

**ASHLAND HISTORIC COMMISSION  
ELECTRONIC MEETING  
(Action) Meeting Minutes  
June 8, 2022**

**Community Development/Engineering Services Building – Electronic Meeting  
6:00PM CALL TO ORDER**

Hovenkamp called the electronic meeting to order at 6:02pm.

<b>Commissioners Present:</b>	<b>Council Liaison:</b>
Shostrom	Shaun Moran - ABSENT
Skibby	<b>Staff Present:</b>
Emery	Brandon Goldman; Planning Manager
Whitford	Regan Trapp; Permit Technician II
Swink	Derek Severson; Planner
Hovenkamp	
Von Chamier	
<b>Commissioners Absent:</b>	ALL PRESENT

**(6:05) APPROVAL OF AGENDA (5 min)**

Commissioner suggested amendments to Agenda

Swink has decided not to renew his appointment with the Historic Commission. He has served on the Commission for 19 1/2 years and will be greatly missed. Swink would like to recommend that the same opening statement that is read at the Council meeting be read at the opening of the Historic Commission meetings.

**6:05 APPROVAL OF MINUTES (5 min)**

***Shostrom/Swink m/s to approve amended minutes for April 6, 2022. Voice vote. ALL AYES. Motion passed.***

- Shostrom recommended edits to his comment regarding the Elk's building mural project:
  - "It's a prominent location and will dominate the whole street scene." Edit comment to: ***"Will dominate the whole historic street which could be controversial in a negative way"***

**(6:15) PUBLIC FORUM (15 min)**

Shelby Scharen introduced herself to the Commission as hopefully the newest member after appointments are made by Council. She is a landscape architect that specializes in Historic Preservation. Von Chamier has been encouraging her to apply for the Historic Commission.

**(6:30) LIAISON REPORTS (5 min)**

Council report - Moran was absent so no report was given.

Staff report (Goldman) – Items discussed were:

June 14<sup>th</sup> 1PM-5PM

Conclusion of the City Manager presentation regarding City budget process. There will be Discussion of Commissions and their roles.

June 21<sup>st</sup> 6:30pm

Appointments of new Commissioners  
165 Water will be appealed to Council

**(6:35) PRE-APP REVIEW (20 min)**

99 N. Main Pre-App Submittal

Severson gave a presentation on the Pre-App. (See Attachment A - Severson presentation)

This is listed as a primary contributing resource in the Historic District.

Mark, Cindy and Dave Sandison, the applicants, addressed the Commission regarding the pre-app application.

The applicants are in their "due diligence" period and want to make sure that their idea can move forward before purchase of the property. They are open to recommendations from the Historic Commission.

*Commissioners reviewed the pre-application proposal and expressed their support for the design, noting however that they felt the 'clipped corner' should be retained with windows rather than a door. Commissioners suggested that the proposal was a big improvement to the site that would enliven the gateway to downtown.*

The applicant will put together a formal application and submit with the Historic Commission recommendations once they decide if they are moving forward with the purchase of the property.

### **(6:55) DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **Historic Preservation recap – Past Forward (5 min)**

One of the best awards ceremonies we have had! Love that people were encouraged to speak about the history of the projects! It's all in the stories!

#### **Update on the Status of MAPS (Marking Ashland Places) (15 min)**

Shostrom gave an update on "edgers" made by Goldman. (See Attachment B)

Hovenkamp asked the Commission if they want to go forward into the next phase and work with PAC? Yes  
Keep it in Railroad District or move on to another district?

- Start with Railroad and then pursue another district to keep momentum going.
- Make it a 2-track approach.

#### **Review Historic Commission Meeting procedures (20 min)**

Key parts of quasi-judicial – Goldman

- The value of recommendations to the planning commission needs to be related to the Historic Design Standards.
- Make effort to be clear with the applicants so that the Planning Commission can make an informed decision – (See Attachment C) for advisory recommendations published by Goldman.
- This makes the Commission more aware of their advisory role.

#### **Annual Election of Officers**

*Skibby/Shostrom m/s to re-appoint Hovenkamp as Chair and Von Chamier as Vice Chair.  
Whitford - Call for the question. ALL AYES. Motion passed.*

### **ADJOURNMENT**


Next meeting is scheduled for July 6, 2022, at 6:00pm via Zoom.

