



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes Historic Review Board

Tuesday, November 26, 2013

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chair McLoughlin called the meeting to order at ?? PM.

2 Discussion Items:

Willamette Falls Legacy Project- Community Conversation

Break for Dinner- meeting will resume at 7:00PM

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Public Hearing

HR 13-04 Approval of a new commercial building (Mike's Drive-In) in the McLoughlin Conservation District

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing and read the opening statement. He asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest or ex parte contact to declare.

Mr. Metson declared an ex parte contact. The owner contacted him by phone to ask for clarification on the design advice hearing that was held a few months ago.

All the Board members had visited the site.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, presented the staff report. This was an application for a new Mike's Drive-In on 7th and Madison. The existing structure would be demolished and a new building built along the 7th Street frontage. She explained the site plan, street view, and elevations. The Neighborhood Association had asked when there were design exceptions relating to materials, the Historic Review Board make specific findings on a case by case basis rather than inferring it was allowed by right for all new construction. The two elements in question were the metal awning and roll up garage doors. If the Board approved those, then findings would have to reflect why, and that it was not intended to be an amendment to the design guidelines. She asked for the Board's direction regarding the parapet on Madison Street and if it was not acceptable, she would like a recommendation that could be included in the conditions of approval. The other item was the parapet on 7th Street was proposed to be flat hardie panel which was outside of the recommended materials. Staff recommended making a finding that allowed this material or require the applicant to utilize a four inch lap siding along the parapet.

Todd Freeman, owner of Mike's Drive In, and Gregg Creighton, architect, were the applicants. The building was built in the 1950s and had many structural issues including a leaking roof. The roll up windows were only six feet tall, and could not be construed as a garage door. The parapet would give the building a presence on the corner and due to the topography of the site, the entry was forced to be in the middle. There was also a north entry directly off of the parking lot. There would be an outdoor window that could serve ice cream and shakes to pedestrians, so there would be outdoor as well as indoor service. They were using a variety of textures and colors on the building and samples were shown of what they were proposing to use. They then discussed the red metal roofing that was not allowed in the district.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner stated the applicant was using metal to bring in the element of the previous building as a mid century modern building. The Neighborhood Association wanted a case specific finding so it was understood that each time someone came in and proposed something outside of the design guidelines there were thoughtful findings as to why.

Mr. Freeman said the red metal roof was an accent to the building and would have a diminished effect.

There was discussion regarding eliminating one of the parapet walls on the Madison side of the building and using smooth lap siding instead of hardie panel.

Denyse McGriff, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, said the Association supported Mike's Drive In. In terms of the roofing, the Association did not have any issues with the red metal. The issue was it was not a material on the acceptable list. As long as the findings were site specific, the Association would be happy with it so it would not set precedent. The Association could find the roll up windows acceptable with site specific findings to allow them. They suggested instead of smooth hardie panel on the upper portion, it should be smooth lap to be more compatible. The Association was satisfied that the parapets would screen the equipment on the roof. They liked the fact the buildings would look like two distinct buildings. The Association thought this would be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

There was discussion regarding roof slope, HVAC system, and ADA accessibility to the second story bathrooms.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Ms. Towle thought they could approve the metal roof as it was Mike's Drive In signature logo and brand recognition. Mr. Metson agreed it was an essential brand recognition and an accent element.

Chair McLoughlin thought the Madison side parapet should have one drop instead of two. He was not opposed to the roll up windows. He did not think the hardie panel should be used.

Mr. Metson said the applicant was looking for a change in texture for the facade, but he did not think it needed to be panels. He did not see a need to deviate from the specified siding types such as lap siding.

Ms. Towle thought there should be a contrast on the siding.

Chair McLoughlin reopened the public hearing to get input from the applicants.

Mr. Freeman said the texture difference as he proposed would look very nice and be a compliment to the community. He thought they should try the product.

Mr. Creighton suggested using a board and batten treatment using smooth hardie paneling. They wanted a smooth texture to counteract some of the other design elements.

Ms. McGriff thought lap siding would look more appropriate than board and batten. The lap siding could have a different reveal.

Chair McLoughlin suggested a taller 6 inch reveal. Ms. McGriff agreed anywhere between a 4 to 6 inch reveal would be appropriate.

Mr. Metson asked if there was any Neighborhood Association discussion regarding the second floor windows.

Ms. McGriff said the neighborhood discussed it, but since the applicant made a lot of changes because of neighborhood input, they could live with what was proposed.

Mr. Metson said for commercial buildings there usually was variation on the first floor, but the second story windows were consistent all the way across the facade. In this application, there were broken up ones on the left as opposed to the grouping on the right, and he thought the grouping on the right could be separated to match the left.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Chair McLoughlin thought the siding could be a maximum six inch reveal on the entire Mike's Drive In building.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner added the following conditions of approval and additional findings:

Condition #1, the applicant shall redesign the parapet on the Madison elevation to reduce it to only one step down approach. Condition #2, smooth lap siding shall be installed on all elevations of both buildings and up to a six inch reveal on the restaurant portion of the building and a four inch reveal on the office portion of the building. If there was a change in reveal, the parapet shall be the smaller reveal. The roll up windows and metal awning would be approved. The findings for the metal roof was it was a signature brand recognition for Mike's Drive In and an accent element. The findings for the roll up windows was they were not doors but windows and were a modern take on a divided light window unique to a commercial building and a restaurant. The parapet and windows on the second floor were unique and allowed for variation.

