

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

December 7, 2016

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

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Commission Chair, Shostrom called the meeting to order at 6:02pm 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>
Shostrom	Carol Voisin - ABSENT
Skibby	
Leonard	<b>Staff Present:</b>
Whitford	Mark Schexnayder; Staff Liaison
Emery	Regan Trapp; Secretary
Swink	
Von Chamier	
Giordano	
<b>Commissioners Absent:</b>	

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Leonard motioned to approve minutes from November 2, 2016. Whitford seconded. Voice vote; All AYES. Motion passed

**PUBLIC FORUM:**

There was no one in the audience wishing to speak.

**COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT:**

No report was given.

Whitford commented on Voisin's wonderful service to the Historic Commission and all agreed that she has been a positive addition to the community and will be missed.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

- Continued discussion of proposed ordinance amendments for public art installations on historic contributing buildings with the Public Arts Commission.

Shostrom started the discussion by giving the background of his interactions with the Public Arts Commission and continued meetings with Ms. Harris. The Commission dissected the proposed ordinance amendments as a group.

The Commission discussed the proposed changes to Ashland Municipal Code section 2.29.165 – Review of proposed artwork in Historic Districts. The Commission unanimously agreed to four specific changes to the most recent draft ordinance sent by the Public Art Commission. The changes include requiring the Public Art Commission to appear before and present the art project directly to the Historic Commission. This was suggested because the most recent Public Art Commission project (Theater Corridor Project) was presented to the Historic Commission by a member of the Public Art Commission. Another change they would like to see is to include a provision that the Historic Commission input shall be provided within 45 days *AND a minimum of two commission meetings*. This was requested so that discussion can take place at the first meeting and a decision will be made at the second meeting of the Commission after delivery of the proposal. In addition, the Historic Commission is requesting that the Public Art Commission notify them directly prior to any public art presentations of art concepts to the general public. The Historic Commission suggested this because the Mayor's report stated that Historic Commission members should attend public art presentations of art concepts to the general public, but they would like "official" notification of the presentations. Lastly, the Historic Commission is requesting that the Community Development Department notify **all** properties within the specified historic district not just properties

located within 200 feet of the perimeter of the subject site. I believe the intent here was to allow for more public input affecting the historic district where the art project is located.

Shostrom announced that due to the length of the meeting he would be adjusting the schedule of planning actions on the agenda.

### **PLANNING ACTION REVIEW**

**PLANNING ACTION:** PA-2016-02201

**SUBJECT PROPERTY:** 221 Oak Street

**OWNER:** Spartan Ashland Natalie Real Estate, LLC

**APPLICANT:** Bemis Developments, Inc.

**DESCRIPTION:** A request for a modification of previously approved Planning Action #2015-01517 for the property located at 221 Oak Street. The modifications requested include: 1) relocation of the recreation area to the east side of the property, between 209 and 221 Oak Street; 2) relocation of the new cottage to the west side of the property, in the previously approved recreation area; 3) the addition of four new parking spaces; 4) the removal of one tree (Tree #1), the large cedar located at the northeast corner of the property near the driveway entrance; and 5) modifications to the design of the home being reconstructed at 221 Oak Street including the exterior treatment and roof pitch. Also requested is an Exception to the Solar Setback requirement to allow the reconstructed home at 221 Oak Street to cast a shadow on the property to the north greater than would be cast by a six-foot fence built on the property line. The owner of the property to the north has agreed to the proposed Exception. *(The previous approval granted Outline & Final Plan, Site Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, Variance, Exceptions and Tree Removal Permit approvals for the properties at 209-221-225 Oak Street and 11 B Street.)* **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** Low Density Multi-Family Residential; **ZONING:** R-2; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 09BB; **TAX LOTS:** 15900.

There was no conflict of interest or ex-parte contact indicated by the Commission.

There was no staff report given.

Shostrom opened the public hearing to the applicants.

Mr. Ed Bemis, applicant, PO Box 1018, Ashland, and Mr. Ray Kistler, Architect, of 66 Water St, Ashland, addressed the Commission. They gave a brief description of the ongoing project there.

After going into detail on the changes, Mr. Bemis stated that they would like a little wiggle room with their choices on siding as the manufactured brands are expensive and not easy to come by.

Shostrom closed the public hearing and opened to the Commission for discussion.

