



CITY OF OREGON CITY HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

Hanlon Commission Chambers, Libke Public Safety Building, 1234 Linn Ave, Oregon City,
OR 97045
Tuesday, May 26, 2026 at 7:00 PM

Ways to participate in this public meeting:

- Attend in person, location listed above. Please see the public comment guidelines below.
- Attend the livestream of the meeting on the City's YouTube Channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofOregonCity>

- Register to provide electronic testimony (email ocplanning@orc.city.org or call 503-722-3789 by 3:00 PM on the day of the meeting to register)
 - Email ocplanning@orc.city.org (deadline to submit written testimony via email is 3:00 PM on the day of the meeting)
-
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2. MEETING MINUTES

- a. Meeting minutes approval for 1-27-2026

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Please see the public comment guidelines below.

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

- a. Certified Local Government Grant (CLG) Education Options

5. COMMUNICATIONS

6. ADJOURNMENT

PUBLIC COMMENT GUIDELINES

Complete a Comment Card prior to the meeting and submit it to the clerk. When the Chair calls your name, proceed to the speaker table, and state your name and city of residence. Each speaker is given 3 minutes to speak. As a general practice, the committee does not engage in discussion with those making comments. Complaints shall be addressed at the department level prior to addressing the committee.

ADA NOTICE

The location is ADA accessible. Hearing devices may be requested from the City Recorder prior to the meeting. Individuals requiring other assistance must make their request known 48 hours preceding the meeting by contacting the City Recorder's Office at 503-657-0891.

Agenda Posted at City Hall, Pioneer Community Center, Library, City Website.

Video Streaming & Broadcasts: The meeting is streamed live on the [Oregon City's website](#) and available on demand following the meeting. The meeting can be viewed on Willamette Falls Television channel 28 for Oregon City area residents as a rebroadcast. Please contact WFMC at 503-650-0275 for a programming schedule.



**CITY OF OREGON CITY
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

Hanlon Commission Chambers, Libke Public Safety Building, 1234 Linn Ave, Oregon City, OR 97045
Tuesday, January 27, 2026 at 7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Present: 5 - Board Member Tim Powell, Board Member Robert Green, Board Member Paul Edgar, Board Member Gordon Lawrence, and Board Member Julia Anne Fulkerson

Staffers: 3 - Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Assistant Planner Jude Thaddaeus, and Assistant Planner Melissa Lopez

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Tim Powell was elected as Chair and Julia Fulkerson as Vice Chair for 2026.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. HR-25-00014: New construction of a 6-unit multi-family building at the Sarah Hughes House (1102 7th St)

Chair Powell opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He 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 since the last hearing.

All Board Members had visited the site.

Jude Thaddaeus, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. He summarized the HRB's direction at the last hearing including: egress areas at the southeastern lot line may be resolved by high-mounted mini-split units,

outboard porch posts may be removed to retain wider-set inboard posts or a floating porch cover could be used or sprinklers but not a fire wall extension, porch depth may be reduced to accommodate more egress area at the rear, along the southeastern lot line, the front façade second floor cantilever should not increase from what was proposed without additional decorative elements to mitigate its effects, and maintain at least five feet of building separation to resolve the window and egress issues between the new structure and the Sarah Hughes House. The applicant submitted a revised site plan and building design. He reviewed the new site plan that addressed the HRB's direction. Guy Altman, Building Code Plans Examiner, had reviewed the changes proposed and thought the applicant had addressed all the items that concerned the HRB. However, he did not think it complied with the fire separation requirements. He recommended that the applicant draw an imaginary property line on the plans and elevations and address the requirements as it related to both structures, which could be done prior to a building permit. He showed renderings comparing the previous and new proposals, revised building position for the mini-split units, removal of the porch posts, second floor cantilever that was not increased, building separation, bicycle parking shed, and trash enclosure. He discussed the items for the HRB to consider and asked if the changes to the building position and design were sufficient and if the location and materials proposed for the bicycle parking shed and trash enclosure were sufficient or should be changed. He then reviewed the conditions of approval.

There was discussion regarding the location of the bike shed, type of siding allowed, and the reveal on the siding.

