



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes

Historic Review Board

Tuesday, August 22, 2017

6:00 PM

Oregon City Public Library

1. Call to Order

Chair Baysinger called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Present: 4 - Claire Met, Ken Baysinger, Grant Blythe and Janet Mann

Absent: 1 - Jon McLoughlin

Staffers: 2 - Trevor Martin and Laura Terway

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

3. Public Hearing

- 3a. MD 17-01, MD 17-02, MD 17-03, MD 17-04, MD 17-05, and MD 17-06.
Six (6) Proposed Cottage Style Homes in the Canemah Historic District
Located near 4th and Miller St.

Attachments: [Commission Report](#)
 [Staff Report](#)
 [Exhibit 1: Vicinity Map](#)
 [Exhibit 2: Applicant's Submittal](#)
 [Exhibit 3: Applicant's Previous Submittal](#)
 [Exhibit 4: Public Comments](#)

Chair Baysinger opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Board member had conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, bias, or any other statements to declare since the last hearing. There were none. All Board members had visited the site. No concerns of the disclosures were identified.

Trevor Martin, Planner, presented the staff report. He explained the purview of the HRB in regard to this application, which was to look at whether the design guidelines and OCMC 17.40 had been met. Public comment had been received from the Friends of Canemah. He described the additional processes required before construction.

Chris Staggs, applicant, gave an overview of the proposed project. He thought this project would benefit Canemah and met all of the code requirements. Through all of the public comments, the project had been adjusted to address the issues. There were only a few who were still objecting to the project and most of the comments that had been made were irrelevant to the HRB process. This application was in alignment with the Canemah context and staff recommended approval. It related to the historic qualities of Canemah and would provide six new homes. He addressed comments that were made by the Friends of Canemah at the last hearing. The density he was proposing was much lower than what the underlying zone would allow to be built and it was lower in visual size than if four single family homes and ADUs were constructed. The site plan was in compliance with city standards, the wetlands had been delineated, and they would not touch the wetland when building. There would be a site plan and design review and geologic hazard review of this proposal after this HRB process. The parking was out of the rights-of-way and the proposal was in alignment with the parking guidelines. A lot of the comments were irrelevant to the process, and he pointed out that it was contrary to making progress and the reason they were here tonight.

Patty Webb, representing Friends of Canemah, stated the Friends believed the cottage concept was a violation of the historic building guidelines and would be a detriment to the historic neighborhood. It would increase flooding to properties downhill and weaken the foot of an active landslide. There was a long list of historic style violations for each house proposed. This was an area where people lived in their homes, not as rentals or flip investments. The HRB had the responsibility to enforce the codes and protect Canemah from future developments like this one. She questioned why the project had made it this far when there were so many violations and objections. She submitted a list of 30 objections to the individual designs of the homes.

Paul Edgar, Oregon City resident, said this was an issue of putting five houses on two

lots and 80% of the two lots were covered with impervious surface. He did not think the preservation incentives should be granted as they could not develop on the wetlands regardless. The historic preservation code took precedence over any other codes and requirements. He had listed in a document how this application was in violation of the historic preservation code.

Tori Goodwin, Oregon City resident, thought this cottage development would devalue the historical registry of Canemah. She was relying on the HRB to protect her neighborhood. This project was asking them to compromise their guidelines, such as setbacks, non-historical architecture, and preservation incentives. Mr. Staggs had used the density on her property as an example to compare to his, and she did not think it was the same. She had one residence and two outbuildings. The architecture was modern and the design was not Canemah.

Clint Goodwin, Oregon City resident, referred to the Oregon City historic district design guidelines. Mr. Staggs wanted to build a community within a community which did not make sense. Lots were supposed to be 5,000 square feet and contain a single home. He described how the parking spaces, building placement, and windows and porches on the homes did not follow the guidelines.

Mr. Staggs answered questions from the HRB regarding the proposed cut outs, retaining walls, windows and doors on the homes, and his interpretation of vernacular style.

Chair Baysinger closed the public hearing.

Chair Baysinger reviewed the conditions of approval.

Mr. Blythe said the siting of house 1 was below the natural slope off of 4th and would be lower than the houses on either side. He thought the elevation should be equal to the two houses adjacent to it. He did not think preservation incentives should be granted on that house.

Ms. Mann said the condition regarding the retaining wall needed to take into account the stepped portion which exceeded the 3.5 feet height. Mr. Martin said the condition could be amended to say it could not exceed 3.5 feet from grade in the front of the home and within a minimum step spacing of 2 feet from step to step.

Ms. Met suggested for House 2 the skylights should be moved to other side of the slope of the roof.

Mr. Blythe suggested adding a condition that windows on the second story of the homes should not exceed the door height plus a transom and should be rectangular wood windows only. He also thought all of the cut outs for all the homes should be removed. Ms. Met agreed. Ms. Mann thought the cut outs were acceptable as long as they were not visible from the street.

