

**ASHLAND HISTORIC COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**

May 3, 2017

**Community Development/Engineering Services Building – 51 Winburn Way – Siskiyou Room**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Commission Chair, Shostrom called the meeting to order at 6:00pm in the Siskiyou Room at the Community Development and Engineering Offices located at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR 97520.

<b>Commissioners Present:</b>	<b>Council Liaison:</b>
Skibby	Rich Rosenthal - Absent
Emery	<b>Staff Present:</b>
Leonard	Maria Harris; Planning Dept.
Swink	Regan Trapp; Secretary
Von Chamier	
Whitford	
Giordano	
<b>Commissioners Absent:</b>	Shostrom(E)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Swink motioned to approve minutes with corrections from April 5, 2017. Von Chamier seconded. Whitford abstained. Voice vote; All AYES. Motion passed.

**PUBLIC FORUM:**

There was no one in the audience wishing to speak.

**COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT:**

Rosenthal was absent. No report was given.

**COMMISSION ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:**

Whitford submitted a letter from George Kramer to be placed on the record regarding removal of the home addressed at 1135 Fern Street. See “**exhibit A**” (attached) from George Kramer.

It was suggested that more severe measures be induced for all developers that demo houses without permits.

Harris to look into the status of this permit and get back to the Commission on what the next steps would be.

Harris discussed a demolition application at 707 Helman and stated they have a report from a structural engineer showing it's structurally unsound. The applicant would like to divide the property. Once approved, there is time for appeal with the building review board if so needed.

Swink discussed the balcony project at 23 N. Main.

Harris stated that 165 Water Street will go back to the Planning Commission next week.

**NEW ITEMS:**

- Review board schedule.
- Historic Preservation Week – Organization & last minute details.
- Update on CLG Grant application

- Harris gave an update on the CLG Grant application. The way finding grant was submitted and was not given to the City of Ashland because the state no longer funds interpretive panels. Harris stated that due to staff time they may have to put this on hold until they get a permanent staff liaison.
- Project assignments for Planning Actions.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

There were no items to discuss.

**Review Board Schedule**

May 4 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Keith, Taylor
May 11 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Bill, Dale
May 18 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Taylor, Piper
May 25 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Taylor, Tom
June 1 <sup>st</sup>	Terry, Dale, Bill
June 8 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Sam, Keith

PA-2014-00710	143 Nutley	Swink & Whitford
PA-2014-02206	485 A Street	Whitford
PA-2015-00878	35 S. Pioneer	Leonard
PA-2015-01695	399 Beach	Skibby
PA-2015-01517	209 Oak	Shostrom
PA-2016-00387	95 N. Main	Shostrom
PA-2016-00209	25 N. Main	Giordano
PA-2016-00818	175 Pioneer	Shostrom & Skibby
PA-2016-00847	252 B Street	Whitford
PA-2016-01027	276 B Street	Shostrom & Leonard
PA-2016-01641	221 Oak Street	Shostrom
PA-2016-01947	549 Fairview	Emery
PA-2016-02103	133 Alida	Swink
PA-2016-02095	563 Rock St.	Whitford
PA-2016-02114	556 B	Von Chamier
PA-2017-00013	15, 35, 44 & 51 S. Pioneer Street	ALL
PA-2017-00235	114 Granite	Leonard
PA-2017-00267	Trellis - OSF	ALL
PA-2017-00325	746 C Street	Von Chamier
PA-2017-00200	165 Water	ALL

**ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

Next meeting is scheduled June 7, 2017 at 6:00 pm

*There being no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm*

Respectfully submitted by Regan Trapp

## George Kramer

george@preserveoregon.com

24-March-2017

Melanie Mindlin, Chair  
Ashland Planning Commission  
Via E-mail to [sassetta@mind.net](mailto:sassetta@mind.net)

Dear Ms. Mindlin,

Like most Ashlanders, I am appalled by the recent demolition of the Sid Ainsworth House on Elkader. As I understand this situation, the owner/contractor had a permit to remodel and build a small addition and during construction decided the building was "too far gone" to save and demolished it. I have no information, nor does anyone else, as to the veracity of that decision because Ashland's demolition process was not followed.

