



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes Historic Review Board

Tuesday, September 27, 2022

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Convene Regular Meeting and Roll Call

Chair Blythe called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present: 4 - Board Member Grant Blythe, Board Member Paul Edgar, Board Member Ray Stobie, and Board Member Sabrina Ferry

Absent: 1 - Board Member Jessica Belknap

Staffers: 3 - Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardiner, City Attorney Carrie Richter, and Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich

2. Public Comment – *None.*

3. Public Hearing: **GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00010 Exterior Alterations to an Approved Project (columns) 1020 5th Street.**

Chair Blythe opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare including a visit to the site.

All Board Members had visited the site.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Senior Planner, said there were two applications tonight for the same site. This was a request for the addition of columns on the front elevation. She reviewed the conditions of approval, subject site, existing conditions, design of the columns, and findings. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

There was discussion on the dormers not matching what was approved in a previous application in 2021.

John Gruszecki, representing the applicant, explained the proposed round column design.

There was discussion regarding piers for the columns and porch roof.

Wendy Marshall, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, said the

neighborhood concurred with whatever the HRB's decision was.

Chair Blythe closed the public hearing.

The Board deliberated on the application, and agreed round or square columns were acceptable. There was consensus to add a condition of approval that the piers be included as proposed. It was suggested that an audit be done to make sure that what was approved previously was done. There was clarification that the approval tonight included the revised porch design in the staff report.

A motion was made by Board Member Edgar, seconded by Board Member Stobie, to approve GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00010 Exterior Alterations to an Approved Project (columns) 1020 5th Street with the revised conditions of approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 – Board Member Blythe, Board Member Edgar, and Board Member Stobie, and Board Member Ferry

GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00011 Resubmission for a full ADA Ramp Modification of HR 20-00001 -1020 5th Street

Chair Blythe opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare including a visit to the site.

All Board Members had visited the site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. This was a resubmission for a full ADA ramp with modifications. She entered new items into the record. She explained the previous reviews, balance of requirements, NPS Preservation Brief, subject site, photos of the street view, originally approved plans, previously denied ADA ramp, new proposed ramp to reduce the number of switchbacks, elevations, cross section analysis for an uphill side ADA ramp, and alternatives analysis. Staff recommended continuing the hearing for the applicant to provide findings that fully addressed the alternative analysis questions.

Carrie Richter, City Attorney, provided guidance on how the Board should balance the ADA requirements and the HRB design guidelines.

There was discussion regarding the obligations of ADA and how they applied to private residences, that ADA would trump local preservation protections but that did not occur until the HRB was satisfied that mitigation had occurred to the greatest degree possible and alternatives had been exhausted, it was in the HRB's right to include conditions to make the ramp more compatible, residential vs. commercial grade accommodations, and if the design was compliant with ADA requirements due to the elevation change.

John Gruszecki, representing the applicant, explained the main issues with the project, topography of the site, accessibility, retaining wall, why other options did not work, calculations for the ramp, previous design, new proposal, and how the site was on the fringes of the historic district. The main concern with other alternatives was being able to use them during an emergency when there was lack of power. Since the ramp was behind the building, it could not be seen from the street. Because the site was in a geologic hazard zone, the construction window ended in October and if the hearing was continued, they would not be able to finish it this year. The building was already near completion. The Building Department would have to review the ramp as well.

There was discussion regarding timing and continuing the hearing, alternative solutions, how the previous approval was for a door on the first floor that led to stairs on the second floor and this was a new proposal for a ramp to the rear of the house to the second floor, how far the ramps came off the back of the house, alternative materials to lighten the appearance of the ramp, and having the landing come off of the porch floor.

Wendy Marshall, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, supported staff's recommendation to continue the hearing for the applicant to submit the information needed including a descriptive narrative and drawings. Information from the Building Official needed to be included and they needed to clarify that it was the side door that was not wide enough, not the ADA ramp that was not compliant. The alternatives analysis had been requested many times and it needed to include in the comparison the ramp and everything that supported it. Regarding the construction weather, she thought there was a way to get a variance to do work in the wet weather. There were ways to get a disabled person downstairs in case of an emergency or getting a generator for the property.

Jilene Modlin, resident of Oregon City, thought there was a lot of information still needed from the applicant. She was in favor of the project, but wanted to make sure it was done right, and the people could get out if there was an emergency.

Mr. Gruszecki said there was confusion about the door width. It was 36 inches, and the accessibility standards were not limited to the width of the door. The staircase and door were already built and could not be altered. He hoped they could come up with a compromise so the owner could occupy the house in a shorter time. He did not think they had a choice but to extend the 120 day deadline.

Chair Blythe suggested the applicant provide as much detail as possible, especially for the alternatives analysis. Board Member Ferry also suggested clearer drawings and landscaping.

A motion was made by Board Member Blythe, seconded by Board Member Edgar, to continue GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00011 Resubmission for a full ADA Ramp Modification of HR 20-00001 -1020 5th Street to October 25, 2022. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 – Board Member Blythe, Board Member Edgar, and Board Member Stobie, and Board Member Ferry

5. Communications

None.

6. Adjournment

Chair Blythe adjourned the meeting at 9:22 PM.