

HISTORICAL BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

August 18, 2016 – 6:00 P.M.

Courtyard Conference Room

A. ROLL CALL:

The Historical Buildings and Sites Commission met in regular session on the above date with Vice Chair Dan McBerty presiding. Commissioners Arden McConnell, Virginia Ford, Shirley Holzinger, and Kathy Marshbank were present. Chair Ward Warren was absent. City Council Liaison Dennis Roler was absent. Representing the City staff was Parks & Community Development (hereafter: PCD) Planner Justin Gindlesperger.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **June 2, 2016**
- **July 28, 2016**

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner McConnell moved and Commissioner Holzinger seconded the motion to approve the minutes from June 2, 2016 as presented. The vote resulted as follows:

“AYES”: Vice Chair McBerty and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, Ford, and Marshbank. **“NAYS”:** None. **Abstain:** None. **Absent:** Warren.

The motion passed.

Commissioner Holzinger moved and Commissioner McConnell seconded the motion to approve the minutes from July 28, 2016 as presented. The vote resulted as follows:

“AYES”: Vice Chair McBerty and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, Ford, and Marshbank. **“NAYS”:** None. **Abstain:** None. **Absent:** Warren.

The motion passed.

C. Public Hearing

I. 303-00102-16 Flores Taqueria “H” St Historic Review

- Vice Chair McBerty stated, at this time I will open the public hearing to consider application 303-00102-16 Flores Taqueria “H” St Historic Review. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant,

statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to consider this matter? Seeing none do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Seeing none are there any Commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding this application? The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff.

- Justin gave the staff report.
- The commission asked if the building was sided in stucco, the applicant clarified that it was very smooth plaster similar to the adjacent buildings.
- The commission asked what year the building was built, Justin was not completely sure but he believes it was built in 1937.
- Joseph Johnson with Natural Creations introduced himself as the contractor for the applicant.
- Manuel and Marisol Flores introduced themselves as the owners of the building.
- Jennifer Johnson introduced herself as Joseph's wife.
- Scott Lindberg – 929 NE Campus Dr – Mr. Lindberg stated that he does not believe the proposed concept meets the goals of protecting the historic district. The overall treatment and stucco look is fine but the removal of the iconic half rounded windows really diminished the original intent and design of the building. From a historic preservation standpoint it would be better to do nothing at all, but possibly a compromise can be made in removing the metal up around the top and in removing the brick veneer that was not original to the structure. From a member of the public standpoint he doesn't think it would reinforce the intent of the historic district.
- The applicant let the commission know that the plan is to remove the brick and the metal to show the original face underneath.
- They would like to remove the brick columns that were put in place in the late 70s/early 80s.
- The applicant and the commission had a discussion concerning the belief that there may be tile similar to the theatre under the brick.

- Commissioner Holzinger expressed that she would like to see a more historic façade rather than the more modern façade that is illustrated.
- The commission asked what the awnings are made of. Mr Johnson let them know that they are made of wood and the hangers are cable/chain.
- The commission and the applicant had a discussion about the extra doors – the applicant intends to remove them as they are unused.
- The applicant would ideally like to move the front door to three feet back from the sidewalk instead of the current five.
- The commission tossed around ideas that may help to preserve the original windows.
- Commissioner Marshbank asked for clarification on if the desire was to keep the building time period historic or preserved back to the original state of the building.
- The commissioners had a discussion about trying to keep the balance between preserving the historic district and making it desirable for tenants to continue to want to be in the historic district.
- Mr. Johnson let the commission know that he and the owners were willing to work with the commission to make something that is beautiful and inviting and also historic and fitting for the historic district.
- Discussion of the width of the door for restaurant standards.
- Commissioner Marshbank let the applicant know that the awning and window treatments seem very 1970s to her. She would like to see the gingerbread type feel she sees in the 1930s Mexican architecture. She likes the stucco treatment and stone treatments but would like them to fit in the 1930 style.
- The applicant took photos of stone work in Mexico on 100 year old buildings that they would like to consider for the revised stone work on the façade.
- The commission discussed ideas to make it have a Spanish feel that keeps the historic integrity of the structure but also enhances the building.
- The commission discussed the desire to change the door design to be consistent with the other buildings in the area.
- Justin and Scott discussed the steps that would need to be taken if the meeting were to be continued to a special meeting. The commission discussed options with the applicant while staff conferred.