Staff has, appropriately, pulled the building permit and issued citations for the violation, the developer will be fined and lose some time before approval for whatever replacement development is allowed in that zone. I believe this minor inconvenience (the fine is about \$1000) is woefully insufficient. As is often the case in Ashland, this situation points out a failing in our current LDO. I hope you and the commission agree with me that this is something we ought address to discourage similar violations in the future. Certainly there are times when demolition is necessary and appropriate but I do not think Ashland benefits when that decision is made on the fly by somebody from the seat of an excavator.

I therefore formally request that the City of Ashland consider amending its development code to include increased penalty for willful disregard to of the existing demolition process. I would point out that while I am generally concerned with threats to historic or potentially significant structures in Ashland, this is not about saving historic buildings per se, it is about following the law and assuring that we do not add unnecessarily to the solid-waste stream when buildings can be effectively and economically reused and repurposed. Demolitions, especially those that allow for construction of new structures that meet other, broader, community need is part of development. The city, however, must have a voice in those decisions before an irrevocable action occurs.

Quick research into how other cities handle this issues offers some ideas that Ashland may want to consider. These range from a sliding scale of fines based on the severity of violation, in some cases of \$50,000 or even higher as a percentage of the property value. Our current \$500 citation for tearing down a building, no matter the situation, is just inadequate. Other communities have the option of denying any future development following an unauthorized demolition for periods of up to five years from the incident, or of limiting future development to the size and square footage of the removed building. I think in Ashland especially, where we have 100s of small footprint existing structures on high-value land, the potential for developers absorbing demolition fees as a cost of doing business ought to be a serious concern. Our fine and penalty structure for avoiding the demolition review process needs to be sufficiently painful to discourage that sort of behavior.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you and the commission further. If any good is to come from this current situation, it will be to take steps that similar episodes do not occur again.

With Regard



George Kramer

C: Mayor John Stromberg, [john@council.ashland.or.us](mailto:john@council.ashland.or.us)  
Bill Molnar, [molnarb@ashland.or.us](mailto:molnarb@ashland.or.us)  
Ashland Daily Tidings, [news@dailytidings.com](mailto:news@dailytidings.com)

**CITY OF  
ASHLAND**  
ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION  
MINUTES  
APRIL 25, 2017

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Melanie Mindlin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

**Commissioners Present:**

Troy J. Brown, Jr.  
Michael Dawkins  
Debbie Miller  
Melanie Mindlin  
Haywood Norton  
Roger Pearce  
Lynn Thompson

**Staff Present:**

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director  
Brandon Goldman, Senior Planner  
Derek Severson, Senior Planner  
Linda Reid, Housing Program Specialist  
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor

**Absent Members:**

None

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/AD HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES**

Community Development Director Bill Molnar announced the continuation of the 165 Water Street hearing is scheduled for the commission's May 9 meeting; the conceptual Cottage Housing site plans and ordinance will be presented at the May 23 study session; and the commission's annual retreat is scheduled for Saturday, June 10.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No one came forward to speak.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. Housing Element Public Involvement Update.**

Housing Program Specialist Linda Reid provided an update on the public outreach and community feedback on the Housing Element policies. She stated as part of the participation plan a subgroup was created to work on community outreach, staff published an article in the City Source newsletter, announcements were posted both on the city's website and in the Daily Tidings, a dedicated webpage was created to keep citizens updated, an open house and community forum were held, and an online questionnaire was added to the city's website.

Ms. Reid explained a few themes emerged from the community feedback, including:

- Citizens felt the wording in the existing policies was unclear. The majority of survey and forum participants commented that the city should use plan language that provides more clarity of purpose to laypeople.
- Another theme was an aversion to certain words in the current policies, including "appearance and character" and "incompatible and destructive", which were cited as being limiting to future development.
- Diversity was a word that came up over and over again, both in context of demographic character of the city's population as well as with regard to the types of housing developed.
- The topic of affordable housing dominated the responses in both the housing forum and online questionnaire. The reoccurring nature of issue reinforced the continued need for a broad policy that maintains affordable housing as a priority for future policy development.

