

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING

City Council Chambers

April 21, 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 5:20 p.m.

ROLL CALL – ITEM 2:

Commissioners Present: President LJ Gunderson, Vice President Michelle Dieffenbach, Commissioners Jack Osterberg, Thomas Stanley, Paul Caruana, and Mac Burns.

Commissioners Excused: Kevin McHone

Staff Present: Interim Planner Mike Morgan and Executive Secretary Sherri Williams.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ITEM 3(a):

President Gunderson asked if there were any changes to the minutes. Commissioner Burns noted the following change on the second paragraph of Page 4: "Commissioner Burns preferred email.", deleting the last sentence

Commissioner Stanley moved to approve the minutes of March 17, 2015 as corrected; seconded by Commissioner Caruana. Motion passed unanimously. Ayes: President Gunderson, Vice President Dieffenbach, Commissioners Caruana, Osterberg, Burns, and Stanley. Nays: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

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.

The Historic Landmarks Commission continued to Public Hearings Item 4(b): EX15-04 at this time.

ITEM 4(a):

EX15-03 Exterior Alteration EX15-03 by Rachel Jensen for Nicholas Zametkin to add a 421 square foot housing addition and a 280 square foot deck to the side and rear of an existing single family dwelling at 1445 Lexington in the R-1 zone.

This agenda item was addressed following Public Hearings Item 4(d): NC15-04.

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.

President Gunderson declared that Rachel Jensen was an employee of her company several years ago, but this would not affect her decision in any way.

President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report.

Interim Planner Morgan presented the Staff report and recommended approval with conditions. Secretary Williams noted no correspondence had been received, but Robert Davis requested a copy of the Staff report. She did not see Mr. Davis in the audience.

Commissioner Osterberg asked how Staff determined the existing stairs were not historic and had minimal historical value, as noted in Criterion 4 at the top of Page 5 in the Staff report. The inventory form used by the City to establish the historic designation did not make any reference to the stairs.

Interim Planner Morgan said he received information from the Applicant that the stairs have been replaced at least once since 1968. The existing stairs look similar to the stairs that were on the house in 1968. Therefore, Staff has assumed the stairs are not historic because they are not original to the house, which was built in 1895. Many of the features like the trim, siding, and some of the windows are original.

President Gunderson opened public testimony for the hearing and asked for the Applicant's presentation.

Rachel Jensen, 1445 Lexington Avenue, Astoria, said her partner, Nicholas Zametkin, is the owner of the property. They have been working with Chadbourne + Doss Architects for several months to create an addition to their property, which would add room for a master bedroom suite and a deck to provide more outdoor living area. They have worked through many designs and phases and were very happy with the way the design worked out. They feel like the addition is true to the character of the historic property, while being a unified design that stands out on its own. The designs do not accurately reflect how the view is obscured from the road. She showed several photographs, explaining what would not be visible from the street. She showed examples of the proposed aluminum-clad wood windows, noting that the design plans did not include any fiberglass or vinyl. The windows would look painted and would require minimal maintenance. Their goal was to choose materials that would last a long time. All of the trim would be replaced with trim that matches the historic millwork. The windows would not protrude any more than the original windows, less than an inch, and the trim will add depth. She referred to a report on historic windows written by John Goodenberger, which stated windows protruding up to 1 inch were historically appropriate. She hoped the HLC would consider the proposed windows and the proposed installation appropriate as well. The standing seam metal roofing will be a dark grey color meant to match the tone of an asphalt shingle roof. The existing porch is not original and the stairs were narrowed to accommodate off-street parking. She does not want to lose the off-street parking because the street is narrow and allows parking on both sides. Turning the stairs will provide safer pedestrian access. The railings on the new stairs will be up to code, providing more safety. The house has been moved from its original site, so the house is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. In 1908, the setbacks were different and the house had a small central front porch. The house was originally built near 15th and Lexington, and was moved in 1916 to make room for the historic house that currently sits on that corner. She showed a Sanborn Map from 1946 that showed the house in its current location. The stripes are historic and contributing. Neither of the adjacent houses are historic and the houses behind are modern and contemporary. Other houses in the area are 1950s style, ranch, and flat-roofed homes. Two historic houses on the block have standing seam metal roofs. She offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Osterberg asked for details about the materials proposed for the metal stairs. Ms. Jensen said the risers would be metal and the treads would be IPE wood making the staircase very see-through. The railings would also be metal. The entire staircase would be custom made.

President Gunderson called for any presentations by persons in favor of the application.

