



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes

Historic Review Board

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Call to Order

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

2. Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments for items not on the agenda.

3. Design Advice:

3a. Design Advice for Public Works Operations Center

Martin Montalvo, Public Works Operations Manager, gave a presentation on the proposed Public Works Operation Center project. He discussed the phases of the project. This facility would be for Public Works Operations staff, which was about 40 employees, and looked at a 20 year growth span. He then explained the layout of the interior of the office building, tool storage building, fleet facility that would be the remodeled armory, and barn building. He discussed three options for the barn roof and how the intersection of 1st and Center Street would be realigned to make a dedicated four way stop. They also wanted to minimize rear turning movements in the lower yard. The exterior facade for the barn would look like a carriage house.

Brandon Dole, DECA Architecture, discussed the exterior facade and elevations of the office building, tool storage building, and barn building, including the materials that would be used. These would all have similar design and details. They tried to respect the scale and keep it lower for the surrounding residents. He explained the initial design of the elevator from the lower yard to upper yard. The elevator tower would also be a way to bring the utilities to the upper level of the site. There would be a covered breezeway from the office to the elevator. The modern contemporary office building would meet the needs of the Public Works department and would also meet the historic design guidelines. He explained the design elements that would be included such as a simple cornice and parapet, belt cornice, historically proportionate vertical windows, large, storefront-like entry, and the building would be simple, rectangular, and they had built in the ability to expand the enclosed area without having to expand the footprint. There would be a low slope roof where all of the mechanical equipment would be hidden by the parapet. The base of the building would be a ground face CMU block and there would be standing seam metal siding for the upper level.

Mr. Montalvo explained the project schedule. They planned to save as many trees as possible on the site.

Chair Metson appreciated the symmetry and bringing the massing down on the lower

level and that the barn looked like an old fire house rather than a large industrial building. Though it was a large building, the design elements such as grouping the overhead doors in threes, made it work well. Any of the roof options would be appropriate. He encouraged attention to detail for the elevator and the walkway to the cliff. He thought the upper yard building either needed to mimic the details and materials from the lower yard or mimic the massing. The building would not be very visible from the public right-of-way, but it needed to be a better fit.

Mr. Montalvo said there would be a 47 foot setback from the edge of the bluff to the building and landscaping would go in to obscure the building even more.

Chair Metson was in favor of reusing the old armory. Mr. Montalvo said the City was working with the State to acquire the armory and to renovate it with as much of the building in tact as possible.

Mr. Baysinger agreed with the basic incompatibility and design differences with the lower building and upper building.

Ms. Met said the lower building mass had more impact on the neighborhood and should be looked at more critically. They didn't know what the upper building would look like from the lower yard, which was where most people would see it. The landscaping would help buffer it, but that should not be used as an excuse. She clarified structurally the armory did not have any issues, but environmentally because of previous practices it might not be able to be used. Regarding the barn roof, she preferred the shed roof option.

Mr. Montalvo stated the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association preferred the gable roof option.

Chair Metson said he did not expect that this building would match the ornate details of the new Carnegie library addition even though that design was recently approved.

Denyse McGriff, McLoughlin Neighborhood Association Chair, said staff had done a good job of reaching out to the neighborhood regarding this project. Both buildings were equally important as people would see them from the park and street. Emphasis needed to be put on both buildings. Some people liked the gable roof, but she preferred the flat roof option. The proposed metal roof was not recommended in the design guidelines. They wanted these buildings to blend in with the neighborhood and suggested they use some of the elements in the neighborhood, but not mimic the library. She did not think the seam metal siding was allowed in the district. The rock walls should be similar to what was already in the district.

Jesse Buss, McLoughlin Neighborhood Association Treasurer, discussed comments that were forwarded to the HRB from James Nicita. There were two buildings, identical in dimension and design, that were in the upper yard. These were currently in litigation. Mr. Nicita submitted City Commission minutes from 1947 and articles from the Banner-Courier newspaper referencing these two buildings which were former officer's clubs from Camp Adair. Camp Adair was Oregon's World War II training facility and was Oregon's second largest city at the time. It was dismantled at the end of the war and most of the buildings were demolished without consideration for preservation. These two buildings in Oregon City might be the only officer's clubs that had survived. Given this new information, he requested the HRB formally move to protect these structures as designated historic structures.

4. Public Hearing

4a. Staff Request to Continue HR 16-09: 7 Proposed Cottage Homes in the Canemah National Register Historic District

Chair Metson opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Board member had conflicts of interest or ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. Most Board member had visited the site.

