



CLARK COUNTY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

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

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, September 5, 2018 - 6:00 p.m.

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.

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

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

Approval of the Meeting Minutes from August 15, 2018. Gall moved to approve the minutes with edits and Denniston seconded. Meeting minutes were approved.

Public Hearing: Nomination to Clark County Heritage Register – Sedgwick Building (801 Washington Street, Vancouver (aka Murray’s Corner)): This nomination came before the commission in 2016 and the commission recommended that the building not be added to the CCHR at that time due to the need for more research to be conducted on the building’s history and the fact that the application did not meet the criteria. Person read highlights from the staff report for the 2018 nomination.

- The statement of significance for the nomination identifies Criterion 5 relating to “persons of significance in national, state, or local history”.
- The nomination provided biographical information on the original owners Cyrus W. Sedgwick and his daughter, Dr. Isabelle Sedgwick.
- Dr. Sedgwick constructed the building and ran her practice from the building at a time when there were very few female doctors in the region.

Chamberlain, on behalf of the applicant, provided some additional info:

- There was no information available about the contractor or architect.
- Property is very unusual in Vancouver as it was built by a woman entrepreneur just after the turn of the century. The history trumps the building itself.



Questions from commission:

- Gall asked if Dr. Sedgwick practiced in the building for a long time. Chamberlain stated that Sedgwick's association with the building was from 1907 to 1913 and that she moved to eastern Oregon in 1913. There is no documentation explaining the reason for the move.
- Hinds asked if there was ever a plaque or sign on the building. Chamberlain stated that there is a reference in the newspaper to it being called the Sedgwick building, while Sedgwick occupied it. No plaque or sign is known to have been on the building.
- Denniston asked if it is known what the underlying materials in the building are. Chamberlain replied that it is probably brick. She has a theory that the stucco might have been added in the mid-1930's, but she has no evidence to document this.

Hinds opened the floor to public comment. There was no public comment. The public hearing was closed and the floor was opened to the commission for deliberation and a motion.

- Hinds stated that the nomination establishes Dr. Sedgwick's historical significance and states that he thinks the nomination is eligible for the heritage register.
- Denniston stated that the building's design in terms of massing and fenestration meets the criteria, even if the exterior materials are not original. Because the significance of the building is more about of the person rather than the building, it therefore meets the criteria.
- Kapitanovich appreciates the documentation of the history of the owner and her significance.
- Gall moved to approve the nomination of the Sedgwick building to the CCHR. Hinds requested that the city ensure that the correct topographic map is included in the nomination. Manley seconded. All approved.

New Business:

1. Clark County Poor Farm (78th Street Heritage Farm): This is a request for feedback on the proposed awning over the ADA door at the west entrance of the Administration building. This application will be for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Annette Vary-Getty, applicant from WSUV, presented to the commission.
 - Vary-Getty explained that the wooden ADA door along the west entrance of the administration building is exposed to the elements and gets very brittle and splintered, making it difficult to grab the door handle.
 - The door was recently replaced and is scheduled for more maintenance soon.
 - The awning will help provide cover to people as they enter and will help protect the door from weathering.
 - The new west parking lot means that the west entrance is used more frequently.
 - There used to be a porch at the west entrance.
 - The proposed awning attachment to the building will not be permanent and can be easily removed in the future. She showed a drawing of an awning with two support legs that would cover the entire area and also explained that the awning can be constructed without legs but will not extend as far out from the door. She passed around fabric samples that could be used on the awning.

Questions from the commission:

