



# City of Oregon City

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

## Meeting Minutes - Draft

### Historic Review Board

---

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

---

#### 1. Call to Order

*The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.*

#### 1a. Selection of a New Chair

**A motion was made by Ms. Met, seconded by Mr. Blythe, to nominate Ken Baysinger for Chair for tonight's meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

#### 2. Public Comments

*There were no public comments on non-agenda items.*

#### 3. Public Hearing Public Hearing

#### 3a. HR 17-04: Historic Review Board Request to Review Phase I of the Proposed Public Works Operations Facility

*Chair Baysinger reopened the public hearing.*

*Carrie Richter, City Attorney, read the hearing statement for all three public hearings that night. She asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare. There were none. All Board members had visited the site.*

*Trevor Martin, Planner, provided the staff report. This was an application for a new Public Works operations facility. He reviewed the site plan which included a new office building, new truck shed, new tool shed, new elevator, and repurposing of the armory. The HRB would be looking at the historic design guidelines applied to the proposed buildings. He showed the elevation of the office building as viewed from Center Street and discussed the proposed design, renderings, and vernacular elements of the office building. He then discussed the details of the tool shed, elevator, truck shed, and existing armory and showed the submitted sample materials.*

*Martin Montalvo, Public Works Operations Manager, discussed the overall site view of the project. The significant changes from the previous master plan were: truck traffic would be located in the lower yard, the administrative building would be located in the upper yard, repurposing the armory building for the fleet shop, equipment and tool storage on the upper yard, and space for future expansion beyond the 20 year plan.*

*David Hyman, DECA Architects, said this was an amendment to the general master plan and approval of the detailed development plan for Phase 1 which was the upper yard improvements.*

*Mr. Montalvo said the overall reduction in scale from the previous master plan was 25%. It would accommodate the department's long term needs and accommodated several neighborhood concerns.*

*Mr. Hyman explained the phases of the project and what was included in the upper yard improvements. The office functions would be shifted to the upper yard and the large trucks would be shifted to the lower yard. He then discussed the floor plans and renderings of the office building, tool storage building, renovation of the armory building, and the truck parking for the lower yard. The materials for all the buildings would be similar and would be compatible with one another. The elevator was for staff only and was meant to unify the upper and lower yards. He then described the elements that were incorporated into the buildings to comply with the design guidelines. Some of the major elements were cornices, parapets, base, middle, and top parts to the building, large storefront windows, vertical windows, and windows of pedestrian scale. The materials were durable and the ground floor would be ground face CMU with ashlar pattern in warm tones combined with two types of metal panels that would provide a variety of textures and spacing that helped divide the layers. There would be a dark band at the bottom to define the base. There were strong horizontal bands, repeating rhythms, and historically proportioned windows, all in a more modern interpretation. All of the other buildings would have similar materials with the CMU, warm tones, and metal panels. The elevator would have the same base and metal top and would have some horizontal bands. Windows and doors would be added to the armory and the roof would be upgraded and the building painted in the same color scheme.*

*Jerry Herrmann, resident of Oregon City, discussed the importance of the armory to the history and development of Oregon City. Many World War 2 efforts were staged out of that location. He thought that history should be integrated into the design. There were some concerns regarding saving the assemblages of unique plants left from ice age floods. He thought they should celebrate and integrate the natural area in the Public Works center. This was a good location for the Public Works buildings and staff had done a good job addressing the community's concerns.*

*Amy Willhite, resident of Oregon City, had seen Public Works work hard listening to and addressing neighborhood concerns as well as meeting the historic guidelines. As a long time citizen, she was in favor of this proposal.*

*Henry Mackenroth, resident of Oregon City, said in general he was in favor of the application. He was also in support of the placement of the buildings and preserving the armory. He would like to see more of a wood exterior rather than brick, CMU, and sheet metal on the new buildings. This would make them fit in better with the ambience of the surrounding area. He suggested splitting the administrative building into two buildings next to each other so it was not overwhelming in size.*

*Charles Combs, resident of Oregon City, identified a conflict between the decision criteria for the Historic Review Board and the Comprehensive Plan. State rule made the Transportation System Plan part of the Comprehensive Plan. There was a shared use path in the TSP that extended from the first house northeast of the armory to the end of Water Board Park and around the uphill side of the Public Works site. There was no provision in the application of retaining that shared use path. When the site was fenced and gated, the existing public access on John Adams would be blocked off. He thought it was important to retain public access as there were a number of*

walking and bicycle solutions that connected into the path that were identified in the TSP.

