

HISTORICAL BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

February 18, 2016 – 6:00 P.M.

City Council Chambers

A. ROLL CALL:

The Historical Buildings and Sites Commission met in regular session on the above date with Chair Ward Warren presiding. Vice Chair Dan McBerty and Commissioners Arden McConnell, Virginia Ford, Shirley Holzinger, and Don Hendricks were present. Also present was City Council Liaison Dennis Roler and representing the City staff was Parks & Community Development (hereafter: PCD) Director Lora Glover, PCD Senior Planner Joe Slaughter, and PCD Planner Justin Gindlesperger.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 21, 2016 meeting Pg. 1-2

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Warren moved and Commissioner Hendricks seconded the motion to delay the discussion and approval of the minutes until the end of the meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair McBerty, Vice Chair Warren, and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, Ford, and Hendricks. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

C. 15-4020004 – Staff report – Comprehensive, Plan Map and Zone Map Amendment, Historic District Expansion. Pg. 3-10

- Chair Warren stated, at this time I will open the public hearing to consider recommendation from the Historic Building and Sites Commission to the City Council to approve the proposed comprehensive plan and zone map amendment to expand the historic district and the text amendment to identify the historic overlay map in the development code. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the

III. Further Explanation from Staff

- Justin brought up his presentation on the Historic Guidelines. He let it be known that the guidelines say that the predominate wall should be of a neutral tone and that there should be no more than three different color choices per single building. He showed a palate of colors with approximately 150 colors listed. Citizens can propose other colors that are not listed on the pallet but they will need to be reviewed by the HBSC. If the citizen's request is denied they can also appeal the decision to City Council. Current Development Code prohibits pure black, pure white, and unmuted primary colors.
- Any signage, paint colors, lighting that falls within the guidelines can go under administrative review and can be approved in a much shorter timeline. Any exterior changes or improvements that do not fall within the guidelines can be taken to the HBSC for review.
- Anything that has an already existing building permit will be fine to continue with the approved permits. As far as Mr. Pondelick's concerns his building is outside of the proposed guidelines so he will be fine to continue as he has been.
- The guidelines are to protect the City as a whole from having buildings that specifically look out of place among the Historic District.
- To clarify the guidelines apply only to the exterior of the buildings within the Historic District and not the interior.
- To address Mr. Dreher's concerns the murals can be put to the HBSC for review the same as any improvements that fall outside of the guidelines.

IV. Discussion

- Commissioner McConnell wanted to express her gratitude that someone had the forethought to preserve G Street for generations to come. The Historic District encourages people to visit our City and will be good for everyone.
- Commissioner Ford is looking forward to the changes and believes the potential expanded Historic District will be a real asset to the City.
- Commissioner Holzinger brought up the concern sent in by the Daily Courier indicating that they didn't want to be included in the proposed Historic District expansion.

- Commissioner Warren responded to Commissioner Holzinger that he feels it is too bad that the Daily Courier doesn't want to be included because he feels that their building has quite a bit of significance within the City. He also stated that he agrees with some of what Mr. Martin said in regards to 7th Street. The boundary has already been decided on by the Commission, however City Council can choose to amend the boundary. He brought up that per the state a historical building only needs to be 50 years old to fall under consideration. He feels that not all of the buildings within the Historic District need to be historic old buildings. He believes that the Climate City Brewing building is one of the most beautiful and old buildings within the City. He let Mr. Baksay know that there wasn't a specific reason why they didn't extend the proposed boundary to include his building, but that they just had to stop it somewhere. He suggested that Mr. Baksay look into making the building a Historic Landmark; Justin let them know that the brewery is already on that list.
- City Council will make the final decision on the proposed boundary on March 16th.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Warren moved and Commissioner McConnell seconded the motion to recommend the City Council to approve the proposed comprehensive plan and zone map amendment to expand the historic district and the text amendment to identify the historic overlay map in the development code. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair McBerty, Vice Chair Warren, and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, Ford, and Hendricks. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

D. Approve Minutes: January 21, 2016

- The Commission expressed dissatisfaction with the minutes being moved from verbatim to summary. Lora explained that the City lost their minute taker and was forced to move to summary minutes for all committees. There was a specific desire to see the questions that were put to Joe at the last meeting. Lora went over the list and gave answers to the commissioners. The questions and answers will be attached as an exhibit to the minutes for this meeting.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Warren moved and Commissioner McConnell seconded the motion to approve the minutes from January 21, 2016 as presented. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Warren, Vice Chair McBerty, and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, Ford, and Hendricks. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.