Trevor Martin, Planner, stated staff did not have a staff report for this application as it was being requested to be continued. A full staff report would be given at the next HRB meeting.

Chris Staggs, resident of Garden Home, was the applicant. He had been working closely with the Planning Department on this project. There were three important considerations for this project, the residential building code, cottage home development code, and historic review criteria. He thought this project worked with the neighborhood and met all of the guidelines. He got design advice from the HRB in November. Take aways from that meeting were to look at the Canemah neighborhood closely and show examples of the neighborhood that related to his design proposal, there was an emphasis on studying the specific elements of the homes and parking to know the characteristics of Canemah, and to show how they were weaving the project into the neighborhood. Being a good neighbor was one of his goals. He wanted it to feel like a part of the neighborhood. He had done an exhaustive study of the Canemah neighborhood. He thought the way the project had been sited and designed and the positions of the homes on the property in relation to the neighbors fit the guidelines and was in harmony with the neighborhood. The proposal was for seven cottage homes on four lots. It was a flag lot that faced 4th and Miller streets. It was considered a multi-family development. There would be a Homeowners Association to ensure the longevity and legacy of the design and to make sure they would be maintained. Some of the HRB objectives were to safeguard the heritage of the historic character, to encourage public knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the City's heritage, and to enhance the visual character of the district by constructing harmonious designs reflecting and supporting the existing character of the neighborhood. He thought all three had been addressed with this design. He discussed the reduced density of the project. The Code allowed him to build four single family homes with accessory dwelling units on these four parcels or he could build eight cottage homes. He decided to preserve the wetland on the site and had reduced the number of cottages to seven. The vernacular style was the basis for the massing and the design was meant to be in harmony with the scale, height, and shape of the vernacular style in Canemah. The architecture proposed was a contemporary vernacular, which was what homes were being built as today. They were to speak to the historic character of the neighborhood, but not mimic or emulate the historic character. He thought these homes did that. This project did not have an adverse effect or impact on the neighborhood. He thought the positions of the homes fit in with the eclectic quality with which homes were positioned in the neighborhood. The homes facing 4th and Miller were more traditional with fewer windows and in keeping with the original, historic fenestration and massing. When the homes faced inward to the site, there were more open windows and larger porches. He was respecting the 4th and Miller public face and more open design facing the wetland. He was requesting a preservation incentive for the two homes facing Miller to be located on the east property line. Because of the distance away from Miller, they were still 30 feet from the street edge, and they were almost in the same alignment as the neighbor to the north. On the south side there was a hillside, right-of-way, and trees.

The visual impact on Miller would be minimal. They were also preserving a significant wetland and greenspace. Many homes in the Canemah neighborhood were on the property line. He met with the Canemah Neighborhood Association twice and had conversations with neighbors about the project.

John Smitts, resident of Canby, had lived in Canemah for 14 years and continued to own property in Canemah. He thought Canemah was improving and new construction had been good for the neighborhood. He thought this project would be another improvement.

Karen Lytle Blaha, resident of Oregon City, lived adjacent to this property. She had read the entire application and thought it had been extremely well done and well researched. The applicant made himself available to discuss and clarify the application. This land would be developed sooner or later. Cottage development was part of the City's code and allowed in Canemah. The applicant's inclusion of an HOA addressed several of her concerns, such as restricting rentals and parking issues. Dense landscaping addressed her privacy and noise concerns. She liked the cottage design offering light and views. Pending a look at the upcoming staff report and facing facts as they stood, it was possible that this project would be a lovely addition to the neighborhood.

Ron Bistline, Canemah Neighborhood Association liaison to the HRB, said the developer had come twice to the neighborhood association. Things did not go well and they had not gotten all of the information about the project, and the association had not met to discuss it. They would meet before the next HRB meeting to forward a recommendation. He personally thought density was an issue especially due to the wetlands. He was also concerned about the preservation of the neighborhood in the design. They were a smaller square footage compared to other homes in the district.

Clint Goodwin, resident of Oregon City, lived adjacent to this property. He was also concerned about the density. There would be four living quarters on one lot, the same size as his single family home. Although there were three buildings on his property, only one was used as a residence and the other two were outbuildings. He thought there would be parking issues as well with the parking lot next to his driveway.

