

## **HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING**

City Council Chambers  
June 25, 2018

### CALL TO ORDER – ITEM 1:

A special meeting of the Astoria Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) was held at the above place at the hour of 7:34 pm.

### ROLL CALL – ITEM 2:

Commissioners Present: President LJ Gunderson, Commissioners Jack Osterberg, Kevin McHone, Paul Caruana and Katie Rathmell.

Commissioners Excused: Vice President Michelle Dieffenbach and Commissioner Mac Burns.

Staff Present: City Manager Estes, City Attorney Blair Henningsgaard, and Planner Nancy Ferber. The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed by ABC Transcription Services, Inc.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ITEM 3(a):

President Gunderson asked if there were any changes to the minutes of May 15, 2018. There was none.

President Gunderson moved to adopt the minutes of May 15, 2018 as presented; seconded by Commissioner Rathmell. Motion passed unanimously.

### 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.

### ITEM 4(a):

NC18-01      New Construction NC18-01 by Craig Riegelnegg, Carleton Hart Architecture for Hollander Hospitality to construct an approximate 29,782 square foot, four story hotel, adjacent to historic structures, at 1 2nd Street (Map T8N R9W Section 7DA, Tax Lots 11800 and 11900; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, Block 1, McClure; and Map T8N R9W Section 7DB, Tax Lots 1300, 1400, 1501, 1700; Unplatted lots fronting on Block 1, Hinman's Astoria) in the C-3 Zone (General Commercial), Bridge Vista Overlay Zone (BVO), Flood Hazard Overlay (FHO), and CRESO 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.

President Gunderson declared ex parte contact as she attended the Design Review Committee (DRC) public hearing on DR18-01 for the same project.

Commissioner Caruana declared that he owned a couple of hotels in Astoria, but he believed he could be impartial.

President Gunderson requested a presentation of the Staff report.

Planner Ferber and City Manager Estes reviewed the Findings and Conditions contained in the Staff report, as well as the DRC public hearing on DR18-01 for the same project. City Code requires at least one member of the HLC sit on the DRC, so LJ Gunderson serves on both commissions. Available on the side table and at the dais were additional public comments and materials submitted by the Applicant.



Commissioner Osterberg asked for an update on concerns and discussions about the proposed building height.

City Manager Estes explained that the C-3 zone has a 45-foot height limit, but the BVO only permits building heights up to 45 feet when building stories above 24 feet are stepped back at least 10 feet in accordance with City Code. This building has the required step back along the north façade of the building. Code Section 3.075 – Exception to Building Height Limitations states that features listed in the section are exempt from height limits established by the Code provided the limitations indicated for each are observed. The features include mechanical equipment and apparatuses necessary for operation and maintenance of the building or structure, including chimneys, ventilators, plumbing stacks, cooling towers, water tanks, panels, devices for the collection of solar or wind energy, window washing equipment, visual screen for such features; elevator, stair, and mechanical penthouses, fire towers, skylights, flag poles, aerials; ornamental and symbolic features not exceeding 200 square feet in gross floor area including towers, spiers, cupolas, belfries, and domes which are not used for human occupancy. Total area of the features shall not exceed 30 percent of the roof area. The elevator, stairs and penthouses will be on the west side of the building. He confirmed that the numeric calculations had been determined and were not of issue. However, the HLC should still discuss scale and massing.

Commissioner McHone asked if the step back would only be on the upper three floors. City Manager Estes explained that floors above 24 feet needed to be stepped back at least 10 feet. Two step backs have been proposed to have a cumulative step back of 10 feet.

Commissioner Osterberg asked if the HLC needed to review the same criteria that had already been reviewed by the DRC, specifically criteria related to the Ship Inn and the Riverfront Vision Plan. City Manager Estes said the DRC has greater review than the HLC because the Ship Inn building is not a designated landmark. Additionally, the Riverfront Vision Plan directs the DRC to review compliance with the BVO requirements. However, the HLC could take a different stance than the DRC.

