

**HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
21420 MAIN ST. NE, AURORA OR 97002
July 18, 2013**

Staff Members Present: Kelly Richardson, City Recorder

Others Present: Bill Graupp, City Council member
Scott Brotherton, City Council
Kris Sallee, Planning Commission
Samantha Feder, Aurora
Sharon Harbeck, Aurora

The meeting of July 18, 2013 was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Townsend.

Chairman Townsend takes Roll Call

Chairman Karen Townsend – Present
Vice-Chair Gayle Abernathy – Present
Member Bill Simon – Present
Member Merra Frochen – Present
Member Mella Dee Fraser – Present

CONSENT AGENDA

- I. Historic Review Board Minutes – June 27, 2013
- II. City Council Meeting Minutes - none
- III. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes - none

A motion to approve the HRB minutes of June 27, 2013, as presented, was made by Member Fraser, seconded by Member Frochen and passed unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

None

VISITORS

No one spoke.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. Discussion and/or Action of Updating the Historic Guidelines per City Council Request.**

1. Review of Design Standards as part of title 17.

Chairman Townsend informs members that the most current version of title 17 is in your packet Planning Commission Chair Schaefer is here. Planning Commission had the public hearing on title 17 July 2, 2013. I and member Simon were in attendance.

I did look at the document and had a few questions:

1. On pg 398 applicability, what was discussed was that paint color for non-contributing commercial structures was that it would need staff approval and when I look back later on in section 17.21.40 the new language is there on pg 441 under paint but it's not reflected in the beginning in applicability,

I think what you say is, 17:40:50 B 3 add after the word structure, and insert (and of non contributing structure in the historic commercial overlay,)

Pg 408 same 17.20.50 C, admin approval process #4 it should also say non-contributing in commercial overlay.

#2, I am bothered by this statement. Before if you were using the same color paint along with the same materials same everything you didn't have to get approval. During discussion it is agreed that this should be taken out and not have to have approval. DELETE #2 agreed.

Pg 404 I asked for clarification on this it was a big change and no discussion was offered nor clarification or reasoning that HRB should no longer have authority to approve items on new construction. **Chairman Schaefer** item #3 on the memo from SHPO. This item was proposed by Councilor Graupp that new construction is not Historic and so the idea was new construction was not really related to HRB and that Planning Commission can over see that and it would cut down on time spent by the applicant.

Chairman Townsend it really is complicated because when you are looking at the commercial district and when 3 original buildings were lost to fire when you are replacing these contributing structures this really is of HRB expertise. I think it is crucial to the Historic District and I think it takes away significant authority. Member Fraizer is there away to work together on these types of applications.

The discussion among members is to do one stop shopping or one meeting once someone wants to appeal a HRB decision it then goes to council but with my proposal the governing body is Planning Commission and if they do an appeal it has a formal appeal process with the Planning Commission itself rather than going to council first.

Chairman Townsend states people have come up to her and stated that one particular property that they would want HRB to have input on. In the past Planning Commission members historically are not interested in HRB items and they typically are not familiar with the historic district is doesn't give a good vibe.

Member Frochen comments doesn't it take away the checks and balance so that one body isn't making all the decisions. **Chairman Townsend** states that really there is no

recourse if we disagree with a decision, **Chairman Schaefer** you can appeal just like anyone else could.

It doesn't mean the HRB will be taken seriously and our comments heard.

I think that this was a significant change and since this was a public hearing on this no one could make comments during that type of forum.

Member Fraizer I would like to see all members in one meeting working together.

Member Abernathy I think that the Planning Commission gets involved in economics and building and I don't think that the Planning Commission would look at the Historic significance of our history.

Member Simon how much vacant property is there, Townsend we are looking at 3 buildings that burned and they have to be replaced and these are significant to our history.

Commissioner Sallee, comments when you look at new construction you still have to consult the Design Standards which are within the Historic Frame work so I think this covers what you are speaking about. It validates that we have to follow exactly the same document. **Abernathy** we just want to have checks and balances I guess I don't have confidence that Planning Commission will follow this document. (Sallee) I have been to these meetings and as Chairman Schaefer stated you can appeal it just like anyone else if you don't agree with the decision made.

Chairman Schaefer points out that this document is written in such a way that you really could have staff do this the new rules are very clear and what the decision or outcome will be. **Chair Townsend** that's true but the board did suggest on more than one occasion items that should be covered and Planning Commission didn't like the format or what was presented.

Chairman Schaefer we structured the document in this format because we thought it would be user friendly with the citizens. This document should be very clear and objective very much trying to stay away from general statements because they can be so easily misunderstood.

Member Abernathy the HRB and the preservation of the historic district must be maintained.

Chairman Townsend The Comp Plan is full of comments and stresses the importance of the HRB. (Schaefer) Good idea everyone reread the comp plan.

Chair Townsend Signs, since we have taken out existing signs on pg 416 does that mean that these properties would need to bring their signs into compliance. I believe I understood it to say if they are up by OCT 1995 or after then they would be grandfathered in. **Chairman Schaefer** 1995 to present they would be in compliance if they received approval but if there is no approval then these properties must update their signs to be in compliance.