*There being no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:15pm*

*Respectfully submitted by Regan Trapp*

# NEW RESTAURANT & PUB

99 N. MAIN STREET, ASHLAND OR 97520




N. MAIN STREET

CHURCH STREET

## EXISTING SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



REVISIONS	
⚠	:

**YBARRA**  
Building Design Studio


5853 Greenleaf Ave., Ste. D Whittier CA 90601  
562.945.5206 ernie@ybarradesignstudio.com

<b>CONCEPTUAL DESIGN</b>	
NEW RESTAURANT / PUB & APARTMENT	
99 N. MAIN STREET, ASHLAND OR 97520	
APPLICANT	DAVID SANDISON
OWNER ADDRESS	-
PHONE	(530) 233-0026
EMAIL	sandison.david@aol.com

DRAWN BY	ERNEST YBARRA
CHECKED BY	
DATE	17 MAY 2022
SCALE	AS NOTED
JOB NO.	YBDS-22-622
SHEET	1
OF	3 SHEETS

# NEW RESTAURANT & PUB



99 N. MAIN STREET, ASHLAND OR 97520



N. MAIN STREET

## CONCEPTUAL 1st FLOOR PLAN


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



N. MAIN STREET

## CONCEPTUAL 2nd FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



REVISIONS	
▲	:

**YBARRA**  
Building Design Studio

5853 Greenleaf Ave., Ste. D Whittier CA 90601  
562.945.5206 ernie@ybarradesignstudio.com


**CONCEPTUAL DESIGN**  
NEW RESTAURANT / PUB & APARTMENT  
99 N. MAIN STREET, ASHLAND OR 97520

APPLICANT: DAVID SANDISON  
OWNER ADDRESS: -  
PHONE: (530) 233-0026  
EMAIL: sandison.david@aol.com

DRAWN BY: ERNEST YBARRA  
CHECKED BY: -  
DATE: 23 MAY 2022  
SCALE: AS NOTED  
JOB NO.: YBDS-22-622  
SHEET: **2**  
OF 3 SHEETS

# NEW RESTAURANT & PUB

99 N. MAIN STREET, ASHLAND OR 97520



VIEW from CHURCH STREET

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



VIEW from MAIN STREET

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

REVISIONS	
▲	:

**YBARRA**  
Building Design Studio

5853 Greenleaf Ave., Ste. D Whittier CA 90601  
562.945.5206 ernie@ybarradesignstudio.com

**CONCEPTUAL DESIGN**  
NEW RESTAURANT / PUB & APARTMENT  
99 N. MAIN STREET, ASHLAND OR 97520

APPLICANT: DAVID SANDISON  
OWNER ADDRESS: -  
PHONE: (530) 233-0026  
EMAIL: sandison.david@aol.com



DRAWN BY: ERNEST YBARRA  
CHECKED BY:

DATE: 23 MAY 2022  
SCALE: AS NOTED  
JOB NO.: YBDS-22-622  
SHEET: 3  
OF 3 SHEETS






ATTACHMENT B  
12" Radius, 1/4" round-over concrete edger



# 12" Radius, 1/4" round-over concrete edger 3-D Printed Examples

ATTACHMENT





## Findings of Fact



“Findings of fact” is a common term used to refer to a city’s written explanation of a land use decision. The term originates from the courts, where judges often explain their determinations by issuing documents entitled “Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.” They recite the relevant facts and then make conclusions by applying those facts to relevant legal criteria.

## Historic Commission Review Procedures

### Quasi-Judicial

Definition: A proceeding conducted by an administrative or executive official that is similar to a court proceeding, e.g. a hearing.

Like courts, the City's land use review process must apply facts to the applicable ordinances to make a decision. In administering land use ordinances, the city must often determine the facts associated with a particular request and then apply those facts to the legal standards.

This process is called "quasi-judicial," and city authority is limited to applying the rules in place to the facts presented. If the facts indicate an applicant meets the relevant legal standards, then they may be entitled to the approval.



## Advisory Commission Recommendations

The Historic Commission advises the Planning Commission and Staff on a variety of planning actions, but in each case the Commission is evaluating the Historic District Design Standards and making a recommendation on whether the applicable criteria are met.

The Historic Commission does not “*Approve*” or “*Deny*” proposals.

Often, Historic Commission recommendations have been stated as follows:

“*We Approve* the application with the following conditions of approval...”

This wording can be confusing to the public and applicants given the project would subsequently be reviewed by staff or the Planning Commission, and thus is not “approved” or “denied” by the Historic Commission. Further the recommendation does not cite the relevant standards which the conditions are addressing.

## Advisory Commission Recommendations

To address the Historic Design Standard directly and acknowledge that the finding of fact is a Historic Commission recommendation it would be better stated as follows:

“The Historic Commission finds that the proposed addition’s siding does not match the finish on the exterior walls of the original building as required in 18.4.2.050 C.2.c., and that the proposed windows on the addition are not compatible with the proportion, shape, and size of the original windows on the historic building as required in 18.4.2.050.C.2.g.

The Historic Commission recommends that the Planning Commission [or Staff] condition any approval of the proposed addition to include the provision of 4” horizontal siding matching the original siding, and double hung windows that match the size and spacing of the windows on the original historic building”