Jesse Buss, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, stated the Association submitted comments about this application this afternoon. The hearing was a continuation from last month, but the notices that went out were still deficient. The Code required notices to be posted every 600 feet on the frontage of the site. There were a lot of signs on the Center Street frontage, but only one on John Adams. There was nothing on Water Board Park Road and the forested area. The effect was people coming down from the top of the hill and going into the park would not see a sign and know about the hearing. He thought it should be renoticed and the hearing continued. The contents of the notice were also deficient because they did not specify all of the criteria that were under review, such as the Comprehensive Plan, Parks Master Plan, and Transportation System Plan, which did apply to this decision. He showed a map from the 1991 Parks Master Plan that included all of the existing and proposed parks in the City. The map showed the Public Works site as an existing park, and argued Public Works was not a park use that was authorized in the Comprehensive Plan or Parks Master Plan. He displayed a map from the current Parks Master Plan that showed the site as park land and a map from the 1952 Parks Master Plan that showed this site was developed for park uses. He had materials dating back to 1910 showing the area was purchased by the Board of Water Commissioners with the intent of building a reservoir and a City park. The reservoir was eventually built up on the hill and all that was left was a park.

Jesse Buss, resident of Oregon City, was also speaking for himself. He agreed with the Neighborhood Association.

William Gifford, resident of Oregon City, said several years ago he was chair of the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association and at that time the Association was opposed to the original design of the Public Works facility. After a lot of investigation, he had changed his mind. The location was the best they could do for now and he did not think they should wait any longer. This was not the Planning Commission or Natural Resource Committee. The HRB's opinions should be framed within the historical context of the buildings on the site. He did not want the HRB to be distracted and not look at the real issues. He supported the design. The community needed an adequate Public Works facility.

Chair Baysinger closed the public hearing.

Ms. Met asked for clarification regarding the Transportation System Plan requirements. Ms. Richter clarified the path needed to be included, but the path was not relevant to the appropriateness the HRB had to evaluate. It was more for the Planning Commission to evaluate.

Ms. Met asked about the issue regarding the notices and asked if the HRB could make a decision that night. Ms. Richter said one of the claims was the notice contents were deficient and she thought all of the applicable criteria had been properly identified. The other claim was regarding the notice not being posted on each frontage of the subject site. Staff needed a few minutes to look into the noticing issue. Regarding the Neighborhood Association objection that the HRB could not review this until after the 120 days, which was August, that statute applied to a demolition permit, and this was not a demolition permit.

Ms. Met was in favor of this proposal. As far as using wood versus other materials, this was going to be a long term structure that would receive heavy usage. She thought there would be use of brick and not much metal siding.

*Mr. Blythe thought the existing design and materials were acceptable. The Public Works Department had gone out of their way to talk to the neighborhood and revise their design.*

*Chair Baysinger said the HRB's input on this application was only on the design of the buildings and compatibility with the historic neighborhood. The conditions included a landscaping plan that stated 20% of the site was landscaped instead of paved, mechanical equipment would be screened from view, there would be fencing around the property for security, the applicant would coordinate with the City to send out public notices for removing the Camp Adair buildings, and the materials on the elevator would be comprised of the same materials as proposed to be used on the other buildings.*

*Ms. Richter said regarding the hearing signs being properly posted, there was a sign posted at the end of the path as someone was walking through Water Board Park towards the site and was posted where the John Adams right-of-way turned into the site, near the intersection of Spring and John Adams. The obligation was to post a notice on each frontage of the subject property. A frontage was a portion of a parcel that abutted a dedicated public street or highway or approved private way. The south side of the Public Works site abutted the park, not a dedicated public street, highway, or approved private way. She thought no signage was required where the park abutted the Public Works property. People who were on the path should have seen the sign posted on the John Adams right-of-way.*