Pg 420 exempt signs I see a that LED sign has a separate definition, we proposed that we could live with this and I believe we came to a middle ground and I thought we came up with no control on images. **Chair Townsend** currently we control images on signs. **Chair Schaefer** as per legal requirements according to the City Planner we cannot limit content. Colors we limited to two colors (Townsend) why, if you are allowing them to be expressive can't they have more colors. (Schaefer) We are doing the best that we can and we are trying to solve a business situation where many businesses want it. The best we can.

Chair Townsend On new business signs we had asked that this be expanded (17.24.060 C 3 pg 420) so that new businesses such as a temporary business they cannot use a temporary sign and have no restrictions and we asked that they can only have up temporary signs while the approval process is taking place.

UNDER Standards PG 442

Sidewalks, there has been a sidewalk standard for many years and this is found in downtown improvement plan and HRB guidelines that you don't have to have trowelled edges and we have many in town that aren't trowelled. The history behind this is when Marion County discussed our options they offered 3 kinds of sidewalks and so we came up with a solution we decided on un-trowelled edges because they looked old.

Chairman Schaefer it is a safety issue and a tripping/safety issue and it last longer I get the ascetic situation but I think for a safety this is better. **Chairman Townsend** what about brick they don't have trowelled edges Schaefer I don't know that's a good point. So why can't we keep what we have had in the past. Member Frochen that's the checks and balance that we are up against new verses old.

Member Abernathy is the City Council going to listen to us. Schaefer yes but they may not agree with everyone.

446pg transom and clear story 17.40.190 B 4 I think this is a typo Schaeffer agrees. Should state above doors.

Pg 450 17.48.020 designated HRB refers to 10A is a typo?

Chairman Townsend I presented a few items to Planning Commission about Colony Structures it should have their own section and or more rules/regulation. I feel that it could have been inserted easily and it was not mentioned at the Planning meeting. **Chair Schaefer** it was agreed upon long ago through Planning to use contributing and non contributing as the separation of structure types. Chair Townsend these items have already been designated a landmark. **Chairman Schaefer** I wasn't aware of that. **Chair Townsend** where are the different standards for the landmarks that HRB proposed, **Schaefer** I think that the contributing structures is strict enough and Planning Commission did not act on the proposed changes. **Abernathy** why didn't you act on it? **Schaefer** because we are trying to simplify the code. **Townsend** if you don't call this out and show the distinction and show the difference you fail to show the history. **Schaefer** that is why it is in the guidelines and the Comp

Plan along with the inventory those documents show the history of Aurora. The inventory the HRB can change the inventory at any time.

Townsend, I think that you are going to lose the historic uniqueness for Aurora.

Schaefer I am not saying they are not important but title 17's function is to be the regulatory document.

Abernathy are you familiar with other historic cities and do you think they are happy with how they are being regulated. By their codes and plans.

Agreement on the board is to press City Council to recognize this colony distinction.

NEW BUSINESS

A. **Discussion and/or action on Wall Sign Application for Pudding Lane, 21620 Main St. Application submitted by Sharon Harbeck.**, Two Wall signs on the application, Chairman Townsend let's look at the sign section of the Guidelines,

1. 415 pg Section 17.20.100 B Wall signs, 17.20.070 Materials wood, Font is approved from the list, Font the lettering is black on white background is met. A, B, C.

2. 417 pg Type of sign for wall signs placement,

The applicant is asked about square footage, it's agreed amongst the group 25 square foot of frontage. The application is asking for two wall signs (one is allowed) however I see this sign over the window and I see it as a parapet sign they generally identify the name of the business. I believe that we can take the top sign as a parapet sign, we can allow the two signs and it looks appropriate for the frontage area.

Next we would then look at size for the wall sign 30x18 and the Parapet 72x12 this would work for the frontage requirements.

Chairman Townsend calls for comments hearing none all is in agreement
17.20.100 B and C

A Motion to approve the application as written was made by Member Simon and is seconded by Member Frazier. Motion Approved by all.

Chairman Townsend asks the applicant if you might be interested in an A-board sign the applicant has a picture on her camera and the board reviews the picture.

- Hand Painted, no more than 5 colors
- Wood material
- Easel back, which will be placed towards the bushes and won't be seen.

Applicant is adding this easel sign and the location would be to the left of the arch on the patio.

Board discussion of sign,

- Pg 415 17.20.100 general sign provisions, discussion on figural sign
- Colors you are limited to 5 colors so that is met
- Printing it would be black (stated by applicant) and one of the approved fonts from the list.
- Lets cite that the applicant has shown a picture of an additional sign a figural sign and it meets, Color, material, a figure and graphics are to be from font list also meets 1720.0790 A 1, 2 B and C,3 and meets free standing 17.20.100 F.

Member Frazier makes a motion to approve the sign as discussed with the applicant and is seconded by Member Simon as cited. Motion Passes.

Tell us about your business it's a typical English tea room. With British flair and English parameters

ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made at 8:45 pm by Member Simon, seconded by Member Frochen and passed unanimously.



Karen Townsend, Chairman

ATTEST:



Kelly Richardson, City Recorder