

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING

City Council Chambers

November 17, 2015

CALL TO ORDER – ITEM 1:

A regular meeting of the Astoria Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) was held at the above place at the hour of 5:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL – ITEM 2:

Commissioners Present: President LJ Gunderson, Commissioners Jack Osterberg, Paul Caruana, Mac Burns, Kevin McHone, and Thomas Stanley. Vice President Michelle Dieffenbach arrived at 5:22 pm.

Staff Present: Community Development Director Kevin Cronin and Special Projects Planner Rosemary Johnson. The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed by ABC Transcription Services, Inc.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ITEM 3:

President Gunderson asked if there were any changes to the minutes. There were none.

Commissioner Stanley moved to approve the minutes of September 15, 2015 as presented; seconded by Commissioner Caruana. Ayes: President Gunderson, Commissioners Caruana, Osterberg, Burns, Stanley, and McHone. Nays: None.

The Historic Landmarks Commission proceeded to Item 5: Report of Officers at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

These Items were addressed immediately following Item 5: Report of Officers. President Gunderson explained the procedures governing the conduct of public hearings to the audience and advised that the substantive review criteria were listed in the Staff report.

ITEM 4(a):

EX15-12 Exterior Alteration EX15-12 by Tommie Hatcher and Ronald Borans to replace the existing awning with a smaller awning over the entrance; expose the transom windows; re-side the building with hardiplank on the side elevations and shingles on the street facade at 2921 Marine in the C-3, General Commercial zone.

President Gunderson asked if anyone objected to the jurisdiction of the HLC to hear this matter at this time. There were no objections. President Gunderson asked if any member of the HLC had a conflict of interest, or any ex parte contacts to declare. None declared. President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report.

Director Cronin presented the Staff report and recommended approval with conditions. No correspondence has been received.

President Gunderson confirmed there were no questions for Staff and opened the public testimony for the hearing. She called for the Applicant's presentation.

Greg Lentini [10:43], 29525 Barker Rd., Rainier, stated he was the realtor who helped the Applicants purchase the building. He understood all of the details of the project had been submitted to Staff. The owners, who were currently in Florida, wanted to change the awning and reside three sides of the building with a cheaper material, replacing the cedar. The front of the building would be left with cedar shingles. The buildings next door all have hardiplank siding on all four sides. The sides of the building cannot really be seen from the street. The owners

plan to remove the awning to expose the windows above and put a smaller awning just over the door. Across the street, a very similar building has a small awning just over the door, similar to the rendering in the Staff report.

Commissioner Caruana said the photograph of the awning in the Staff report did not appear to be retractable. However, the Staff report states retractable awnings would be used.

Mr. Lentini understood the Applicants were planning to use a fixed awning above the door and was unsure why the Staff report stated a retractable awning would be used. The Sunbrella material was simply a suggestion. The Applicants are looking for direction from the HLC about what material they should use.

Commissioner Caruana said the Astoria Coffee House uses striped retractable awnings. The Staff report indicates more of a traditional fixed awning.

President Gunderson noted that one of the conditions of approval in the Staff report requires the use of traditional wedge shaped retractable awnings.

Commissioner Caruana explained he was asking for clarification about whether the awning would be as shown in the picture at the back of the application or like the Astoria Coffee House.

Director Cronin confirmed Staff was recommending a 'traditional wedge shaped retractable fabric design (Sunbrella or similar).' Staff would like direction from the HLC about what type of awnings work in Astoria.

Commissioner Caruana stated the photo in the Staff report, which is not retractable, contradicted the recommended condition of approval.

Commissioner Osterberg believed, and Commissioner Caruana agreed, it was not possible for a wedged shaped awning to be retractable. He asked if the Staff report was recommending an awning with sides on it. The Finding in Item 5 on Page 4 of the Staff report asks the HLC to consider a traditional wedge shaped retractable awning, yet the Commissioners are not familiar with this type of awning. He suggested a different type of awning be considered and asked if the Applicant had any additional opinions.

Mr. Lentini said he only discussed fixed awnings with the Applicants, which he preferred because of Astoria's weather. The Applicants would like to remove the awning that spans the width of the entire building and replace it with a fixed awning just over the door. He believed it would be unwise to install a retractable awning, considering the winds and weather. The Applicants want to keep the charm and a retractable awning does not look like it is from 1900. He believed a fixed awning would match the style of the building and confirmed the Applicants would be comfortable with removing the word retractable from the Staff report.