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

Craig Riegelnegg, 830 SW 10th, Suite 200, Portland, Carleton Hart Architecture, introduced Sam Mullen with Hollander Hospitality and Mo Faul with Carleton Hart Architecture. He said the project was for a hotel by Marriott at 1 2nd Street in the C-3, Bridge Vista Overlay, near the Astoria Megler Bridge and is undergoing both historic and design review. The project is located between Marine Drive and the Riverwalk and the site currently contains the closed Ship Inn, Stephanie's Cabin and an unused parking lot.

He displayed a 1908 Sanborn Insurance Map showing the original White Star cannery, which had a significantly larger footprint than the proposed building. The orientation of the project is parallel to the river due to the shape of the site and other Code requirements for fire lanes and setbacks. Historic research and the map show that while overwater developments were perpendicular to the land, buildings on the land had a variety of orientations. The piles, boiler, ballast rock, and remains of the White Star cannery are the basis for the historic review. The Applicant was directed to follow criteria for a working waterfront, which was observed along with hotel precedence and general architecture in the city. He displayed photos of historic context from the historical society. The Union Fisherman's Co-op is four stories tall and is likely taller than 45 feet based on floor to floor heights. The White Star cannery was three stories tall and likely around 50 feet tall.

The Ship Inn and the Riverwalk were drivers of the design. The site plan showed that Stephanie's Cabin and the parking lot were included. The building will be oriented east/west. The fire lane to the south and the sidewalk will be the required width. The new building will be set back 10 feet from the north side, but the Ship Inn is existing non-conforming.

The floor plan shows the Ship Inn repurposed as the hotel lobby and dining area, ground floor condition spaces and covered parking. The three hotel floors will have a double-loaded corridor and units on the north step back with decks on the second and third floors that overlook the Riverwalk. The height is below the 45-foot BVO requirements with the conforming setbacks at 43.4 feet from the low point. One 10-foot step back is required, which has been divided into two to create the decks on the second and third floors. The Ship Inn is beyond the set back, but is a non-conforming existing use. The steps on the ground floor elevation allow the building to sit lower on the site and measures about 3.5 feet lower than the building entry. Riverfront Vision Plan Article 14.085 on Page 37 mentions trading building height for width and mass. This building was built taller to keep it from extending farther to the east and obstructing the view for a longer distance along the Riverwalk.



He displayed a few photographs showing the proposed building from areas with the greatest obstruction of views. The Astoria Megler Bridge will still be visible from 2nd and Marine, but slightly obstructed. They researched the 'working waterfront' precedence. The response to historic context was not intended to mimic other buildings exactly, but to be a respectful current interpretation of the fundamental character of the old architecture and the community; to create a building that observes and honors the previous context while placing itself in the history of the city as that history continues to be written. Some of the buildings the Applicant looked at were at the water's edge and some were a block to two back, but all were considered working waterfront buildings. They worked with John Goodenberger to identify those buildings on the historic registry. They found wood frame and masonry examples of functional designs and industrial uses. There was also one residential example, the Larson House. They also considered historic hotels to inform design in areas where the working waterfront did not offer clear guidance or where the hotel use made parts of the fishery typology less informative as they needed. Many were made of stucco and masonry. They also looked broadly at historic districts, which were not strong drivers of design details but helped to fill in the fabric of the city's character for reference. They looked at contemporary waterfront buildings where appropriate and found new buildings, adaptations of older buildings, mixes of materials and styles, and generally simple aesthetics without a lot of ornament. Contemporary hotels were not considered historically accurate for this region and were not used to inform designs. Common qualities in building form included simple geometric, flat facades, few ins and outs on the facades. Openings on the buildings had regular patterns and organizations, but with variations to suite functional needs.