*John Lewis, Public Works Director, showed a picture of the site where the signs were placed. They were the most prominent areas for drivers and pedestrians.*

*Ms. Richter was comfortable that the notice was adequate and the HRB could move forward with a decision. If approved, staff would bring back to the next HRB meeting revised findings that would be consistent with the decision.*

**A motion was made by Mr. Blythe, seconded by Ms. Met, to approve HR 17-04: Historic Review Board request to review Phase I of the proposed Public Works Operations Facility with staff's recommended conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:3-0-0**

**3b.**

**HR 16-09, HR 16-10, HR 16-11, HR 16-12, HR 16-13, and HR 16-14: Seven (7) Proposed Cottage Homes in the Canemah National Register Historic District located near 4th Avenue and Miller Street**

*Chair Baysinger reopened the public hearing. Ms. Richter read the hearing statement as new audience members had come in. She asked if any HRB member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare. There were none. All members had visited the site.*

*Mr. Martin delivered the staff report. He showed the site plan from the original application and discussed how the setbacks had been the main issue of the HRB at the last meeting. The applicant had revised the site plan and he showed a picture of the new site plan. Some of the changes included a larger space between House 4 and the Casady House, the parking and landscaping had been adjusted for more buffer space, and there was additional landscaping abutting Miller between the Casady House and proposed site. He then showed pictures of the site and reviewed the elements of the proposal.*

*Chris Staggs, applicant, discussed the revised site plan. What he was proposing for the property was lower density than the adjacent property in terms of site coverage*

and visual mass. The cottage home guidelines talked about visual density. He read from the guidelines the intent of the cottage housing, which was to provide a housing that responded to changing household sizes and ages, to encourage creation of more usable open space for residents, to ensure overall size including bulk and mass of cottage structures and cottage housing developments remained smaller and incurred less visual impact than standard size single family dwellings, and to provide centrally located and functional common open space that fostered a sense of community and openness in the neighborhood. It was true the number of dwelling units would be higher than a typical single family dwelling in the R-6 zone, but in terms of visual impact and visual mass, he was proposing lower density than the Casady House. This was a constrained site with a hillside and wetland. They would be preserving an environmental amenity and with the preservation of that amenity, it was appropriate and justified to allow preservation incentives to have the homes on the property lines and closer to the property lines than what was approved in the R-6 zone. The revised site plan was meant to address the HRB's concerns. It included keeping seven units on the property, increasing the setbacks of Houses 4 and 5 to be further away from the property line and Casady House, reducing the retaining wall on the west property line so it was now a maximum of 4 to 5 feet tall, and adding landscape mitigation to the dense hedge of Douglas Firs between this property and the Casady House and between the right-of-way and the two homes on Miller Street. This would help reduce the visual impact between this property and the Casady House and the neighborhood. Most of what was being proposed had been approved before in the Canemah District including retaining wall heights, density, and parking. When he looked at the historic appropriateness in Canemah, cottage home guidelines, and the R-6 zone, he thought what was being proposed was very closely aligned with the City's intent.

Howard Post, resident of Oregon City, said this was a national register historic district and there was no precedence for this type of development. He did not think it conformed to the guidelines. Some of his concerns were parking, preservation incentives for the setbacks, wetlands and flood zones, use of aluminum windows and metal roofs were not allowed, and creating an HOA in a historic district. What defined Canemah was a steep pitched roof and windows. Canemah had no land use committee and they had to speak as private citizens.

Daniel Fisher, resident of Oregon City, said there was nothing historic about this plan and he did not think it should be approved. There would be increased vehicles that would come along with these dwellings. He lived by one of the proposed parking areas. If he knew this type of development would come in, he would not have moved to where he lived now. He thought this idea of a neighborhood within a neighborhood should not be in Canemah. The HRB was obligated to make sure the regulations were followed. This was a challenging site with the wetlands and an odd shape.

Tori Goodwin, resident of Oregon City, stated this development was asking for special exceptions to the density rules in this historic neighborhood. The density should never be put on this property as there was not enough space to build it. It was disrespectful to the neighborhood and historical registry. Canemah was not about the newest and greatest trends, but was about history. The density of small homes and parking lots was not respectful to the guidelines or historical registry. The historical registry and the neighborhood should not have to compromise because there were natural resources on the site that inhibited this density agenda. It did not fit the guidelines.

