



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes Historic Review Board

Tuesday, February 25, 2014

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chair McLoughlin called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.

Sign Code Update

Laura Terway, Planner, presented the Sign Code update. She explained the project goal, public involvement campaign, and Community Advisory Team final recommendations that would affect the HRB.

There was consensus not to allow temporary banners, internally lit signs, or electronic message centers in the historic districts. There would be no internally lit signs except for neon when approved by the HRB through the 1740 approval process regardless of whether or not they were individually designated.

There was discussion regarding how to trigger an HRB review for internally lit signs for non designated structures.

Ms. Terway said staff was now writing their recommendations and finalizing the report from the CAT team. A legislative application would go before the Planning Commission and City Commission. She summarized the HRB was generally in favor of the proposed Sign Code. They did not want to allow temporary banners in a historic district or individually designated structures. For internally lit signs, staff would investigate a way to allow neon signs and allow them for non designated structures if they did not meet the definition of new construction. If they did meet the definition of new construction, they would come before the HRB.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, introduced Jonathan Stone, new Main Street Manager.

Mr. Stone explained the heritage story telling process happening for downtown, which was a branding project and essay competition around the First City Story concept.

2014 Historic Review Board Work Plan

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner reviewed the changes made to the 2014 HRB Work Plan. She proposed two projects for the Certified Local Government Grant, historic home owner education packets and a pamphlet of the historic structures in the City.

There was discussion regarding applying the grant towards the Ermatinger House. Mr. Metson thought the Ermatinger House was more important than the other projects.

A motion was made by Mr. Siewert, seconded by Ms. Towle, to approve both staff projects and Ermatinger House projects pending staff recommendations for specific funding levels for the CLG grant. The motion carried by the

following vote:

2. Discussion Items

Break For Dinner- Public Hearings will start at 7:00 PM

Chair McLoughlin recessed the meeting at 6:52 PM for dinner, and reconvened at 7:05 PM.

3. Public Hearings

HR 14-01- New Construction in the McLoughlin Conservation District

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest or ex parte contact to declare. There were none. All Board members had visited the site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. This was an application for new construction in the McLoughlin Conservation District at the base of Waterboard Park. She explained the site plan, elevations, and existing condition of the site. One item for HRB review was the preservation incentive which would need to be renoticed for the March HRB meeting or the applicant could follow the condition to push the rear porch to 15 feet as allowed by Code. The McLoughlin Neighborhood Association had concern regarding the porch detailing in the rear and pitch of the roof. There also needed to be HRB direction regarding the windows. She discussed how the Historic Review Board process and Geologic Hazard Zone process worked. These were separate processes and after going through the HRB process, the applicant would apply for the official geotechnical review.

The Board pointed out Conditions 1 and 2 were the same as 5 and 6 and 5 and 6 would be eliminated.

Raymond Bell, Bell's Construction Inc., was the applicant. He thought the design helped mitigate for both the geologic hazard and historic guidelines. He went over the conditions of approval. He thought pressure treated wood could meet the conditions for the deck and porch and explained the details of what was being proposed for the deck and porch. The design of the back deck was entered into the record as Exhibit 1, and the design of the front porch was entered as Exhibit 2. The siding would be changed for a tighter reveal. He preferred not to put any lighting on the wall of the porch, but to use recessed lighting. French sliding doors would be the solution to the rear sliding glass doors. Back porch windows were double pair with moulding down the middle. They could be separated. The design of the house was dependent on the 9/12 roof pitch. He had redrawn the pitch of the dormer at a 6, which was entered into the record as Exhibit 3. He took photos of houses in the area that his design was taken from with steep roof pitches in bungalow styles, which was entered into the record as Exhibit 4. The home next door was small, but new construction often spurred the neighborhood to upgrade or add on and maybe that person would do the same.

There was discussion regarding putting knee braces on the sides, the eave overhang, columns in the front, and windows on the front.

Don and Dominique Baker, residents of Oregon City, lived next door and were

concerned about the construction and not being able to access their driveway and that people would not walk on their property.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said those concerns could be addressed through the right of way permit.