A precedent has been set for free form end elevations, as seen on the west elevation of the project. Window articulation and trim include windows set back from the face of the cladding, trim, and painted solid materials, simple geometries, composed rectangles, and various sizes of window lites. Storefront profiles would have a mix of frame materials and rectangular frame profiles. Cladding materials would be horizontal boards, which were very common on the working waterfront. The Ship Inn is currently clad in cedar shake and it would be updated for a newer use. Concrete exterior finishes are typical on working waterfront buildings. They planned to match that with board formed concrete on the ground floor. Cornices, bands, the parapet articulation, termination of the flat wall, and an overhang give a different appearance for masonry, concrete, and wood. Projecting bands above the ground floor and continuous horizontal profiles with minimal details will provide a relatively simple profile. Exterior lighting would be downward directed lights and shades with a goose neck or standoff in black, bronze, or raw metal finishes.

The exterior open stair was a non-historic precedent, but the Applicant had to look to it as a contemporary Code adaptation. It would have exposed and uncovered steel column supports, a utilitarian rail design, vertical and horizontal pickets. There was not a lot of historical precedent for decks and railings on the working waterfront, but they tried to capitalize on the step backs and create exterior space. The rail design would be exposed and uncovered to maximize the views.

The north elevation shows the development's overarching design approach from the aesthetic character, construction methods, durable material selection, and simple functionally minded detailing of applicable context to suit a new piece of architecture that is not built from a hotel prototype, but specifically for the community of Astoria. He made materials boards available and said the colors shown were meant to match the white painted fisheries and canneries. They had a master thesis expanded context that looked at the white paint as the most frequent and more frequent than the red buildings in town. They proposed Resysta siding. It is a synthetic cladding, but made from natural materials and meant to evoke the character of wood without mimicking wood with an overly embossed texture, like the Hardi siding. The cedar shakes have a nine-inch exposure to match the Ship Inn. It will start with a warm color and weather to grey. There will be glazed moveable wall panels on the north wall of the Ship Inn to maximize the visual and auditory connection to the Riverwalk during fair weather. They are tucked into a recess for protection from the elements. The river facing decks on two levels will have a grey colored trim, packaged terminal heat pump (PTHPs), window frames, and flashing. The south elevation will have a flat façade, which is typical of the working waterfront buildings. It will be broken up for variation created by the sliding play of the window openings and updated as varied rhythms they identified in the working waterfront precedent. There would also be a projecting band and a cornice terminating at the top of the wall. The through wall PTHPs would provide heat and air conditioning. Instead of a punched opening with a louver sticking out, they will be concealed behind a grill that serves as an accent panel beneath the windows. It will be oversized to run the entire length of the windows. The elevator overrun will apply as an ornamental screen that conceals the entry to the roof and allows the hotel to not have a railing. There is no interior space above the roofline. There will be heavy gauge powder coated steel and ornamental grates to screen the parking area. On the east/west elevation, there will be a free and functional organization of the windows. The Ship Inn shape will be streamlined to make up for the aggregated additions. The lighting plan includes all dark bronze



lights. The windows will be recessed approximately six inches from the wall. The storefront detailing includes an awning with glass to maintain views of the Ship Inn. There will also be cornices, stairs, decks and rails. He showed alternate color elevations. The white was most in keeping with the historic context, but the City had expressed interest in grey, which they also like.

President Gunderson stated the material examples were being passed around at the dais.

Commissioner Osterberg said the Applicant had done a thorough job of listing many other buildings in Astoria, some historic and some not, some along the waterfront and some not. Distinguishing elements of those buildings were listed. He asked the Applicant to summarize what was learned from the other buildings and how that was applied to the new structure.

Mr. Riegelnegg explained that a round of redesign occurred on the heels of the community meeting they held and upon learning they had to go through the HLC process, which they were not aware of initially. The cornice was added. Previously, the windows had been more contemporary and the PTHP was off to the side. After receiving input from the community and surveying other examples in town, they redesigned the windows to be more squared off, simple, and recessed more to create more depth. The cladding was realigned on the second through fourth floors and concrete was added at the grade level, which seemed to respond more to the working waterfront rather than carrying the cladding all the way down or changing the color.

Commissioner Osterberg asked what elements were used to meet the historic review criteria and make the building compatible with surrounding historic structures.

