



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes

Historic Review Board

Tuesday, February 28, 2017

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

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

Present: 4 - Derek Metson, Claire Met, Ken Baysinger and Grant Blythe

Staffers: 3 - Trevor Martin, Carrie Richter and Laura Terway

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

3. Public Hearing

3a. HR 16-09, 16-10, 16-11, 16-12, 16-13, and 16-14: 7 Proposed Cottage Homes in the Canemah National Register Historic District

Chair Metson re-opened the public hearing.

Carrie Richter, City Attorney, explained the quasi-judicial hearing procedure. She asked if any Board member had conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, bias, or any other statements to declare. There were none. Most of the Board had visited the site. No concerns of the disclosures were identified.

Trevor Martin, Planner, delivered the staff report. This was a request for design approval for the construction of seven new cottage style dwelling units with preservation incentives and adjustments to the front and rear yard setbacks in the Canemah Historic District. These seven units would be constructed on four lots of record. The code allowed for up to eight cottage style homes in R-6 zones, however there was no precedent for cottage style homes in this historic district. Although the proposed building footprint mirrored historic vernacular structures, adjacent areas maintained a lower density. The applicant requested a preservation incentive to allow the siting of the seven cottage home structures in the setbacks and on the property lines. He discussed the site plan and elevations. Homes 1, 4, 6, and 7 were requesting preservation incentives to be along the side, rear, and front yard property lines. Homes 1 and 4 would be butting against the Casady House as well. Homes 1 and 2 would have access from 4th Avenue, and the rest would have access on Miller Street. He showed pictures of the site and surrounding neighborhood on Miller and 4th Avenue. The applicant proposed to remove some of the fill to lower the grade for better access, but it would also mean there would be a different grade than the Casady House and the home next door, breaking up the context of the neighborhood and adding a disruption with the layout down the street. The question was would a retaining wall fit better and make more sense than the fill. The cottage homes were designed in the vernacular style and all averaged out to the cottage housing average square footage in the code.

For Homes 2 and 3, was the roof cut out an appropriate style for the neighborhood? For Homes 4 and 7, were the glass windows and glass wall appropriate? For Home 5, was the corner porch and glass doors wrapping around appropriate? Staff recommended approval with conditions. One condition was reconfiguring the site to accommodate all buildings and the parking on site and in accordance with the code. Overall this might reduce the number of units on the site. Without the preservation incentives, the front yard setback was 10 feet, front porch was 5 feet, garages were 20 feet, corners were 15 feet, the rear yard setback was 20 feet, rear porch was 15 feet, and interior side yard setbacks were 9 and 5 feet. There would also need to be 10 feet between the homes.

There was discussion regarding the design of the homes, requiring the parking to be on site, and the retaining wall facing Home 1 exceeding the three and a half feet.

Chris Staggs, applicant, said this project had a lot of moving parts and several standards. This was the first cottage home development in Oregon City. He thought the siting of the homes was contextually appropriate in the Canemah district. There were many homes in Canemah on the property lines. The siting of the homes were greatly influenced by the topography in Canemah and all but one of his proposed homes were at grade. There was a wetland resource on the site and the siting of the homes related to where that water resource was located. Although they were requesting the homes on Miller to be on the property line, they were a greater distance away from the road than most homes were in Canemah due to the nature of the road. He thought the proposed density of the site was contextually appropriate for the Canemah district. There was R-6 density, cottage home density, and Canemah district density. The staff report suggested going back to the original idea of four single family homes on each parcel. This R-6 density would allow them to build four 2,000 square foot homes with accessory dwelling units on each parcel. Each house could not exceed 40% lot coverage and this would be much denser on the property. For the Canemah district density, it stated for properties south of 3rd Street, the density for a proposed home should not exceed 30% lot coverage. His current proposal was 17% lot coverage for each parcel. He did not think it was a correct assessment to say the project was not in the context of the Canemah density. He showed diagrams of 7 cottage homes, 8 cottage homes, and 4 single family homes on the property to show the difference in densities and impact to the neighborhood. He had provided the necessary findings to approve the requested preservation incentives. The request was grounded in the wetland preservation. Because of the wetland on the site, there was a large impact to the buildable area. It was equivalent to nearly one parcel. The preservation of the historic water feature in Canemah was enough to justify and a nexus for the preservation incentives of being on the property line on Miller, on the property line on the right-of-way, and three parking spaces in the right-of-way. The parking context in Canemah was that people parked in the right-of-way. They were going to pull the cars off the street as much as possible where they would not be seen and would do planting mitigation on Miller to reduce the visual impact. This submittal did not require a landscape plan, but a landscape plan had been done for the site and design review process. He explained the landscaping, how the parcels would be buffered, and how the wetland would be preserved. He thought the design of the homes was contextually appropriate. He was confident he could meet the design requirements and to meet the Canemah guidelines. He then discussed the model of the site and what the cottage homes would look like on the site. His proposal had appropriately scaled cottage homes on the site, he had reduced the number of cottage homes from 8 to 7, and the homes were almost half the allowed density for the Canemah district.