A motion was made by Ms. Towle, seconded by Mr. Metson, to approve HR 13-04 with the conditions and findings as discussed. The motion carried by the following vote:

HR 13-05 Barlow Road Easement Modification

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing. He asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest or ex parte contact to declare. There was none. Mr. Metson, Ms. Towle, and Chair McLoughlin had visited the site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. This application came before the HRB in 2007 and received approval for a subdivision, but with the market at the time the applicant was not ready to move forward. With the market improving, the

applicant resubmitted the same subdivision application. The HRB would be looking at the Barlow Road overlay and preservation incentives being requested for the reduction in width of the lots. She gave a background on the Barlow Road Historic District. Staff found the applicant submitted a proposal that allowed for an open visual corridor to be created that connected to an existing Barlow Road easement to the north. Staff also found that the proposed offset did not compromise the visual corridor and by placing it adjacent to a future right of way and public easement area the road could be accessed by the public. Staff recommended the HRB require the applicant to utilize Option 1 for the road which was a slight alteration to the west. It would maintain a visual open corridor, the applicant could redevelop the property to the extent of the zone, and provide good use of land within the City limits in an orderly fashion. The preservation incentive was to make lots 4 and 5 56 feet wide instead of 60 feet wide. She thought it was a reasonable request to allow longer skinnier lots as the City was asking for a reduced front setback.

Kiersten Van Loo, Landmarq Consulting Group, represented the applicant. The Barlow Trail was famous and an important part of history. However the piece of property that was left over after preserving the trail was shaped miserably for residential development with a very busy street and no individual passenger vehicle access. Option 1 kept the approximate mapped center line within the 30 foot wide easement, made a snaky move through the property, created large front yards for lots 3, 4, and 5, and connected to the easement to the north. Option 2 was the preferred option of the applicant because it realigned the center line for modern street construction and straightened out the alignment of the old trail and would reduce the amount of front yard and make larger back yard on lots 3, 4, and 5 that would be dedicated to the easement. Either option was acceptable. The reduction of lot widths for lots 4 and 5 was being requested due to the shape of the parcel, access, and to pay homage to the alignment of the Barlow Trail.

Bob La Salle, representing the Park Place Neighborhood Association, said the Association had some concerns regarding this development. They had submitted a letter in September to the Planning Department.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner and the HRB had not seen that letter. The letter was submitted as Exhibit 1.

Mr. La Salle said the specific areas of concern were that the lots did not meet City requirements in regard to width. They did not think the historic corridor had an impact on the lot width. Lot 6 was under width due to a storm drain facility between lot 6 and Holcomb Boulevard. The side yard should be 9 feet and 7 feet for an R8 designation, and the applicant proposed 5 feet and 5 feet. They did not see any reason the lot widths should be allowed to be less than R8 designations required them to be.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner explained the subdivision application was currently being reviewed by staff. This was the proposed layout, but if the applicant was not requesting a reduction in the setbacks a builder would meet the setbacks when it was developed.

Denyse McGriff, resident of Oregon City, asked questions regarding the Barlow Road, how residents would be made aware of the corridor, would they be able to fence their backyards, would fences obstruct the view, and was there going to be something on the individual deeds.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said fences were not regulated and were allowed. The HRB could add an extra condition to make sure the restriction was recorded as a document so it would be included with the deed to the properties. For a subdivision,

applicants were required to develop 80% of the density of the zone and not allowed to under build. If the reduction was denied, most likely a lot would need to be dropped and there was a question of whether that would make the development drop below the 80%.

Ms. Van Loo said the easement would be a 35 foot wide view corridor paying homage to the Barlow Trail and would be recorded on the plat and would show up on every individual title report for any subsequent property owner. The easement was running in the front yards of lots 3, 4, 5, and 6 and the City did not allow six foot fences in the front yard. The view corridor would go from Holcomb Boulevard to the north property line of lot 3 where you would see a six foot tall fence from an existing property owner. That was the best they could do. They wanted to keep the lots as proposed. Because they had to consolidate accesses and do a group of flag lots, there was a very restricted lot layout. The reduction in the lot width would correspond in the reduction in the width of the house so the houses would meet the correct setbacks. They were doing the best they could with a difficult piece of land.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner ran the numbers, and confirmed they could not drop a lot and stay within the 80%.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Mr. Metson said the preservation of the corridor was a generic line on a map and was not precise and they had to match it up on both ends of the property.

Chair McLoughlin thought reducing the lot widths was reasonable and preferred Option 1.

Mr. Metson also had no problem with the lot widths and Option 1. The finding for the width reduction was it would meet minimum density standards for the housing units, and the finding for the Barlow Road alignment in Option 1 was that though the known route was inaccurate, they would be keeping the assumed center line of the road within the view corridor.

A motion was made by Mr. Metson, seconded by Mr. Siewert, to approve HR 13-05 with the preservation incentive and Option 1 as proposed by the applicant. The motion carried by the following vote:

5. Communications

There were no communications.

6. Adjournment

Chair McLoughlin adjourned the meeting at 9:05 PM.