Mr. Riegelnegg said his task was to identify what that looked like based on the criteria provided. The Applicant had referenced the ruins of the White Star cannery, the working waterfront precedent they had been directed to, and conversations with John Goodenberger and the City. Based on those references, they concluded that no significant changes to the building massing were necessary because they found it to be conforming based on their interpretation. After reviewing the Code for historic review, the Applicant used an interpretation that was sensitive to the modern context and modified for this use and for the time period, but that also honors the historic precedent, and is original and functional. They kept the organization and articulation related to what was behind it and the use of the building.

Commissioner Rathmell explained that the pictures provided by the Applicant show that historically, buildings on the waterfront were long and low with pitched roofs, which is completely different from what was proposed. She asked if the Applicant had considered a longer, lower building with a pitched roof.

Mr. Riegelnegg said yes and that had to be weighed against the programmatic needs of the use. They also had to work within Code requirements for area and height. He acknowledged that elements of the building clearly recall historic precedent while others are interpreted as appropriate to the use. The overall shape, not so much the scale, would probably be longer in a similar-sized historical application. And it might be lower by a story, but there was precedent for buildings up to 45 feet in the examples they considered. The form drivers were considerable, as the site is tight with fire lanes on the south and setbacks on the north, so there was no room to grow to the north or south. The Applicant was trying to keep the building compact, so it did not become too long and take up the entire site at the expense of being a floor lower.

Commissioner Rathmell said the flat façade and window relief was similar to some other historic cement buildings in town. Astoria was not trying to reinvent historic buildings. She asked if the Applicant would consider something that gave more relieve and texture to the building.

Mr. Riegelnegg stated absolutely, adding they had thought about it. However, physical constraints of the setbacks and minimum depths required made it difficult to make guest rooms and a double-loaded corridor work. They tried to make up for the lack of depth by maximizing the impact of the step backs and adding awnings and cornices. There just was not room to project out three feet and then come back to create much of a massed effect.

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



Sam Mullen, 119 N. Commercial, Bellingham, WA, Hollander Hospitality, said this would be the company's eighth, so they did not have many hotels. The company did not work for Marriott, but Marriott was one of the companies they worked with. There are 20 people in the home office, so Hollander is not a huge company coming to try to change Astoria. The people who work at Carleton Hart did not have a design aesthetic that they tried to put in every community. At the community meeting, they talked about how they were trying to design a building that worked, which is difficult to do because there are so many different types of historic buildings in this community. They have one hotel in Tacoma, a Courtyard hotel by Marriott that was a renovation, and one third of the hotel rooms are a historic building. They wanted to build a good product that mixed and made the most sense.

One of the architectural hallmarks is the simplicity of the forms, but the feedback at the community meeting was that it looked like a jail and prison yard and there were specific requests for cornices and to enhance the design as well as to true up the staggered windows in the original design. The Applicant did what they could. He believed that to a degree, a determination would have to be made about what works historically knowing that none of it would look exactly like what is already present, which is difficult because consensus is needed from a lot of people. He learned at the DRC meeting that there was a wide range of what is appropriate. Hollander likes Astoria, but the Commissioners and residents live in Astoria and have ownership. The Applicant wants feedback to make the project as good as they can.

President Gunderson called for any presentations by persons impartial to the application. There were none. She called for any presentations by persons against the application.

Rachel Jensen 389 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Astoria, Executive Director, Lower Columbia Preservation Society, said even though this review was triggered by the White Star cannery remains, putting so much design emphasis on the corner of the property detracted and overshadowed the true depth of history on the property. She was concerned that what is really there was being disregarded. Putting so much emphasis on this part of the building screamed incompatibility with the other things being done in town. If the Commission believed that the Applicants found that part of the site to be important and that they wanted to touch on the nostalgia people in the community had for the building, they have stripped everything from that building that made it the Ship Inn they remember. The Applicants are not taking it back to what it was in 1947. Any communication between the two buildings is falling flat. According to the Comprehensive Plan and historic preservation goals, this is not providing an appropriate visible recognition of the historical significance of the site and that area of town.