Dave Louma, 308 W. Lexington, Astoria, believed the Applicants have always wanted a fixed awning, not necessarily of fabric, but of metal or wood. He understood the awning in the photograph looked like fabric, but the photograph was just included to give the HLC an idea of the size. The Applicants are looking for a recommendation from HLC on what size would fit with the building. He confirmed the awning would be fixed, but not made of fabric. The existing awning is made of wood and metal. He confirmed for Commissioner Caruana that all four sides of the building are covered in cedar shingles. The historic photograph shows the building covered in lap siding, so it would be historically correct to go back to lap siding.

Commissioner Caruana explained he did not have any issues with the awning, he was just a bit confused because the language in the Staff report was contradictory. Retractable awnings were used a lot in the downtown area in the 1920s, but there is probably a good reason they are not used anymore. The Astoria Coffee House faces a direction that gets little weather.

President Gunderson asked Staff to describe awnings that are traditional in Downtown Astoria.

Director Cronin noted the historic photograph showed no awning on the building. The awning is being suggested by the Applicants because they believe it will help attract customers to the building.

Planner Johnson said if the Applicants are installing a wedge shaped awning, the awning would be fabric or metal. Traditionally, wood is used on the flat awnings. Wedged awnings are not retractable; they have solid sides and are tilted so that the top is slightly narrower than the front. She recommended a metal awning. However, the

HLC should consider what type of metal should be used because certain metals could result in high standing seam metal applications. The metal should not look like the modern corrugated metal or high standing seam. She did not believe wood would be appropriate for a wedge awning on this building, but fabric would be traditional.

Commissioner Caruana asked why shingles were proposed for the front of the building, instead of lap siding.

Mr. Louma said the Applicants would like to replace all of the cedar, but they believed they were limited to removing it from the sides and back of the building. If the shingles remained, they would be left natural and not painted.

Commissioner Caruana believed lap siding with corner boards looked more classic, like the siding on the building shown on Page 2 of the Staff report to the left of the Applicant's building. Weathered shingles begin to look drab after a while. The building is charming and lap siding would dress it up. He recommended siding in a non-wood grain with a five-inch exposure. Exposure on siding is important because wide gaps make a building look like a manufactured home.

Mr. Louma said that would be fantastic. The Applicants want to move away from the cedar because it is expensive and difficult to maintain.

Commissioner Caruana added that leaving the cedar on the front would make the front look like a façade on an old western building. However, the building used to be quite ornate and this project presents an opportunity to make it look more charming with lap siding. Vice President Dieffenbach agreed.

The Commissioners confirmed for the Applicants that they could not dictate color, so the Applicants would not have to come back to the HLC for approval of siding color. However, if the Applicants are interested in staying within a historic color palette, Staff has some recommendations.

Commissioner Caruana confirmed he did not have a problem with the awning. He just wanted to clear up contradictory language and he was okay with a retractable or fixed fabric awning. Buildings all over town have rigid steel flat awnings that have minimal impact. Other buildings use fabric awnings. With many different examples throughout town, he preferred freedom of expression with a feature that is easy to remove. He was much more concerned about the siding and the use of corner boards of an appropriate scale. He would like the building to look as original as possible to the era.

President Gunderson asked if it was possible that some of the original siding still existed under the shingles.

Mr. Louma said the plasterwork on the front still exists. The front door used to be on the left, but now it is centered. Based on the historic photograph, it looks as if the charubs on the upper rail have been moved from the lower rail. He believed the charubs were original, so they should be saved. He agreed lap siding on the front would be more original. The reveal of the siding on the building to the left is actually 3 1/2 inches and is made of fir. He believed smooth hardiplank siding with a four-inch reveal would look fabulous with a big corner board. He confirmed any plaster or relief work would be salvaged and restored as much as possible.

Vice President Dieffenbach agreed with Planner Johnson that wood awnings were not traditional. She would prefer fabric or metal.

Commissioner McHone preferred any kind of awning that looked good with the transom windows.

Mr. Lintini said the building has a nice set of windows, but they do not let any light in. The Applicants want to allow more light into the building. All of the windows will eventually be replaced. Staff had indicated Tuscan series or Montecito windows would be appropriate. The Applicants will likely install Milgard's Montecito windows. The existing windows are replacement Anderson windows and they are failing. He believed the existing windows were only between seven and ten years old. Some of the windows on the back of the building have been boarded up. The Applicants plan to make part of the building a living space.