Chris LaPointe, 461 Exchange Street, Astoria, believed the design was cool and respected the history of the house. The design also matched other projects in the community like Buoy Beer and Fort George Brewery. The addition would integrate the old with the new very well. Even though the back porch would be a different material, it would still look like all of the other houses in Astoria that have a series of porches. The profile completely fits with the tradition of Astoria homes. He believed the materials were exciting and nice. The back cannot be seen from anywhere except the contemporary homes behind it. He believes the design is a nice contemporary design that blends well with the historic neighborhood.

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

Interim Planner Morgan said he misinterpreted the specification sheet and had believed the windows would be fiberglass clad; however, the windows would be metal clad wood windows.

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

Commissioner Caruana liked that the new additions looked completely different from the original house, and yet the original house had been preserved. He believed the windows respected the historic molding and the siding preserved the original décor of the house. The new front stairs integrate what is happening on the back of the house, which he believed was appropriate. He did not like the existing stairs and noted the new stairs would be safer. He was in favor of the application, but suggested the Applicant be mindful of areas where the new elements come in contact with the existing house. He was concerned about how the details would come together. However, it did not appear from the design that this would be a problem.

Commissioner Stanley agreed and said he liked the concept of adding something radically different to the building. This concept is evolving in other cities and he believed it added more character to the community. At some point, this concept will become historic. Therefore, he was in favor of the application.

Commissioner Caruana believed the HLC should review color because all of the additions should be a different color. He would not want the next owner to unify the house by painting or installing different siding. President Gunderson agreed.

Commissioner Burns said at first, he did not like the proposed additions. However, the more he looked at the design and after hearing the Applicant's presentation, he believed the project looked good.

Commissioner Osterberg said the historic inventory from 2000 shows the current stairway on the front of the house and does not indicate that the stairway is not historic. He realized Staff meant the staircase was not original from 1895. However, he believed the current staircase is very compatible with the existing architecture and historical values of the house, which is a cute Victorian cottage. Therefore, he believed the proposal for a metal staircase in a modern design would not be compatible, nor would it comply with Criterion 4. He did not believe there was any evidence to support the conclusion that the existing staircase was incompatible or inappropriate. He understood the existing staircase might need to be replaced and rebuilt, but he suggested it be made of wood. A different configuration would be acceptable as long as it was not replaced with a modernist staircase that hangs off the side of a cute Victorian cottage. He appreciated the information about the window recess, which satisfied his concerns about the appropriateness of the depth of the windows. While the modern internationalist style of the addition with vertical corrugated metal siding seemed to be done well, he believed it was not appropriate and did not meet Criteria 6 and 9. Exterior materials that need to be replaced should be replaced with materials that are compatible in terms of composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. He understood color was not an issue, but an entirely modernist approach with modernist windows was not appropriate in this case and in a residential historic neighborhood. The design does not match and is not compatible. He agreed the additions should be either extremely compatible or dramatically different in order to avoid an inappropriate combination of the two designs. A building addition that implemented the established aesthetic qualities, materials, and other features in the historic district and on the house would satisfy the conditions of approval. He understood an exact match would not be possible, but believed the proposed project was not appropriate and did not meet the criteria. Existing landscaping is one mitigating factor that should be considered with regard to Criteria 9. He did not believe much weight should be given to landscaping because all of the landscaping could be completely redesigned. He concluded by stating he believed the proposal did not meet Criteria 4, 6, or 9.

Vice President Dieffenbach liked the design of the addition because it looked completely different. She did not mind that the new stairs on the front would look completely different, but did not like that the existing house would be changed. In order to make the design work, the house should stay intact and exist as a historic home. The windows should be one-over-one, the house needs to retain its historic elements, and the additions need to be distinctly different. The additions are different in many ways, but she was unsure about the metal roof. The windows were her biggest concern because changing the windows on the existing house really changes the house drastically. When putting up an adjacent structure that will oppose a historic structure, the historic structure should remain as historic as possible. Criteria 9 states contemporary designs can be added, but the significant historical architectural and cultural materials on the existing house should be kept as is. She wanted the house to remain as is and the additions to be completely different. She would not have a problem with the proposal if the Applicant installed one-over-one windows on the original house.

Commissioner Osterberg believed Vice President Dieffenbach was echoing other Commissioners, that the design should stay true to the desire to endorse both historic preservation for the existing house and a new dramatically different design on the additions.