Chair Baysinger suggested instead of sliding doors, french doors be installed on all of the homes.

There was discussion regarding the entrance to House 4 needed to be facing south towards the wetland or towards House 3.

The conditions that would apply to all of the houses were: requiring wood windows,

there would be no sliding doors but there would be french doors instead, second story windows would not exceed a door height plus a transom of about 12 inches, the windows would be rectangular in shape, there would be no roof cut outs, the retaining walls would have a horizontal distance of two feet before stepping up the height. For House 1, there was concern about a side yard setback adjacent to the Casady House. For House 2, there was concern about the skylights not facing Miller Street. For House 4, there was concern regarding where the entrance was facing.

Mr. Blythe suggested a condition that no vertical siding would be visible from the right-of-way.

Chair Baysinger thought the staff report and conditions of approval had addressed the comments made by the public except for whether or not to allow parking lots.

Chair Baysinger walked the entire Canemah Historic District and listed all of the parking lots he saw. There were 15, and 8 of those were on residential properties and 7 on commercial properties.

Laura Terway, Community Development Director, said since this was new information which might influence the decision, she recommended reopening the public hearing to allow the public to ask questions regarding this item.

Chair Baysinger reopened the public hearing and asked for comments regarding parking lots in Canemah.

Paul Edgar, Oregon City resident, did not think there were parking lots that were separate from a building. He did not think there was an example in Canemah of what was being proposed.

Clint Goodwin, Oregon City resident, asked what the Board was defining as a parking lot. His driveway could fit four to five cars in it, but it was not a parking lot. There were several properties with single family homes where people used part of their property to park their vehicles because they did not have garages or driveways. The applicant was proposing parking for six homes and putting down lines to delineate a parking lot for 9 parking stalls.

Chair Baysinger said parking lots were oversized parking areas that were open for multiple vehicles in excess of four parking spaces. He entered his list into the record. He did not think the appearance of the parking lots on his list were different than the parking lot that was being proposed.

Patty Webb, Oregon City resident, was in agreement with Mr. Goodwin. There was an easement between a lot of the houses in Canemah that were used as parking and no one else was allowed to park there. These were private parking areas, not parking lots.

Howard Post, Oregon City resident, said most homes needed two parking spaces and this would be 1.5 parking spaces for each of the six homes. He thought there would not be enough parking and they would be parking elsewhere.

Chair Baysinger closed the public hearing.

Chair Baysinger did not walk around the neighborhood trying to find evidence to support the application. He went out to see what the real situation was. There had been comments that the parking lot was not compatible, and he thought parking lots existed

and he did not think what was being proposed was incompatible.

Mr. Blythe thought most on the list were in the McLoughlin mixed use area and he did not think it was appropriate to compare commercial parking lots with this area.

Mr. Martin explained what was in the record regarding the parking lot. Ms. Terway clarified the question before the HRB was, was the design proposed historically appropriate in context.

Ms. Mann thought it was appropriate. These would be six homes that blended in with area, but was not like it. The proposal provided something the Canemah neighborhood did not have and developed an area that needed to be rehabilitated. It was appropriate for the parking to be on site instead of the street.

Mr. Blythe said there was not room on the property to have covered parking or outbuildings or a traditional driveway. The parking was broken up in a four spots and six spot areas, and the four was appropriate. However, six was heavily pushing the density of surface parking beyond what was in the residential area.

Chair Baysinger discussed how the application hinged on whether the zero setbacks should be allowed through preservation incentives for Houses 1, 5, and 6.

Ms. Mann thought the setbacks were appropriate for Houses 5 and 6 so they would not infringe on the wetlands. Chair Baysinger thought the undeveloped rights-of-way in front of those houses provided a mitigation for the lack of the setbacks from a visual standpoint. There were many zero setbacks in Canemah due to the challenging topography.

Mr. Blythe was not in favor of the preservation incentive for House 1 because it would have a detrimental impact to the Casady House and the historic context of the neighborhood. He thought it was concerning that combining the cottage housing code and the preservation incentives was using multiple tools to increase the amount of dwellings and space on a constrained lot.

Ms. Met discussed the massing. She thought six homes was still too many on the site.

Ms. Mann thought six smaller homes would fit the site better than four larger homes.

Mr. Blythe stated the scale of the conditions was getting to the point that they were major architectural changes and multiple pages. He thought they were outside the realm of approval. He was in favor of cottage housing in Canemah, but he did not think it was appropriate for this site.

Ms. Met agreed with Mr. Blythe. She did not think this was the right place for cottage homes. It was a constrained lot, and in a historic district.

Mr. Martin reviewed the list of conditions, which included no preservation incentives for House 1, no skylights facing Miller for House 2, in general remove requirements for facing parking lot, windows shall be wood, no sliding doors and all should be french doors, second story windows shall not exceed door height plus a 1 foot transom, windows shall be rectangular or square, no foot cut outs, the retaining wall spacing would be clarified, and no vertical siding facing the street.

