



City of Oregon City

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Historic Review Board

Tuesday, November 22, 2022

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

1. Convene Regular Meeting and Roll Call

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

Present: 3 - Board Member Grant Blythe, Board Member Ray Stobie, and Board Member Sabrina Ferry

Absent: 1 - Board Member Paul Edgar

Staffers: 3 - Senior Planner Christina Robertson-Gardiner, City Attorney Carrie Richter, and Community Development Director Aquilla Hurd-Ravich

2. Public Comment – *None.*

3. Public Hearing: **GLUA-22-00035: HR 22-00012 De-Designation or reduction of the size of a Landmark located at 13889 Cleveland Ave (A.D. Hill House).**

Chair Blythe 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.

Board Members Blythe and Ferry had visited the site.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. This hearing had been continued from the October meeting. It was initially a request for a de-designation, but now was a request for a reduction of the landmark size. She gave a background on the A.D. Hill House, site location, natural resources on the site, site photos, and options. The Board's goal tonight was to look at the options for reducing the boundary of the landmark. The remainder would be reviewed without a historic overlay. She then reviewed the conditions of approval.

Diane Woitte, applicant, was there to answer questions.

Chair Blythe asked if she had a preference for which reduction option they should approve.

Ms. Woitte was undecided.

Terri Stenick, real estate agent for the applicant, did not know which option was preferred as she did not know what potential buyers would want. If only the home was designated, how hard would it be to divide the rest of the property?

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner discussed the options, both for the size of the landmark and the land division.

Board Member Ferry asked about the condition of the outbuilding behind the house. Ms. Woitte said it used to be a chicken coop remodeled to living quarters for her uncle and her mother used it as a getaway. She did not know the condition of it now.

Chair Blythe did not think the outbuilding needed to be preserved and was inclined to go with the smaller boundary of 5,000 square feet. The applicant supported that.

Chair Blythe closed the public hearing.

Board Member Stobie also supported the 5,000 square foot boundary, but asked about the 25 foot buffer between the landmark and new construction. Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said any new construction would probably need a new driveway.

Board Member Ferry was in favor of option 2, to include the outbuilding in the boundary. It was in fair condition and sound. She thought the view all the way to the end of the property should be preserved as opposed to having something built behind the historic house. The new construction could be on the undeveloped part of the property.

A motion was made by Board Member Ferry, seconded by Board Member Blythe, to approve GLUA-22-00035: HR 22-00012 with Option 2. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 – Board Member Blythe, Board Member Stobie, and Board Member Ferry

GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00011 Resubmission for a full ADA Ramp Modification of HR 20-00001 -1020 5th Street

Chair Blythe 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.

All Board Members had visited the site.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner entered an email into the record from Wendy Marshall of the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association where the Association thought the alternatives analysis was incomplete. Staff recommended continuing the hearing to allow the applicant to submit more information. She gave a background on the application and ADA ramp, new and revised information received, questions for the Board, use of metal railings in the historic district, recommended revisions prior to approval, and recommended conditions of approval. She reviewed the landscape plan, elevations, renderings, and alternatives analysis.

There was discussion regarding the conditions, how changes approved by the Board needed to be approved through the site plan and design process, and for the final certificate of occupancy, they had to meet the requirements of HR 20-0001. There was frustration with the number of revised applications that had been turned in and how it had been time consuming for both the Board and staff.

Erin Ward, attorney representing the applicant, discussed her company, Heritage

Consulting Group. She then reviewed the alternative options, proposed ramp design, and how it was her professional opinion that the current design of the ramp was the best option that provided the ADA access and addressed potential impacts to the surrounding historic district.

There was discussion regarding reasons for a metal ramp vs. wood and cost estimates for the elevator option vs. the ramp.

John Gruszecki, representing the applicant, said it was a safety issue with the elevator, due to possible power outages.

Jillene Modlin, resident of Oregon City, said this building was supposed to look like the Crawford House. It did not look like a residential building that belonged in the historic district, especially with a metal ramp. They kept asking for information that was not being provided.

Ms. Ward explained why she thought the metal ramp was appropriate.

The Board expressed their frustration that cost estimates still had not been supplied after several requests.

Carrie Richter, City Attorney, said the Board needed to be specific about the information to be brought back. She suggested doing the audit on the previous approval and bringing that back as well.

There was discussion regarding what should be included in the analysis of elevator vs. ramp and how the Board wanted to see the exact drawings and detail of what would be built with the correct topography. There was further discussion regarding painting the metal railing.

The applicant agreed to extend the 120-day deadline to May 1, 2023.

Mr. Gruszecki said the dimension details were already submitted for the ramp and no other details were necessary. Some of the details were dictated by ADA standards and if the Board wanted to know the standards, they could review them. He thought there should be one ramp from the corner of the building to the end of the building and it should be metal. He did not think it should be 80% of the elevation on one ramp, and 20% elevation on a different ramp as it would not look good.

Chair Blythe noted that he would need to ensure the set of plans he submitted to the Board met ADA standards.

There was discussion regarding the location for the transition from the wood ramp to the metal ramp. Mr. Gruszecki explained what he thought would look more aesthetically pleasing.

There was consensus that the applicant would provide two different renderings and elevations showing the termination of the ramp at the entrance door and at the first corner. They also wanted a plan drawing for how the ramp tied into the sidewalk with the correct topography and all the structure underneath the ramp, sample of the railing, confirmation from the landscape architect that the proposed plants would still survive in the resulting refined dimensions, and the analysis of the different options.

A motion was made by Board Member Blythe, seconded by Board Member Stobie, to continue GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00011 resubmission for a full ADA ramp modification of HR 20-00001 -1020 5th Street with staff's and the Board's recommendations to the applicant for revisions to January 24, 2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 – Board Member Blythe, Board Member Stobie, and Board Member Ferry

6. Communications

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said the McLoughlin Neighborhood Association position on the HRB was vacant. There would be no December meeting.

Chair Blythe said this was his last meeting.

The Board and staff thanked him for his leadership.

7. Adjournment

Chair Blythe adjourned the meeting at 9:42 PM.