Trevor Tyree and Tony Uzuegbunam, applicants, thought they had met all the requirements while keeping the units livable and functional. For the bike shed, the cedar look would not match the Sarah Hughes House so it would not detract from the historic house. They wanted to keep the trash enclosure near the property line so it could be hidden from 7th Street. One of the windows was a fixed window and the other was a casement window. They could get windows that looked like single hung windows.

The HRB thought it would be a much better look to put in single hung windows. They asked about using painted metal roofing for the bike shed and trash enclosure, painted siding for the trash enclosure to match the new building, natural stained look or painted the same trim color as the Sarah Hughes House for the bike shed, type of siding for the shed and enclosure, location of the doors, relocating the shed by the trash enclosure, accommodating the change

in grade for rolling the trash carts out, changing the full windows at the rear of the building to functional windows, and minimizing the entryway by taking out the posts.

The condition was modified to allow both options for the shed, to stay on JQ Adams or to relocate to the rear next to the trash enclosure and a sign to the entrance of the Sarah Hughes House would be added indicating the location. The cedar siding would be painted the same trim color as the Sarah Hughes House or green to disappear from view. If the bike shed fronted JQ Adams, the roof would be painted to match the trim of the Sarah Hughes House. Other conditions included: the front and rear elevation windows should be 1:1, casement window dividers should be externally applied, applicant should replace the faux windows on the southeastern elevation with real 1:1 windows and the position may be changed to suit, the shed roofs on the trash enclosure and bike shed should be painted or treated so as to be non-reflective or the material could be changed to comply with HRB policy, and the trash enclosure would use Hardie board lap siding.

Chair Powell closed the public hearing.

The HRB thought the previous issues with the application had been resolved.

A motion was made by Board Member Edgar, seconded by Board Member Lawrence, to approve HR-25-00014: new construction of a 6-unit multi-family building at the Sarah Hughes House (1102 7th St) with the amended conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

5. DISCUSSION

- a. Compatible Change: New Construction Review in Historic Districts- HRB Policy and OCMC 17.40 Code Review

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Senior Planner, reviewed what had been discussed previously for the compatible change project and the direction the HRB had given staff on dormers. Staff had taken the changes and put them in

a codified document. She also discussed the archeological monitoring requirements, which would be updated through a different process. She asked the HRB what they were trying to encourage and discourage with Policy 13 and if Policy 13 provided a middle ground approach that was neither too specific nor too broad. If not, what should be adjusted? Once the HRB reached consensus on the revisions, staff would schedule a Work Session with the City Commission before moving forward with the legislative adoption process.

The HRB discussed what they were trying to encourage with Policy 13, which was development of small, affordable dwelling units that had the correct aesthetic for the historic neighborhoods and would limit public backlash. They wanted to discourage barriers to development by streamlining and simplifying the process. They were close to providing a middle ground approach.

Board Member Green thought for the dormers, there didn't need to be a second floor for a dormer to be approved. Dormers would be appropriate as long as they did not go above the ridgeline and were set back one foot from the wall below, and did not total more than 50% of the wall length. He did not think people would be able to see two dormers at the same time.

The requirements for dormers were changed to: could be at or below the ridgeline just not above the ridgeline, three feet from the gable roof edge, one foot back from the wall below, and a dormer could be on both sides so long as it was no more than 50% of the wall length. There would be a minimum of 3:12 roof pitch for shed dormers and gable dormers would need to match the roof pitch of the main structure.

Board Member Green also suggested requiring 20% or less glazing for the sidewalls and 30% on the front. There was consensus to make that change.

Board Member Green also thought oval glass in the entrance doors should be allowed.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said the oval was more of a higher style design, and the smaller accessory buildings would be simpler, more affordable designs. It would not be seen on the more Vernacular style of home as opposed to a Victorian style. There was consensus not to allow oval glass.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said staff would be working on the CLG Grant application.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Powell adjourned the meeting at 9:00 PM.

Date Approved: _____

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office

In the Oregon Heritage Conference's off-year, Oregon Heritage hosts a Virtual Summit. The purpose of the summit is to be single-issue-focused and to provide an opportunity for larger-scale discussions at the state-wide and regional levels. Previous year summits have focused on fundraising (2017), Board development (2019), collaboration (2021), volunteers (2023), and advocacy (2025).

