Agenda from SHLC Retreat

**(Leaders)  and Topics: [Resources/Reading Materials]**

1. (Larry & Ray) A discussion on how the Commission and Register can be a larger part of the historic narrative and reflect the diversity of Spokane / Insights into how successful commissions in other communities operate
2. (Dave) Roles & responsibilities of Commissioners and the role of committees**[PLEASE BRING YOUR COMMISSIONER NOTEBOOKS!!! the**[**2019 notebook is linked here**](http://www.historicspokane.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Complete-Member-Notebook-2019.pdf)**.]**
3. (Betsy & Jacque) Review of regulations relating to demolition and rehabilitation of historic buildings with an emphasis on WINDOWS!!! [**Please**[**review this proposal from Betsy]**](http://www.historicspokane.org/wp-content/uploads/Alternative-window-approval-proposal-Betsy-Bradley.pdf)
4. (Dave & Larry) A discussion on whether we might take steps to improve the quality of register nominations / What should be in a nomination and what shouldn’t? **[Larry would like the Commission to review**[**this guide for nominations from Missouri**](https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/docs/National%20Register%20Guide.pdf#.XQrFQKvL5kE.gmail)**. This guide may be overkill, but a starting point. Here is**[**our current SRHP nomination guide.**](http://www.historicspokane.org/wp-content/uploads/Spokane-Register-Nomination-Guide-2018.pdf)**]**

Notes from SHLC Retreat

Key: RED – Staff Commitment / GREEN – Commissioner Commitment / BLUE – Wish List Item

**Larry and Ray: How does the commission take on a bigger role?**

Larry would like to see the commission assert our authority over the historic issues city wide. For an example, he brought up Spokane Parks signage in Nettleton’s and other interpretive signs that have missed the mark.

There was lots of discussion about advocacy and how SHLC can do that.

Staff explained the changes in the city ordinance that does not allow any person to nominate a property.

Larry proposed that the commission assert itself in ongoing projects in the city, particularly signage in parks. Megan committed to initiate a conversation with Garrett Jones in Parks. Megan reminded that commissioners would need to be involved in that process.

Betsy mentioned that parks and schools have their own governance systems which can make it more challenging.

Ray focused a conversation on the ways that our nomination reflects the history of Spokane.

Ray encouraged an analysis of our currently listed resources in order to “find the gaps” in what we already have listed and where we can focus future efforts.

How do we as the commission advocate? Why is staff resistant to advocacy? Megan explained her understanding of the role and level of advocacy that is appropriate for our office.

Dave explained that SPA was formed to fill the advocacy role in Spokane.

Sylvia suggested the SHLC be involved in U District Façade Improvement Grant. Staff agreed that would be a great collaboration and that we have been somewhat involved – we have shared the survey that was conducted by HRA of the street with the Urban Design staff. They have consulted with the HP office on projects involving those buildings that were found to be eligible for listing.

The East Sprague survey came up and Megan explained its origins and funding source.

Ray said that he is interested in pursuing that type of work for the SHLC. Let’s look around the city and see what is eligible but that has not been listed.

Betsy brought up the challenge of getting from survey to nomination

Betsy also suggested that we might think about how in-depth or involved a Spokane Register Historic District Nomination should be.

Jacque summarized some of the discussion points and reiterated the commission’s desire to assert itself in projects that are already funded.

Larry suggests a wish list item: amend the Title 4 membership section to include new requirements: Tribal position, other positions?

Ray initiated a discussion about significance and improving nominations.

Betsy asked the commission if they want to be proactive or reactive, there was some division.

Ray suggested an analysis of our register to determine the gaps in the register. Identify key areas not represented on the register. Identify physical components of areas that are important to residents/users.

Betsy suggested that we analyze how many properties on the register have been nominated under category B for men versus woman.

Austin asked if one day of staff time could be dedicated to gathering data and analyzing the register. Staff said that a day could be committed to this and we could likely get some good analysis out of that time commitment.

Wish list item: an enhanced focus in the ordinance on preserving archeological sites, a tailored archeological program. (Waikiki, Drumheller Springs, Spokane River)

There was a discussion about design review and nominations committee having an additional informal meeting to discussion their recommendations. Develop more robust committee reports. Ideas generated having a committee meeting immediately following site visits or a conference call if committee members were unavailable directly after site visit.

Ray raised a question about the site visit timing. Should they be moved sooner? Ray also committed to meeting between the site visit and the hearing to sort things out.

Wish list item: Make a specific administration plan for each committee at the next time each committee meets.

**Whip around the room introductions –** the takeaway is that our commission has diverse and varied skills and experiences

**Betsy and Jacque: Windows!!!**

Betsy presented a new concept for window review that sought to incentive maintain original windows, but allows for changes to windows without review if incentives were not sought.

Discussion led some commissioners to question whether or not this proposal would actually incentivize maintaining original windows.

Some suggested a survey of all windows when an applicant is proposing to remove historic windows.

Although the commission was not open to trying Betsy’s proposal, commissioners were interested in pursuing Betsy’s goal of maintaining historic windows by finding some other way to incentivize retention.

Megan suggested a potential strategy where we might give a property owner the costs for new windows if the rehabilitate their historic windows. Megan committed to looking into if something like this would be possible.

**Larry and Dave: Improving Historic Register Nominations**

Larry suggested that it would be good to update and expand our guide for writing Spokane Register nominations. He suggested that the Missouri guide is overkill, but might be a jumping off point as the commission considers improving our guide.

Commissioners suggested hosting workshops on writing nominations and taking advantage of incentives

**A guidebook committee tasked with improving the nomination guide was formed. Current members are Betsy, Dave, and Larry.**

Someone suggested that staff could write nominations for nonprofits when staff time allows for that. Staff was open to this suggestion. Should we advertise this? Or just address as they come on a case by case basis?

Ray suggested that the deadline for nominations be increased from 4 to 6 weeks to provide more time for editing and feedback.

Wish list item: Commissioners suggested that staff create a preliminary nomination application form, a sort of outline, so that staff and the historians can provide initial guidance on what specific elements would be important to include in the nomination.