

**CITY OF OREGON CITY
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
MAY 25, 2010**

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

Board Members Present:

Chair John McLoughlin
Ken Baysinger (arrived at 7:30 p.m.)
Vicki Yates
Todd Iselin

Staff Present:

Pete Walter, Associate Planner
Laura Butler, Assistant Planner
Carrie Richter, Deputy City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair McLoughlin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON AGENDA

There was no public comment on items not listed on the agenda.

3. HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD HEARINGS

PG 10-02 Preservation Grant for 509 High Street

Laura Butler, Assistant Planner, said this grant was for window repair. She described the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the Chosen Wood Windows bid with a maximum grant amount of \$3,000. The work had to be completed and approved by the City by June 30 and the applicant could not apply for grant funds for next year.

Ron Thom of Oregon City answered questions regarding his application. Work would begin next week.

Motion by Mr. Iselin, second by Ms. Yates, to approve PG 10-02 as recommended by staff. Motion passed unanimously 3-0.

AP 10-02 Atkinson Memorial Church Remand

Chair McLoughlin read the Historic Review Board Opening Statement. He asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest or ex parte contact to declare. There was none.

Pete Walter, Associate Planner, said this was a remand by the City Commission of a previous Historic Review Board decision. In February the Board reviewed this application and voted to approve it 4-1. That approval was appealed by Margaret Foss due to the lack of compatibility to the Historic Overlay District. On April 21, the City Commission considered the appeal and remanded the matter back to the HRB because the proposed materials were inappropriate and incompatible with the District and recommended changes to the facade materials. The applicant revised their proposal to change the materials and made changes in response to the original conditions of approval set by the HRB. The HRB had to determine if the exterior design

revisions were generally compatible with the immediate context as well as the larger McLoughlin Conservation District and to make a finding whether the revised plans including the use of four inch cement lap siding satisfied the compatibility requirements. The additional revisions addressing the conditions of approval had to do with handling of the mechanical units in the center of the roof which had been relocated and a parapet wall proposed to completely screen them. The elevations had also been refined to include revised wall sections and details for the main entrance canopies, exterior horizontal banding, hand rails, and window trim as requested by the Board. Gutters and downspouts had also been added. Staff recommended the HRB find that the applicant met Oregon City Municipal Code 17.40.060E5, that the changes to the exterior and materials for the facade were more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and authentic to Oregon City, and to approve the revisions as proposed by the applicant with the conditions of approval. Regarding the revised recommended conditions of approval, Conditions 3 and 4 relating to the Site Line Study had been addressed. The 120 day land use decision deadline for HR 10-01 was June 2, 2010. If the decision that night was appealed, the appeal date for City Commission review would be July 7, 2010. The Planning Commission continued their public hearing to June 14, 2010 on the Conditional Use and Site Plan and Design Review for this application. If there was an appeal, the next Planning Commission hearing would be July 12, 2010.

Mr. Baysinger arrived at 7:30 p.m. He had no conflict of interest or ex parte contact to disclose.

Paul Falsetto of Carlton Hart Architecture was representing Atkinson Memorial Church. He gave a background of the process and how they had applied the standards and zoning to the design. He discussed the general compatibility of the exterior design arrangement, proportion, detail, scale, color, texture, and materials proposed for the building.

Ms. Yates suggested using smooth coat stucco for the breezeway.

Ms. Butler said the applicant's PowerPoint presentation would be entered into the record as Exhibit 1.

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing.

Mary Johnson, attorney representing Margaret Foss, asked for 15 minutes for her testimony because of the number of issues she had to raise and number of exhibits.

Ms. Johnson's exhibits would be entered into the record as Exhibit 2.

Four people volunteered to give their allotted three minutes to Ms. Johnson so she could have a longer testimony time.

Ms. Johnson discussed what compatibility was and the differentiation requirement for new construction. She described how the architectural elements and materials for the proposed addition were non compliant with the elements of compatibility and did not compliment the church. She specifically mentioned the color, exterior material, roof, plain long wall, windows, landscaping, and equipment as not compatible. She discussed her exhibits which gave good and bad examples of compatibility.

Dean DeSantis of Oregon City was a member of the church's Building Committee and owned a landscaping business. His firm did the landscape plan. The church's history, architecture, and place in the community was a source of great pride for the congregation. He discussed the

history of how the church hired Mr. Falsetto and Mr. Falsetto's expertise in historic preservation. The church invested in experts to help ensure compatibility of the structure with the neighborhood.