President Gunderson said she had seen many designs similar to the one proposed in other cities, and they look good as long they are well maintained. She did not like the proposed change in the windows on the existing house and preferred the windows on the front of the house be kept as is. However, she liked the rest of the proposed design. She believed the new with the old went together well. She understood Commissioner Osterberg's opinion about the landscaping, but noted the HLC has based many of its decisions on the fact that landscaping does play into the design. She noted there are other metal roofs in the area. She liked the project overall, but was concerned about the windows.

Commissioner Stanley believed Vice President Dieffenbach made a good point. The original building must remain true to its design and the addition can be a stark difference. He believed the HLC should require the windows to remain the same.

Vice President Dieffenbach believed the look of the one-over one-windows was one of the strongest historic characters of old houses. Using different windows really changes the character of the home. She did not have any issues with the aluminum clad material or the number of windows on the house, just the proportion and look of the windows. Double hung or single hung windows would retain the original character of the home.

The Commissioners reviewed the photographs of the original windows, noting that they were double hung.

President Gunderson reopened the public testimony portion of the hearing and asked the Applicant to return to the podium.

Ms. Jensen confirmed the existing windows on the house were double hung. There is a fixed window with a leaded glass transom and a glass transom above the door on the front of the house. She proposed to remove the leaded glass window.

Commissioner Caruana noted the house next door had large aluminum picture windows, probably installed in the 1970s. The proposed west elevation drawing shows that one window will become shorter and another window will become two separate windows. However, the left window will actually become three windows.

Ms. Jensen confirmed the one window would become three separate windows, another window would become two separate windows, and a third window would become shorter because it is in the kitchen. The windows were the one element of the house she took the longest to make a decision on. She originally fought to change the windows when developing the design. She would be happy to leave the picture window as one window and consider installing a transom. Double hung windows on the front façade would look nice. However, the windows are 120 years old, the house has no insulation, and the windows have deteriorated. She wanted to make changes to the house that would last a lifetime and make the house more livable. She questioned whether new double hung windows would look original or create a design conflict; casement windows would not look original. She kept the rhythm of the three bays and kept the windows vertical and narrow. She did not want people to think that the work done was historic because the work will be new.

Vice President Dieffenbach explained she was not concerned with the window materials or whether they looked old or new. Materials cannot be expected to last forever and they should be replaced so they retain the appearance of the original material. She believed keeping the proportion, look, and feel of the house as a whole was the most important thing. The historic character should remain, even if the materials are not exactly the same. She was particularly concerned with the front façade and one side of the house because they are so visible. She believed all three of the windows on the front of the house could be double hung.

President Gunderson confirmed all of the Commissioners except Commissioner Osterberg had an issue with the windows, but approved of every other aspect of the project. Commissioner Stanley added the HLC wants to keep the charm and the look of the house. Commissioner Caruana said in order to justify the radical changes to the exterior areas beyond the original footprint of the house, the original house should remain as close to its original condition as possible. Window could still be added to the original house, but changing from double hung to casement window could take away from the original look of the house.

Commissioner Burns asked if Ms. Jensen would be willing to install double hung windows. Ms. Jensen said her architects and the homeowner could not attend the hearing and it was difficult for her to speak for them. She

struggled with the windows as well, but has come to believe that the unity of the design as a whole affects the interior of the home. She understood the HLC did not review interior work, but the house is being changed to accommodate the way it is used. This is why she did not propose a large picture window on the corner. The interior is very open and she wanted to retain the view from that window. It is difficult to imagine three double hung windows in that location. She accepted the new casement windows on that side of the house in order to keep the rhythm and she liked the contrast. She did not believe compatibility meant matching and the rhythm of three narrow windows satisfied her concerns. The picture window on the front of the house is proposed to be casement windows similar to the others, but she would happy to agree to a fixed-pane picture window or a design with a transom like the original window.

Vice President Dieffenbach did not have any problems with the three separate windows. She just preferred double hung windows instead of casement windows. Commissioner Caruana noted the Applicant could install a larger picture window flanked with narrow double hung windows. Commissioner Osterberg agreed that both ideas would be more appropriate and compatible.

Ms. Jensen did not believe she could agree to the suggested changes without consulting the designer and the homeowner.

The HLC discussed how to proceed and decided to require double hung windows on the original house. Commissioner Caruana suggested allowing a picture window flanked by narrow windows, but then agreed with Vice President Dieffenbach that three double hung windows would be better proportioned on such a small house. Vice President Dieffenbach also believed keeping the picture window on the front of the house retained the character of the house better than two double hung windows.

Interim Planner Morgan suggested the HLC continue the hearing to allow Ms. Jensen time to consult with the designer and the homeowner. Commissioner Caruana noted the Commissioners could change their mind before the next meeting. He suggested approving the request with the condition that double hung windows be installed on the original house. Ms. Jensen agreed with Commissioner Caruana.