Whitford motioned to approve PA-2016-02201 as presented. Skibby seconded. Voice vote; ALL AYES. Motion passed

**PLANNING ACTION:** PA-2016-01947

**SUBJECT PROPERTY:** 549 Fairview

**OWNER/APPLICANT:** James Williams/Bob Haxton

**DESCRIPTION:** A request for a Site Design Review to allow for the construction of a 499 square foot second dwelling unit on the subject property. The proposed structure will be two stories with a single car garage located on the first floor and the dwelling unit on the second floor. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** Low Density Multiple-Family Residential; **ZONING:** R-2; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 09CA; **TAX LOT:** 14100.

There was no conflict of interest or ex-parte contact indicated by the Commission.

Schexnayder gave the staff report for PA-2016-01947.

Shostrom opened the public hearing to the applicants.

There was no applicant present.

Shostrom closed the public hearing and opened to the Commission for discussion.

Some issues brought up by the Commission during their discussion were size of the siding, the porch roof, use of vertical and horizontal materials and the horizontal railing.

Shostrom motioned to approve PA-2016-01947 with recommendations. Giordano seconded. Voice vote; ALL AYES. Motion passed.

### **Recommendations**

Belly band with top at floor level. 10 or 12 inches wide

Upper level siding with 4 or 6 inch exposure. If its hardy plank it should be smooth.

- Shostrom announced that next on the agenda was 563 Rock Street and he asked Schexnayder why it had been removed. Schexnayder stated that it had been put on hold by the applicant because of some issues with the demo application. Schexnayder went on to say that the planning department has requested further information from the applicants regarding the project, specifically engineering and economic calculations. Mr. Casey Bright, neighbor of the applicants at 563 Rock approached the table and said he didn't know that this project had been pulled from the agenda. Mr. Bright asked about the project and wanted to know the specifics of the permit and wanted to meet the applicants to discuss the potential for saving the house.

**PLANNING ACTION:** PA-2016-02103

**SUBJECT PROPERTY:** 133 Alida Street

**OWNER/APPLICANT:** Mike and Karen Mallory, trustees for the Mallory Revocable Trust

**DESCRIPTION:** A request for Site Design Review approval to construct a 417 square foot Accessory Residential Unit for the property located at 133 Alida Street. The application includes requests for Exception to the Site Development and Design Standards for the placement and screening of parking relative to the Accessory Residential Unit. *(The proposal is based upon designation of Alida Street as the front lot line which is consistent with the established orientation of the historic contributing "James A. & Viola Youngs" house on the property.)* **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** Low Density Multi-Family Residential; **ZONING:** R-2; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 09DA; **TAX LOT:** 3300.

Von Chamier stated that she works for Kencairn Landscape who is the applicant for this project. She stated that she can make an unbiased decision and doesn't know any of the details regarding the project.

Schexnayder gave the staff report for PA-2016-02103

Shostrom opened the public hearing to the applicants.

Mike and Karen Mallory, owners of 133 Alida Street, in Ashland, and Kerry Kencairn, applicant representative at 545 A Street, Ashland, addressed the Commission. Ms. Kencairn gave a brief description of the project and went on to say that every effort was made to make it work and make sense in the neighborhood. Mr. Mallory pointed out that the unit encroaches into the 8 foot buffer and it will replace the existing garage. Mr. Mallory added that they shifted the porch back to the north side and put a fence up to address the neighbor's concerns. They feel they have gone above and beyond for all interested parties.

Shostrom closed the public hearing and opened to the Commission for discussion.

Giordano motioned to approve PA-2016-02103 as presented. Whitford seconded. Voice vote; ALL AYES. Motion passed

### **COMMISSION ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:**

- 165 Water presentation

Amy Gunter, Rogue Planning and Development, 1424 S. Ivy Street Medford, OR addressed the Commission. Mr. Gil Livni and Brian, from Ron Grimes Architects was also present.