2027 Virtual Summit SAVE THE DATE: April 15-16

BACKGROUND:**NEXT STEPS:****OPTIONS:**

Historic Review Board 2025-2027 Biennium Work Plan

Adopted October 28, 2025

Project	Purpose	Action Items	Staff Level of Effort	HRB Role	Timeline	Status
<p>1. Education List conference, webinars, and other educational experiences</p>	<p>Provide HRB members with educational opportunities to enhance their understanding of historic preservation and their role in creating policies and reviewing applications.</p> <p>Apply for Certified Local Government (CLG) grant to help pay for attendance</p>	<p>Attend sessions</p>	<p>Low Outside educational opportunities</p>	<p>Attend sessions</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p>2. Education- Yearly preservation presentation from City Attorney- Carrie Richter on Preservation and Public Hearing basics</p>		<p>Attend sessions</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Attend sessions</p>	<p>Scheduled for January or February 2026 and April 2027 HRB meetings</p>	
<p>3. 17.40 Code Revisions Compatible Change – Definition of New Construction – Thresholds for triggering review of non-designated structures</p>	<p>Implement the compatible change policy recommendation, create redline drafts for OCMC 17.40 Historic Overlay District, and revised HAP policies.</p> <p>Support staff as they move the revision through the legislative process.</p>	<p>See the project page for more details https://www.orcity.org/3246/Compatible-Change--New-Construction-Revi</p>	<p>High Support website, Survey, and consultant on this topics</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>October 2024 - June 2025</p>	<p>In Progress –</p>

Project	Purpose	Action Items	Staff Level of Effort	HRB Role	Timeline	Status
4. Improving the Historic Review Approval process Coordination with applicants and other departments to ensure compliance with Conditions of Approval	Ensure that built historic projects are consistent with the approved decision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure Conditions of Approval are added to plans • Attend Building pre-construction meeting • Investigate if the mid-build inspection is helpful/feasible 	Medium Provide status updates to HRB at future meetings	Provide staff with any requested direction	Ongoing	In progress New E-review system going online in winter 2025-
5. Improving the Historic Review Approval Process Revisit HRB Policy #12 Solar Panels at the end of the biennium work plan to see if this item needs to be revisited in the next biennium work plan		Revisit at a future HRB meeting	Low	Discuss at the future HRB meeting.	Spring 2027	
6. Public Outreach Policy 13 and Compatible Change Adoption Trail news More Historic Articles	Continue to educate historic homeowners on the regulatory requirements and grant opportunities available to them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send quarterly to new historic homeowners • Write articles for Trail News, a Chamber of Commerce member magazine. • Mail out letter and flyer to all MCD property owners once the compatible change is adopted. 	Low Utilizing existing materials	Encourage HRB members to work with staff to write articles about historic resources and HRB programs	Quarterly	
7. Public Outreach	Promote historic places to instill community pride,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation Month • Ruth Powers Award 	Low	Select the award winner	May 2024, 2025	

Project	Purpose	Action Items	Staff Level of Effort	HRB Role	Timeline	Status
Public Education and Recognition	promote heritage tourism, and showing the social and economic benefits of historic preservation	<p>Coordinating awards, proclamations, and city communication.</p> <p>If coordination with another entity is needed to promote a shared preservation month event, additional staff time would be needed, which would be added to the work plan.</p>	Utilizing existing materials			
<p>8. McLoughlin Conservation District (MCD) Resurvey Begin research on the process and cost to resurvey the McLoughlin Conservation District. Based on cost and commission support, it will be implemented in a future work plan.</p>	The last survey of the McLoughlin n Conservation District was conducted in 2002. Many changes have occurred since then, and updated information will clarify the significance of the district and how to approach compatible infill and additions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reach out to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to understand the scope and funding opportunities, as well as average costs. Discuss at the upcoming HRB meeting to determine if this will be an HRB budget request to the City Commission during the next budget discussions. 	Med	<p>Provide additional research if needed.</p> <p>Advocate to the City Commission during the next budget cycle.</p>	Fall 2026	