E. ADJOURMENT:

Chair Warren adjourned the meeting at 7:10 P.M.

These minutes were prepared by Carlie Paulsen, Administration Department, City of Grants Pass.

Questions from January's meeting:

- When is the sign being replaced? When will Council take action on this item?
 - Hopefully the sign will be replaced by the end of this fiscal year (6/30). It might be delayed because of the upcoming bridge work for Caveman Bridge. This project was approved by the City Council through the budget process of fy16.

- Where are the funds for this coming from? Are they being taken from HBSC funds (funds that would otherwise pay for other HBSC recommended projects)?
 - No, they are dedicated funds to this specific project.

They wanted to make clear that they did not support taking money from other HBSC projects to fund the replacement of the sign. In general, they did not feel that the replacement of this sign was a high priority.

They also had a few questions about the contract George Kramer has. I know I have seen this information before but I wasn't sure about the exact figures and didn't want to guess at a response:

- How much is George Kramer being paid for the work he is doing?
 - \$19,450 (see proposal)
- Where are those funds coming from?
 - LB 6276 (\$20,000)

City Council/Budget Committee makes budget decisions. They also asked how much they had in their budget for projects. Currently, the only account related to the HBSC is the expansion project. Does the City dedicate a certain amount of money for HBSC projects that the HBSC has discretion in spending? No, the HBSC does not have a discretionary account. That is the importance of Goal Setting to bring those potential projects forward for possible funding. Or does the Council only set aside funds to pay for specific projects? I think we might need to have a talk with HBSC at their next meeting to cover some of this information.

Christmas tree and lights that were placed on 5th Street this year. The City Council plans to continue with the installation of lights for the downtown area. An additional \$10,000 is being proposed for this year's budget.

**CITY OF GRANTS PASS
PARKS & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AND ZONE MAP AMENDMENT
HISTORIC DISTRICT EXPANSION
FINDINGS OF FACT-HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMISSION**

Procedure Type:	Type IV: Historic Buildings and Sites Commission Recommendation and City Council Decision
Project Number:	15-40200004
Project Type:	Comprehensive Plan Map and Zone Map Amendment
Applicant:	City of Grants Pass
Planner Assigned:	Justin Gindlesperger
Application Received:	December 24, 2015
Application Complete:	December 24, 2015
Date of Staff Report:	February 11, 2016
Date of HBSC Hearing:	February 18, 2016
Date of HBSC Findings of Fact:	March 17, 2016

I. PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment to expand the Historic Special Purpose District to encompass additional properties within the downtown area in order to enhance the protection of the City's historical features.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Sections 13.5.5 and 13.8.3 of the Grants Pass Urban Area Comprehensive Plan provide that joint review by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners shall be required for amendment and revision to Comprehensive Plan findings, goals, policies, and land use maps of the Comprehensive Plan. However, the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement modified that provision with the result that the City Council will make the decision, and the County will have automatic party status.

Section 13.8.3 of the Comprehensive Plan provides that notice shall be as provided in Section 2.060 of the *Development Code* for a Type IV procedure. Sections 4.045 and 13.442 authorize the Historical Buildings and Sites Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council and authorize the City Council to make a final decision on an application for historic designation or amendment to the historic district requiring a Type IV procedure.

The text or map of the Comprehensive Plan may be recommended for amendment and amended provided the criteria in Section 13.5.4 of the Comprehensive Plan Policies

VI. GENERAL FINDINGS:

With increased pressure to convert historic sites and areas to new uses, many cities in Oregon are establishing historic districts to protect the culturally significant sites in their communities. The current Historic District boundaries were approved by the City Council in 2013 to protect the “old town” district along G Street, as identified in Policy 3.50 of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Historic Building and Sites Commission has identified additional resources in the downtown area, outside the current Historic District, that would benefit from expansion of the district. By expanding the Historic District, the City will be able to further preserve and protect the historic features in accordance with Section 13.411 of the Development Code. The expanded district will include properties along NW 6th Street between NW ‘D’ Street and SW ‘J’ Street and properties between SW 4th Street and SW 7th Street, south of the existing district.

As part of the proposed expansion, the HBSC recently developed design guidelines for local historic landmark structures and structures within the Historic District. The design guidelines will provide administrative review and approval for exterior improvements that conform to the design guidelines.

VII. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

A. For comprehensive plan map amendments, Comprehensive Plan Policy 13.5.4 requires that all of the following criteria be met:

CRITERION (a): Consistency with other findings, goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The proposal is consistent with the applicable Goals and Policies found in Element 8 ~ Economy and Element 13 ~ Land Use of the Comprehensive Plan for reasons summarized below.