- Justin let the commission know that the discussion could be continued to a special meeting time that is no less than seven days from this meeting date. If a time could not be agreed upon it would be the next regularly scheduled meeting.
- The commission and the applicant both agreed to a special meeting date of September 1.

Commissioner McConnell moved and Commissioner Holzinger seconded the motion to continue the meeting until September 1, 2016 at 6:00PM. The vote resulted as follows:

“AYES”: Vice Chair McBerty and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, Ford, and Marshbank. **“NAYS”:** None. **Abstain:** None. **Absent:** Warren.

The motion passed.

D. Items from Staff

- Justin gave the commission an update on the Redwood Empire Sign. This project is being handled by Assistant City Manager Dave Reeves and is currently on hold while the focus is on the new municipal building sign.
- Justin let the commission know that the landmark list can be updated with a recommendation from the HBSC followed by an approved ordinance from the City Council.
- He confirmed that the owners of the structures to be landmarked would need to be notified and give their consent.
- The commission discussed the desire to get a letter together to send out to the owners of the buildings they would like added to the landmarks list..

E. Items from Public

- None.

F. Items from Commissioners

- The commission reviewed a draft of proposed additional landmarks.
- Justin confirmed that the commission would be able to do all of the additions and removals with one ordinance once they have final approvals from the land owners.

- The commission has been in contact with the Elks club. The original portion of the building would qualify for landmark status but the addition put in place in the 1980s will not.
- The commission discussed items they would like to see landmarked including; the Caveman Bridge, the remains of the original bridge and the diversion dam, Riverside Park, Riverside School (Coalition for Kids), and Croxton Memorial Park.
- The commission discussed some of the history behind the diversion dam, City Park (now Riverside Park), and Croxton Memorial Park.
- The commission discussed the need for guidelines for the buildings that have non-historic additions. They feel that the Elks Building could set the standard for future landmarks.
- Commissioner McConnell would like to have midcentury modern classification and SHPO put on the agenda.
- The commission would like an update on the Historic District map from Jon and Commissioner Warren at the next meeting.
- It was requested that the commissioners please look at Taqueria and come up with ideas and goals to give to the applicant. Please send an email with ideas but be cautious to avoid a quorum.

G. Adjournment

Next meeting: September 1, 2016

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

HISTORICAL BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

September 1, 2016 – 6:00 P.M.

Courtyard Conference Room

A. ROLL CALL:

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

B. Public Hearing

I. 303-00102-16 Flores Taqueria “H” St Historic Review

- Vice Chair McBerty stated, at this time I will open the public hearing to consider application 303-00102-16 Flores Taqueria “H” St Historic Review. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to consider this matter? Seeing none do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Seeing none are there any Commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding this application?
- Vice Chair McBerty disclosed that he had a brief conversation with the applicant last Thursday to disclose the Commissions feedback for the redesign of the application.
- Seeing none in this hearing the decision of the Commission will be based on specific criteria which are set forth in the development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the staff report please let us know and we will try and get you one. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the

Commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue you'll not be able to appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff.