Becky Thurmahlen, 194 Lincoln Street, Astoria, said the previous meeting was full and standing room only. Astorians and a tourist pleaded with the City not to do this. Local Astorians work hard to keep their homes looking the way Astoria looks and keep the charm of the town as it is. The Applicant explained attempts to make this building fit Astoria's charm and uniqueness. However, Design Review Commissioner Sarah Bardy presented a slide of this company's other hotels around the United States and they all look the same. They are cookie cutters and they all have the same little gold rusty element. You could be in any town anywhere in the United States. That was really powerful. It may fit the Code, but it does not fit the heartbeat of the community. The presentation worked hard to show the history of Astoria, but the Applicants picked out a lot of funk. There were many seedy parts of Astoria in the presentation. Astoria is loved because it has so much funk, but the community is moving forward. At the DRC meeting, she mentioned that Rockaway Beach sold their soul to development years ago. Once the first building goes up, the next one will become a runaway train that cannot be stopped. The community members at the DRC meeting were not happy about this project.

Andrea Mazzearella, 875 Franklin Avenue, Astoria, said she was at the DRC meeting. This design did not seem original based on the designs displayed/discussed by Commissioner Bardy at that meeting. The design might work great in other places, but obviously, people do not feel like it fits here. If the Applicant is actually listening and wants to be part of the community— People realize they cannot stop the Applicants from building a hotel, and not that they want to, but everyone wants it cuter and lower. She understood the Applicants needed to maximize profit and square footage, but it would be a battle to the end unless they hear the community, go back to the drawing board, and to the client to say, "The town is going to bust our balls if we do not try to find a middle ground". Astoria is good at fighting things like this and the town has had to fight a lot worse. It would be nice to have an amicable resolution, but this is not the answer.



Larry Thurmahlen, 197 Lincoln Street, Astoria, said he owned two hotels. One was built very inexpensively in the 1970s and he saw it in this building. If someone had given the Applicant enough money you would have a hotel you were very pleased with. This is cheap and disgraces the neighborhood. He went to sea for 42 years and came to Astoria many times. That is not a waterfront building; it is a cookie cutter hotel with lots of windows for people to look out and enjoy the view that is blocked to everyone in town. Make the hotel lower, even though the Applicants are within their rights to have it as high as proposed. They are maximizing their profits as inexpensively as possible. After he retired from being at sea, a very nice hotel was built with four times the money that was necessary. He purchased it as a home and turned it into a hotel. Everyone loved it, people write about it in their memoirs, and famous people go to it. It is a nice place that added to the village. He hoped the Commission would do what it can to make the building an asset to the community. Now that he has retired in Astoria, he enjoys the waterfront view. If the hotel was going up in front of his house, his house would be for sale now.

Elizabeth Menetry, 3849 Grand Avenue, Astoria, said she was at the DRC meeting. This is a very historic town with a historic aesthetic, so the HLC's opinions do matter and that the HLC and DRC functions overlap. Noting the scale of the building, she read from the Staff report "The large massing on the waterfront is a much larger scale than the historic structures. It is recommended that the HLC determine if the scale of the proposed development meets criteria." The Comprehensive Plan, Astoria Riverfront Vision Overlay Area Section .68, states, "Maintaining the authentic feel of the waterfront..." she argued that water-related uses are in the future of the town, "and protecting the historic character of the city's neighborhoods." She believed the HLC was a big part of the review.

Loretta Maxwell, 1574 Grand Avenue, Astoria, said she had not originally realized that this was supposed to be a cannery type building. It looks like a cookie cutter motel/hotel that could be found anywhere. When she looked up images of canneries, she found that most cannery buildings have a pitched roof. This building would have a roofline that related better to the Ship Inn, which has a little slant to it. She would like the building shorter and was surprised to hear that John Goodenberger condoned this building.