Element 8 – Land Use

Goal: To improve, expand, diversify and stabilize the economic base of the community.

Policy 8.8(e) – “The City shall assist in maintaining the Downtown commercial area as a vital business and office district by encouraging private building owners to maintain and improve their buildings.”

1st Conclusion under Criterion (a):

With increased pressure to convert historic sites and areas to new uses, many cities in Oregon are establishing historic districts to protect the culturally significant sites in their communities. Historic districts protect and enhance the City’s attractions and downtown core area. Along with protecting the structures and consideration towards complimenting the existing historic fabric of the

downtown core area, historic districts also stabilize, and improve, property values for structures within those districts, providing incentives for property owners to maintain and improve their buildings.

Element 13. Land Use:

Goal: To provide a vision of the future through maps and policies that shall guide and inform the land use decisions of the present, in such a manner that:

- (d) is responsive to the wishes of the citizens and property owners of the planning area, and

Policy 13.2.4 Other Maps:

The Development Code shall include a Zoning Map that shall include Special Purpose District Maps and Utility Maps, which maps and their criteria and standards shall meet the following basic functions:

- (b) The Special Purpose District Maps and Standards shall determine which special development standards and review procedures, if any, apply to any given development proposal.

Policy 13.2.5 Special Purpose Districts:

Special Purpose Districts shall be adopted to include the following:

- (c) Historic: delineating areas of historic value to the community, whose primary function is to encourage viable and economic use of historic areas while conserving and enhancing the area's historic resources.

2nd Conclusion under Criterion (a):

While zoning is not ideally suited to deal with areas of specific needs, Special Purpose Districts are used to identify special development standards and review procedures. The Historic District serves to safeguard the City's historic, aesthetic and cultural heritage and protect areas or features that represent architectural history. The preservation of historic sites lends a sense of place and renovation of historic buildings can be less expensive than to provide equivalent floor area through new construction.

CRITERION (b): A change in circumstances validated by and supported by the database or proposed changes to the database, which would necessitate a change in findings, goals and policies.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendment will not change the database and the underlying zoning will remain in place for the properties within the expanded Historic District. The proposed amendment would amend the plan and zoning map and would not require the amending of findings, goals or policies.

CRITERION (c): Applicable planning goals and guidelines of the State of Oregon.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The proposal is consistent with four (4) of the nineteen (19) applicable statewide planning goals described below:

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement

The proposal is reviewed and noticed according to the requirements for a Type IV-B procedure. Owners of property within the proposed boundary expansion and property owners within two hundred and fifty (250) feet were sent notice of the application. Public notice is posted for both the Historic Building and Sites Commission and City Council hearings in the *Daily Courier* (the local newspaper), on the City of Grants Pass website, www.grantspassoregon.gov and on the first floor of the City Hall building. Such notification provides the public an opportunity to provide written or oral comments on the matter either before or at the hearings.

The City has an acknowledged Citizen Involvement Program adopted under Resolution 1748 that insures the public can actively engage in the planning process.

One comment was received from surrounding property owners during the notice period.

Conclusion: The City's procedures outlined in the *Comprehensive Plan and Development Code* pertaining to citizen involvement are being followed. The proposal is consistent with Goal 1 standards and requirements.

Goal 2: Land Use

The Grants Pass *Comprehensive Plan and Development Code* outline the planning process to consider a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and the Zoning Map Amendment. The process requires the application to be heard by both the Historic Building and Sites Commission and the City Council. The Historic Building and Sites Commission will review the proposal and provide a formal recommendation that will be considered by the City Council for final decision. Specific criteria have been adopted that relate to the proposal. The review bodies will evaluate the proposal against those criteria in order to make a decision.

Conclusion: The application is being reviewed through the City's land use process, making it consistent with the purpose of statewide Goal 2.

Goal 5: Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces

The Historic District serves to safeguard the City's historic, aesthetic and cultural heritage and protect areas or features that represent architectural history. The preservation of historic sites lends a sense of place and renovation of historic buildings can be less expensive than to provide equivalent floor area through new construction.

Conclusion: The proposal to expand the Historic District serves the purpose of Goal 5 by adding protections to resources within the current district and incorporating resources into the district.

Goal 9: Economic Development

With increased pressure to convert historic sites and areas to new uses, many cities in Oregon are establishing historic districts to protect the culturally significant sites in their communities. Historic districts protect and enhance the City's attractions and downtown core area. Along with protecting the structures and consideration towards complimenting the existing historic fabric of the downtown core area, historic districts also stabilize, and improve, property values for structures within those districts, providing incentives for property owners to maintain and improve their buildings.