Denyse McGriff, resident of Oregon City, said the bigger issue was this was a national register historic district. How did cottage housing meet the purposes and intent of the Canemah area as a national district? Did it follow the pattern, scale, and initial layout? She asked the HRB to think about how to balance the goals from Metro regarding housing and the goals of the community and historic districts. She thought the national historic district trumped everything else.

Mr. Staggs gave rebuttal. Regarding density, this application would be less dense than what was allowed by code. The way the homes were positioned relative to the neighborhood and the context of this place along with the buffering, the visual impact and impact to the neighbors would be minimal. Regarding the comment about the square footage of the homes being too small, the homes would follow the guidelines and were not as small as trailers or tiny homes. Regarding the historic Canemah neighborhood and cottage homes guidelines, he thought when the cottage home guidelines were adopted there were studies about how they would fit in with all of the districts in the City including Canemah.

There was discussion regarding using the 5th Avenue right-of-way for access and the challenges of the steep grade and trees.

Mr. Staggs said the historical structures from the old Canemah water works were not on the 5th Avenue right-of-way but were one parcel up going up the hill. Utility improvements and extensions would be done on Miller and 4th.

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

4b.

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

Chair Metson opened the public hearing.

Mr. Martin presented the staff report. This was a request to construct a new single family home in the Canemah Historic District. The property was currently undeveloped and was located on the north side of 4th Avenue. It was also included in the Geologic Hazards Overlay District. He discussed the elevations and site plan. The parcel sloped from the south side down towards the north side. The proposed driveway would be in the public right-of-way. The applicant had a preservation incentive for a zero lot line front setback so the front of the house would be on the property line on the south. This was being requested due to the steep slope on the property, to reduce massing, and create a stable foundation for the home. The house would be built in the Canemah vernacular style and would be rectangular, would have ship lap siding, period appropriate windows, and roof slope of 10 to 12. There would be two elevated decks on the rear elevation. The applicant did not meet all of the design standards for new construction. The applicant needed to pursue alternatives and mitigation to reduce the massing of the house and its effect on the neighborhood. Was moving the house to the property line and putting in a vegetative buffer the best method to reduce the massing? If it was not, did the HRB have recommendations to further reduce the massing? The applicant was hesitant to bring additional fill to the site and was interested in pursuing a vegetative buffer. Staff was also requesting further guidance on the massing on the front side of the building and the proposed breezeway.

Dave Green, applicant, said he had gotten design advice from the HRB in November. Some adjustments had been made due to the concern about the massing. There was still concern about the massing and how to screen it. He revised the plot plan for more clarity and to show how the elevations were stepping down in three foot increments around the east side of the house. There would also be terracing to conceal the stepping down in the foundation. He did not want to try to raise the grade due to potential stability concerns. He suggested a vegetative screen behind the house to screen the lower portion of the house as a means of mitigating the view from 3rd Street. The staff report suggested strategic planting of trees, but the trees would block the view of the waterfall and would not help screen the lower portion of the house. He thought the most effective way to minimize the massing was vegetative screening on a three foot cyclone fence. He was also proposing ultra-block retaining walls on the left side of the house to help maintain stability. There was a cedar tree cluster on the southeast corner of the lot. From 4th Street, the cedar cluster would obscure the house and he planned to retain the cedar cluster. Regarding the breezeway, he realized it was outside the guidelines. He addressed it in his original design narrative and the Captain Miller House on Miller and 99E had that same element. He was told the house was in the McLoughlin Neighborhood, not Canemah, but the sign for Canemah was at the intersection where the house was located. The breezeway was key to keeping the building as small as it was. Regarding the ornamentation, there was

a small section of vertical siding on each gable end. He was flexible on the issue, although he thought it added architectural interest. If the shouldered head trim was problematic, he would propose a pedimented head on all of the windows. He planned to remove most of the soil that would be excavated. There would be some fill in the front. There was public comment about the roof pitch and the pictures were out of perspective so it looked shallower than it was. The design narrative explained the roof pitch, and he would be fine with going to 12 to 12 although it would mean increasing the massing. He was open to the Board's recommendation for the roof pitch.

Mr. Martin said because the preservation incentive was not included on the original application, and therefore not in the notice, the single family home application would need to be continued.

Chair Metson said the upper story deck was of concern. The upper story deck stuck out beyond the lower story deck and there were tall, unrestrained columns going down. He thought there should be a retaining wall in back to raise the elevation three feet. He thought both decks should be the same proportions. The amount of lap siding on the back of the house made it appear like it was another full story. If the concrete came up higher or if there was a retaining wall, it would help.