- Justin explained that as this was a continuation he did not have anything additional to add as a staff report.
- Justin clarified that this building was listed as not contributing and not eligible for land marking at this time. This simply means that while this building is in the historic district it does not contribute to the historic nature of the district. Justin will add this information to the original staff report.
- Joseph Johnson – Natural Creations- Mr. Johnson let the commission know that they took into consideration the feedback that was provided to them and they modified the rendering and he believes that this will better suit the Historic District.
- They have left the doorway the same as it was. It will have the same footprint with the original structural lines. They have also left the original windows that were a concern at the previous meeting. They did have to change the little 28" doors and round windows as they are no longer up to code. They will be modelling the replacement windows after the windows across the street to keep the consistency in the area.
- The replacement sign will be neon similar to the Wonder Bur to be in keeping with the era – similar feel to the original 1930s/1940s style.
- They will be keeping the smooth plaster finish and will be choosing the color from the historic palette.
- Commissioner McConnell asked for clarification on the round window and door they are removing. Mr. Johnson explained that the windows are in poor repair and the hope was that by keeping the other round windows that were a concern for the commission they might be able to reach a compromise.
- Mr. Johnson clarified the buildings he modelled the replacement windows off of to keep in the same era.
- Mr. Johnson clarified for the commission the shape and framing of the recessed windows.
- The applicant explained to the commission that unfortunately at this point if they are unable to make a few compromises they will likely leave the building as is and not do the improvements.

- Mr. Johnson clarified that the sign will be a little lower and smaller than it appears on the rendering.
- Justin clarified that if the sign meets the design guidelines it will be approved through city staff.
- The commission asked what is covering the doors in the rendering, the applicant let them know it is Spanish tile.
- Justin confirmed that the sign should meet the design guidelines.
- Mr. Johnson clarified that the beams will be made of concrete so that they will not deteriorate but they will have the appearance of wood beams.
- The door will likely be a Rogue Valley Door custom made wooden door.
- The applicant would like to get started on the façade mid-September if approved. They will be putting in a smooth plaster that will weather very well. The color will be in the plaster so you will not have to be repainted.
- City staff will see a sample of the plaster before they start on the whole building.
- The applicant really feel this will be a beautiful building.
- Mr. Johnson let the committee know that they will be moving the bar towards the front of the restaurant to accommodate the changing atmosphere and vibe on H Street.
- Mr. Johnson clarified that the only thing they will be doing to the sidewalk is giving it a good cleaning.
- The commission asked the applicant if they planned to do anything with the larger Mexican pots or with outdoor seating. Mr. Johnson clarified that they would love to do something along those lines but it would have to be limited to what the City will permit.
- Manuel Flores – Applicant/building owner – Mr. Flores expressed his desire for the commission to approve the application.
- Commissioner McConnell asked for clarification on which guidelines were not met. The applicant let the commissioners know that the materials had been shifted to meet the approved materials in the historic design guidelines with the one exception of the tile roof.
- Councilor Roler believes that this will be a classy building and the neon will tie in well with the theatre and that what the applicant is asking for isn't unreasonable.

- Commissioner McBerty believes that there was a little bit of give and take here and that this is more on the restoration side.
- Commissioner Holzinger believes it is an appropriate compromise.
- The commission made a recommendation to make the side windows the same shape but larger.
- The commission and staff had a discussion on how to approve the application and give room for the window modifications.

Commissioner McConnell moved and Commissioner Holzinger seconded the motion to approve application 303-00102-16 with the condition of making the larger windows. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair McBerty and Commissioners McConnell, Holzinger, and Ford. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Warren and Marshbank.

The motion passed.

C. Items from Staff

- None.

D. Items from Public

- None.

E. Items from Commissioners

- The September 15th meeting has been cancelled and the next meeting will be October 20th.
- Councilor Roler let the commission know that the new visitor guide does show some of the historic district.
- Councilor Roler let the commission know that six new historic district signs will be going up on 199.