Commissioner Caruana believed the wedge or umbrella awning looked peculiar against the transom windows. An awning similar to the existing one, but narrower, would look better.

President Gunderson confirmed the Applicant planned to install Montecito windows and noted the Staff report stated Tuscan windows would be installed.

Commissioner Stanley confirmed the Commissioners, Staff, and the Applicants agreed on siding with a four-inch reveal and wide corner boards.

Mr. Lintini said the existing windows look mismatched and the Applicants would like the building to look more original, like the front windows that have crown moulding on top and a sill on bottom.

Commissioners asked Staff to describe the difference between the Tuscan and Montecito windows.

Planner Johnson explained that while the styles might be the same, the two could be made of different materials, which would result in different looks. She suggested the Applicants be required to present samples to Staff so that Staff can be sure to approve the appropriate material.

Mr. Lintini confirmed the Applicants would have Staff approve the windows.

Commissioner Osterberg asked if the Applicant was okay with using a non-wedge awning.

Mr. Lintini said he wanted to do what the HLC recommended.

Commissioner Stanley said he did not believe it was appropriate for the HLC to dictate the style or shape of the awning.

Commissioner Osterberg explained that this is the Applicant's only opportunity to provide testimony and this matter was already raised by Commissioner Caruana. He wanted clarification about the Applicant's opinion before the public hearing closed.

Commissioner Stanley stated the Applicant should be telling the Commission what they would like to do. Commissioner Osterberg agreed.

Mr. Lintini apologized for failing to be more prepared. With the Applicants out of town, he was just present to show photographs and represent the building owner. The Applicants emailed all of their information to Staff prior to the hearing. He was glad Mr. Louma was present to straighten out the siding issue. The Applicants just want to expose the windows and keep something small over the door. He believed the Applicants were aiming for what is original to the building. The style would have been rigid like metal, wood, or fabric, so he would like to understand what the HLC would allow. Fabric with a frame would cost less because its weight would not have to be supported above the door. However, he was unsure exactly what the Applicants wanted. He offered to bring the Applicant's specific proposal to Staff, just like the windows. No work would be done until all parties agreed.

President Gunderson called for any presentations by persons in favor of, impartial to or against the application. Seeing none, she called for closing remarks of Staff.

Director Cronin reminded the Commissioners they could add any specific condition of approval they would like or allow Staff to make an over the counter decision. He confirmed the HLC wanted the building to have lap siding with a four-inch reveal and corner boards that any architectural details uncovered during removal of the cedar shingles be preserved if possible, and the specific style of proposed windows be verified. The HLC just needs to direct Staff about the awning.

President Gunderson closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and called for Commission discussion and deliberation.

Commissioner Stanley believed the HLC should allow Staff to approve the awning. There seems to be no consensus among the Commission about what type of awning should be used and Staff could consider the economics and appropriateness of the awning the Applicant proposes.

Commissioner Caruana said he would approve the three visible sides in a hardy four-inch exposure. A fixed or retractable awning would be okay, but once an awning is selected, Staff should have the final approval. He would like to consider more details, like the size of the corner boards or the window trim details. As a member of the

HLC, it is his job to give his opinion about what looks good. However, the Commission continues to send Applicants away with vague direction, indicating Staff is being trusted to make judgment calls about the details. The scale of the window trim is more important than whether the window is inset. He finds it difficult to add these details to a motion and it would be nice to have the details included in a plan so that the Commission can simply approve or disapprove specific items.

Commissioner McHone suggested the issue might be the result of recent staffing changes. The Commission may begin to receive more details as time goes on.

Commissioner Caruana said the HLC could lay out the specific information they are looking for. More details will help the HLC make a decision.

Commissioner Stanley asked if Commissioner Caruana had a specific recommendation for the size of the corner board. The Applicants have indicated they are willing to work with the HLC and just want direction.

Commissioner Caruana recommended a minimum 4 1/5 width on the corner board, noting that 5 1/5 would be a bit too large. He would like to see the proposed window trim, even if all he could see is an image of trim the Applicants plan to duplicate. There is a classic historic way to trim windows. He would prefer to see such details because Staff has so much other work to do. He was not comfortable trusting Staff to oversee execution of the details, especially when the HLC does not have the details. He recommended the HLC give the Applicants as much direction as possible. The Commission is clear about most of the aspects of the project and only a few items need to be nailed down. The HLC's decision will inform Staff about what the Commission will consistently approve and can help develop a format for future applications.

