



# City of Oregon City

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

## Meeting Minutes - Draft

### Historic Review Board

---

Tuesday, April 25, 2017

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

---

#### 1. Call To Order

*Chair Metson called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM.*

#### 2. Public Comments

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

#### 3. Communicaiton

##### 3a. Briefing of a Historic Nomination for the Community Cannery and Workshop Annex in the Upper Yard of the City's Public Works Operations Center

*Laura Terway, Community Development Director, said the City received a request for nomination for a local historic designation of two buildings on the Public Works Operations Center site. The buildings were the Community Cannery and the Workshop Annex. They were both located in the upper yard. The application was submitted by the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association. The buildings were associated with Camp Adair, a World War II training facility from 1942. Staff had researched these two buildings and had spoken with SHPO, Adair Living History, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Ft. Vancouver, Clackamas Community College, and Restore Oregon. The structures had been changed quite a bit including the roofing material, windows, and doorways. They were constructed with a utilitarian design and for a minimal life span. Some comments were received from a state archeologist that they were impressed the buildings had lasted this long. SHPO stated they were not eligible for the national register. They did not meet the needs of the Public Works operations. Because of these facts, the City withheld owner consent on the request for nomination and that meant the HRB could no longer consider the historic nomination. The City will try to find a place where the structures can be relocated to, however if there was no feasible home for them, the City would look at deconstructing them.*

*Bill Kabeiseman, City Attorney, explained the statewide process for nomination and consent to designate. He read the State Statute regarding designation. Once there was a refusal to consent, that prevented any further consideration of the nomination. Historic designation was not an option for these two buildings.*

*Jesse Buss, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, expressed strong disagreement with the legal process that was just explained by the City Attorney. He distributed a packet of information that included a letter titled Determination of Application Completeness sent from City staff to the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association in March confirming the application was deemed complete and that a hearing would come before the HRB today. He said the hearing was*

canceled and no notices went out. There was also a letter written to Denyse McGriff, Chair of the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, by Tony Konkol, City Manager, dated April 18 which stated the City was refusing to consent to the historic designation which revoked the HRB's authority to consider the nomination. He also included a copy of ORS 197.772, and he read Section 1. He also provided cover sheets to the Lake Oswego Preservation Society case. That case focused on the meaning of the term property owner. The statute made a distinction between the term local government and the term property owner. He also provided a copy of the City's code regarding the designation procedure. The procedure required the HRB to make a decision on an application for landmark designation. The City Manager did not have the authority to revoke permission under the statute even if the statute did apply to public property. The Neighborhood Association was requesting the HRB to direct staff to set the application for a Type 3 quasi-judicial hearing next month.

Chair Metson agreed with the City Attorney as the City was the steward of the property and was responsible for making the decision.

#### **4. Public Hearing**

##### **4a. HR 17-04: Historic Review Board Request to Review Phase I of the Proposed Public Works Operations Facility**

Chair Metson 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 statement to declare. There were none. All Board members had visited the site.

Trevor Martin, Planner, said this was a proposal for a new Public Works facility in the McLoughlin Conservation District. The HRB's scope in this application was looking at the design and appropriateness of the project. The project would focus on the upper yard. All of the existing buildings would be removed except for the armory and new buildings would be placed on the site. He gave a background on the McLoughlin Conservation District which was established in 1986. There were approximately 153 blocks in the district, and 121 of those were from the original plat of Oregon City. The site was directly adjacent to Water Board Park. This would be a phased project done in three phases. He showed pictures of the upper and lower yards, access from John Adams, existing buildings on the site, homes near the site, and overall site plan. He explained the proposal for a new office building, a new tool storage building connected to the office building through a breezeway, a truck shed, elevator, and reuse of the armory building. The office building and the elevator could be seen from Center Street. He discussed the submitted elevation from Center Street that outlined the visible portions of the proposed development. He then explained the proposed office building design and showed color and material samples. To break up some of the massing, they proposed recessing the long lines and using different materials. The building had been designed to incorporate pedestrians. He then reviewed the tool storage building design. It would be connected to the office building. It would have brick and man made materials and would be screened by vegetation and would be setback from the office building. The elevator incorporated the colors and materials that would be found in the other two buildings. The elevator was not to be a primary focus but was to be incorporated into the overall design. He described the truck shed design which would be screened by vegetation and would use similar materials such as the manmade brick and similar colors. For the armory building there would be doors added on the west elevation and refinishing of the concrete exterior in a different color to make it more appropriate with the overall design. He then reviewed the conditions of approval which included a minimum of 20% landscaping and placing trees in front of the office building, screening all mechanical equipment, fence restrictions, and sending out a notice in the newspaper to see if

*there was interest in the Camp Adair buildings. The application needed to be re-noticed as it was not sent to an appropriate party and the hearing would need to be continued.*

*Martin Montalvo, Public Works Operations Manager, said there was an approved master plan from 2009 that was updated in 2017. The major differences between the two plans was the administrative functions were moved from the lower yard to the upper yard, the number of vehicles that would be stored in the upper yard was reduced which also reduced the traffic impact by causing the majority of vehicles to be in the lower yard and use Center Street as the access, repurposing the armory for the fleet facility, and reducing the footprint of the storage needs by going with a tool storage building. Phase 1 called for the demolition of the buildings of the upper yard with the exception of the armory building. There was also discussion about plans to possibly relocate the Camp Adair buildings. Phase 2 of the project would be the construction of the lower yard for heavy equipment storage and Phase 3 called for an additional 10,000 square foot storage facility for future expansion. He then discussed the site plan. The elevator connected the lower and upper yards, the stormwater treatment would be improved, the rocky outcropping of white oaks on the northern perimeter would be retained, and the buildings would be set back and screened as much as possible.*