F. Adjournment

Next meeting: September 15, 2016

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

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

**TAQUERIA – ‘H’ STREET HISTORIC REVIEW
HISTORIC BUILDING AND SITES COMMISSION
FINDINGS OF FACT**

Procedure Type:	Type III: Historic Building and Sites Commission Decision
Project Number:	303-00102-16
Project Type:	Historic District Review/Facade Renovation
Owner/Applicant:	Manuel Flores
Representative:	Natural Creations, LLC. (Joseph Johnson)
Property Address:	137 SE ‘H’ Street
Map and Tax Lot:	36-05-17-CB, TL 7200
Zoning:	Central Business District (CBD)
Parcel Size:	0.11 acres
Planner Assigned:	Justin Gindlesperger
Application Received:	July 27, 2016
Application Complete:	July 28, 2016
Date of Report:	August 11, 2016 Due: 08/11/2016
Date of Hearing:	September 1, 2016; continued from August 18, 2016
Date of Findings:	October 20, 2016
120-Day Deadline:	November 25, 2016

Note: ~~Strikeout Text~~ indicates text that was deleted. *Italic Text* indicates text that was added.

I. PROPOSAL:

The application is to remodel the façade and replace the sign of the existing building located at 137 SE ‘H’ Street in the Historic District. The façade faces SE ‘H’ Street near the intersection with SE 7th Street. The applicant submitted a narrative and rendering of the proposed facade and sign as part of the application.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Sections 2.050, 7.063, and 13.451 City of Grants Pass Development Code, authorize the Historical Buildings and Sites Commission to consider any exterior alterations to a site, building or structure within a Historic District and make a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny said requests. The decision must be based upon the criteria contained in Section 13.452 of the Development Code.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.050, City of Grants Pass Development Code, provides for an appeal of the Historic Building and Sites Commission decision to the Grants Pass City Council. An appeal must be filed with the Director within twelve calendar days of the Commission's oral decision. A statement of grounds to the appeal must be filed with the Director within seven (7) calendar days of the Commission's written decision.

IV. PROCEDURE:

- A. An application for a Historic Review request was submitted on July 27, 2016 and deemed complete on July 28, 2016. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.
- B. Public notice of the August 18, 2016 hearing was mailed on July 28, 2016, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.
- C. A public hearing was held on August 18, 2016 and the Historic Building and Sites Commission voted to continue the Historic Review request to September 1, 2016.
- D. A public hearing was held on September 1, 2016 and the Historic Building and Sites Commission voted unanimously to approve the Historic Review request.

V. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the Staff Report, which is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein.
- B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Historic Building and Sites Commission on August 18, 2016 and September 1, 2016, attached as Exhibit "B", summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.
- C. The PowerPoint given by staff is attached as Exhibit "C".
- D. The applicant's rendering of the proposed façade improvements are attached as Exhibit "D".

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Historic Building and Sites Commission found that based on the responses stated in the staff report and included below, and the minutes from the public hearing, and with the attached conditions, the proposal meets the requirements of Section 13.452 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code.

VII. GENERAL FINDINGS:

A. Characteristics of the Property:

- 1. Land Use Designation:
 - a. Comprehensive Plan: Central Business District
 - b. Zone District: Central Business District
 - c. Special Purpose District: Historic District

- 2. Size: 0.11 acres

- 3. Frontage: SE 'H' Street

- 4. Access: N/A

- 6. Existing Land Use:
 - a. Subject Parcel: Commercial
 - b. Surrounding: Mixed commercial uses

B. Discussion:

The subject property is in the Historic District and is located at 137 SE 'H' Street, near the intersection of SE 'H' & SE 7th Streets. The property is developed with an existing commercial structure. The applicant proposes to reface the existing building and replace the existing sign. *The property is listed as "not contributing/non-eligible" in the recent Downtown Resurvey that was completed as part of the Historic District expansion.*

The approved rendering depicts the doorway and windows adjacent to the doorway in the original configuration. The round windows on the east and west sides of the façade are removed and the rendering depicts smaller windows with similar lines to the windows by the entrance and other buildings along SE H Street. As conditioned below, the replacement windows are required to be enlarged by twelve (12) inches in height and twelve (12) inches in width.

The proposed sign complies with the elements of the Historic District Design Guidelines and is not considered as part of this review. The Historic Design Guidelines were updated to maintain consistent design standards while providing flexibility of design to property owners. Signage and exterior alterations that comply with the design guidelines may be approved administratively and do not require further review.