Senior Planner Brandon Goldman noted the full summary report and all of the online responses are available for review on the city's website. He explained the next step in the process is to draft revisions to the existing policies based on the feedback received and to bring those back to the Housing & Human Services Commission and Planning Commission for review before a final draft is formed. He added staff is still in the drafting stage and stated any comments the commission has would be helpful as they move forward and coalesce the comments into policy changes.

Staff clarified the Ashland Comprehensive Plan is set up with goals and policies, and the policies are the springboard for the City Council and Planning Commission that support code writing, code standards, and program development. In addition, the policies influence the funding priorities for the city.

#### Commissioner Comments & Questions:

- Is staff examining the current goals and policies? Mr. Goldman clarified staff is reviewing the Housing Element in total and noted the goals and policies have not been revisited since the 1980s.
- Suggestion was made to have more than four goals, and within those goals refine the strategies.
- Concern was expressed regarding the limitations imposed by state regulations.
- Comment was made questioning how the city could encourage developers to build housing that is more affordable.
- Suggestion was made for the revised policies to address a range of housing for all the different income sectors instead of just one segment.
- Concern was expressed regarding the steady removal of starter homes from the city's inventory. Suggestion was made to consider a limitation where if the original house is removed, the new home cannot be more than 10% of its size.
- Opinion was given that no matter what you are building, those houses will increase in cost over time; even if they were built for low income families, they will likely not stay affordable for very long.
- Comment was made that the survey responses showed that people seem a lot more open to diversity imbedded into the neighborhoods.
- It was noted that a number of comments talked about green space, wildlife, and protecting character, and the commission should remain mindful of this too.
- Comment was made that they will likely receive push back if they make too many changes to the single family neighborhoods.
- Comment was made that people want to know what their neighborhood will be like in the future, and predictability is important to residents.

Ms. Reid thanked the commission for their input and stated this topic will come back again at a future meeting.

#### MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

##### **A. Missing Middle Housing.**

Staff presented a short video on the "Missing Middle Housing". Several commissioners questioned if there are current obstacles to this and if so they should identify those regulations and see if they can be modified or removed. Additionally, there was strong interest expressed in the idea of dividing larger houses into apartment units. Other comments made by the commissioners included keeping the limitation on the size of a structure, but not the density within; and looking into the possibility of allowing live/work units as a commercial use.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

*Submitted by,  
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor*

**CITY OF  
ASHLAND**  
ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES  
MAY 9, 2017

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Melanie Mindlin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

**Commissioners Present:**

Troy J. Brown, Jr.  
Michael Dawkins  
Debbie Miller  
Haywood Norton  
Roger Pearce  
Lynn Thompson

**Staff Present:**

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director  
Derek Severson, Senior Planner  
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor

**Absent Members:**

Melanie Mindlin

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. Approval of Minutes.**

1. April 11, 2017 Regular Meeting.

Commissioners Brown/Dawkins m/s to approve the Consent Agenda. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed 7-0.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No one came forward to speak.

**TYPE II PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. PLANNING ACTION: PA-2017-00200**

**SUBJECT PROPERTY:** 165 Water Street (*corner of Van Ness & Water Streets*)

**OWNER/APPLICANT:** Magnolia Investment Group, LLC/Gil Livni

**DESCRIPTION:** A request for Site Design Review approval to construct a 42,841 square foot, three-story, mixed-use building consisting of commercial tenant space on the ground floor, 26 hotel units on the second floor, and ten residential condominiums on the third floor for the vacant property located at 165 Water Street, at the corner of Van Ness and Water Streets, in the Skidmore Academy Historic District. The application includes requests for a Conditional Use Permit to allow hotel/motel use; an Exception to Street Standards; a Physical & Environmental Constraints Review Permit for the development of floodplain and severe constraints lands; and a Tree Removal Permit to remove seven trees. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** Employment; **ZONING:** E-1; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 04CC; **TAX LOT #:** 2000. (*Continued from April 11, 2017 meeting*)

Commissioner Pearce announced the public hearing procedures for land use hearings.

