

**ASHLAND HISTORIC COMMISSION
ELECTRONIC MEETING
Meeting Minutes
March 3, 2021**

Community Development/Engineering Services Building – Electronic Meeting

CALL TO ORDER:

Shostrom called the electronic meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

Commissioners	Council Liaison:
Present: Shostrom	Shaun Moran
Whitford	Staff Present:
Swink	Maria Harris; Planning Dept.
Von Chamier	Regan Trapp; Secretary
Hovenkamp	
Emery	
Commissioners Absent:	Skibby

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Whitford/Swink m/s to approve minutes for February 3, 2021. Voice vote. ALL AYES. Motion passed.

PUBLIC FORUM:

There was no one wishing to speak.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT:

Council Liaison Moran gave the report. Items discussed were:

- An email received from Ms. Brown regarding a potential award for a property being cleaned up on Church Street. Harris to reach out to Ms. Brown regarding her question.
- The rate study with a financial consultant to update rate modeling forecasts for the water and wastewater enterprise funds. This will allow Council to fully understand impacts to the fund and provide an avenue to move forward with finalizing an update to the Food and Beverage Ordinance.

PLANNING ACTION REVIEW:

PLANNING ACTION: PA-T1-2021-00141

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 599 East Main Street

APPLICANT/OWNER: Rogue Planning & Development Services, LLC for
Livni Family Trust (Gil Livni, *Trustee*)

DESCRIPTION: A request for Site Design Review approval to modify the existing building at 599 East Main Street including converting the former church to office use and adding a new entry. The application also includes a request for a Conditional Use Permit as it involves the expansion of an existing non-conforming development. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

DESIGNATION: Commercial; **ZONING:** C-1; **MAP:** 39 1E 09AC; **TAX LOT #:** 7600

Shostrom met with Harris and Mr. Livni regarding the project, prior to the Historic Commission meeting.

Harris gave a detailed staff report for PA-T1-2021-00141. She announced that there were a couple of details regarding the plans that need to be confirmed with the applicant.

Shostrom opened the public hearing to the applicants.

Amy Gunter, applicant's representative, addressed the Commission regarding this project. The proposal is to make substantial exterior changes to the church to fix many years of damage. Window, door, and siding changes were discussed as well as a change of use to accommodate a larger occupancy rating for tenants. Ms. Gunter went on to say, because of the change of use on this space, the parking will not be an issue. She emphasized that it will be a great addition to Ashland's office/business inventory.

Gil Livni, developer, and owner of 599 E. Main spoke in detail about the project. Mr. Livni stated that the position of the entrance doors (in the corner) works for ADA and exiting for groups of people. Mr. Livni wanted the tower to be more of a feature of the building and wanted to soften the look of the front façade and maybe add a bike rack or planters. He pointed out that the floor plans in the Commission packet were incorrect and needed to be updated.

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

Ms. Harris read the email comment from Mrs. Levison into the record. (See exhibit A)

Commission requests further information and would like to continue PA-T2-2021-00002 until April's meeting.

Shostrom re-opened the public hearing to the applicants.

Ms. Gunter requested that the record be left open for further submittals and comments.

Shostrom/Hovenkamp to continue(with below recommendations) PA-T1-2021-0014, leaving the record open. Applicant will need to submit revised plans for the April meeting. Voice vote. ALL AYES. Motion passed.

Recommendations for PA-T1-2021-00141:

The Historic Commission recommends continuing the application to allow the following items to be addressed.

The Historic Commission was generally positive about the building design as shown in the color architectural renderings. However, the Commission was unable to determine whether the proposal is consistent with the applicable design standards because the building details are not clear in the elevations or there is an inconsistency between the floor plans and architectural renderings (i.e., color drawings of building).

- *The site plan and elevations are not readable with all drawings combined on one page (i.e., site plan, elevations, floor plans) and are not to scale as required by 18.5.2.040. Please submit plans and elevations that are scaled for printing on 11" x 17" paper. Also see cross section requirements in 18.5.2.040.B.4.d.*
- *The floor plan shows a door facing E. Main St. but the architectural renderings do not. Please clarify the location of the main building entrance and show the proposed entrance(s) on the elevations and floor plans.*
- *Concerned about use of brick for the base of building and how the brick will align with existing window and door openings.*
- *Include details on window and door type and size, siding and trim type and size, and other specifics about other exterior building materials.*
- *The east elevation is also visible from E. Main St. The Commission commented that it was difficult to see where the windows are located on the east elevation.*
- *The Commission discussed the proposed "tower" element of the front entry feature in relation to the east elevation. Some members suggested that the tower feature needs to be differentiated on the east elevation, rather than using different building materials on the north*

(stucco) and east (horizontal siding) elevations. One suggestion that was discussed is wrapping the stucco that is used on the north elevation of the "tower" around on the east elevation for the depth of the entrance or the same distance as the "tower" treatment on the west elevation.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Historic Preservation Awards – May 20, 2021 @12PM via Zoom
The discussion included how the presentation would run and how long the awards recipients would talk. Shostrom will see what the interest would be for Mayor Akins to be involved in the awards ceremony. A draft of awards ceremony will be sent to Commissioners in their packet and blurbs will be included.
 - Each Commissioner will read aloud the blurbs that were written by them. Von Chamier to read Giordano's blurb.
 - Cemetery- Self guided tours to be planned for Friday May 21, 2021 so that Shostrom can announce them during the zoom awards ceremony.
- Commission Vacancies and Membership
 - The Commission is committed to talking to at least 2 people in regards to volunteering for the Historic Commission.
 - Shostrom to speak on behalf of the Historic Commission at the City Council meeting in May (this falls in line with Historic Preservation week).

ADJOURNMENT:

Next meeting is scheduled April 7, 2021 at 6:00pm via Zoom.

There being no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:00pm

Respectfully submitted by Regan Trapp

EXHIBIT A

From: [Maria Harris](#)
To: [Regan Trapp](#)
Subject: FW: ADVISORY COMMISSION HEARING TESTIMONY
Date: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 2:30:08 PM

Regan,

Please forward this comment to the Historic Commsision.

Maria Harris, AICP
Planning Manager
City of Ashland, Community Development Department
20 E. Main St., Ashland, OR 97520
541.552.2045 Tel
800.735.2900 TTY
541.552.2050 Fax

This email transmission is official business of the City of Ashland, and it is subject to Oregon Public Records Law for disclosure and retention. If you have received this message in error, please contact me at 541.552.2045. Thank you.

From: Diane Levison <dilevison@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 2:24 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: ADVISORY COMMISSION HEARING TESTIMONY

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

My husband and I own an Ashlander condo on East Main Street where my mother used to live, but we now live in California. Not until today--March 2--did I receive your mailed "Notice of Application" for the proposed church property conversion on the corner of East Main and Fifth Street. Your Notice required any e-mailed comment to be submitted by 10 a.m. on March 1--obviously an impossibility for me in this case.

I would hope that my only concern could still be considered, and that is the question of parking. If the property is to be used for office/assembly space that would involve daily use and parking, surely there should be a requirement that the applicant provide parking for the proposed use. The prior church use entailed need for parking only on Sundays, and this proposed use is another matter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Diane Levison
1268 Drake Circle
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405