Chair Baysinger reopened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant could meet the

added conditions.

Mr. Staggs said it would be difficult to meet the requirements for House 1 if no preservation incentives were allowed. He did not think this house would have an impact to the Casady House. There was not enough discussion on that issue. He thought all the other conditions could be met.

Chair Baysinger asked if the applicant could bring back drawings that showed the proposed changes so everyone could visualize what the outcome would be. Mr. Staggs could bring back drawings, but he preferred an approval. He had complied with every request the Board had given him.

Chair Baysinger closed the public hearing. The board voted on a motion from Ms Mann and seconded by Mr Baysinger to approve with conditions as amended.

Aye: 2 - Grant Blythe and Janet Mann

Nay: 2 - Claire Met and Ken Baysinger

Chair Baysinger agreed that the HRB did not fully vet the condition regarding no preservation incentives for House 1.

Ms. Terway suggested if they would like to see revised drawings from the applicant, they may reopen the record to allow additional testimony and the applicant to submit additional drawings that visualized the recommended conditions. If the hearing was continued, they would need to request the applicant to continue the 120 day deadline for another 30 days. She asked if the HRB wanted two staff reports prepared, one for approval with conditions and one for denial, though the HRB would have to articulate the rationale for the decisions so it could be written into the report.

Mr. Blythe said denial would be based on the siting and the context. Most of the buildable area was covered by driveways, parking, or the homes. He thought this crowding of the homes against each other and against the existing homes was out of context with the neighborhood and impacted the historic characteristics of the neighborhood.

There was consensus for staff to bring back two staff reports, one for approval and one for denial.

Chair Baysinger reopened the public hearing to ask for a continuance of the 120 day deadline and asked Mr. Staggs if he would be willing to continue the 120 day deadline.

Mr. Staggs said Mr. Blythe's concerns were beyond the proposed conditions. Mr. Blythe clarified his reasons for denial. Ms. Met said her reasons were similar to Mr. Blythe. The siting of the homes was too close together. Also the massing was too great as the houses were right against the wetlands. It was not appropriate for the historic district. The conditions had addressed her concerns regarding the architectural detailing.

Mr. Staggs said the 120 day deadline continuance was acceptable, but was concerned that another continuance and developing drawings would not change the outcome. He could increase the spacing between House 2 and 3 and House 4 and 5. He asked for clear direction on what he should bring back to make the application acceptable.

Mr. Blythe said given there was no practical way to move the structures or reducing their size, he thought there would need to be removal of one house and reducing the parking which would give the spacing a better context and siting.

Chair Baysinger asked staff to look back at the direction the HRB had given to the applicant regarding the number of homes. He thought they had asked him to reduce the number from seven to six. If they had said six, he thought they were obligated to stand by that number. Ms. Met thought they had asked him to reduce the number, but not a specific number.

Ms. Terway said the HRB had not made a final decision on the previous HR application as the applicant withdrew the application and submitted this application which differs by reduced number of units, all of the parking was on site, and the buildings were moved around. Mr. Baysinger closed the hearing.

Ms. Met agreed that five homes would be acceptable. The current proposed density was too much for the neighborhood.

Ms. Terway said staff could come back with two staff reports, one for approval of six homes and one for approval of five homes.

Mr. Blythe said he could approve this application tonight if a condition was added that

would reduce the overall number of homes on the site to five. He suggested removing House 2 and readjusting House 1 to be further back on the lot, but to be compliant with the code setbacks. Ms. Met thought the parking could remain the same to address the on-street parking concern. A motion was made by Mr. Blythe to approve with conditions previously identified with the removal of house #2 and house #1 complying with setbacks. The motion was seconded by Ms. Met.

approve

Aye: 4 - Claire Met, Ken Baysinger, Grant Blythe and Janet Mann

4. Grant Requests

4a. Grant Request PG 17-04 : Refinish Windows at 910 Washington Street Home (John Busch House) in the McLoughlin Conservation District

Attachments:

[Commission Report](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Exhibit 1: Applicant's Submittal](#)

[Exhibit 2. Historic Resource Inventory Form for 910 Washington St.](#)

Mr. Martin explained the grant request for 910 Washington Street. The proposal was to refinish window trim and soffits on the home. Staff recommended approval for a \$1,000 grant, although the applicant would like more.

Bill Schumann, Oregon City resident, said he had requested his home to be designated as historic. He wanted the home stay in good shape, but it was overdue for maintenance. There was a significant amount of trim on the home, and the body was stucco which was in good condition.

There was discussion regarding the available grant funds, which were \$3,000.

approve

Aye: 4 - Claire Met, Ken Baysinger, Grant Blythe and Janet Mann

5. Communications

Mr. Martin explained what was on the next agenda and discussed the new Welcome Wagon packets providing education of historic preservation and review to new properties.

6. Adjournment

Chair Baysinger adjourned the meeting at 9:40 PM.