Clint Goodwin, resident of Oregon City, said people came to Canemah knowing this was a national historic neighborhood where design was governed by the historic building code. The developer was trying to go around the rules. Just because it was

*permissible through the City, did not mean it was acceptable in the historic neighborhood. There would be two trash dumpsters and only apartments had trash dumpsters. These were like detached apartments. There would be an HOA and rules within rules. The pattern of 4th Avenue was one house, one accessory dwelling unit, and one garage on two lots. This did not fit in the neighborhood. Just because it was permissible in the code, it did not mean it was permissible in the national historic district.*

*Paul Edgar, resident of Oregon City, thought the preservation incentives violated the intent of the code and should not be considered. There was a need for a vegetative corridor from water areas. There was a history of flooding on the site. This was a greater density than had ever been considered in Canemah and it was not compatible. The units had cut away roofs and other design characteristics that had not been allowed in Canemah and were not compatible. If they were not compatible, then they detracted. They could not be considered vernacular in design. There were four lots of record and three of the lots were compromised by the wetland. The code stated one house per lot. The skylights and cut aways should be eliminated as they were not historically appropriate. The porches proposed were not compatible with the vernacular style. There was nothing like the parking areas proposed in Canemah and they detracted.*

*Ron Bistline, resident of Oregon City, did not have an issue with the cottage homes, but had an issue with the cottage homes in this area and the density of them. The preservation incentives were for single family homes that had restrictions, not for development for profit. Parking was an issue. The homes that the HRB had approved had garages because of the parking issue. The streets were narrow and there were no sidewalks. There would be more children in the area and with the extra cars and already busy streets, he was concerned about safety. The applicant had submitted Mr. Bistline's retaining wall as an example of a 15 foot wall, but it was four feet tall with an eight foot divider between each level. He thought the application would be acceptable if there were not as many homes.*

*Mr. Staggs gave rebuttal. Regarding parking, he did a calculation of the parking on the corner by the Casady House and the square footage of that parking area was 100 square feet larger than what he was proposing. He thought the parking lot he was proposing was consistent and appropriate in Canemah. They were not going to have dumpsters, they were going to have trash cans. The trash cans would be in an enclosure so they could not be seen by the neighbors. He was not sure if this was the place to debate the social impact in terms of the number of children on the street. He had been tirelessly trying to do what was right in Canemah and follow the code. He thought the proposal was contextually appropriate for Canemah and the City's intent for growth and economic development.*

*Chair Baysinger closed the public hearing.*

*Chair Baysinger said the HRB had to follow what was in the code whether or not they personally agreed with the cottage home concept.*

*Mr. Blythe did appreciate the cottage home design in general and the amount of work that had gone into the application. Cottage housing could be possible in Canemah and it could be complimentary. The HRB had asked the applicant to come back with something that was more buildable and that if it was approved would be close to what was actually built. He did not think that had happened. The setbacks had not been entirely addressed. He did not have a problem with the preservation incentive setbacks on Miller Street, but approving them for several sides of the property was a new precedent. He did not see any changes to the roof cut outs and non-rectangular*

windows and the proposed homes did not fit the vernacular style.

Ms. Met agreed about the roof cut outs and the basic glass walls. The chalet porches also did not fit the vernacular style. Her biggest concern was about the density and pushing the homes right up against the wetland. The parking he mentioned by the Casady House was for one home, and the applicant was proposing seven homes with ten spaces.

Chair Baysinger said at the last HRB meeting they talked about the density and determined when taking the combined footprint of the seven structures they met the code regarding allowable density and did so by a significant margin. He was concerned with the fenestration and contemporary design with the chalet style porches. It was not compatible with Canemah.

Ms. Met asked if the density was allowed with the full property or allowed with the full property minus the wetland. Ms. Terway said the HRB was reviewing the overall impact of the proposed development on the historic district. There was a condition of approval and findings that said they could not use preservation incentives and all the buildings had to meet the setbacks and the parking had to be on site within the property lines. It would change the design. There was no condition about the number of units. There were no density requirements. The HRB was looking at the contextual appropriateness of the development in the historic district and if they met the criteria for the preservation incentives.