Alice Ericksen of Molalla was the moderator for the church's Board of Trustees. Even those in the congregation who did not live in Oregon City cared a great deal about the City. They wanted to make sure everything they did was compatible with the historic district. All the guidelines had been followed. The projected growth for the church was about 4%. The addition would enhance the church's programs. They wanted to be good neighbors.

Denyse McGriff represented the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association. She said the steering committee had a meeting on May 17 and reviewed the criteria for this application. The applicant submitted revised drawings based on comments from the City Commission and HRB. The new work was clearly differentiated from the old, and was compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historical integrity of the church. There was a lot of discussion regarding the colors and the Association wanted to make sure they were complimentary and would provide a unifying element to tie the buildings together. It was suggested the windows in the transition building be more compatible with the church. The Association felt the proposed addition exterior alterations met the standards of the City Codes and Secretary of the Interior's standards for exterior alterations and additions.

Eddie Sheufelt of Oregon City was a member of the church's Building Committee. The church tried to follow the letter and spirit of the planning and historic review process and chose a highly regarded professional to help them comply with the regulations. They viewed this as a separate building with a breezeway attaching it to the church not as an addition. They had received a lot of member, community, and professional input and a lot had been contradictory. He asked the Board to apply the standards responsibly and professionally and approve the design as submitted.

Kimberly Walch of Oregon City was a neighbor and employee of the church. She urged the Board to approve the plan. This was not about reaching a unanimous public decision but was about what the church wanted and if the design met the criteria. The design was consistent with the neighborhood in terms of materials used, scale of the building, spacing of windows, use of porches, and the setback. The design elements, products, and materials were allowable and were picked to be compatible to the church and neighborhood.

Mick Mortlock of Lake Oswego was a member of the church's Building Committee and Director of Community Outreach. The church membership voted on this design several times and the last vote earlier that year was 93 to 3 in favor. He urged the Board to approve the application.

Gregg Stults of Oregon City was a parent of a child in the Oregon City Preschool and Preschool Board President. He also attended the preschool and grew up in the neighborhood. The church was an iconic structure and no addition should mimic it as it would detract from the historic value of the church. The addition was a simple, efficient, but non conflicting design that allowed the church to grow, but wouldn't detract from the value of the church. They had done a good job of blending into the neighborhood. It would work well in the long term and he asked for approval.

Ron Schweiger of Oregon City said he lived in the historic district. The McLoughlin Neighborhood Association did not speak for everyone in the neighborhood. A lot of the neighbors did not want the addition.

Mr. Falsetto said they were sensitive to the compatibility and it could be very subjective. He read from Preservation Brief 14, which had been used and applied. The landmark in the neighborhood had been protected with good spirit and good design. The State Historic Preservation Office said it was simple and compatible. He also read the Oregon City design principles and explained how they had guided the design. The color was appropriate to the church and neighborhood. He addressed the windows, landscaping, and transformer issues. They had worked hard to create a building that was appropriate and compatible to the district.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Ms. Yates was glad the HVAC units were shielded on the roof. She was concerned about the cement board on the breezeway and smooth stucco was a good alternative. She disagreed with Ms. Johnson's interpretation of the rules. The examples she gave were not comparable to the church's design. She was pleased with what she saw.

Mr. Baysinger said the examples from Ms. Johnson were not relevant to the application and none of those projects had been approved by the HRB. He thought if the Neighborhood Association did not reflect the neighborhood's views, more participation was needed. The Neighborhood Association diligently reviewed the application and contributed to it and the Board was bound to honor their recommendation as long as the results reflected the guidelines.

Mr. Iselin would like to see the panels at the bump outs instead of changing the exposure on the siding. He liked the cornice design on the first submittal better, but these were minor elements. Color was subjective and would change through the years.

Chair McLoughlin appreciated the public testimony and process. He was trained in preservation and understood the opinions on both sides. They needed to follow the guidelines and a lot had been done to try to rectify, simplify, and appease those surrounding the building. He agreed with the suggestions for smooth coat stucco and exposure of the siding on the bump outs.

It was clarified that the applicant should use authentic and historic smooth finish stucco.

Motion by Mr. Baysinger, second by Mr. Iselin, to approve AP 10-02 in its redesigned form and with the added condition of replacing the fiber board panels with a smooth finish stucco on the breezeway. The changes to the exterior materials for the facade were more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and authentic to Oregon City. Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

4. ADJOURN

Chair McLoughlin adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.