



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes - Final

Historic Review Board

Tuesday, September 25, 2012

6:00 PM

City Hall, Commission Chambers

1. Call To Order

Chair Metson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present: 3 - Derek Metson, Cynthia Towle and Cynthia Towle

Absent: 1 - Robert Siewert

Staffers: 1 - Christina Robertson-Gardiner

2 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Discussion Items

3a. Ermatinger House Update

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, gave an update on the Ermatinger House. In December, the City put out an RFP for an architectural firm to do architectural engineering drawings for the Ermatinger House, and Maya Foty of Architectural Resources Group was chosen. Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the consultant's findings for the Ermatinger House including the importance of the building, historic and recent images, discussed the exterior, basement, and first floor issues to be addressed, and the proposed rehabilitation of those areas. She explained the proposed locations of the enclosed staircase, the proposed location of the ADA access entering from John Adams Street, which was accepted by the National Parks Service, the proposal to keep the additions of the house as is, but use the backside for the ADA bathroom, and a proposal for a full basement. The intent was to rehabilitate the house back to 1845 as closely as possible. She concluded with a discussion about the funding for the Ermatinger, reporting that 1/3 of the funding is still needed.

3b. 2012-2013 Preservation Grant Program Update

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, provided an update on the 2012-2013 Preservation Grant Program. She reported that, again this year, they have \$5,000 for grants, and she formally asked that the Board move forward with offering five (5) \$1,000 grants.

There was consensus to move forward with this process, as it has worked in the past. There was one question about clarifying the second category of non-window work, porch repair, siding repair, and foundation issues - what is meant by foundation issues

or repair? The consensus was to let the applicants know the Board might be hesitate, but not without a complete review. An application would more likely be approved for a foundation under the entire house versus an application requesting approval for a foundation under a porch or kitchen type addition only.

3c. 2012-2013 Historic Review Board Work Program

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, updated the Board on the 2012-2013 Historic Review Board Work Program and mentioned it could be reviewed again next month with other Board members. She received consensus that the Board is in favor of keeping the photo contest as a yearly event. The downtown nomination is still being worked on and will be moving forward with an RFP this fall or winter for, at least, the City properties. Priority number 3 is to conduct a staff audit to determine how unauthorized alteration occurred on the delist landmarks that have irretrievable loss of integrity and/or were demolished. This priority will not be moving forward due to lack of staff time. Priority number 4 was completed last month, which was to revise the existing Guidelines for Alterations and Additions and combined with previously adopted Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The City's Website has not been revised because of staff resources. Priority number 7, the Local Preservation Grant Program - Metro Enhancement Grant, has consistently not been funded and staff recommends that the Board cease applying. Priorities 8 and 9 are public outreach items that have not been done; these priorities can remain for future work session discussion. Priority number 10 is the Ermatinger House and will remain as a priority on the work plan. Metro spent funds from its open space program to conduct research about the Canemah Cemetery Road and will be giving a presentation, so this item can be removed from the Board's future projects list.

4. Communications

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, explained she added this agenda item to allow the Board members to share any preservation oriented issues and communications. Staff would like to use this to further the education aspect.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner shared that Bill Hawkins is doing a presentation on Federal Era and Territorial Era buildings in October and will be discussing the Ermatinger House. Further information may be found at www.visitahc.org. She concluded with an explanation of the new agenda look.

5. Future Agenda Items

There were no future agenda items.

Break for Dinner

The meeting was paused for a dinner break.

6. Public Hearing (to start no earlier than 7:00PM)

6a. HR 12-02 - 920 7th Street- New Construction

Chair Metson read the hearing statement describing the hearing format and correct process for participation. He asked if the Board had any ex-parte contacts, conflict of

interest, bias, or statements to declare.

Chair Metson opened the public hearing.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, explained this item was a request for new construction at the former Olson Pharmacy site. The Board was being asked if the proposal meets the adopted design guidelines and the applicable sections of OCMC 17.40 - Historic Overlay District since the property is in the McLoughlin Conservation District.