*David Hyman, DECA Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan which included preserving the white oak outcropping and white oaks surrounding the site, detention pond, preserving the significant buffer along the bluff, preserving pathways to Water Board Park, and adding a public pathway and parking access to the park. He displayed the designs for the lower yard to show the compatibility to the upper yard and answered some of the neighborhood concerns. They would add public art to some of the blank facades of the office building. He explained how they worked to make the office building fit into the historic context and design guidelines. It was a building with a lot of shadow lines, modulation, outdoor spaces, strong entry statement, and landscaping in front. Regarding the materials, the ground floor would be ground face CMU with an ashlar pattern.*

*Mr. Blythe asked about the transition between the site and Water Board Park. Mr. Montalvo explained the location of the access parking, staircase, and trail connection that would be created. For safety and security purposes, traffic would no longer be able to use the old John Adams Street access. Mr. Hyman said there would be wrought iron fencing around the site.*

*Jesse Buss, representing the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association, stated because the application only became available a week ago, and the Association wanted to request a continuance to have time to review the application.*

*Gordon Wilson, resident of Oregon City, said in 1910 this site was purchased to build a reservoir and a City park. This was one of the most picturesque spots in the City. From 1910 until 1999 the area from Center Street up to the bluff was known as Water Board Park. To do anything with the park, it would have to go to a vote of the people and that had not happened. Around 2005, Water Board Park started getting cut away on maps. He was concerned about putting this development in Water Board Park and how it violated LCDC's Goal 5.*

*Mr. Linker, owned a rental property on John Adams. He asked what street improvements would be made for the project and who would be responsible for the improvements. Chair Metson said the applicant would be responsible. Street improvements were outside the purview of the HRB. That would be discussed under site plan and design review. Mr. Martin said there would be opportunity to comment on the site plan and design review.*

A motion was made by Mr. Baysinger, seconded by Mr. Blythe, to continue the hearing for HR 17-04: Historic Review Board request to review Phase I of the proposed Public Works Operations Facility to May 23, 2017. The motion carried by the following vote:3-0-0

4b

HR 17-03: Additions and Alteration to an Individually Listed Property on the Local Register of Historic Places Located at 16430 Hiram Avenue.

*Chair Metson opened the public hearing. He asked if any Board member had ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or any other statement to declare. There were none. All Board members had visited the site.*

*Mr. Martin presented the staff report. This was an addition and alteration to a locally designated landmark located outside of a historic district and the removal of a two car garage on the site. The applicant wanted to add 80 square feet to the existing 650 square foot home. The applicant was looking to subdivide the property in the future, but currently wanted to improve the existing home and remove the garage. This was a 50x310 foot parcel located on the northeast intersection of Hiram and Rock Streets in the Park Place neighborhood. He showed pictures of the existing house and discussed the proposed floor plan and elevations. Staff recommended approval with conditions. The conditions included submitting the front porch elevation to make sure the design of the posts was appropriate, covering pressure treated wood, the railings, decking, and stairs should match the home, there should be one by one windows, wood horizontal lap or channel siding, and they should receive proper building permits. The house needed a lot of work, and the applicant indicated the materials would be replaced with like materials.*

*Kevin Granger, applicant, said he had come to the HRB for design advice in November and was told those ideas were not in line with the historic guidelines. He thought this proposal was a good representation. He did have the porch elevation and provided it to the HRB. From the street the house would look almost exactly the same. There were some existing posts on the house with the roof slanting down and that would be the same look for the extension. To make this a viable project, they wanted to expand the house. The expansion would be on the back of the house.*

*Chair Metson said the railings in between the posts would need to be removed.*

*Victor, applicant's designer, explained the floor plan with the addition.*

*Chair Metson said the columns in front appeared to be oversized in proportion to the overall facade. He suggested tapering them down. He thought this was an appropriate approach.*

*Paulette Merrill, resident of Oregon City, was in support of the application with the exception of removing the garage. She asked that the garage be saved otherwise the people's stuff would be out in the yard. The garage was appropriate for the house and was in the same condition as the house. If they were going to put a lot of effort into the house, they could also fix the garage.*

*Mr. Granger said the garage was in disrepair and could not be used at this point. They could replace the garage. He showed elevations of a proposed new garage.*

*Chair Metson thought the garage was appropriately placed and was not competing with the size of the house. By reducing the roof slope it made the garage feel much smaller. The garage doors were appropriate. He would not have an issue if the*

*garage was part of the proposal.*

*Ms. Terway said they would have to continue the hearing to renotice the application to include the garage. Mr. Granger preferred to move ahead with the project instead of continuing it and come back with a proposal for the garage.*

*Chair Metson closed the public hearing.*

*Chair Metson thought there should be a garage, but there were no findings to force the applicant to do so. It was not a historic structure and was in disrepair.*

**A motion was made by Mr. Blythe, seconded by Mr. Baysinger, to approve HR 17-03: additions and alteration to an Individually listed property on the local register of historic places located at 16430 Hiram Avenue with staff's recommended conditions of approval. The motion carried by the following vote:3-0-0**

## **5. Communications**

*Mr. Martin said Oregon City Enhancement Day was on April 29. Ms. Terway thanked Chair Metson for his work on the Board as this was his last meeting.*

## **6. Adjournment**

*Chair Metson adjourned the meeting at 7:25 PM.*