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, requested this hearing be continued so they could

look at how this fit in with Canemah. He took principles from the National Historic Preservation League document and discussed how they lined up with the City's criteria. One of the first principles listed was that the Canemah historic district was significant as a collective whole and should be protected in its entirety. This proposed development changed the look and feel of the historic district and was not compatible by design, density, road coverage, and parking. Another principle was the construction should protect the integrity of the overall historic district in the same way an addition did to a historic building. He thought this proposal detracted from the district as it was different. The primary source for the historic status of Canemah was a set of defining characteristics that in fill development should compliment, and there was no parallel to those characteristics in this development. The cuts proposed were about ten feet and this area flooded historically. What was being proposed had the possibility to be flooded. The site had to be looked at in detail and cutting away on it would be significant.

Clint Goodwin, resident of Oregon City, said if they were planning to build the homes at street level, the retaining wall by Home 1 would be nowhere near three and a half feet. It would have to be much taller. The retaining wall would be built up to the property line, which would only be four feet from the neighboring house. The foundation of the neighboring house and his house would be held up by that wall. It did not fit in this neighborhood and did not fit with what was allowed in Canemah. He asked that the HRB review the information he had previously submitted.

Chair Metson asked if Mr. Goodwin thought it would be more contextually appropriate to put four single family homes on the property instead. Mr. Goodwin said the four single family homes would be his preference rather than the seven cottage homes, although the four homes did not quite hit it either. They would be more compatible with the neighborhood look. For the cottage homes, with the grade taken out on 4th it was not compatible and the parking lot did not fit. The standard for the south side of 3rd was one house, one garage on two lots.

Mr. Staggs presented rebuttal. There were standards in the code for the Canemah district, cottage homes, and R-6 zones which were all overlapping in this project. The Canemah historic district and Canemah character and context were what was being discussed that night in governing the decisions about the project. He thought the proposed density was far more contextually appropriate than the R-6 zoning density. The proposed design was much more in keeping with the look and feel of the Canemah district. He wanted the project to look like it belonged. He discussed the retaining wall adjacent to Home 1. It was true the retaining wall was up to ten feet high when it got back to the interior of the site. That part would be far from the neighboring house and the wall would be clad in the appropriate contextual material. They were stepping the retaining wall so when it got to the street, it was only three to four feet tall. The landscaping would mitigate the retaining wall as well. One of the written comments received had the Canemah design guidelines with some highlighted areas and near the back of the document it talked about the sites from 3rd Street up and 30% lot coverage. He reiterated that this project was at 17% lot coverage.

Mr. Baysinger asked about the parking and how the minimum was 1.5 spaces per unit, but there was only 1 space per unit proposed. Mr. Staggs said there were 11 spaces total and three were in the right-of-way. Laura Terway, Community Development Director, said that would be discussed further in the site and design review process.

Mr. Blythe asked about the appropriateness of the walls that had a large portion of windows facing the wetland. Mr. Staggs said there were many places in Canemah

where there were large window openings in homes and the closest example was the house to the west that had a large window wall that had most of the facade as a glass opening. All of the elevations facing the public rights-of-way and neighborhood had the more traditional window openings, but those facing the interior and wetland were opened up with more glass.

Ms. Met said the windows looked more modern as opposed to the historic look. She also did not like the skylights. Mr. Staggs said they could make it more contextually appropriate and the divisions between the glass could be larger.

Chair Metson was not convinced that the ten foot retaining wall met the standard. Mr. Staggs said he had a photographic survey of Canemah. Retaining walls all around Canemah were that high. Because of that and the mitigation of the wall, he thought it was appropriate. There were some examples in his application. That was a challenging edge of the site and they were trying to do it in a way that made sense in Canemah.