Denyse McGriff, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, recommended the posts on the decking match the posts on the front. She thought the french door reveal would be much better than the sliding glass door. Regarding the roof pitch, the dormer needed to be proportional. It currently looked out of scale, and she asked if the HRB could help with that. The Association concurred with staff's findings.

Mr. Bell preferred one over one for the windows as opposed to nine over one as he thought he had to do.

Chair McLoughlin suggested dropping the roof pitch to a 7 and creating dormers on either side.

Ms. Towle said a lot of homes near this site had T-11 siding and were non significant historically. She read from the design guidelines how new construction was not historic nor should attempt to be historic, but stand by historic structures in a respectful manner and would compliment one of these styles to support the historic context. She thought this new building had enough elements in it to be compatible with what was standing around it. It did not have to be an authentic 1920s bungalow.

Chair McLoughlin suggested a square side bump out to be more historic.

Mr. Bell explained the reasons he decided against a shed roof, which made the roof seem too large.

Chair McLoughlin suggested breaking up the windows into three or four windows across instead of one big one.

Mr. Metson complimented Mr. Bell in making the house look like a Bungalow on the interior which helped to form a bungalow on the exterior.

Mr. Bell said options for the back porch were making it shorter and moving the house forward.

Ms. McGriff thought having the geotechnical report after the applicant came to the HRB put the applicant at a disadvantage. It was helpful in the design of the house, and she thought the processes needed to be parallel.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner reviewed the potential additions or revisions to the conditions. The applicant needed to tell them whether or not he wanted to move forward with the preservation incentive. The added conditions were the applicant shall redesign the rear deck to be compatible but simpler in design to the front deck. The applicant shall include knee braces on either side of the main elevation and the dormer. The applicant shall redesign the bay bump out to be a square bump out on the side elevation. The applicant shall break the windows on the front dormer into a minimum of four smaller divided light windows.

There was discussion regarding the two car garage door and making a condition that

the applicant add on elements to make it look like a carriage garage door.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said the condition could be added to say the applicant shall provide additional elements in the two car garage doors to break it up to look like two one car garages such as hinges and handles. The applicant had proposed a four and a half inch reveal and she could change the condition to match that. Staff could help direct the applicant in using the proper porch lighting. The Board added these additional conditions to enhance the compatibility of the type of home, style, and the neighborhood. The topography played a role in making a unique form.

Mr. Bell wanted to work to make the 15 foot setback, either moving the house forward or reducing the deck to stay within the setbacks.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said a new condition of approval would be the applicant shall either reduce the length of the porch to fit within the setbacks or shift the house forward. Regarding the condition for the garage door, the reasons were the vehicle ingress and egress and turning radius.

A motion was made by Mr. Metson, seconded by Ms. Towle, to approve HR 14-01 with the conditions as stated by staff. The motion carried by the following vote:

HR 14-02 New Construction in the Canemah Historic District

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing. He asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest or ex parte contact to declare.

Mr. Siewert resided in the house kitty-korner from the applicant property. All Board members had visited the site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. She discussed the site including a possible driveway, historic rock walls, tree removal plan, vernacular design, elevations, detached garage, pictures of the property, and geologic hazards as a separate Type 2 process. The items for review were the front elevation of the second story window configuration, side elevation window configuration, greater porch detailing, and allowing some flexibility to move the garage during the geologic hazards review. She then explained the proposed conditions of approval.

Todd Speck, Mt. View Contracting Co., and Dave Kemple were the applicants. They discussed the windows on the front elevation. The applicant didn't want to do a false window, so Mr. Speck suggested symmetry of the windows that were proposed. There was discussion regarding switching the locations of the bathroom and the closet of the master bedroom to get the proper symmetry.

There was further discussion regarding the front windows on the first story, size of the windows, handrail, and massing of the posts.

Mr. Speck discussed the garage being 10 feet from the back of the property and the majority of the foundation working as a retaining wall. The Board did not have an issue with how it was proposed. Chair McLoughlin suggested using a 2 x 10 for the upper fascia boards on the front elevation.

