



# City of Oregon City

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic Review Board

Tuesday, May 28, 2024

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

### 1. Convene Regular Meeting and Roll Call

*Chair Ferry called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.*

**Present: 5 -** Board Member Sabrina Ferry, Board Member Tim Powell, Board Member Robert Green, Board Member Paul Edgar, and Board Member Gordon Lawrence

**Absent: 0 -** None

**Staffers: 2 -** Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardiner and Community Development Director Aquila Hurd-Ravich

### 2. Public Comment – *None.*

### 3. Meeting Minutes

*Christina Robertson-Gardiner noted some errors in the February 28 minutes.*

**A motion was made by Board Member Powell, seconded by Board Member Edgar, to approve the minutes for the January 26, 2016, November 22, 2022, February 28, 2023, March 28, 2023, and April 25, 2023 meetings as corrected. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye: 5 –** Board Member Ferry, Board Member Edgar, Board Member Green, Board Member Powell, and Board Member Lawrence

### 4. Public Hearing: **GLUA-24-0005 and HR 24-00004: Historic Review -920 7th Street- Railing Modification.**

*Chair Ferry opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare including a visit to the site.*

*All Board members had visited the site.*

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. This was a request for*

*modification to a previously approved project. The applicant had appealed the application for the building height and setback. The City Commission approved the request to lower the height as a way to reduce the massing but denied the request for the setback. The applicant did not request review for the railing material in the initial application. Staff agreed with the approach for the proposed metal railing on this mixed-use infill project and a revised Condition #8 to say the railing should be wood, black metal, or composite material and that the applicant shall choose only one material option for the railings. She discussed the comments received by the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association who ultimately concurred with the proposed material but requested there be consequences to the applicant's behavior to prevent recurrence and minimize the negative community impacts. She explained the subject site, elevations, and options.*

*John Delson, applicant's representative, explained why they proposed metal railings instead of wood.*

*Chair Ferry closed the public hearing.*

*The HRB deliberated on the application, including agreement that the metal railings fit in, would be low maintenance, and would be safer long term. They thought the process should be streamlined to minimize missteps.*

**A motion was made by Board Member Green, seconded by Board Member Lawrence, to approve GLUA-24-0005 and HR 24-00004: Historic Review -920 7th Street- Railing Modification with the revised conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Board Member Ferry, Board Member Edgar, Board Member Green, Board Member Powell, and Board Member Lawrence

## **Public Hearing: GLUA-24-00006/ HR-24-00005 Solar panel proposal at 720 11th Street, the James and Sarah Roake House.**

*Chair Ferry opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare including a visit to the site.*

*All Board members had visited the site.*

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner presented the staff report. This was a request for solar panels on the James and Sarah Roake House, which was a designated structure in the McLoughlin Conservation District. She reviewed HRB Policy 12 which addressed solar technology. Two panels were proposed along the northwest front facing roof gable, which was slightly within the first 1/3 of the front gabled roof. No public comments had been received. She discussed the subject site, proposed roof and mechanical equipment plan, solar study, design guidelines, recommended conditions of approval, and options.*

*Terri Poppino, applicant, wanted to get solar power for her house. She thought historic architecture and green energy could live together. She wanted to put on nine panels to get the maximum usage.*

*There was discussion regarding moving the panels proposed in front to a different location to get more irradiance and not impact the street and putting some panels on the garage.*

*Chair Ferry closed the public hearing.*

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner discussed revising Condition #2 to say the applicant shall revise the final design to locate panel section 1 to the back 2/3 of the east gable Jefferson Street elevation or add it to the rear array. If they were unable to move the sections to that location, the applicant could decide if they wanted to move it to a location that met the policy today or wait to see what the new policy would be.*

*The HRB deliberated on the application, discussing the effectiveness of the solar panels where they were proposed, missing information from the application, how this decision could affect the current revisions to the solar panel policy the HRB was working on, reasons for the proposed solar panel configuration, and if the panels could not be put on the Jefferson side the applicant could put them on the back 2/3 of the building or come back to the HRB.*

**A motion was made by Board Member Green, seconded by Board Member Edgar, to approve GLUA-24-00006/ HR-24-00005 solar panel proposal at 720 11th Street, the James and Sarah Roake House with the conditions and revised Condition #2 to say panel section 1 on the west facing front gable would be relocated to the back of the east front gable on the Jefferson Street elevation behind the cupola and the ridge or added to the rear array. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Board Member Ferry, Board Member Edgar, Board Member Green, Board Member Powell, and Board Member Lawrence

## **5. Other Business: Improving the Historic Review Approval Process- Revisit HRB Policy #12 Solar Panels**

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner explained the process for revising the HRB solar panel policy. The HRB would discuss expanding options for Type I review and provide a tentative approval for the proposed redlines. If tentatively approved, it would go to the Canemah and McLoughlin Neighborhood Associations and then a City Commission Work Session. She then reviewed the redlines and staff recommendations.*

*There was discussion regarding ambiguity in the setback from the top of roof peak, what was meant by primary gable roof, how the rear 2/3 should be of the front gable roof not side gable roof, identifying the primary vs. secondary gable for cross-gabled homes, better example photographs in the policy, grouping the panels together, how the primary gable interacted with the street presence, providing information to show that the proposal was the best balance of solar benefit, and the solar provider be on Zoom during the meeting to answer questions.*

*Staff would revise the document per the discussion and bring it back to the June meeting.*

## **Improving the Historic Review Approval process- Work Plan Item #6 Coordination with applicants and other departments to ensure compliance with Conditions of Approval**

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner gave an update on this work plan item. She explained the current process with applicants for compliance review with the conditions of approval.*

*Regarding windows, the HRB would be discussing how to create template window conditions of approval for projects. A consultant would be working with the HRB to frame these conditions in the fall.*

## **6. Communications**

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner gave an update on the compatible change project which had been put on hold during the pandemic but would start again in the fall.*

## **7. Adjournment**

*Chair Ferry adjourned the meeting at 9:21 PM.*