Chair Metson said that was the difficult part of this application for him to justify, as they were creating the problem with cutting into the hillside for the parking lot and not mitigating for an existing slope. He encouraged Mr. Staggs to find some examples of walls in the neighborhood and submit the pictures into the record.

Mr. Staggs said at the design advice meeting, he was told to have a good understanding of Canemah and show them the precedence of the character and context of Canemah so the HRB could make good decisions about this project. He thought this proposal met the requirements and was the most appropriate for the site. His plan could comply with all of the setbacks if the preservation incentive was denied, however he would have to ask for a vacation of the right-of-way.

The HRB suggested the applicant submit some drawings showing what compliance with the conditions would look like for the homes and show any issues there might be.

Chair Metson was surprised that the preference would be larger homes and massing on these lots. He thought the zero lot line setback was not unique to this area and the houses were spread apart as much as possible. The proposal offered a lot of variety and the homes were similar or smaller than the ones around them. He was still concerned about the retaining wall, and suggested seeing what it would like to move the parking lot to the front. He recommended for the large sliding glass doors that they be no more than three feet wide and not vinyl. There needed to be some thickness to them or encasement. The wetland was a large intrusion into the site and he thought it justified the variances requested.

A motion was made by Mr. Blythe, seconded by Ms. Met, to continue the hearing for HR 16-09: 7 proposed cottage homes in the Canemah National Register Historic District to March 28, 2017. The motion carried by the following vote:4-0-0

Aye: 4 - Derek Metson, Claire Met, Ken Baysinger and Grant Blythe

3b.

HR 16-02 Construction of a New Single-Family Dwelling in the Canemah National Register Historic District on 4th

Chair Metson re-opened the public hearing.

Ms. Richter asked if the Board had any conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, bias, or any other statements to declare since the last hearing. There was none. No concerns of the disclosures were identified.

Mr. Martin presented the staff report. There had been some changes to the conditions of approval regarding the connected garage and removal of language regarding the ornamentation around the windows and peaks of the home. The connected garage was appropriate because the applicant had gone through the design advice, had shifted the proposed site for the house and re-noticed the application, and had done everything they could to reduce the massing of the home given the topography of the site. They recessed the attachment of the portion of the home attached to the garage and had put in effort to further mask the massing by installing rockery work and landscaping.

Dave Green, applicant, read the four points that were removed from the conditions. He had not made any design changes since the last hearing. Staff was satisfied with the vegetative screen that he planned for the back to reduce the massing. He did not think additional screening would have any public merit. He would be adding some for privacy between the house to the east and this house. He asked for clarification on the screening, as staff suggested planting trees but that was not helpful in screening the massing. He submitted a product approval request for Milguard ultra fiberglass windows and he wanted to know if that product was suitable. There was some discussion regarding the vertical siding and the peaks, and that had been removed as a concern. He asked for a suggestion on the roof pitch, and if a 12 to 12 roof pitch would be the most appropriate when it would increase the massing.

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, said this lot had over 30% slope and he was concerned that the code did not allow this house to be built on the lot. Chair Metson confirmed that it did allow this house.

Mr. Edgar said the width of the house was beyond the scope of what was in Canemah. There was no historic precedent for the width. It created a significantly greater frontage on 4th Avenue. The parcel had DOGAMI mapping that showed landslides on the property. He thought the windows should be clustered more historically in appearance rather than big glass windows and sliding doors. The water that flowed off of 4th would flow over the driveway to the house and could lead to the property being subject to a landslide.

Chair Metson said landslides were not a part of the HRB's purview, but historical appropriateness was.

Mr. Green gave rebuttal. The lot was approved for one dwelling unit. Regarding the width, there were a number of buildings that were 50 feet or wider in Canemah, such as the Miller House. The geo hazards would be addressed in the geotech review. There were no sliding doors proposed, but there would be double french doors that would not be viewed from the public right-of-way. He would be working on the water management to make sure the water was collected and connected appropriately so there would be no hazard to his property or anyone else's. He explained the vegetative screening that would screen the lower six feet of the back of the property.

Chair Metson closed the public hearing.

Chair Metson thought there should be a condition of approval that the lower section of the porch be screened.

Ms. Met thought the transoms and french doors were acceptable and broke up the massing, and were much better than a sliding glass door.

Chair Metson looked up the Milguard ultra windows and thought they were appropriate. Due to the 30% slope, the alternative solution was to have an elongated house with a larger massing as it retreated down the hill. The front of the building and massing had been broken up with a breezeway which was recessed in the front and back. There was precedent in the neighborhood and homes with similar breaks, massing, and width.