Commissioners agreed staffing changes have resulted in less detailed Staff reports. They believed the problem would solve itself over time. Until then, the HLC would give direction that is more specific.

President Gunderson reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Louma said the window trim would have 4 1/2 inch sides and the top would have a 5 1/2 inch one-by-six with a crown moulding. The sills would extend 1 1/2 inch past with a skirt board underneath. The Commission can see more of his work in Mill Pond. The Applicants are going for a traditional look, similar to Mill Pond, to fit the location of the building. He said the next time he would present a picture or drawing.

Commissioner Caruana said all of these details would still need to be spelled out and then the HLC could defer to Staff to approve the final selection of window, window trim, and corner board details. The siding choice and awning has already been proposed.

President Gunderson closed the public hearing and called for a motion and vote.

Commissioner Burns believed the proposed awning would cover a couple of the transom windows, which looks like an afterthought. He did not believe this would do the building justice.

Commissioner Caruana moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) approve Exterior Alteration EX15-12 by Tommie Hatcher and Ronald Borans and adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report, with the addition of the following conditions:

1. The awning over the doorway shall be a traditional straight shaped, angled, proportional to the entry, and made of metal or fabric design. Awning shall not cover the transom windows. Final awning design shall be approved at time of building permit by the Community Development Director.
2. The replacement windows on the second story shall be one over one inset windows (Milgard "Tuscan" or similar) verified at time of building permit by the Community Development Director.
3. The Hardi-plank or similar fiber cement product siding shall be smooth, not wood-grained with 4 inch reveal exposure on all elevations with corner boards at 4.5 inches.
4. If the renovation uncovers significant architectural details, such as decorative motifs, the applicant shall preserve and salvage said details. If said details are damaged beyond repair, the applicant can replace with like materials.
5. Significant changes or modifications to the proposed plans as described in this Staff Report shall be reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

6. The applicant shall obtain all necessary City and building permits prior to the start of construction.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Stanley. Motion passed unanimously.

Director Cronin noted he could take John Goodenberger and the Applicants to the site and use the conditions of approval to guide a conversation about how to move forward.

President Gunderson read the rules of appeal into the record.

Vice President Dieffenbach believed the issues discussed at this meeting are important. The HLC should discuss these issues with the new planner and request specific details. Staff could be asked to submit Findings to the HLC earlier so there is time for Commissioners to request more details from Staff. She feels bad putting Applicants out for an additional month or two and asking them to come back to the City. Maybe Planner Johnson could help the HLC with the transition.

Planner Johnson confirmed she would help train the new planner.

Commissioner Caruana believed the HLC had never been presented with the level of detail he would like to see. However, the HLC has always trusted Staff in the past. He believed certain questions should automatically be triggered when an Applicant states they want to put new siding on a building. Asking for details about the product, exposure, grain, and corner boards is not asking for very much. All he would like is a picture of a window casing to be replicated with an arrow indicating the size. He was not comfortable trusting new Staff.

Commissioner Osterberg believed the HLC has discussed this before. Everything needs to be in writing. He believed a new application form should be created. The applications should be longer, have a lot more attached to them, or refer to a design manual that an Applicant and the public could refer to. Many cities use design manuals or design guideline books. These documents include good examples, references, drawings, and illustrations. The City has some of this information, but he believed a longer, more detailed application that lists specific types of drawings or photographs is needed.

Planner Johnson noted that Applicants are already submitting incomplete applications with unanswered questions. Generally, Staff must pull this information from the Applicants. Only 10 percent of the applications are good. If Staff held every Applicant to the state's completeness requirements without helping them complete the applications, they would never receive a complete application.

Commissioner Osterberg understood. Many cities have Staff that work with Applicants to complete applications through meetings, pre-application conferences, or informal reviews. Astoria Staff may need to get more information from the Applicant in some way.

Vice President Dieffenbach said she has made some of the applications. Part of the challenge is that Applicants must get approval from HLC early in their projects, often times before they have decided on all of the details. Applicants want the HLC's approval before spending any money. She believed the HLC was tasked with considering specific aspects of a project, many of which were mentioned by Commissioner Caruana. The HLC does not necessarily need more information, just specific details about certain aspects of the projects. Applicants might not be able to give the HLC a specific window trim size, so the HLC should give a parameter for the Applicant to stay within. This creates a more user-friendly process.