The applicant, Joe Van Lom of Architects VanLom Group, started by going over all the background information. He explained they attended the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association and implemented some changes from the suggestions provided. As a result, open space has been created on the second and third levels and attempted to match the Church House, which is next door (on 7th Street), with the bay windows and the projection forms above the windows. The applicant proposes the double windows, but is showing examples of both the single and double window options. He explained that the main entrance is on Monroe Street rather than 7th Street, mainly because of the slope of the lot and the building is right on the lot line. If the entrance was on 7th, ADA compliance would be difficult. Tonight's goal would be to approve the main entrance on Monroe or 7th Street, but not make it a condition of approval. This is a site plan review decision. The balconies on the building are simple metal balconies, and there will be tree planters on the roof.

Exhibit B entered into the record - the revised front drawings.

Tom Larus, Architect, explained they chose the vernacular style because 85% of the residential buildings in the neighborhood are that style, but they did keep the massing similar to the Queen Anne style.

Denyse McGriff, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, stated for the record that the neighborhood association felt because of the nature and size of the development the applicant presentation should have been heard together with the neighborhood association and either the Historic Review Board or another body. She expressed parking concerns. This development could cause conflicts or make it hard to rent the Church House apartments on the second level on the side abutting this property because of the open-space party area. She agreed with the vernacular style instead of going with the Queen Anne. She felt that more research and work was needed for the entrance on 7th Street to work. With using the existing wall that remains, it has restricted the options. The neighborhood supports the double windows instead of the single windows. There is concern about the overall massing of the building. She questioned how the little roof would be articulated, as it is right between the two buildings near the tree. Most of all the concerns are parking, parking, parking, and traffic. She said the overall, the neighborhood is supportive of the project, though change is difficult.

Charlie Swan, previous owner of the Church House and owner of property about 1 mile away, wrote a letter which was entered into the record as Exhibit C. He shared his thoughts and support for the applicant's plan and thinks it will improve the area. He encouraged the Board to allow the Church House to install windows on the upper level on the north and south ends of the building instead of where they are now looking right at that proposed building.

Bob Swan, current owner of the Church House, wrote a letter which was entered into

the record as Exhibit D. He explains the window situation that Mr. Swan referenced. He was very supportive of the applicant's plan and appreciative of what Oregon City had done with the 7th Street corridor. Ms. Yates asked if he is concerned with the use of the community deck and the possibility of it bothering his tenants or if it was amenable. Mr. Swan liked the open space area and knows it is hard to be 10 feet away from the building and smoking. He may see the noise as an issue and the Church House does not have much insulation, but he is willing to wait and see if the noise is a problem, then mitigate the sound issues later.

Chair Metson brought the applicant back up and questioned if the owner was pushing for as many units as possible and at any point in time were there hopes to put units in that open space. He noted that the initial planning included units all the way through, but if they broke it up it brought it down to residential scale. The code rejects roofs longer than 70 feet and requires an open space or community/social space.

Chair Metson closed the public hearing and invited Board discussion.

Ms. Yates was concerned about the impact on the Church House and was happy to see the owners of the Church House were supportive of the plans. She was really glad to see three stories and the density it brings. Her main concern now is parking and feels the application is incomplete about voicing what they heard from the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association regarding their concerns about parking. She feels this will affect the value of the Historic District.

Ms. Towle addressed the matching of the Queen Anne look of the Church House, while keeping it vernacular, was good. She was not as concerned about addressing the 7th Street corner main entrance. She did not see a big parking problem because there is at least one parking space for each unit and three additional spaces (15 apartment units and 18 parking spaces overall).