**Ex Parte Contact**

No ex parte contact was declared.

### Staff Report

Senior Planner Derek Severson briefly reviewed the application and explained the applicants have modified their proposal to add a mechanical vehicle stacker in the basement which would increase their on-site parking to 55 spaces. Mr. Severson displayed the project elevation perspectives, provided the Historic Commission and Tree Commission recommendations, and noted both commissions were supportive of the application as presented. The three outstanding items from the initial hearing were listed and reviewed in further detail.

Integration of Required Public Plaza Space: Mr. Severson stated the applicants have indicated that in addition to the proposed plaza space treatments discussed at the April hearing, there will also be rooftop garden space. He stated the applicants did an excellent job of clarifying the treatment of the plaza spaces at the prior hearing and based on their presentation and the additional clarification regarding the rooftop greenspace, staff feel the proposal satisfies the requirement.

Off-Street Parking: The applicant's proposal for a mechanical car stacker brings the total off-street spaces to 55 and requires only a 13% reduction in the parking requirement. Staff is supportive of this modification and have added a condition of approval (for discussion purposes) that would require no parking be gated or otherwise restricted. Mr. Severson added the back-up area for the compact car parking is fairly tight, and suggested the commission discuss this during their deliberations.

Alley Encroachments: At the last meeting a neighbor pointed out the proposed location for the transformer and stairway impacted the backup area in the alley. Staff has included a condition of approval asking for this to be modified so that backup can continue on neighboring property.

### Questions of Staff

Mr. Severson clarified the six on-street parking spaces will be accommodated by adding additional width along Van Ness and inserting parking bays. This area is currently signed for no parking.

Mr. Severson clarified there is no requirement in the code to provide parking for staff who work at the hotel. The approach the city has historically taken is a presumption that the hotel rooms will not always be at 100% occupancy and the unused spaces will be utilized by the business employees.

Mr. Severson clarified the applicants could not intensify the mix of uses proposed without approval.

Mr. Severson commented on the exception to the 5ft. buffer between parking spaces and the property line. He explained the applicants are building a retaining wall which will have vegetation on it and stated staff is supportive of the exception as it has the same effect as a landscape buffer.

### Applicant's Presentation

**Amy Gunter, Rogue Planning & Development/Dave Evans, Ron Grimes Architects/Gil Livni, Magnolia Investment Group**/Ms. Gunter reviewed the proposed site layout and stated they believe the issues raised at the last hearing have been addressed. She stated the project architect has made change requested by the Historic Commission to the end unit; the rooftop plan includes garden areas and functional open space; and a mechanical parking structure has been added to the garage to increase the on-site parking. Ms. Gunter clarified the parking structure will work within the proposed basement area and meet height clearances, however the property owner does want to restrict some of the below grade spaces for residents. She commented on the traffic impact analysis that was conducted and stated the engineer has determined that this proposal will meet the parking demands. Regarding the stairway issue, Ms. Gunter stated the landing has been reduced in length from 8ft. to 4ft. and shifts the stairs away from the neighbor's property. She commented on the issue raised by staff regarding the compact vehicle back-up area and stated if they require it to be expanded they will need to work with the neighboring property owner regarding the easement potential. Ms. Gunter concluded her presentation and stated this is exactly the type of development sought for an enterprise zone.

### Questions of the Applicant

Ms. Gunter clarified they are requesting four on-street parking credits on Water Street along their frontage only. She also clarified their proposal provides a total of 55 on-site spaces; 22 surfaces spaces, 15 below ground, plus 18 below ground for the residential use.

Gil Livni clarified the car lift will work with the 11 ft. basement height.