**Below is an excerpt from Amy Gunter's presentation describing the project at 165 Water:**

The proposal is for a 44,516 square foot, three-story, mixed use commercial, hotel and residential condominium structure. The proposed structure is oriented towards both streets with the primary orientation towards the higher order street, Water Street. The proposed structure is 9,309 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor divided into nine tenant spaces. The spaces are a mixture of retail, commercial space, coffee shop, the hotel lobby and lobby for the residential units. The second floor is proposed as 17,220 and is proposed as a 27-unit hotel. The hotel rooms are between 250 and 450 square feet. A larger studio unit and Honeymoon Suite are proposed they 712 square feet and 631 square feet. There is also breakfast dining area, a 1,062 square foot fitness center and a balcony area. Each hotel unit is proposed to have a small balcony area to provide some outdoor space. The second floor is larger than the first floor with most the additional building square footage at the rear of the structure where the second floor overhangs the rear of the first floor. The third floor is proposed as ten residential units. The entire square footage of the floor is 18,257 square feet in area. The residential units range in size from 1,055 square feet to 1,637 square feet and between one and three bedrooms. Orientation of the structure is towards the intersection with prominent ground floor entrances on both street frontages. An "anchor" space entrance faces Water Street near the intersection. The structure is proposed as close to the intersection as feasible with the building façade occupying much of both street frontages. The entrances to the commercial units open onto the public pedestrian areas and the outdoor seating areas. The entrances are all designed in a manner to provide clear, visible, and functional entrances with direct access to the public sidewalk. Emphasis has been provided to the entrances using roof overhangs and awnings. Upper story floors provide roof cover, the recesses in the façade provide arcades and awnings protect pedestrians from the rain and sun. The façade of the building along the street frontages have offsets, jogs and other distinctive changes in the building's façade will create a pedestrian friendly environment. The building has been designed to give the impression of separate, 25 – 30-foot wide buildings with building material changes, surface treatments and finishes that provide interest and emphasize the "separate" buildings attached along the frontage and provide emphasis on the entrances.

#### **End of excerpt.**

Ms. Gunter went on to say that the next step is a formal application and they are looking for feedback on the proposal. The Commission discussed the proposal in depth and below are comments that were made.

- The Commission likes underground parking rather than the "car stacker," which was part of the last proposal.
- Shostrom stated that the building is too big but a big improvement over the first few proposals. He went on to say that there is very good quality of detailing on the building.
- Emery likes the design because it breaks up the massing and looks like separate buildings. Makes it look like mixed architecture and more like downtown.
- Swink stated that he likes how the building is broken up. He likes the stucco, brick and wood.
- Giordano says that it may be the rendering, but there is something off about it.
- Shostrom likes the grounding of the corners but feels, a masonry building shouldn't be sitting in the air. Seems like the applicant is trying to put too much building on the lot.
- The Commissioners were in agreement that they wanted more time for the review of the photos.
- Emery commented that the building is transitional and next to commercial, industrial area and seems to fit and likes this design much better.
- Skibby remarked it's quite an improvement.
- Leonard conveyed she wishes the building could sit flat on the ground.
- Emery called attention to the fact that the City needs more hotels downtown.
- Commissioners heartily endorsed the project and appreciate all the perspectives given.

#### **NEW ITEMS:**

- Review board schedule
- Project assignments for planning actions
- Historic Preservation Week: May 14<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> 2017 – Banner info

\*\*Commissioners request accordion style file folders to hold their plans during their site visits. Trapp will order these before the next meeting.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no old business to discuss.

**Review Board Schedule**

December 8 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Keith, Bill
December 15 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Taylor, Tom
December 22 <sup>nd</sup>	Terry, Piper, Sam
December 29 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Taylor, Bill
January 5 <sup>th</sup>	Terry, Keith, Dale

**Project Assignments for Planning Actions**

PA-2014-01956	Lithia & First	All
PA-2014-00710/711	143/135 Nutley	Swink & Whitford
PA-2014-01283	172 Skidmore	Shostrom
PA-2014-02206	485 A Street	Whitford
PA-2015-00178	156 Van Ness Ave	Shostrom
PA -2015-00374	160 Lithia Way	Emery
PA-2015-00878	35 S. Pioneer	Leonard
PA-2015-01496	35 S. Second-Winchester Inn	Shostrom
PA-2015-01695	399 Beach	Skibby
PA-2015-01517	209 Oak	Shostrom
PA-2015-02203	868 A Street	Whitford
PA-2016-00275	574 Allison	Emery
PA-2016-00387	95 N. Main	Shostrom
PA-2016-00763	5 N. Main	Swink
PA-2016-00209	25 N. Main	Giordano
PA-2016-00818	175 Pioneer	Shostrom & Skibby
PA-2016-00847	252 B Street	Whitford
PA-2016-00587	872 Siskiyou Blvd	Skibby
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

**ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

Next meeting is scheduled January 4, 2017 at 6:00 pm

*There being no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:03 pm*

Respectfully submitted by Regan Trapp