LaRee Johnson, 1193 Harrison Avenue, Astoria said her home is historic, built in 1922. She has owned the building 161 3<sup>rd</sup> Street since 1990, and she and her husband have done everything they can to preserve it authentically. It was probably a fisherman's boarding house originally. She could modernize it and make it fancy, but she liked the look of the simplicity for Astoria. It costs a lot of money to maintain her home with paint jobs and window repairs. She knew the Commissioners had an appreciation for Astoria's historic homes because of what they do. She objected to this project because it resembles a lot of what Astoria already had on the riverfront, which are corporate hotels. The Best Western looks like a prison, but there are good examples of hotels in Astoria. She loved the Commodore because the outside was not changed and it is a working hotel. The work done on Hotel Elliott is beautiful. She felt like the scale and compatibility of this hotel was too high, too large, and did not fit. She did not want Astoria to become like Leavenworth, Washington and Astoria did not need canneries everywhere. There is something about the charm of Astoria that needs to be retained. She just hosted visitors from Montana who had never been to Astoria before. She took them to all the high points, and they loved the Riverwalk and the bridge. She wanted to retain that. The City cannot prevent the hotel from being built, but she believed it was important to make the building fit in. This is the front yard of people who live in Astoria year-round and pay taxes. She liked looking at the river and the bridge. She liked walking on the river front and seeing the river. She understood the Applicants had a bottom line to work with and wanted to maximize profits, but she did not want that at the expense of why people live in Astoria.

George Hague, 1 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Astoria, thanked the HLC for designating the ballasts, pilings, and boiler as historic several years ago. That should be honored by this building. The hotel could be built almost anywhere. The Applicants do not care what the building looks like because they are just looking for a tax base and a few jobs. He hoped the HLC cared enough to say this does not work with what the HLC did a couple of years ago. This building should somehow limit the small walkway that goes down to the ballasts and pilings so people do not go down to that area on a regular basis. At least one member of the DRC said that the setback is a false setback because the second floor has two wings that stick out. And that is why the additional fourth floor does not fit in and should be questioned by the HLC. The HLC has been told that the rust building is permitted, but they are permitted away from the edge of the building, not at the front of a building. The frontage of the building is being extended straight up. All of these things that are permitted will be put elsewhere in the city, but not in the Bridge Vista Area. They would just be extending the wall farther than 45 feet. If those things were put farther back,



away from the edge to protect the view, he would appreciate it. The documents say they want it in that location so the sign can be installed on it.

Kris Haefker, 687 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Astoria, asked if the building in the front and the old Ship Inn were being permitted as an addition or was it all new construction. It is not an attractive building and he did not think it was worth saving. He did not know where the shake motif was called out on other historic buildings in town. He was looking for a unique piece of architecture. What is called out in a lot of the pictures are some really unique forms, but this does not have a uniqueness. He asked how it would be a landmark piece of architecture. He believed that was what the people of Astoria really wanted. He asked if there were details about the cornice or the upper overhang. Many modern buildings drop the ball on those details and a lot of times, the proportions are off. He did not know if it would be wood or sheet metal. He suggested something that would give the building a little more definition.

Commissioner Osterberg confirmed the Applicant's detailed plan of the cornice was displayed on the screen.

Mr. Haefker said it was fairly bland. He suggested knee braces and that other historical references be called out. Many cannery buildings had knee braces during the 1900s. The blob in the middle and the lack of pronounced features failed to give the building the landmark architecture that it should have being along the river front. He would like to see that because he walks by the site every day.

Olynya Levy, 509 Kensington Avenue, Astoria, said she moved to Astoria because there was something personal about the city still left. Astoria is not anywhere America where this is seen everywhere. The project seems to benefit the developers and she did not see how it would benefit Astoria in the long term. The trolley goes up and down every day all day long. There are cruise ships that come in and people come from everywhere to visit or move here. They are not moving to Astoria to see this hotel. Letting these things come in would be like shooting yourself in the foot, but she understood the hotel could not be kept out. She wanted the hotel to be made quaint somehow. She asked if the Applicants needed 65 rooms and suggested 35 rooms. She also suggested the building be made smaller, be moved back off of the Riverwalk, and built on the other side of the Marine Drive or on the Subway site. It belongs to all of the residents, not just the Applicant. The Applicants are taking the very thing that Astorians love and it benefits them. She believed the room would be full of people if they knew about this project. She did not know the project was going on. Many people just heard about it. She asked how the project got to the point where designs were being reviewed. It is heartbreaking to many people. People move to Astoria to get away from every day generic impersonal homogenous modern America. She asked that the hotel be put somewhere else. The bottom line is not always about money. This is the community's front yard and a Hampton and a Best Western are the first things seen as you drive into town. She asked what the trolley looked at when it is driving up and down.