VIII. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

Section 13.452 ~ Criteria for Approval/Historic Review of the City of Grants Pass Development Code states that in reviewing the appropriateness of this application, the Historical Buildings and Sites Commission shall consider the following:

Criterion (1): The purpose of the Historic District.

1. Effect and accomplish the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of such improvements and of districts which represent or reflect elements of the City's and County's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history;
2. Safeguard the City's and County's historic, aesthetic and cultural heritage as embodied and reflected in such improvements and districts;
3. Complement any National Register Historic Districts designated in the City;
4. Stabilize and improve property values in such districts;
5. Foster civic pride in the beauty of historic buildings, structures, sites and signage and noble accomplishments of the past;
6. Protect and enhance the City's attractions to tourists and visitors and the support and stimulus to business and industry thereby provided;

HBSC Response: Satisfied. The proposed façade changes will further enhance the property by updating and restoring the building face. The new design will enhance the visual aspect of the building and provide a stimulus to the existing business and other businesses on SE 'H' Street.

Criterion (2): The general compatibility of the signage, exterior design, arrangement, proportion, detail, scale, color, texture, and materials proposed to be used in the construction of the new building or structure.

HBSC Response: Satisfied with conditions. The proposed exterior alterations will remove the existing corrugated metal siding and provide a variety of materials to add elements of visual interest with the use of canopies, window treatments and lighting. The building was previously used as the Rogue Food Shop/Rogue Café. While the restoration of the façade does not try to recreate the historic face of the structure, it eliminates the use of materials that are not preferred in the Historic District.

Brick and stucco are recommended materials for building faces, depending on the age and design of the building. As conditioned below, the applicant shall submit a list of materials and colors that will be used on the updated façade.

The proposed sign complies with the elements of the Historic District Design Guidelines and is not considered as part of this review. The placement of the sign is in the appropriate location and is constructed of appropriate material and color. As conditioned below, the applicants are required to obtain a sign permit from Parks and Community Development.

The applicant is required to provide signage to reroute pedestrians around the work zone if the sidewalk is closed, or partially blocked during working hours. Materials and equipment must be removed from the public right-of-way at the end of each work day and may not be stored overnight. As conditioned below, the applicant will be required to obtain a no fee encroachment permit from the Engineering Division for use of the right-of-way along SE H Street.

Criterion (3): The effect of the proposed new structure on the historic value of the district.

HBSC Response: Not applicable. The property is developed with an existing building. No new structure is proposed.

Criterion (4): The economic effect of the new structure on the value of the historic district.

HBSC Response: Not applicable. No new structure is proposed under this review. The proposed facade will complement and enhance the property and the historic district.

IX. DECISION AND SUMMARY:

The Historical Buildings and Sites Commission **APPROVED** the request for the proposed facade renovation with the conditions listed below. The vote was 4-0 with Commissioners McBerty, McConnell, Ford and Holzinger in favor. None were opposed. Commissioners Warren and Marshbank were absent.

Conditions of Approval

The following shall be accomplished within eighteen months of the date this report is signed and prior to issuance of a Development Permit. Otherwise, the approval shall expire. Extension of the Site Plan Review approval is permitted pursuant to Section 3.077(2) of the Development Code. Extension of the Development Permit is permitted pursuant to Section 3.093(2) of the Development Code. (NOTE: A development permit is required prior to commencement of construction).

1. Submit a materials and colors list for all materials and colors that will be used on the façade update.
2. *Submit revised window design that increases the size by twelve (12) inches in width and twelve (12) inches in height.*
3. Obtain a no fee encroachment permit from the Engineering Division prior to use of the right-of-way for any work associated with the façade improvements, including the use of the sidewalk for material storage during working hours and the use of scaffolding or ladders. All materials and equipment must be removed at the end of each work day.
4. Submit a signage plan for routing pedestrians around the work zone if the sidewalk will be closed during working hours.
5. Obtain a sign permit for the installation of the proposed sign.

X. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMISSION
this 20th day of October, 2016.

Ward Warren, Chair

