



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes Historic Review Board

Tuesday, May 28, 2013

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chair McLoughlin called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

2. Discussion Items:

Illuminate Oregon City, Municipal Elevator Light Art Project, Architect's Concept Design Scheme

Martin Montalvo, Public Works Operations Manager, introduced Joann Dao Le with DAO Architecture and Kristen Minor with Peter Miejer and Associates. Mr. Montalvo explained the project, partners involved and the process.

Ms. Dao Le and Ms. Minor gave a presentation on the Municipal Elevator project, history of the elevator, and explained the connectivity the elevator provides to Oregon City.

Mr. Montalvo explained the timeline for the project.

Pedestrian Crossing on 7th Street at John Adams Street

Mr. Montalvo discussed the pedestrian crossing on 7th Street at John Adams, implementation of a rapid flashing pedestrian beacon at the intersection near the Library, signage and lighting, timeline for completion, and the long term maintenance of a painted crosswalk versus the flashing beacon.

Ms. Yates asked about the proposed location on 7th Street and suggested an alternate location due to traffic coming down Singer Hill.

Mr. Montalvo explained the reason for the location was due to the availability of existing electricity for the flashing beacon.

There was discussion about funding, long range planning, safety concerns, solar versus electrical power, and maintenance.

There was unanimous consensus from the Board for staff to move forward.

Chair McLoughlin called for a dinner break.

Break For Dinner: The Meeting Will Resume at 7:00PM

3. Public Comments

Chair McLoughlin reconvened the meeting at 7:00 P.M.

There was no public comment.

4. Preservation Grant Program

PG 13-01 (1214 Washington Street- Siding Repair)

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, explained the applicant was not able to get the second bid and asked the Board for a recommendation on what the second bid should be based on and get direction once the applicant has presented.

Jay and Patty Pearce, residents of Oregon City and applicant, gave a description of the house, the renovation they've done to the interior of the house and the proposed renovation to the exterior of the house.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner explained the grant funding available and recommendation options available to the Board.

Chair McLoughlin applauded the applicants for renovating the home and gave suggestions on material to be used for the decking.

Mr. Metson suggested other homes in the area for the applicant to look at for comparison.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner explained this was the last chance for grant funding for the current fiscal year and the deadline for completion of work if the grant funding was approved.

The Board asked what happens if the remaining grant funds are not used in the current fiscal year. Ms. Gardiner said the remaining grant funds would be lost.

The Board discussed the grant matching amount and the requirement for getting a second bid.

A motion was made by Mr. Metson, seconded by Ms. Towle, to approve PG 13-01, with the conditions that the decking be vertical grain tongue and groove fir, there be a second bid, and that it be approved to the maximum matching amount allowed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Yates, Ms. Towle, Mr. Metson, Mr. Siewert, Chair McLoughlin

5. Design Advice

Design Advice -Mike's Drive-In

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner gave the Board an explanation of the project.

Mr. Metson disclosed conversations he had with the applicant, Todd Freeman, about the project; specifically, regarding some of the design standards, process with the City, and whom he should speak to.

The Board had no concerns.

Todd Freeman, owner of Mike's Drive In, and Gregg Creighton, Creighton Architecture, gave some background on the building, its current condition, description of the proposed remodel, reasons for the remodel, color and design scheme, signage, and timeline for the remodel.

The Board discussed the proposed roof and gave the applicant suggestions on how that could be changed.

Mr. Creighton explained the reasons for the proposed design of the roof.

Ms. Towle suggested Mr. Freeman notify the neighborhood association.

The Board suggested the applicant look at other buildings to help with the design of the roof line and the parapet build up.

6. Public Hearing

HR 13-02 New Single Family House in Canemah (4th Avenue)

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

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, presented the staff report. She entered two items into the record: Exhibit A, a memo from Carrie Richter, Assistant City Attorney, and Exhibit B, an email from Paul Edgar. This was an application for a new single family house in the Canemah historic district. The applicant proposed a vernacular design and had been before the Board twice for design advice. She explained the area surrounding the property and proposed design of the house. The items for the Board to review were the location of the garage, request to increase the pitch to a 12:12 pitch, request for taller, thinner, and divided light wood windows on the main elevation, request to require cedar lap siding, and if the side yard setback was reduced five feet, the application would be continued to the June HRB meeting to include a preservation incentive for the side yard setback. She reviewed the proposed conditions of approval.

Bill Heintz, builder, was looking for guidance. The shed from the neighbor's house was on this property which was still being addressed. The lot was 80 feet wide instead of 85 feet wide and the Center Line plans were submitted as Exhibit C. There was the ability to move the house to the right. The corner of the garage was two to three feet into the shed that the neighbor owned, which meant the shed was eight feet onto the property and he hoped the shed could be moved. If the garage was pushed back any further, it would affect the tree. Mr. Edgar brought up other issues, such as roof pitch, windows, and siding. He was not sure how to proceed with those. He would like to start building this summer.

Bo Robinson, project designer, said they had sincerely tried to follow the proper process and wanted to meet everyone's expectations within reason. He hoped their application would not be extended another month.

Mr. Metson asked the reason for the size of the windows.

Mr. Robinson replied they were in keeping with historical proportions as much as possible with also functioning inside the floor plan. It was reasonable to heighten them and the higher pitch was reasonable and would look more vernacular, although it would make the house a little taller. The lower roof would also be more proportionate to the neighbor's house. It came down to a massing issue, but wanted guidance whether it should be a 10:12 or 12:12 pitch.