President Gunderson called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Mullen stated he appreciated the comments. His company built a hotel in 1982 and sold it in 2014. They do not build things cheaply because they will inherit it. They operate the hotels, so they want to do a good job despite whatever the design may indicate. They ran into some very well written, prepared comments at the DRC meeting by one of the Commissioners who showed a picture of six hotels. He did not believe the City had designed a Marriott before, certainly not for his company. They have a Fairfield and it looks nothing like this proposal. They are really not trying to cheat Astoria on the design.

Mr. Riegelnegg added the Applicant will do their best to address the many unfavorable reactions to this design, but they will never be able to please everyone. They want to fundamentally preserve the character of the town and the things that are important to people. The slide of the six hotels pulled four slides together that included rust on some elements, which they did not claim to have copyrighted for this project. There are buildings, hotels and others, all over the place that have the rust color. The reason they wanted to apply it was as a nod to the boiler. The design was based around the working waterfront and a simple and functional design. It will not be cheaply built. There are much cheaper ways to build the building and they have already received proposals that they have refused. They want to provide what works best for the community and conform to the Code. They are trying to satisfy a lot of different things. Regardless of what happens at this meeting, they are not ready to move forward on the design. They are eager to hear constructive feedback to allow them to provide something that will work. They are open to ideas. The pitches roofs on the cannery buildings are more common on historic



buildings and there is some precedent on the working waterfront for flat roofs on hotels. That was a function of the massing and keeping the building condensed horizontally. John Goodenberger is not working for them in a design capacity. He was their consultant helping with the historic information. He has seen the design and did not weigh in on it. They would consider the comment about making the hotel a piece of landmark architecture because conformance and consistency with the historic context and the BVO requirements do not push the design towards a landmark building. It pushes the design more towards a building that has more of a response to its surroundings. But they will work on that to make the building something special that feels unique and is more universally recognized that way.

President Gunderson asked that the building design being proposed be displayed and called for closing remarks of Staff.

Planner Ferber stated Staff would like the Applicant address five main areas of concern that were criteria specific and listed on Page 17 of the Staff report: the Comprehensive Plan, the massing and scale of the site, some architectural detailing, a decision on the two staircases on the west side, and the orientation and location of the building. Focusing on these criteria would be a key way to move forward.

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

Commissioner Caruana said sometimes he was willing to trade mass for air rights on neighboring properties. If this building were lowered to three stories, he would be concerned that it would become twice as long and that would be worse. There is a large parcel to the west that could be considered for future development. He was concerned that if this hotel were successful, a parking garage would be built to look like the hotel. The HLC would not have anything to say about it because it would conform with all the rules for the property. He was most concerned about what could happen in the future. The building is 157 feet long, which looks big, but the parking area to the west is at least that long. He liked the staggered skyline. He would not want to look at the waterfront from Marine Drive and see a wall of building, even if it was two stories and the bridge could still be seen. He liked the black on the windows, but was concerned about the orange material and the height of the elevator. The orange seems to be more of a branding element and another material might be more fitting for the location.

Commissioner Rathmell stated the HLC was supposed to look at style, architectural details, and materials. She did not like the height or the size of the building. She believed the scale was too large for the area and that the architectural details were flat. A pitched roof and a smaller scale would be better. The huge box did not seem to fit in the area or anywhere. Astoria has big box hotels at both ends of town and this is a widely used tourist area. Once one hotel goes in, it would be very easy for the rest of the riverfront to be developed in this way. She did not believe that was the City's vision for Astoria. Big buildings will block the water for the residents and the tourists. This hotel will cut the town off from the river front. It is out of place and she believed a complete redo of the design was necessary.