Ron Bistline, Canemah Neighborhood Association liaison to the HRB, said this application would be discussed at the next association meeting. Personally he thought the biggest challenge was the geography. Most of the houses in this area went down one or two stories due the slope. The applicant was trying to work with the geography and meet the guidelines. He thought the applicant had done a good job.

Mr. Baysinger said there was precedent to allow the zero setback and he was not opposed to it. Regarding the gabling, he would go along with the consensus.

Chair Metson thought it would be boring without the gabling. Regarding the breezeway, the applicant followed the initial design advice for that. This element was present in other buildings throughout Canemah. He had no objection.

Ms. Met did not have a problem with the vertical detailing and gable ends, but the upper window on the main section of the house with the side lights should be kept simple.

Mr. Blythe liked the side lights and thought they were consistent with the Coburn House. He was fine with the breezeway the way it was set back and thought it was consistent with other homes that had additions.

A motion was made by Mr. Baysinger, seconded by Mr. Blythe, to continue the hearing for HR 16-02, construction of a new single-family dwelling in the Canemah National Register Historic District on 4th to February 28, 2017. The motion carried by the following vote:4-0-0

4c.

HR 16-08: Addition of Approximately 96 Square Feet to an Existing Out Building Located at 103 Jersey Avenue, A Locally Designated Historic Structure.

Chair Metson opened the public hearing. He asked if any Board member had conflicts of interest or ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. Most of the Board visited the site.

Mr. Martin delivered the staff report. This was a request to construct a 96 square foot

addition at 103 Jersey Avenue. The addition would be 13 feet, 9 inches tall and would be attached to an existing outbuilding located behind the existing home. It would be 7 feet from the rear property line. The existing outbuilding was 200 square feet in size. It would be an additional living space for the applicant's family. It would be constructed in the same materials as the outbuilding, such as horizontal siding and wood windows.

The applicant was not in attendance and there were no public comments.

Chair Metson closed the public hearing.

Chair Metson said this was not a large addition and was cut and dry.

A motion was made by Ms. Met, seconded by Mr. Baysinger, to approve HR 16-08: addition of approximately 96 square feet to an existing out building located at 103 Jersey Avenue. The motion carried by the following vote:4-0-0

4d.

Staff Concurrence on HR 15-01: New Rear Patio Located at 517 13th Street, a New Home in the McLoughlin Conservation District

Mr. Martin stated this application had come back because a deck had been built on the house. Staff was looking for concurrence on approving the deck at the staff level. He had included the existing conditions in the staff report. The question was if the applicant complied with the existing conditions, would staff be able to approve it.

Ms. Met was concerned that the upper deck and lower deck rails were different and how it looked like the upper deck was more appropriate.

Chair Metson asked the HRB if there was an issue with them having a deck rather than a patio. No one had an issue.

Chair Metson said the pressure treated posts needed to be addressed. As long as the rails met the requirements, he was fine with allowing staff to approve it.

Denyse McGriff, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, stated the association submitted comments on the original application. She was not comfortable with this being a staff approval. It was not part of the original application and the railing was inappropriate. The applicant should have known better as they had been through historic review before. She thought someone was already living in the accessory dwelling unit, which should not have happened until the certificate of occupancy. She asked what staff would do to get them to comply.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Planner, said they had not received a certificate of occupancy. Staff could not sign off on it because this was not in compliance. The applicant would have to meet the conditions of approval, such as both the upper and lower railing would meet the plans submitted in the application and the exposed pressure treated wood was not allowed. The applicant could revise the railing to meet the plans, provide a design approach that covered the pressure treated wood either through wrapping the wood or providing extra lap siding below the deck or providing a combination of extended siding and true historically proportional lattice. Staff was asking if it should be a staff approval with the conditions or did the applicant need to apply to the HRB for a modification to their original application.

Chair Metson said there were additional ornaments on the posts that were not illustrated in the elevations, which was good as it made it less boring. He thought the bottom hand rail did need to comply. He liked the three options staff proposed for the

exposed pressure treated wood. He would be fine with a different option for obscuring the wood if the applicant came up with one.

There was consensus that the existing conditions were sufficient and staff would use those conditions to approve the application at the staff level. The railing should match what was submitted in the application.

5. Communications

There were no communications.

6. Adjournment

Chair Metson adjourned the meeting at 8:30 PM.