Commissioner Stanley said Planner Johnson was the City's design manual. She would send Applicants back and forth until they had provided all of the details the HLC needed. The process will not work this way anymore and the HLC would like Planner Johnson to help the new planner develop guidelines. Once the guidelines are complete, the HLC would like the opportunity to review them and suggest changes.

Planner Johnson said that as she is involved in training, she would emphasize the HLC's needs. However, the HLC should also discuss their concerns with the new planner. It is important for the new planner to hear directly from the HLC.

Vice President Dieffenbach did not want the HLC's discussion with the new planner to be in front of the public when an Applicant is waiting on a decision.

The Commission agreed the conversation could occur during a work session.

Vice President Dieffenbach believed most people were unaware of Staff's design information. Staff has already put a lot of information together and the City just needs to use it. The Commissioners should be aware of the information as well.

Commissioner Osterberg agreed and said it appeared as if applicants were not being asked to review or respond to the information, nor are they being asked to provide any of the details the HLC is looking for.

Commissioner Caruana said he has seen some of the completed restoration work in town and realized he had something different in mind when he approved the projects. In these instances, he felt bad for failing to state his specific preferences during the hearing. If the details are not on paper, they must be stated. The HLC exists to consider aesthetics.

Vice President Dieffenbach said if the HLC can get some parameters, they could push each project in the right direction.

Commissioner Caruana added that when he sees some properties for which the HLC has approved work, he questions who is enforcing the conditions when the HLC did not specify any criteria. Staff has been in flux for a while, so the HLC needs to know what it is approving instead of deferring to Staff as much.

Commissioner Osterberg noted that one person cannot be depended on to remember everything the HLC has said. The criteria needs to be more institutionalized and made part of application forms, design handbooks, and public information.

Vice President Dieffenbach added that these documents would give the HLC something to stand on. The HLC could say it does not want a wood canopy. However, if this does not exist in the conditions, the applicant could install a wood canopy and the HLC would not be able to say the canopy was not per the application.

President Gunderson directed Staff to set up a work session with Nancy Ferber, the new planner. A work session would also be a good opportunity for the HLC to welcome her and allow her to get to know the Commissioners.

ITEM 4(b):

HD15-01 Historic Designation HD15-01 by the Historic Landmarks Commission to designate the site and remaining features from the historic seafood industry uses as historic at 3 - 2nd Street, generally described as the water area at the foot of 2nd Street generally between the existing former pier on the west to the west side of the Columbia House Condominiums, and between the shoreline to the pierhead line in the A-2, Aquatic Two Development zone.

President Gunderson asked if anyone objected to the jurisdiction of the HLC to hear this matter at this time. There were no objections. President Gunderson asked if any member of the HLC had a conflict of interest, or any ex parte contacts to declare. None declared. President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report.

Planner Johnson presented the Staff report. She noted that while the HLC usually designates buildings as historic, there are a few historic sites in Astoria, like the site of the old Tanner School, now the Crestview Care Center. Only the site is designated as historic, not the building. Another example is the site of the old Bumblebee Cannery. The historic designation was not removed when the building burned because it was the site of the Bumblebee Cannery. Upland property owners have first rights of refusal to use the property within the proposed area. Members of the Columbia House Homeowners Association asked Staff to initiate this application and their Board of Directors submitted a letter of support. She worked closely with the Division of State Lands because they were hesitant to allow this historic designation at first. The State cannot prohibit the designation, but the City wanted their support. State representatives met Planner Johnson at the site, reviewed the details of the designation, and submitted a letter of support. Both letters of support were included in the Staff report. The designation would not prohibit construction in the area, but any future development would have to consider physical and visual impacts to the three major features of the site and the view of the site in its current condition. The Bridge Vista Overlay Zone of the Riverfront Vision Plan limits the height of any development to the top of the

bank, like docks. Staff is working with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Unical, the owner of an upland parking area, because there is some contamination at the site. Some of the shoreline and an area in the water will need to be capped. If this capping impacts any of the ballasts, they will replace the ballasts or work around them. DEQ is aware of the historic designation and they believed the cleanup work could be done around the ballasts. She recommended approval of the request.

Commissioner Osterberg noted that Page 9 of the Staff report indicates Serena Orwick considered the boiler significant under Criterion A. However, he believed she made this statement prior to the recent Development Code amendments. He asked if Criterion A is now referred to as Criterion D.3.

