

**CITY OF OREGON CITY
DRAFT HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 23, 2010**

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

Board Members Present:

Chair John McLoughlin
Ken Baysinger
Vicki Yates
Cindy Towle
Todd Iselin

Staff Present:

Christina Robertson Gardiner, Associate Planner
Laura Butler, Assistant Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair McLoughlin called the meeting to order at 7:05 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

HR 09-09 Beemer Way Lot #2 Condition of Approval #1

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Associate Planner, said last fall the Board reviewed an infill new construction on a partition of a landmark and the remaining condition was the applicant needed to resubmit a detailed landscape plan showing how they were adequately buffering the new construction with the landmark. The plan showed an increased setback and proposed trees at full growth. Staff thought it met the intent of what the Board wanted. With this approval, the applicant would move forward with building permits.

Scott Rainey of Oregon City and Michelle Lowe of Molalla were the applicants. Mr. Rainey explained the proposed landscape plan.

Motion by Mr. Baysinger, second by Ms. Yates, to approve HR 09-09 Beemer Way Lot #2 Condition of Approval #1 as submitted. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

HR 10-01 & HR 10-02 Atkinson Memorial Church Addition & Demolition Request

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.

Ms. Robertson Gardiner said the applicant did a pre-design meeting at a noticed public Historic Review Board meeting in October 2009. All the Board members were present at that meeting.

Ms. Robertson Gardiner reviewed the staff report and PowerPoint presentation as well as a memorandum from M. Jarrett which were entered into the record.

Paul Falsetto of Carleton Hart Architecture of Portland, OR was representing Atkinson Memorial Church. He discussed how the addition was appropriate to the McLoughlin Conservation District and church building itself. The applicant was requesting a variance to push the building back eight feet, six inches so it would be equal to or behind the church and the highest part of the building was half of what was allowed. He explained the design for the front and back of the building, classroom wing, transition zone, and HVAC units. They were trying to preserve the neighborhood, historic resource, and use of the Oregon City Preschool. The architectural site plan included adding trees and landscaping and stormwater guarding which would handle the water quality for the entire development.

Ms. Yates asked about the HVAC unit being visible from 5th Street and Mr. Falsetto thought with the trees, buildings, and distance it would not be visible.

Mr. Iselin was concerned about changing the main entry. Mr. Falsetto explained why it was important to have a second entry independent of the church and described the design.

Ms. Towle thought the historic character of the neighborhood did not match the building.

Chair McLoughlin opened the public hearing.

Alice Erickson, Chair of the Board of Trustees for Atkinson Memorial Church, said their congregation overwhelming supported this plan. It gave them more space, accessibility, and fit in with the existing building and neighborhood. She explained why they chose Carleton Hart for this project. She thought this addition showed honor, respect, and love for historic buildings and hoped the Board would approve the plans as presented.

Scott Silver of West Linn was in favor of the project. He was a member of the church and served on the church's Facilities Committee. The church was the center of the community, but there were accessibility issues for those unable to use the stairs. He asked the Board help them take the next step.

Margaret Foss of Oregon City lived across the street from this addition, and was outraged and heart sick about the proposed destruction of a formerly designated landmark of the Oregon City Preschool building. The project was not in the best interest of the neighborhood and not appropriate to the historic value of Oregon City. She had been unaware this was being planned until a few months ago.

Mark Mask of Oregon City said he was the closest homeowner to the proposed site. He was opposed to the building plan. He thought the roofline needed to be changed. He was also confused about the east elevation and how it would affect the view from his home. He did not think this was harmonious with the historical integrity of the neighborhood.

Robert Foss of Oregon City said he lived across the street from the site and had questions about what the project would do to the integrity of the historic district of Oregon City. He also wondered what it would do to his property value.

Karin Morey of unincorporated Clackamas County said putting a brick structure across the street detracted from the Carnegie building and its uniqueness. This proposal was not compatible with the beauty of the church and detracted from the church and neighborhood.

Dana Worsnop of Milwaukie, OR was the minister of the church. The congregation was profoundly aware of the history of the church both architecturally and community wide. She explained how the church had been a community center in the past and needed the accessibility to continue to be a gathering place. They had been in contact with the Neighborhood Association from the beginning and had a relationship with Oregon City Preschool that they wanted to continue.

