



CITY OF OREGON CITY

Staff Report

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

To: Historic Review Board

Agenda Date: 11/22/2022

From: Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: GLUA 22-00031: HR-22-00010 resubmission for a full ADA ramp modification of HR 20-00001 -1020 5th Street

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes that with the submittal of revised drawings and concurrence from the landscape architect, it is likely that the revised design, including metal railing and landscaping, will be compatible with the character of the McLoughlin Conservation District as conditioned or if it is not compatible, the Applicant has offered sufficient evidence in the record to find that no other option is consistent with the therapeutic purpose required or would be financially viable. Staff recommends that this matter be continued to a date certain meeting in December to allow the Applicant to submit a modified site plan, elevation, renderings, and landscape architect-designed plans detailing the recommendations identified in this report. Once shown, Staff recommends approval of the application as the proposal demonstrates an appropriate balance between historic resource protection obligations and the needs of the Applicant under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

BACKGROUND: The site has numerous files associated with its construction. The Applicant has submitted a new full-length powder-coated black metal ADA ramp option which replaces the previously submitted full-length wood ADA ramp design as part of their alternatives analysis.

In response to the HRB request for additional information at the October 25, 2025 Hearing, the Applicant submitted the following information:

1. Alternative analysis memo, Erin Ward, Heritage Consulting Group
2. Elevation and renderings (revised)
3. Site Plan (revised)
4. Landscape Plan (revised)

The Historic Review Board is tasked to answer the following questions as part of the analysis for the revised metal railing ADA ramp design:

1. Does the revised metal railing ADA design satisfy the standards, particularly the obligation to ensure that new construction does not introduce a new building style that “dilutes and distracts from the historic context of the district?”
Guidelines p 7.
2. If not, short of eliminating the rear exterior ramp, are there other design changes or improvements that would further mitigate those impacts?
 - a. The HRB’s previous denial was based on a finding that the overall length of the building when viewed from the side, without mitigation, failed to reinforce the context of the conservation district with respect to the Foursquare style. Are there additional design/landscaping changes that might further restore the Foursquare style?
3. If the Design Guidelines cannot be satisfied, has the Applicant provided sufficient evidence in the record to reject the other design alternatives as either inconsistent with the Applicant’s identified therapeutic objectives or financially infeasible?

With respect to financial feasibility, it is important to keep in mind that the construction of this building is very nearly complete. Whether or not this Applicant could have made different design decisions to provide an interior to the accessibility as part of the original building design cannot be considered to any greater degree than the HRB would require the same from a retrofit request to make an existing home accessible. In other words, questions of timing for pursuing this request should not be used to penalize this Applicant with respect to its current accessibility needs. If the Board finds that the new metal ADA design meets the standards, then the answer to question #3 does not need to be answered.

OPTIONS:

Staff recommends that this matter be continued to a date certain meeting in December to allow the Applicant to submit a modified site plan, elevation, renderings, and landscape architect-designed plans detailing the recommendations identified in this report.