- Kapitanovich asked if the doorway is historic. Vary-Getty replied that the door has always been there, but the ADA ramp is a newer addition to comply with code.
- Manley asked if the awning would be attached above the light. Vary-Getty replied that it would.
- Hinds asked if the awning would obstruct the light from the door. Vary-Getty said she will ask about it.
- Manley asked which fabric sample she preferred. Vary-Getty said she preferred the medium brown fabric.
- Manley asked what the building wall was constructed of (stucco on masonry). Vary-Getty stated that she is not sure.
- Gall stated that this west entrance has already been altered for the ADA ramp and it doesn't seem like adding an awning will detract from the historic nature of the building.
- Hinds stated that the nomination should demonstrate how the application responds to the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.
- Denniston stated that there are two things to consider as the application is prepared. One is how you plan out the awning. Second are the things we like to see to as we make the decision. Because it is a modern awning, you don't need to worry too much about the standard concerns about differentiation because the awning is not original to the building. You don't want to give the impression that it is original to the building. In general, it should disappear as much as possible and not obstruct the building and change the way the building looks.
- Denniston stated that a bigger concern is how the awning is attached to the building. If you were doing a permanent connection, it would need to have counter-flashing so that it is not subject to water infiltration. It may be better for the awning to be free standing with four pillars so that it doesn't have to be bolted to the building. The HPC will want to see drawings of how the awning will be constructed and how it will look on the building.
- Gall stated that the drawings presented here don't give a clear depiction.
- Denniston stated even a drawing over a photo might work.
- Manley also has concerns about the attachment to the building and weatherization. There is an overhang, maybe only 18 inches, but it does offer some protection from the weather up high, and then the stepped fascia below the overhang offers some protection. It may have a drip edge at the bottom of that fascia. The two concerns about the attachment and weatherization is that it is probably ok if it is not flashed because of the two protecting elements on the wall. He suggested not placing it tight to the wall. With the anchor bolts, there is some concern as you have a 6 'x 8' sail and our prevailing winds are from the south and west. It may be difficult to project something off the deck to support the east edge of the canopy and prevent any racking or lateral movement of the canopy structure without pinning it to the wall somehow.
- Denniston stated he was concerned with the wind driven water that hits the wall and runs down. Manley stated you could leave a gap. Denniston agreed to leave a gap and have a mechanical connection.
- Annette stated that the awning company proposal was to attach the posts to the ramp. Manley stated that that would be the easiest and most effective way. Denniston stated that the ramp is not historic, so it wouldn't be a concern.
- Manley stated that powder coated framework and mounting posts could match the existing ADA hand rails and will help to make the awning and its supporting beams fade away.

- Denniston stated that the awning fabric will likely need to be replaced every few years. Manley stated that the lighter fabric colors might hold up longer than the darker shades.

The applicant will be back to the commission with the application when ready.

2. **Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs) Historic Categories:** Kamp is part of the county's PBRs committee. Open Space classification is one of the benefits for properties being on the local historic register. Current Use Program is a tax deferral program to protect commercially farmed land and land set aside for enjoyment and social well-being of the state and its citizens. Historic sites are eligible under the Open Space category. Eligibility for the benefit is that you have to be on the national register, the state register or the CCHR.
 - PBRs is a tool to evaluate the benefit to the community as well as the value of those benefits.
 - Under the Current Use program used by the county, everyone gets the same benefit. Under the PBRs, there is a rating system (with a scale) to determine the benefit assigned to each property.
 - PBRs allows flexibility to address unique land situations, provides tax options for those who no longer qualify for other programs, and empowers the community to further conserve.
 - 17 out of 39 counties in Washington have a PBRs. King County has a robust program that is being used as a template for Clark County to develop its own program.
 - King County's historic categories:
 - Historic landmark or archaeological site: buffer to designated site (native plant community)
 - Historic landmark or archaeological site: designated site on the local register (that is regulated)
 - Historic landmark or archaeological site: eligible site
 - The county's PBRs committee wants to seek feedback from the Historic Preservation Commission on historic categories by Wednesday, September 12.
 - Denniston stated that under the new proposed PBRs, the value could be reduced for historic properties if compared to the benefit they are receiving under the Current Use system. He suggested making the point value for historic properties under the PBRs as high as possible as historic preservation does have a public benefit. Benefit should be attached to an obligation to preserve. National register properties do not have an obligation to preserve. For eligibility, the SHPO makes the determination of eligibility. There should be an obligation to preserve before the property can get the benefit.

Old Business:

1. The 2019 Historic Promotion Grant applications are due by Sept 14. A subcommittee to select grant recipients will convene in early October. Manley, Kapitanovich, and Hinds volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.
2. Update on the July 2018 National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) conference in Iowa: Denniston attended the conference and gave an update on his presentation on the Jefferson Davis memorial. Denniston stated his takeaways:

- Clark County Historic Preservation Commission was very transparent, open, and respectful in the way it handled the delisting of the Jefferson Davis memorial and that we had a process for how to address our confederate marker.
- Other communities have much larger equestrian statues compared to our highway marker, but they didn't have a transparent process for delisting and removing the statues.
- Hinds stated that he got positive feedback when he made a similar presentation at the Revitalize Washington conference.
- Kamp requested that Hinds and Denniston submit their PowerPoint presentations from the conferences.

Chair Elections. Elections were postponed to the October meeting because two HPC members were absent from tonight's meeting.

Public Comment:

- October 1 is the deadline for the Valerie Sininski/Washington Preserve Grant Funds. Info is available at preserve.wa.org.
- October is Washington Archaeology Month.
- The Hillborn presentation at the Clark County Historic Museum is on Thursday, October 4, at 7:00 p.m.. Michael Houser is not able to attend, but he will share his Powerpoint presentation so that an HPC member can give the presentation. Hinds proposed to form a subcommittee for this consisting of Hinds, Denniston, Gregg, and Manley. Four is a quorum so staff will have to give public notice of their meetings.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.