Paul Edgar, Land Use Chair of the Canemah Neighborhood Association, said he had started working with the builder 65 days ago. It needed to be compatible by design, and all vernacular houses in Canemah had a 12:12 pitch roof. The massing horizontally went from lot line to lot line, and a 12:12 pitch would help mitigate the massing. The windows also needed to be proportional by being narrower and taller. They did not want the house to stand out next to significant historic homes. The garage could be set back and would not hurt the tree. The cost of changing the windows was minor. He recommended shifting the building as far to the right as possible, within one and a half feet of the property line to move it away from the historic house next door and reduce the impact to the view and importance. He brought in examples of siding used in the Canemah district. He thought the siding and windows were so important that a grant or reduction of SDCs should be given the applicant. He thought the windows and siding could be done on the street side only to be compatible and that the set back of the garage should be equal to the house. He had requested a continuance to be able to come to an understanding with the builder.

Howard Post, resident of Oregon City, was in support of the project. He thought it should be a 12:12 pitch to keep continuity to the house next door. He thought the garage should be moved back to be flush with the house. If done correctly, this would be a showcase on 4th.

Greta Michales, owner of the Draper House and next door neighbor, said her house was built in 1876. When she bought the property, she was told the cedar tree was the property line. She did not have an objection to a nice house being built next to her and was willing to compromise. She did not want to tear down her shed, however. She thought the higher pitch would be more compatible and the windows in the front and the garage would be very close to her house and cedar tree.

Mr. Metson asked how long the shed had been in its location, and Ms. Michales would bring that information back to the Board.

Reed Rothschild, resident of Oregon City, supported the comments made by Mr. Post. He thought the pitch of the roof should represent the surrounding homes. He suggested putting the garage on the other side of the house. Regarding the width of the house, he was on the builder's side and thought it was his right to build a house that fit current lifestyles. The windows and siding should be changed.

Mr. Heintz said the garage was on the other side of the house originally, but as part of a compromise, it was moved to the other side. When he dropped off the application to the City, he also dropped off a copy to Mr. Edgar. He got a phone call complimenting him on his application, and the only comment made was about the 12:12 roof pitch. A week later other items were brought up, and he met with him to discuss windows, roof pitch, and setback of the garage and it got to a point that this hearing was scheduled. He thought he should get direction from the Board before changes were made. The last request was for the siding which was brought up a week ago. He discussed the cost of the windows and siding. He did not have a problem with the pitch or garage setback. He would prefer not to do the windows and was unsure about the cost of the siding.

Mr. Robinson said in regard to the trees being added for separation and privacy, he thought darkness should be a consideration for the neighboring house. As far as materials, how things had been done in the past should be the precedent.

Ms. Michales just had siding replaced on one side of her house and it was not expensive.

Mr. Rothschild stated this builder was coming into a historic neighborhood and he needed to be prepared for the additional cost. It was more expensive than other areas in the City. What worked for the neighborhood was what the builder had to do. If the neighbor's shed was infringing on the builder's property, it needed to be moved.

Mr. Edgar submitted pictures of windows into the record as Exhibit 4. He had gotten a quote from Woodale Windows for the windows. He could bring the quote back to the Board at the next meeting. He wanted to come up with a degree of compatibility in design and materials so this house did not negatively impact the immediate important historic houses and historic district as a whole. This was a significant property and he wanted it done right. He had discussed this with national historic folks who said no to hardi plank siding, proportionality of the windows, and 12:12 pitch.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner stated if the Board wanted to provide additional conditions, they would have to provide findings for them. The question was, was the overall massing and architecture compatible and did it meet the design guidelines.

Mr. Metson did not think there was anything more to bring to the table that would have a significant sway for a continuance.

Mr. Edgar said the reason for a continuance was to have a dialogue with the builder and come to an agreement and come back with no questions.

Ms. Yates said the builder agreed to most of Mr. Edgar's concerns, except for the siding issue. There was not much in dispute now.

Mr. Edgar said the siding issue was important, because it was part of the overall appearance. If they couldn't arrive at an agreement, the siding would be part of the appeal. They were requesting a 12:12 pitch, proportional windows, set back, and moving the house away from the neighbor. Mr. Edgar asked that this item be continued.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

The Board did not think there was additional information that would better inform their decision to warrant a continuance.

Chair McLoughlin called for a 5 minute break.

Mr. Metson discussed reducing the massing through landscaping. There was further discussion regarding landscape and tress, roof pitch, windows and siding.

Chair McLoughlin did not think every roof needed to look the same. The garage issue can be worked out, and he did not have an opinion about the windows. He did not think they had to deviate from the proposed siding. The proportion for the window could be one over two for the window, could be taller, but they could still be fiberglass, no one could discern if they were wood or not, and was indifferent about the divided light.

Mr. Metson said the one to two proportions should be limited to the first floor, not the second floor.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner listed the modifications to the conditions of approval:

1. *Condition 5a would remain as written with no requirement for wood or divided light windows.*
2. *Condition 5b would be wood or smooth composite siding as depicted in the submitted plans.*
3. *Addition of Condition 5d which would say, the ground floor elevation of one to two proportion windows on the front elevation.*
4. *Condition 8 would be removed regarding the 12:12 pitch.*

A motion was made by Mr. Metson, seconded by Mr. Siewert, to approve HR 13-02, with condition 5 as revised by staff and removal of condition 8. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Yates, Ms. Towle, Mr. Metson, Mr. Siewert, Chair McLoughlin

7. Communications

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.