Chair Metson was happy to hear the neighborhood association say growth will happen. He feels the scale of the building was appropriate and three stories was fine. The Monroe Street entrance still throws him off a little bit, but no one else was concerned with it so he will not make an issue of it. He suggested that the door of the storefront entrance on the Monroe Street side, closest to the 7th and Monroe Street, swing open in the opposite direction. He appreciated the support of the adjacent owner. He does not want the balconies to be C-Channel and reduce exposed fasteners, and he suggested to face mount the posts if tube steel is used. He questioned why lighting was only seen on the south side facing the alley, as no other lighting is shown on other elevations. He would like to see lighting that carried around the rest of the building, not as a condition of approval, but just a suggestion.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner summarized what she heard as the conditions of approval:

1. Bay windows on the 7th Street side
2. Double window configuration all the way around
3. The balconies will not use C-Channel and minimize exposed fasteners when attaching the railings
4. Design the first store door on Monroe Street closest to 7th Street to have the door swing open in the opposite direction
5. Approve a corner entrance and a 7th Street entrance, based on the requirements of site plan review and what is feasible

In regards to the 7th Street entrance, Chair Metson encouraged staff to look at NSI

117. The Oregon Code just switched to that and he did not know if all egress exits need to be accessible.

A motion was made by Ms. Yates, seconded by Ms. Towle, to approve HR 12-02 with the conditions of approval as stated. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Derek Metson, Cynthia Towle and Vicki Yates

6b.

HR 12-05 1005 and 1007 Prospect Street New Construction.

Chair Metson asked if the Board had any declarations of ex-parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, or statements to declare. There was none. All had visited the site.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, presented the background on properties located at 1005 and 1007 Prospect Street. The abutting Landmark house is known as the Charles Moran House and is located at 404 May Street, which is at the intersection of May and Prospect Streets. The two lots being reviewed were partitioned from the original Landmark in 2006.

The house was rehabbed in 2006/2007. A rear addition was removed, a new one car garage was added to the May Street frontage and two dormers were added to the prospect elevation. Finally, the Historic Review Board allowed the use of vinyl windows as part of this specific rehab. They looked at the condition of the Landmark and the location of the house in the deliberations. At this time, the code allowed for demolition of Landmarks, and the Board feared that the Moran House would be a likely candidate if the vinyl windows were not allowed as part of the larger rehab project.

The applicant proposed vinyl windows and attaching the garage. Staff feels that is fine since it was already allowed in the 2006/2007 rehab. Staff asked the Board to consider whether both of the properties are equally related or should 1007 Prospect Street have a lesser review as it is not directly abutting the Landmark. With that question left up to the Board to decide, staff recommends the following additional conditions of approval:

- 1. The use of wood, fiberglass, or the proposed vinyl windows.*
- 2. For the vernacular style, use of the 1/1 windows with no grids, especially in the front elevation or any others seen from Prospect Street.*
- 3. The porches shall be a minimum 18 inches off the ground.*
- 4. Need to use wood or a minimum 4 inch smooth composite lap siding.*

The applicant, Dustin McBeth, stated that after he previously came before the Historic Review Board for a consultation, he took the Board's advice and recommendations and applied them. He entered into the record an updated drawing of 1005 Prospect Street as Exhibit A. The applicant questioned if the upstairs ceiling height could be increased from 6'8" or 6'10" to 8' foot vault style ceiling. This would increase the overall height of the house to 17'.

Chair Metson opened the public hearing. There were no additional speakers or comments, so the public hearing was closed and the Board began deliberations. There was consensus that no separate conditions of approval needed to be set for the two separate properties, but that they could be discussed together and have the same conditions of approval.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner summarized the conditions of approval to be:

1. *A final inspection is required by Planning staff prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.*
2. *Incised lumber or pressure treated wood shall not be used on any visible surfaces.*
3. *All railings, decking and stairs shall be painted to match the house body or trim - through paint stain or paint.*
4. *The applicant shall utilize the following materials: vinyl windows (no grids), both porches shall be a minimum of 18 inches off the ground, a minimum of 4 inch smooth composite lap siding (no dutch lap), and an 8' foot ceiling on the second floor for 1005 Prospect.*

A motion was made by Ms. Towle, seconded by Ms. Yates, to approve HR 12-05 with the conditions stated. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Derek Metson, Cynthia Towle and Vicki Yates

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.