Mr. Blythe said when talking about density, it was not in regard to the square footage of the buildings, but about the crowding of seven homes on the site. He thought the proposed configuration did not comply with the setbacks and created a crowding issue that most people were opposed to. If the HRB approved the application with the current conditions, the application would have to come back to the HRB again because it would require the site to be reconfigured.

Ms. Richter said it sounded like the HRB did not think the conditions were sufficiently detailed to be able to evaluate the compatibility issues with this project. That coupled with the design incompatibility of the architectural elements could be findings for denial.

Mr. Blythe added to the findings for denial. He thought the overall design did not comply with the historic district including the setbacks, roof cut outs, and non-rectangular windows.

**A motion was made by Ms. Met, seconded by Mr. Blythe, to deny HR 16-09, HR 16-10, HR 16-11, HR 16-12, HR 16-13, and HR 16-14 and to direct staff to come back to the June 27 meeting with written findings consistent with the HRB deliberations. The motion carried by the following vote:3-0-0**

**3c.**

HR 17-01: Historic Review Board review of a new single-family home in the Canemah Historic District at the intersection of Ganong St. and 4th Ave.

Chair Baysinger opened the public hearing.

Ms. Richter said the same hearing procedures that had been previously read applied to this application. She asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statements to declare. There were none. All Board members had visited the site.

Mr. Martin provided the staff report. This was a request for a new single-family home

*in the Canemah Historic District at the intersection of Ganong Street and 4th Avenue. He discussed the site plan and the elevations of the home.*

*Todd Iselin, Iselin Architects, and John Ares, applicant, stated not much had changed since they had come to the Board for design advice. They had explained to Mr. Edgar why the house was sited where it was. They were trying to minimize the disruption to the site which was why they had changed from a detached garage to a garage underneath the house. There was room on the property to provide a stormwater facility that was required.*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Baysinger closed the public hearing.*

*Chair Baysinger said his observation particularly in light of the discussion they just had about density and parking out of the right-of-way, all spoke towards the advantage of having a garage for the overall appearance and the visual impact on the neighborhood. He recommended deleting Item 1 from the Certificate of Occupancy.*

*Mr. Blythe said he read the design guidelines and they generally supported detached garages, however the most important factor was that the garage was not on the main frontage and the proposed garage fit that. He agreed with the comments about moving vehicles off of the right-of-way, reducing the traffic congestion, and having a positive impact on the historic characteristics of the neighborhood. He thought additional design elements could be added to break up the surface and massing. He thought there was justification for the removal of Item 1.*

*Chair Baysinger said allowing the attached garage was based on the geographical and geological site constraints. Most of the site was very steep and there was only a small buildable area. Attaching the garage minimized the disturbance of the site and it was not visible from 4th Avenue.*

*Mr. Blythe said the attached garage was also acceptable because it was not on the main level of the home and did not detract from the design of the main structure.*

*Mr. Martin said additional screening of the massing could be done by landscaping. Chair Baysinger said two large trees were being retained at the corner of the lot that would provide screening as well.*

*Mr. Martin said the findings would include clearing traffic from the street, the garage was not on the main frontage and level of the home, it was a steep site, it had little visibility from 4th Avenue because of the landscaping and steepness of the site, and the home was setback further on the site than most homes in this area were.*

**A motion was made by Ms. Met, seconded by Mr. Blythe, to approve HR 17-01: Historic Review Board review of a new single-family home in the Canemah Historic District at the intersection of Ganong St. and 4th Ave. with staff's recommended conditions and removing Item 1 from the Certificate of Occupancy. Staff would come back with revised findings on June 27. The motion carried by the following vote:3-0-0**

#### **4. Communications**

*Mr. Martin discussed the proposed letter of support from the HRB to the Metro Enhancement Committee for a grant for fixing the concrete caps along the Promenade.*

*Chair Baysinger read the letter out loud.*

**A motion was made by Mr. Blythe, seconded by Ms. Met, to direct staff to send the letter as read with the typos revised. The motion carried by the following vote:**

## **5. Adjournment**

*Chair Baysinger adjourned the meeting at 8:22 PM.*