Howard Post, resident of Oregon City, entered pictures of surrounding houses into the record as Exhibit 1. He did not think the proposed house was compatible with the neighborhood. He entered pictures regarding the toe and slope cut in the hillside as Exhibit 2. The cut should not remove the toe of any slope that contained a known landslide or greater than 25% slope. He was concerned about the steep slope. He

suggested moving the house closer to 4th Avenue to take less of a cut in the hill.

Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, entered his packet of information as Exhibit 3 into the record. His house was immediately above this property. It was a shared responsibility to create structures that were contributing in a manner that did not detract from the existing contributing inventory of historic buildings which represented the core reasons for having historic district status. He thought the proposed house was not a historic Canemah district vernacular design, but more of a hybrid big box house with virtually no contributing vernacular design type features. The proposed massing was not found in Canemah. Most of the vernacular houses were narrower and longer with higher pitched roofs and three to one height to width windows. He thought it detracted from the Canemah neighborhood. The width of the house created a problem with leveling out the lot and forced cuts into a very steep slope.

Denyse McGriff had provided design advice to the applicants. The level of detail on the plan was missing. Since this was the Canemah national register district, the findings needed to be very specific. If the applicant needed to resubmit a drawing that reflected more accurately what was required to go with the findings, she encouraged them to do so. She agreed the garage doors should have no detail and agreed with the suggestion on the windows. She did not have an objection to the pitch of the roof.

Mr. Speck had more detailed plans of the topography of the house and how it would look. The detailed plans were entered into the record as Exhibit 4. Regarding resubmitting a set of drawings, he wanted to know what would be approved to bring back. There was discussion regarding the porch.

Ms. McGriff said the detailed plans shown were the old plans, and she encouraged new detailed plans to be brought back to the HRB.

Mr. Edgar pointed out the corner of the lot was where the driveway turned and did not extend up the hill, but if they did extend it would cut up a steep bank and that bank was in a landslide area. The contour and dimensions being shown were incorrect.

Chair McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said as part of the notice of the decision and findings of fact, the applicant could turn in a revised plan that would address the items of concern.

Ms. Towle said the grading needed to be done before construction.

Mr. Metson thought there should be more detail in future applications. He thought the design was simple, the south elevation was disproportionate, but the applicant was trying to do this right.

Chair McLoughlin said there was concern about proportion and aesthetics and if it fit in the area. The vernacular style was simple and he thought it would fit in the neighborhood. If the slope became an issue after the geotechnical review, then they would have to deal with it at that time. He thought even though this was a historic district, most of the homes were not historic and the entire area was a geo hazard and there were homes that had been there for 100 years.

Ms. Towle added the general design principles for new construction stated the application should not attempt to be historic.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said this wording would be added to Condition 8 regarding

the porch, 4 x 4 posts wrapped in cedar with scrollwork where the posts connected to the beams with two by two pickets and a top and bottom rail. Nothing would change for Condition 2. She would take out the last sentence in Condition 7, the applicant shall provide either two or three proportionate separated windows on the second story. Conditions 9 and 10 would be removed. The applicant shall redesign the plan to provide the following: either two-thirds or three-fourths light front door, the bottom of the porch shall be wrapped in either siding or square one inch lattice, raise the ground floor windows to be a minimum of 18 inches above the floor, and continue the barge boards and not cut them and that they be minimum 2 x 6 and maximum 2 x 10, not 2 x 12. The reasons for these conditions were the drawings were lacking and required the HRB to ask for additional findings to make the details necessary. Ms. Robertson-Gardiner would create the findings of fact, conditions of approval, ask for the applicant's resubmittal, and would mail the notice of decision out.

A motion was made by Ms. Towle, seconded by Mr. Siewert, to approve HR 14-02 with the conditions as stated by staff. The motion carried by the following vote:

4. Communications

HR 14-03 New Construction in the McLoughlin Conservation District
-Request for Continuance.

A motion was made by Mr. Metson, seconded by Ms. Towle, to continue HR 14-03 to March 25, 2014. The motion carried by the following vote:

5. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were suggested.

6. Adjournment

Chair McLoughlin adjourned the meeting at 9:20 PM.