### Public Testimony

**Jim North/85 Central Ave**/Stated he lives at the corner of Water and Central and commented that this is a gorgeous project that will be great for the neighborhood. Mr. North noted he raised two issues at the last hearing. The first, regarding the placement of the stairs and transformer has been addressed. The second issue is regarding the lighting for the public spaces. Mr. North stated this area is a magnet for people and he does not want to see this become a problem. He stated he is a bit concerned that some of the parking might be reserved and reduce what is available, but all in all he supports the project.

**Eric Bonetti/2552 Old Mill**/Stated he owns the adjacent parcel and believes this will be a successful project. He is happy the neighbor's issues are being resolved and stated it seems the applicant has made a considerable effort to address all of the approval elements and believes it is appropriate to grant the on-street parking credits.

**Donn Comte/175 Piedmont**/Mr. Bonetti read Mr. Comte's statement aloud. The letter voiced approval of the project and stated it will be an asset to the neighborhood and a safe place to live and work.

**Sandra Royce/1045 Timberline**/Stated this spot has been unsightly for some time and this project will make a big difference. Ms. Royce commented that it will make the town more attractive and the hotel will bring jobs and revenues.

**Sylvia Massy/1374 Iowa**/Stated this is an exciting project and will bring life to a dead spot adjacent to downtown. She noted she has out of town guests that often come without vehicles and this will be a great spot since it is close to retail, restaurants and the theater.

### Applicant's Rebuttal

Ms. Gunter commented briefly on how they reached the parking calculation and requested the commission's approval on the proposal.

Mr. Livni commented on their request to have 18 spaces reserved. He explained they are spending an additional \$300,000 on the stacking mechanism so that he can provide reserved parking for the condo owners and stated he will not be able to sell the units if they don't provide this parking. He added it would be preferred for the stacking unit to be reserved for residents since this type of system works best when it is utilized by people who know how to use it and not random visitors.

*Commissioner Pearce closed the hearing and the record at 8:25 p.m.*

### Deliberations & Decision

Commissioner Thompson voiced her support for the addition of the mechanical parking structure. She stated this is a big financial investment and improves the parking numbers. She stated she feels comfortable with the proposal, including the reservation of the 18 spaces; however she is not sure about the compact car backup space.

Commissioner Brown stated he is good with the parking and commented that he has seen these types of lifts used all over San Francisco. He recommended they adopt a condition that addresses the backup space and stated he is comfortable with the applicants working this out with the Public Works department.

Commissioner Norton commented that he is skeptical about the parking, but does not think it will be a detriment to the city. He stressed that any intensification of use, which includes a restaurant, should come back to the commission for approval and stated he could support this under those terms.

**Commissioners Brown/Dawkins m/s to approve the project with the conditions as presented with an additional condition to address the backup space requirement for the six compact car spaces and a modification to Condition #12 that says the parking spaces shall remain available except for the spaces reserved for the condos. DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Miller voiced her concern with the reserved parking spaces. Commissioner Dawkins agreed with the concerns raised with the vehicle backup area but stated there are ways to resolve this. He stated regardless of what the traffic engineer states he feels there is a lack of parking in this area, however he would not support a motion that did not include the reserved spaces and stated it is appropriate to have a reserved space for units you own.

**Commissioner Norton/Thompson m/s to amend motion to add a condition that any intensification of use that increases the parking requirement would need to come back before the Planning Commission for approval. DISCUSSION:** It was clarified that under current requirements this change would require administrative approval. Comment was made that a tiny change should not have to come back to the full commission and support was voiced for keeping this in staff's court. Additional comment was made that if it is an issue of great concern staff can always kick this up to a Type II hearing before the commission. **Roll Call Vote: Commissioners Miller, Norton, and Thompson, YES. Commissioners Brown, Dawkins, and Pearce, NO. Motion failed.**

**Roll Call Vote on Main Motion: Commissioners Brown, Dawkins, Miller, Norton, Thompson, and Pearce, YES. Motion passed 6-0.**

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

*Submitted by,  
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor*