



# City of Oregon City

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

## Meeting Minutes - Final

### Historic Review Board

---

Tuesday, May 24, 2016

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers

---

#### 1. Call to Order

*Chair Baysinger called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.*

**Present:** 3 - Claire Met, Ken Baysinger and Jonathan Stone

**Absent:** 2 - Derek Metson and Robert Siewert

**Staffers:** 1 - Christina Robertson-Gardiner

#### 2. Preservation Grant

##### 2a Preservation Grant for a Porch Repair at 312 Madison Street

**Attachments:**    [Commission Report](#)  
[Preservation Grant PG 16-02 Staff Report](#)  
[PG 16-02 Applicant's Submittal](#)

*John Stutesman, Planner, said this was a grant request for front porch repair at 312 Madison Street. The builder the applicant chose was qualified to do the work. Staff recommended approval of granting the request for \$600.*

**approve**

**Aye:** 3 - Claire Met, Ken Baysinger and Jonathan Stone

#### 3. Design Advice

*Chair Baysinger closed the regular session at 6:33 PM and Jonathan Stone left the meeting via conference call.*

*Chair Baysinger opened a Work Session at 6:33 PM to provide design advice, which did not require a quorum.*

3a

Design Advice for a 560 square foot addition at 811 Monroe Street.

**Attachments:**    [Commission Report](#)  
[Applicant's Submittal](#)  
[Inventory Form](#)

*Bob Perron, architect, was asking for design advice for a 560 square foot addition at 811 Monroe Street. The applicant's grandchildren were going to move in, and the house was not adequate for it. She was requesting an addition to the south of the existing house. It would be a one story addition with an unfinished attic for storage. Some of the architectural features of the existing house would be replicated including the pitch of the roof and siding. He described the elevations, windows, trim boards, colors, solar panels, and skylights.*

*Mr. Stutesman said staff would need to research whether the solar panel*

*Mr. Perron explained some of the siding was hardie panel and some was aluminum, and some was PVC plastic. The plastic was damaged and would be removed and replaced with hardie panel four inches to the weather.*

*Ms. Roberson-Gardiner said this was a designated structure that had been highly compromised. It was a question of whether to keep acknowledging it as a designated structure and any new work needed to adhere to the standard or acknowledge a building that had been highly compromised and approve an appropriate addition that did not meet all of the standards or based on its merits recommend to de-designate it and the addition would move forward. Multiple exterior alterations had been done to the building by past owners that did not meet the standards. She recommended the second option.*

*Chair Baysinger thought the proposed chimney that would be encased in wood did not fit the historic character. It would be better to have it encased in brick or have a black sheetmetal pipe or vent it so it was not an element. fake stone material. He was in favor of what was proposed for the siding and windows. The solar panel was still in question.*

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said if they were placed in a non-prominent elevation and could not see it, they had been allowed. It would be a context sensitive analysis at the time of the staff report. She asked if the addition was more than 30% of the size of the house. If this was not a designated structure, would it have come before the HRB? That might be another finding for the vinyl windows because a new construction would need to be fiberglass. If it was less than 30% it would not be considered new construction.*

*Ms. Met thought this house had been altered so much that it should not be designated anymore. Ms. Robertson-Gardiner stated they could make it a condition of this addition that once it was done, they could come back and ask to de-list it.*

3b

## Design Advice for a Restoration at 203 Jefferson Street

**Attachments:**    [Commission Report](#)  
                              [Applicant's Submittal](#)  
                              [Inventory Form](#)

*David Hazen was asking for design advice for a restoration at 203 Jefferson Street. His goal was to bring the house back to the original design as much as possible. The home was moved in the 1940s and lost many of the original windows, front porch, and interior features/layout. The planned alterations were to bring back the original porch, bring back the original side windows, add dormers to the rear wing, add a back deck, and eventually restore wood siding and wood trim. There were no original photos of the porch, but they had used Sanborn maps and comparison homes. It would be a hip roof porch with a railing if required. He was planning to match the upper windows on the lower level sides and make them true to the original architectural style.*

*Chair Baysinger suggested pairing up a couple of the windows. Ms. Met suggested using taller, narrow windows for a more vertical look.*

*Mr. Hazen said in order to finish the attic space in the rear wing, he planned to add dormers to the roofline. Other exterior alterations included the back deck which would partially wrap around to the southwest side and be largely out of site from the street, for the foundation he would replace cinder block walls with solid concrete as needed, he would bring back the original wood siding, and install period authentic wood trim. He then discussed the architectural plans and showed current photos.*

*Chair Baysinger said he did not need HRB approval for the repairs to the foundation and he could work with staff on that. Mr. Hazen was asking for direction on the dormers and windows because it would affect the foundation.*

*Chair Baysinger thought the porch design was a great improvement and was consistent with the design of the structure. Regarding the dormers, the roof pitch appeared to be the same as the main house. He would like to see an alternative to the windows being proposed to be more compatible with the original design.*

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said when there was a house that had additions or alterations, applicants were not responsible to rehab those alterations as it was part of the structure's story. She suggested a simple casement window or a simple one over one or two matching four over fours. They needed to either replicate what was there in the past for a restoration or take a non-compatible addition and make it more compatible, but don't fake history if you don't know the history. This project was eligible for preservation grant funding.*

#### 4. Communications

*Mr. Stutesman discussed awarding the Ruth Powers Preservation Award at the last City Commission meeting recognizing those who worked on restoring the Ermatinger House. He wanted to discuss the way he was looking at the City Code and be consistent as staff with what the HRB thought was important at the next Board meeting. He had been getting calls regarding grant funding for foundations.*

*Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said typically the grants had been for projects that were more visible and would get the most out of the funding.*

*Ms. Met said she was on the Willamette Falls Heritage Area Coalition Board. The state declared parts of Oregon City, West Linn, and Lake Oswego as the state's first heritage area. One of the requirements was to recognize businesses that had been operating for 50 years or more. The recognition celebration would be held on June 23.*

#### 5. Adjournment

*Chair Baysinger adjourned the meeting at 7:50 PM.*