Denyse McGriff represented the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association. The church started this process two years ago and came to many of the neighborhood meetings. She reviewed the project and it was complete. The church was still the dominate building. The windows were being preserved. She was not troubled by the flat roof. It would blend in over time and they tried to take some elements from the neighborhood. She recommended approval of the proposal.

Patrick Sweeney of Oregon City was in opposition to the proposal. He thought the compatibility of this addition to the Carnegie Center was too similar in architecture and would be a conflict of interest. He thought this building lacked in creativity and did not fit in the neighborhood.

Ron Schweiger of Oregon City lived in the neighborhood and was not in favor of the project. He explained how the new building did not tie in with the church and neighborhood. The look took away from the Carnegie Center and anything else around it.

Chuck Scott of Oregon City was a member of the church and in favor of the proposal. This process started eight years ago addressing the growing need for more space. The first set of plans was for a building much larger than what was being proposed. He explained why the building had been scaled back. They had received a lot of input and the handicapped issue had been a struggle for years that needed to be addressed.

Dean DeSantis of Oregon City was a member of the church and served on the Building Committee. He was in support of the project. Mr. Falsetto was a widely recognized historical building expert and the church had hired Carleton Hart because of their expertise in historic building renovation and architecture. They met the design requirements of the City and historic neighborhood and he asked for the Board's support for the project as proposed.

Ann Scott of Lake Oswego was the Director of Religious Education for the church. She had the responsibility for the safety and well being of children and their families when they came to the congregation. They currently used every room possible on Sunday morning, and it was crowded and they wanted to make better use of the building. The new building would make it accessible for children who had special needs and the preschool families could enter on the Jefferson entrance which was level.

Kimberly Walch of Oregon City and Childcare Coordinator for the church was in favor of this proposal. It was important the neighborhood thrived historically and economically and this project would do both.

Mr. Falsetto said they worked hard to make sure this building fit in the neighborhood. The layout of the neighborhood near parks and institutional uses helped mitigate the new building. They made sure the building was down on the site, was scaled properly, and had internal integrity to it.

Ms. Yates liked the design and was not troubled with the flat roof. It fit with the Carnegie Center and the massing and proportion were good. Her only concern was the HVAC units from the back of the building.

Mr. Iselin said the massing and articulation were good as well as the variety of materials. He was not troubled by the flat roof either.

Ms. Towle had trouble with the design of the structure and the flat roof. She expressed concern about the compatibility of the structure.

Mr. Baysinger was impressed with the thoroughness and completeness of the applicant, staff, and Neighborhood Association work. He thought the result of the process had to be right.

Mr. McLoughlin said he saw both sides and was sensitive to those in the neighborhood and saw the need for the church. This met the criteria and conditions of approval and it was compatible.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said they could add a condition of approval that before release of a building permit, the HVAC units would be screened from pedestrian views along Jefferson and Sixth Street and the applicant could use a site line study to show that. This would be Condition 3. She also suggested adding another condition of approval, Condition 4, to identify when the Board wanted to see the small changes come back for a modification to the approval.

Mr. McLoughlin said the proposed building looked like a vacant box and thought the landscape plan could help with enhancement or softening.

Mr. DeSantis owned a landscape contracting business that had created the design. He explained the landscape plan.

Mr. McLoughlin closed the public hearing.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner discussed the two proposed conditions of approval. The Board explained the details of what they wanted to review for a modification to the approval.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said the applicant would come back at a noticed public hearing and provide the Historic Review Board with specific details on materials, siting details, awning details, and railings or support beam details. This would be Condition 4. Condition 3 would be in regard to the HVAC units and the applicant would submit to staff a site line drawing.

Motion by Ms. Yates, second by Mr. Baysinger, to approve HR 10-01 & HR 10-02 Atkinson Memorial Church Addition & Demolition Request with the two added conditions of approval. Motion passed 4-1 with Ms. Towle opposed.

4. ADJOURN

Chair McLoughlin adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.