Conclusion: The proposal protects and enhances the City's attractions to tourists and visitors, providing support and stimulus to businesses, thus meeting the standards and requirements of Goal 9.

CRITERION (d): Citizen review and comment.

Staff Response: Satisfied. Public notice of the proposal was mailed to properties within the proposed boundary of the expanded Historic District and surrounding properties in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code procedures. No comments were received from property owners during the notice period.

CRITERION (e): Review and comment from affected governmental units and other agencies.

Staff Response: Satisfied. Affected governmental units and agencies were notified.

Notice of the proposal was mailed to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on December 23, 2015. No comments were received.

Notice of the proposal was mailed to Josephine County on December 23, 2015, in accordance with the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement. The County had no comments.

CRITERION (f): A demonstration that any additional need for basic urban services (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, parks, and fire and police protection) is adequately covered by adopted utility plans and service policies, or a proposal for the requisite changes to said utility plans and service policies as a part of the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Staff Response: Satisfied. Water, sewer, storm, and streets are all present within the proposed Historic District expansion. Therefore, the proposed amendment is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

CRITERION (g): Additional information as required by the review body.

Staff Response: Satisfied. Additional information will be provided upon request of the review body.

CRITERION (h): In lieu of item (b) above, demonstration that the Plan was originally adopted in error.

Staff Response: Not Applicable. There is no indication that the original boundaries were adopted in error.

B. For amendments to the Historic District Special Purpose District Map, Section 4.045 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code requires that all of the following criteria be met:

CRITERION 1: The designation of a District or Landmark serves the purpose of this section.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The Historic District serves to safeguard the City's historic, aesthetic and cultural heritage and protect areas or features that represent architectural history. The proposal to expand the Historic District serves the purpose of this section by adding protections to resources within the current district and incorporating resources into the district.

CRITERION 2: The boundaries of a District are adequate and suitable for designation.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The proposed expansion is adequate and suitable for designation to provide additional buffer from non-contributing development that would detract from the historic resources within the district. The expanded district will also incorporate additional historic resources that are located outside of the existing district that will benefit from the same protections as the local Landmarks and structures within the existing historic district.

CRITERION 3: Consideration of the positive and negative effects of the designation upon residents, businesses, or property owners of the area.

Staff Response: Satisfied. The proposed expansion has considered the positive and negative effects of the designation. Expansion of the district will require historic review for modifications to structures within the district boundary. Historic review will only apply to exterior modifications and not affect the allowable uses of the property, as determined by the underlying zoning district. As part of the proposed expansion, the HBSC recently developed design guidelines for local historic landmark structures and structures within the Historic District. The design guidelines will provide administrative review and approval for exterior improvements that conform to the design guidelines.

C. *The text of the Development Code may be recommended for amendment and amended provided that all of the following criteria of Section 4.103 of the Development Code are met.*

CRITERION 1: The proposed amendment is consistent with the purpose of the subject section and article.

HBSC Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendment is consistent with the purpose of Article 13. The Historic District protects historical features within Grants Pass. The proposed expansion will incorporate additional historic resources that are located outside of the existing district that will benefit from the same protections as the local landmarks and structures within the existing Historic District.

CRITERION 2: The proposed amendment is consistent with other provisions of this code.

HBSC Response: Satisfied. The proposed text amendment will identify the Historic District on the Historic District Overlay Map. The special district standards apply in addition to the standards of the underlying zoning districts. This change will not substantially change the code and the revised Section will remain consistent with other provisions of the code.

CRITERION 3: The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and most effectively carries out those goals and policies of all alternatives considered.

HBSC Response: Satisfied. The proposed changes are consistent with Element 13, Land Use, of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment refers to the Historic District Overlay Map to identify the boundaries of the Historic District. Pursuant to 13.2.5, the Historic District shall identify areas of historic value to the community.

Most Effective Alternative

The alternative to approving the proposal is to retain the existing description of the Historic District boundaries. The proposed historic district expansion will expand the boundaries, and the description will not correspond the boundaries. The proposed amendment will reference the Historic District Overlay Map and more effectively carries out the goals and policies stated above.

CRITERION 4: The proposed amendment is consistent with the functions, capacities, and performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan.

HBSC Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendment is not expected to affect the functions, capacities, or performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan (MTP).

VIII. RECOMMENDATION:

The Historic Buildings and Sites Commission recommends that the City Council **APPROVE** the proposed Historic District expansion, as presented in the staff report.

IX. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 17th day of March, 2016.

Ward Warren, Chair