President Gunderson closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Vice President Dieffenbach moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff Report and approve Exterior Alteration EX15-03 by Rachel Jensen, with the following changes to the Staff report conditions:

Page 6, Section V. Conclusion:

- Omit Number 1 in its entirety and replace with: "The additions to the house are appropriate and meet the criteria of the development code, including the front staircase.
- Omit Number 2 in its entirety and replace with: "The metal standing seam roof is appropriate to the design."
- Omit Number 2 in its entirety and replace with: "The window replacement is appropriate if the applicant installs one over one (single or double hung) windows rather than casement windows."

Motion seconded by Commissioner Stanley. Motion passed 5 to 1. Ayes: President Gunderson, Vice President Dieffenbach, Commissioners Caruana, Burns, and Stanley. Nays: Commissioner Osterberg.

President Gunderson read the rules of appeal into the record.

Vice President Dieffenbach said she hoped the conditions were not a deal breaker. She believed the Applicant had done a great job. President Gunderson thanked Ms. Jensen for a nice presentation. Commissioner Osterberg added the presentation was very professional. The HLC appreciated the information about the depth of the windows.

The HLC proceeded to Item 5: Reports of Officers and Commissioners.

ITEM 4(b):

EX15-04 Exterior Alteration EX15-04 by New Cingular Wireless (AT&T Mobility), c/o Velocitel, Inc. to add three panel antennas with ancillary equipment to an existing wireless communication facility at 342 14th Street in the C-4, Central Commercial zone.

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

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.

Commissioner Caruana declared a conflict of interest, recused himself, and stepped down from the dais.

President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report. Interim Planner Morgan presented the Staff report and recommended approval. No correspondence had been received.

President Gunderson opened public testimony for the hearing and asked for the Applicant's presentation.

Tom McAuliffe, 4004 Cruise Way Place, Suite 220, Lake Oswego, offered to answer any questions and explained that AT&T is expanding its facilities for new technologies. This project involves Long Term Evolution (LTE) equipment. AT&T is adding one antenna per sector, so there will be nine antennas on the elevator penthouse. The antennas will be flush mounted to the walls and painted to match the building. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has already approved this project.

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. There were none. She closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and called for Commission discussion and deliberation.

Commissioner Osterberg said the project will create minor changes from the existing conditions, especially for the use of panel style WCFs. He hoped the City would develop a process that eliminated the requirement for a public hearing before these antennas need to be replaced. Other jurisdictions do not require public hearings for this type of mounting and this type of facility. He asked Staff to look into changing the requirements. Interim Planner Morgan agreed and said he would consider approving applications for this type of project through the Type 2 review process, which is an administrative review that does not include Commission input.

Commissioner Burns moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff Report and approve Exterior Alteration EX15-04 by New Cingular Wireless (AT&T Mobility), c/o Velocitel, Inc.; seconded by Commissioner Stanley. Motion passed unanimously.

President Gunderson read the rules of appeal into the record.

Commissioner Caruana returned to the dais.

ITEM 4(c):

EX15-05 Exterior Alteration EX15-05 by Buoy Beer Company to add a 30-foot high grain silo on the south elevation at 1 8th Street 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.

Commissioner Burns declared that Andrew Bornstein is a member of the Clatsop County Historical Society Board of Directors. He has not discussed this request with Mr. Bornstein. The last time the HLC reviewed an application by Buoy Beer, he did not participate in the conversation but was allowed to vote, as advised by City Attorney Henningsgaard. He assumed the same process would be appropriate for this hearing and did not believe his relationship with Mr. Bornstein would affect his decision.

Vice President Dieffenbach declared a conflict of interest and stepped down from the dais.

President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report.

Interim Planner Morgan presented the Staff report and recommended approval with conditions. No correspondence had been received.

President Gunderson opened public testimony for the hearing and asked for the Applicant's presentation.

David Kroening, 1078 Harrison, Astoria, said the silo will provide improved efficiencies as well as financial benefits. The brewers will no longer have to carry as many bags of grain back and forth. The silo will sit on a leased portion of City property between 7th and 8th Streets that contains a concrete skirt. This is the only place a silo can be placed because the building is out on the dock. He believes the silo will fit in with the working waterfront and will not block any of the historical aspects of the building. He clarified that Bornstein Seafood owns the building, not the company.

Commissioner Osterberg asked what the exterior material would be on the silo. Mr. Kroening said the silo would look identical to the Wet Dog's silo with straight sides. He believed the material would be powder coated steel and it would be painted.

