

**CITY OF OREGON CITY
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
August 28, 2012**

**City Hall – Commission Chambers
625 Center Street, Oregon City**

Board Members Present:

Jon McLoughlin
Vicki Yates
Derek Metson
Cindy Towle
Bob Siewert

Staff Present:

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Associate Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair McLoughlin called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Metson, second by Ms. Towle, to approve the Regular Meeting and Work Session minutes of February 28, 2012, Work Session minutes of March 27, 2012, and Regular Meeting and Work Session minutes of April 24, 2012. Motion passed 5-0.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON AGENDA

There were no public comments on items not listed on the agenda.

4. DESIGN ADVICE for 1005 & 1007 Prospect Street

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Associate Planner, explained the purpose of the non-binding design advice. She gave background information on the site, nearby historic landmark, and the 2006 application for the property. The applicant had two possible plans for the lots, Plan A and Plan B.

Dustin MacBeth, applicant, had already purchased the lots. He wanted to blend into the existing houses and was building the houses to sell. He presented pictures of homes in the area, which was labeled Exhibit 1. His goal was to match the price point and blend in with the area. He discussed vinyl vs. wood windows and requested allowance for an attached garage. Plan A was for the lot closest to the historic house, and Plan B would be for the next lot over. Plan B had a side entry with a front porch.

Chair McLoughlin liked Plan A, but thought Plan B was too modern of an application and atypical with a vernacular house. The attached garage was not historical, but in that area historical elements were not consistent.

Ms. Towle suggested putting in a historic garage door, such as a carriage door, on the garage to help blend in.

Ms. Yates did not think the attached garage was problematic.

Mr. Metson agreed that a carriage door would help, suggested a gable roof on the garage, the applicant needed to evaluate the south and north elevation windows to be closer in size, on the

east elevation two windows were off set from the one in the attic, and thought the side entry door was appropriate.

Chair McLoughlin suggested hardy shingle on the gable.

There was discussion regarding using fiberglass windows rather than vinyl.

The consensus of the Board was there was not an issue with attached garage, use a gable rather than a hip roof, use hardy shingle, remove the bump out on Plan B to make it less modern, and were understanding regarding the price point for the windows.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

HR 12-03

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner stated the applicant provided insufficient information and staff was not ready to make a staff report. She requested continuance of the hearing.

Motion by Ms. Towle, second by Ms. Yates, to continue HR 12-03 to the meeting of September 25, 2012. Motion passed 5-0.

HR 12-04: 208 John Adams

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing. He read the hearing statement describing the hearing format and correct process for participation. He asked if members of the Board had any ex parte contact, conflict of interest, bias, or statements to declare. There was none. Chair McLoughlin, Ms. Towle, and Mr. Metson had visited the site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. This was a proposal for new construction in the McLoughlin Conservation District. A previous house on this site had been demolished in 2006-2007 and a request for new construction had come in 2009. That application had expired and the applicant was back with a revised version. The property was accessed from a private shared driveway on Jefferson Street. The property next door had been approved in 2007. Both homes faced John Adams. She compared the revisions to the 2009 application. The McLoughlin Neighborhood Association requested a continuance to get more information about the proposed new construction. They thought there was not enough detail to show compliance with the standards. The residents next door had concerns regarding the massing, lack of dormers, and that the carport did not have a history in Oregon City. The applicant originally proposed a Bungalow style, but with the revisions, there was a question if the applicant had removed too many details to still be a Bungalow. She read a list of the elements that could be brought back into the design to make it a Bungalow. Regarding the carport, it was not inappropriate as it was not in a prominent location. She then reviewed the conditions of approval.

Steve Ediger, applicant, explained his approach to the design. It was a difficult site due to the elevations. The garage was proposed on the lower level, then retaining walls, and the house on the higher level. He also took into account where the neighboring house was located. The carport was minimal. He was planning to move into the house. There was a house on Jefferson that had a carport and a lot of houses nearby did not have dormers.

There was discussion on how the applicant could put in a dormer.

Chair McLoughlin understood the need for a carport, but thought there were not enough elements for a Bungalow. He thought it was to save money, but it needed to meet the requirements for a conservation district. He agreed with the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association that the application was incomplete and did not include enough details.

Mr. Metson disagreed with the comments made by the neighboring residents, but agreed with the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association that there was not enough information to make an assessment.

Ms. Yates discussed the carport and that they had been found not to be appropriate for the neighborhood in the past. She wanted to be consistent.

Ms. Towle thought a rear dormer would make more sense than a front dormer and discussed the height of the garage.

There was discussion regarding what the Board would like to see when the applicant came back. The revised drawings needed to include details of the design and materials from all angles, a dormer needed to be added, and there needed to be consistency with the floor plan and elevations.

Motion by Ms. Towle, second by Mr. Metson, to continue HR 12-04 to the meeting of October 23, 2012. Motion passed 5-0.

Adoption of the Revisions and Reformatting of the Design Guidelines for Alterations and Additions

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said in the spring the Board decided to combine the design guidelines for alterations and additions into one document and add a page preface to help applicants. There was a sentence added in regard to landscaping that stated there was discouragement of berms and extensive non vegetative ground cover such as mulch or bark dust.

Ms. Yates suggested adding rocks, so the ground cover would not be extensively mulch, bark dust, and rocks. There was discussion about discouraging berms.

There was no public testimony.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Motion by Ms. Towle, second by Ms. Yates, to approve Resolution 12-01 as amended. Motion passed 5-0.

Chair McLoughlin adjourned the regular meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Chair McLoughlin opened the Work Session at 8:53 p.m.

6. WORK SESSION ITEMS

2012-2013 CLG Grant Update

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said the grant was written to pursue a multiple property submission in downtown Oregon City for national historic register. A letter was sent to all downtown properties

that had buildings that were potentially eligible to meet with a consultant regarding tax credits and feasibility. It was found that substantial rehabilitation would be needed and there was not enough income to get the credit. Not a lot of property owners thought it was not an opportunity for their property. The elevator and promenade would be listed, but she was not sure about any other properties. A lot of properties had been so altered they lost the eligibility for national register, therefore there would probably not ever be a historic district downtown.

Discover Oregon City Hidden Gems Photo Contest Update

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner thought the contest was a success and thought it should be a yearly event.

The Board agreed to make it an annual event.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner explained this was a time the Board could announce or report on events or add new agenda items.

8. ADJOURN

Chair McLoughlin adjourned the Work Session at 9:06 p.m.