landscape was important. Stones are a good idea. Public access has been a huge issue. Ideally I would love to see gates that open and close. The main gates have issues with whether it should be gardeners and it's not very welcoming to have people meander through. Having access should be more than going in the front gate. It should be how communities interact. Ideally, I'd like to see the perimeter fence be at least 6' in all the way around and have a path all the way around. Thousands of people live around that farm property and it would be great to allow all of them access to the property. I have heard that when the fence comes down that would become the path that would be accessed and I think that is wrong as there are burials there. I think it should come up along the edge of the cemetery/property.
- Robin Summers said she was concerned about the maintenance of her fence as she is on the western boundary if another fence was right next to it and would like some room between them. Take the barb wire off. Also she likes the idea of foliage/vegetation boundary. There are also significant trees, big Doug Firs and cherry trees along the property edge.
- Jacqui updated the HPC that the July meeting falls on July 4. It was decided to cancel the July meeting.

VII. Meeting adjourned. Sarah made a motion to adjourn and Shell seconded. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.