Mr. Blythe suggested a condition that the upper deck and lower deck project out in an equal amount. It was not historically appropriate to have an upper deck project beyond the lower deck.

Mr. Martin said the conditions to be added were landscape screening for the basement portion of the deck and the reduced upper deck.

A motion was made by Mr. Baysinger, seconded by Mr. Blythe, to approve HR 16-02 with the added conditions of approval. The motion carried by the following vote:4-0-0

Aye: 4 - Derek Metson, Claire Met, Ken Baysinger and Grant Blythe

4. General Business

4a. Historic Review Board Concurrence: Solar Panels at 215 Washington Street

Ms. Richter asked if the Board had any conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, or site visits to declare. No concerns of the disclosures were identified.

Chair Metson spoke briefly to the applicant at the last meeting not directly related to this and he had not seen anything the applicant submitted.

Mr. Martin stated this was a request for HRB concurrence to allow staff approval for solar panels on a home at 215 Washington Street or if it should be brought to the HRB for a hearing. He discussed the proposed conditions of approval, such as the panels would not be visible from the Washington Street right-of-way and all mechanical equipment would be screened and not visible. He showed pictures of where the solar panels would be located on the west side of the home and the type of solar panels that would be installed.

Mr. Baysinger asked if the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association commented on this. Mr. Martin said no, they had not as this was an item that could be done at the staff level without sending out notices. It could be an over the counter review.

Ms. Met asked if this was on the historic register. Mr. Martin said this home was locally designated.

Chair Metson said if the solar panels were visible from the street, there would be an issue.

A motion was made by Ms. Met, seconded by Mr. Baysinger, to concur that the solar panels at 215 Washington Street could be approved at staff level. The motion carried by the following vote:4-0-0

Aye: 4 - Derek Metson, Claire Met, Ken Baysinger and Grant Blythe

4b.**Design Advice: Development on an Individually Designated Historic Property on Washington Street (Hackett House)**

Mr. Martin said the design advice was for the Hackett Hospitality Group project on 17th and Washington. There was a parcel of land adjacent to the Hackett House that was being proposed to be redeveloped. They would retain the Hackett House and wanted to integrate it with the redevelopment. The applicant was requesting design advice from the HRB for the project. This would be part of a multi-family residential and hotel/retail development. The Hackett House would be an office or restaurant/retail use. He explained possible pedestrian and bicycle connections to the site. A hotel of approximately 100 rooms would be located adjacent to the Hackett House. The lobby floor of the hotel would be elevated above Washington Street to keep above the flood elevation. The primary vehicular access would be from Washington Street and secondary access would be on 17th. The Hackett House would remain on site and there would be parking next to it.

Lloyd Hill and Mark Foley, applicants, confirmed the house was not being moved. The hotel would be on a separate tax lot. The large maple tree on the site would remain and the landscaping would be redesigned. There were some evergreen trees on the site, and if the arborist deemed them healthy, they would be kept as well. If not, they would be replaced by new, healthy specimens. The rest of the property that extended to the railroad depot would be redeveloped as part of this master plan. The current plan had two new structures plus the Hackett House. There had been flooding on the property previously. The hotel would be a Hampton Inn and Suites. They wanted an entrance where people could be dropped off or picked up, which needed to be out of the flood zone. They also wanted 100 rooms and in order to do so, it had to be a five story building. It was smaller footprint and left the Hackett House where it was. The Hackett House was currently being used as office space, but it might evolve into a bistro restaurant or meeting space. It would continue to be a historic property and any alterations would come before the HRB. They did not want the hotel to detract from the historic character of the house.

Chair Metson did not have any large concerns. They would probably need to remove the large conifer by the bay window, but he hoped they could keep the large conifers on the back side of the property for screening. The south facade variation was good, although there could be more variation, and he was in favor of keeping the curb in the same place.

Ms. Met thought the biggest issue was the height. Chair Metson thought given the options, this was the most sensitive solution.

5. Communications

Ms. Terway said a new plans inspector had been hired. There were some planning applications that went before the Land Use Board of Appeals, the Beavercreek Road Concept Plan and remand of the Comprehensive Plan amendment and zone change for the intersection of Beavercreek and Highway 213. These were now both in the Court of Appeals. There had been some land slides around the City and five were being watched currently.

Mr. Martin said next month there would be an application for a new home in Canemah.

6. Adjournment

Chair Metson adjourned the meeting at 8:32 PM.