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. There were none. She closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and called for Commission discussion and deliberation.

President Gunderson believed this silo would sit in the perfect location and fit with the waterfront, so she was in favor of the request.

Commissioner Stanley believed the silo would add ambiance and was also in favor of the request.

Commissioner Caruana understood the HLC could not review color. However, he encouraged the use of colors that would draw attention to the silo. He is proud of Astoria for being known as a brewing town. Structures like this silo are a welcomed addition. Instead of looking like an attachment to an old building, the silo will look like something fresh and new that celebrates Astoria's new identity. Brewing has done a lot for this town and he is in favor of the request.

Commissioner Osterberg said the request meets all of the criteria. It is certainly appropriate to have a metal structure adjacent to other large metal structures and Astoria is already familiar with silos at other breweries in the downtown area. He believed the silo would be very compatible.

Commissioner Stanley moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff Report and approve Exterior Alteration EX15-05 by Buoy Beer Company, with conditions; seconded by Commissioner Caruana. Motion passed unanimously.

President Gunderson read the rules of appeal into the record.

Vice President Dieffenbach returned to the dais.

ITEM 4(d):

NC15-04 New Construction NC15-04 by David Dieffenbach for Clatsop County to locate an emergency generator on the west side of the county courthouse surrounded by a wrought iron fence at 749 Commercial in the C4 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.

Vice President Dieffenbach declared a conflict of interest and stepped down from the dais.

Commissioner Burns declared that the Clatsop County Historical Society owns property adjacent to this property and leases the old county jail from Clatsop County. However, he has not discussed this project with anyone involved with the county and did not believe his judgment would be impacted.

President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report.

Interim Planner Morgan presented the Staff report and recommended approval with conditions. No correspondence had been received.

President Gunderson opened public testimony for the hearing and asked for the Applicant's presentation.

David Dieffenbach said over the last few years the County has been switching to paperless filings and needs electricity. Therefore, the county is requesting to install a generator surrounded by a wrought iron fence on courthouse property. He offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Caruana said the image in the Staff report shows a new wrought iron fence with a shaded area. Mr. Dieffenbach explained the shaded area shows the generator behind the fence, but the black and white image did not turn out well. The fence will not contain any chain link.

Commissioner Osterberg wanted to know if the fencing material was actually wrought iron or a similar material. He understood that few fence contractors handled true wrought iron work. Mr. Dieffenbach said he was not sure, as he did not know the difference between wrought iron and the steel used today. He believed the fence would be wrought iron, powder coated black to prevent rust. He believed the design of the fence had to be done with wrought iron. Commissioner Osterberg said the design could be done in any metal. He noted the material did not make a difference to him, but he was simply interested to know if the fence would be true wrought iron. He would approve either material. Mr. Dieffenbach said the fence needed to be custom made so it would match the rest of the fencing on the property. However, he has not yet spoken with a fence contractor.

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. There were none. She closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and called for Commission discussion and deliberation.

Commissioner Burns said he was a neighbor who would have to look at the fence every day and he did not believe it would have much impact.

Commissioner Osterberg believed the fence would be very compatible because it would match the rest of the fencing on the property.

Commissioner Stanley thanked Interim Planner Morgan for working with the Applicant to choose the location for the generator. He appreciated that the generator would be tucked away in the corner.

Commissioner Caruana moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff Report and approve New Construction NC15-04 by David Dieffenbach for Clatsop County, with conditions; seconded by Commissioner Burns. Motion passed unanimously.

President Gunderson read the rules of appeal into the record.

Vice President Dieffenbach returned to the dais.

The Historic Landmarks Commission continued to Public Hearings Item 4(a): EX15-03 at this time.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS/COMMISSIONERS – ITEM 5:


President Gunderson announced former Planner Rosemary Johnson would be receiving an Oregon Heritage Award for Outstanding Preservationist later in the week. The award will be presented to her at a Preservation Conference being held in Coos Bay.

Staff said nominations have opened for the Dr. Harvey Award. Staff encouraged Commissioners to let them know if they believe a particular property should be considered for the award. Nominations will be open until April 30th and the HLC will select award recipients at their next meeting. Two weeks after that, the award recipients will be forwarded to City Council for presentation. John Goodenberger has nominated the Presbyterian Church for their work on the church building. Another nominee is a derelict building at 775 38th Street that has been renovated. Staff stated that work must be completed in order to be eligible for an award.


ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

ATTEST:


Secretary

APPROVED:


Planner