Planner Johnson said no and explained that Ms. Orwick made the statement in a paper she wrote for a college class. She was referring to the national and state criterion for historic designation, not Astoria's local criterion. Planner Johnson included her statement in the Staff report to show that she stated the boiler was significant according to national criteria.

Commissioner Osterberg understood Staff has cited the quote as being applicable to Criterion D.3 Historical Significance, which he agrees with. Ms. Orwick's statement is perfectly applicable to Astoria's criteria. He understood this designation would not prohibit future development of the site. He wanted to know if a recreation of the Van Kamp cannery building could be built on the site.

Planner Johnson confirmed recent changes to the Comprehensive Plan, zoning, and Bridge Vista Overlay would not allow reconstruction of a building. The City is trying to protect the vistas at this site. A Development Code amendment and a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be required to build a building in the area. Currently, structures cannot be built taller than the top of the bank. The Rivertrail is above the bank.

President Gunderson confirmed there was no public testimony regarding the application and called for Commission discussion and deliberation.

Commissioner McHone asked if an interpretive aid for visitors could be installed if this application was approved.

Planner Johnson said the Staff report recommends an interpretive sign be installed some day, but it would all come down to funding.

Commissioner Caruana said he was confused about how to score the site because the designation did not include a building. Without a good understanding of how to score the site, he was afraid of scoring it too low. He asked if the designation would prevent a dock from covering all of the pilings.

Planner Johnson believed the designation would make it more difficult to cover the entire area with a deck. Any alterations to the site would be reviewed by the HLC. As Staff, she would not recommend approval of anything that would completely cover the pilings and ballast rocks. A small dock for mooring boats would seem reasonable, but the overall concept of the site would need to remain intact. Without the historic designation, the pilings could be cut down and sold for wood, the boiler could be dismantled and removed, the ballasts could be redistributed, and a dock completely covering the entire area could be built.

Commissioner Caruana stated those details were important, adding he is becoming increasingly protective of the waterfront.

Planner Johnson noted the City does not protect vistas and views very often. The Riverfront Vision Plan does provide some areas the City is able to protect. People have asked the City multiple times over the years to designate this area as historic, but Staff never had the time. Therefore, she took this on after retirement. Without the designation, every bit of the area could be lost.

Commissioner Stanley added the designation is the first step towards getting an interpretive sign. Once the site is designated, it is likely someone would be willing to donate the funds for a sign. Planner Johnson suggested Staff talk to the homeowners association about donating funds for a sign.

Commissioner Osterberg said he supported the application because of its unique character and what it contains. This historic site contains the ballast rocks, the pilings, and the old boiler, which is a structure. The site has all four elements he looks for when he thinks about waterfront preservation. He is not in favor of simply approving a

historic designation for every set of pilings along Astoria's waterfront or an area with just ballast rocks. However, this site has all four important elements. He believed this site was worthy of the designation and protection.

Commissioner Osterberg moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report and approve Historic Designation HD15-01 by the Historic Landmarks Commission; seconded by Commissioner Burns. Motion passed unanimously.

President Gunderson read the rules of appeal into the record.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS/COMMISSIONERS – ITEM 5:

This Item was addressed immediately following Item 3: Approval of Minutes.

Item 5(a) – Mid Modern Century Homework Assignment

Director Cronin announced he would be speaking to John Goodenbergers' historic preservation class about his role in community development. He planned to audit the winter class, which is focused on construction skills. Commissioners are welcome to attend as well. The next issue of RAIN Magazine, Clatsop Community College's literary magazine, will focus on preservation. He invited Commissioners to submit contributions for the issue by the deadline in January.

He attended the Columbia Pacific Preservation Board meeting. His intention is to reenergize the board, establish a mission and purpose, and reevaluate the frequency of meetings. The next meeting in January will focus on the board's top three priorities in an effort to streamline a work program. He asked the Board to provide input on which priorities, projects, programs, or policies the board should consider. He listed some of the members of the board, noting which community groups each member represents. He explained that the Board advocates for preservation through its partners.

In September, he attended the Certified Local Government workshop, where he learned about Federal Guidelines Section 106. He described two specific projects in Oregon that were discussed at the workshop.

He announced that Nancy Ferber has been hired as the new City Planner / Projects Manager. He gave some background information about Ms. Ferber and noted she would begin in mid-December.

The Historic Landmarks Commission proceeded to Item 4: Public Hearings at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – ITEM 6: There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

APPROVED:



Community Development Director