Commissioner McHone said the materials give the hotel a flat look and there is no modulation of the building face except for the offset windows on the third floor. The massing seemed large for the space. He visited several places on Bond Street and Marine Drive. There is a hotel down the street of similar size and proximity to the waterfront, but it is in a space that is more open without so many small buildings around it, so the height and density of the structure does not seem to affect the space as much as this one would. It is a very small space for this size of building. He was also concerned about adding employees to the parking, so something more would need to be done depending on the success of the hotel. He found the design between the Ship Inn and the column to be a bit confusing. Combining the Ship Inn, the column, and the more modern aspects of the project do not work.

Commissioner Osterberg said he agreed with most of the Findings in the Staff report, even though the Staff report is neutral. He did not believe the new hotel would be very large. It would only occupy a small space that just seemed squeezed in-between other elements on the site. He did believe the building was tall, which was more important than the mass. He did not consider 154 feet to be very long. This proposal is a difficult design challenge because the HLC must consider how the old boiler and pilings could somehow be used and applied to the historic character of a new hotel. It is not possible, nor is it appropriate, to try to build a new cannery with a



hotel in it; and that is not being proposed. The Code asks that new structures be consistent with existing adjacent historic structures and there are none. The Applicant and Staff have done a reasonable job of presenting the facts and comparisons. The Comprehensive Plan asks that consideration be focused partly on Astoria's working waterfront and that the HLC maintain the authentic feel of the river front. He wished that such subjective language was not an issue here, but the HLC must do its best to make sense of it and apply it. A few waterfront design standards were presented in the Staff report and by the Applicant to help and he wished the HLC had something to rely on to interpret an authentic waterfront feel. When considering the merits of waterfront architecture and design, the HLC should be careful of what it asks for. If Astoria really wanted buildings that recreated the historic and authentic waterfront architecture, they would be talking about canneries with very plain building facades and very basic utilitarian structures that would be massive. He did not believe anyone wanted massive utilitarian structures, but that is what all the canneries were. One person gave testimony about landmark buildings. There can be nothing about the White Star boiler and pilings that can be used in any interpretation to inform the design of a hotel. However, the boiler and pilings are landmarks and the HLC must faithfully interpret and meet the desire of the Comprehensive Plan to remain true to the authentic feel of the waterfront. Testimony described that because the White Star structures have been designated as landmarks, the City should expect a landmark designed building in return, whatever that may be. This proposed design is not landmark historic. He believed the hotel did several things right and pointed in some right directions with some of the design elements. But, the overall design will not make the hotel a landmark. The HLC must require consistency with the landmark. Unfortunately, the proposal does not meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan.

President Gunderson said she did not feel the Ship Inn married well with the hotel. The hotel is a box and she wanted something along the lines of what the Cannery Pier did, which is something unique and different. It looks historic even though it is not. She did not believe the proposal met the criteria. She asked for a straw poll on the two staircase options.

Commissioners Osterberg and Caruana believed the open stair case was appropriate.

President Gunderson said the scale and massing of the main building needed to be addressed.

Planner Ferber noted that the DRC voted to tentatively deny the request and continue the meeting to July 10, 2018 at 5:00 pm. If the HLC voted to tentatively deny this request, she recommended the meeting be continued to the same date so that the Applicant did not have to come in twice. Additionally, that would result in the same deadline for appeals on both requests. Staff also needs to write new Findings of Fact that reflect the denial.

Commissioner Osterberg moved that the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) tentatively deny New Construction NC18-01 by Craig Riegelneegg pending revised Findings and Conclusions in support of denial, to be reviewed on July 10, 2018 at 6:30 pm; seconded by Commissioner McHone. Motion passed unanimously.

#### REPORTS OF OFFICERS/COMMISSIONERS – ITEM 5:

There were none.

#### STAFF UPDATES – ITEM 6:

There were none.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS – ITEM 7:

There were none.

#### ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

#### **APPROVED:**

  
City Planner