

**HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
21420 MAIN ST. NE, AURORA OR 97002
May 22, 2014**

Staff Members Present: Kelly Richardson, City Recorder

Others Present: Tara McKnight, Canby

The meeting of May 22, 2014 was called to order at 7:06 p.m. by Chairman Abernathy.

Chairman Townsend takes Roll Call

Chairman Gayle Abernathy – Present
Member Bill Simon – Present
Member Merrra Frochen – Present
Member Mella Dee Fraser – Present
Member Karen Townsend – Present

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes

- I. Historic Review Board Minutes – April 24, 2014
two changes were discussed one on page 2 regarding removing daughter as it was a girlfriend however ill-relevant to the minutes so it was removed all together. On the last page under old business rather than deadline be set it would be more like a benchmark.

A motion to approve the HRB minutes of April 24, 2014, as corrected was made by Member Townsend, seconded by Member Simon and passed unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

- I.

VISITORS

No one spoke.

5. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **Discussion and or action on Sign Inventory**, No discussion on this topic at this time.
- B. **Discussion and/or action on paint color list.**
Everyone on the Board likes how it is written.
- C. **Discussion and or action on Historic Inventory list**, Townsend makes suggested changes to Historic Guideline and Kelly will make updates in draft form in the document for each meeting.

Headings or categories were needed to determine what other information is needed.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion and or action on Conditional Use Permit for 21680 Main Street Owners McKnight. Pheasant Run Winery Tasting Room.

Tara McKnight explains there concept, the goal is to create a garden space and make a positive visual impact as you drive in to Aurora we would like to enhance it and make it inviting and included would be an outside gallery. In the Southeast corner of the lot we want to have a food cart from time to time.

Questions regarding the concept from HRB,

1. Is there going to be a lot line adjustment or does the lot you're proposing to do this all on the same lot as the bank building.
2. What are you proposing for landscaping because it makes a difference if it is over \$2500 based on each lot? Checkerboard brick pavers, seating and possibly grass Is what we have so far.

Applicant states that they believe it won't be over \$2500 value out of pocket so shouldn't require an application be made for landscape.

3. Fencing what are you proposing what does OCLL require for fencing. Our concern is that you may need a fence application which requires approval as well.

4. How do you propose getting the food cart in there? Applicant states behind the tree we would create a gate so we could bring it in and out that way.

5. Steps, going to area proposed the materials are slabs of nice concrete or natural stone, the board states we have little guidance on what stairs should be made out of. Building codes rules would apply on these.

6. What about tents or canopies? The applicant states possibly for a weekend event because of rain or shade needed for an event we had not really thought about it.

Townsend reads the guidelines regarding tents and canopies however there is little language regarding this in title 17.

The Board states that many of these items such as food cart and outdoor materials were not presented here tonight so it's hard to include these items. Your application is really not complete at this point, we have very little to look at.

Applicant states, regarding the food cart we want it to be a variety of different vendors so the look would change depending on who was on site at the time. Members state and with no information presented on the cart itself we cannot really comment.

Member Simon asks clarification of the rest of the board regarding the guidelines on tents and leaving them up which was not appropriate to the historic district, creating a flea market effect.

Member Townsend states that this was written because businesses were putting up tents.

We are unclear at this point what we are to comment on to Planning Commission because there is not a lot to comment on if no sign app is presented and no landscaping plan is needed.

These are the items that as a board we would need an application for and area of concerns,

1. Fencing application if and when it was needed.
2. Stairs to make sure it fits with the historic preservation of the area.
3. Signage on cart along with application that could be flexible signage for Pheasant run, only if visible from right of way (being sidewalks or roadways).
4. Pop up tents and canopies. No preference on color in good condition.
5. Landscape plan with materials submitted along with surfaces and possible pop up tents.

Member Townsend agrees to write the letter for the next Planning Commission meeting addressing our concerns.

7. ADJOURN

Chairman Abernathy adjourned the meeting of May 22, 2014 at 8:50 pm.



Gayle Abernathy, Chairman

ATTEST:



Kelly Richardson, CMC City Recorder

HRB Memo to Planning Commission

Re: Pheasant Run Winery Conditional Use Permit/Food cart use/Landscape

May 26, 2014

The applicant attended the HRB meeting on May 22 and was available to answer questions from the board. From this discussion the HRB had these concerns and comments for the Planning Commission to consider in granting conditions of the requested permit. Overall, the board had a positive impression of the plan as described by the applicant, however there were items not addressed either by application or code that we have outlined here.

Food Cart:

The applicant does not currently own/lease a food cart and envisioned that various vendors would provide service on call. Discussion about how a vendor's cart might be approved according to code was discussed and a suitable/practical plan needs to be worked out with the Planning Commission for the occasions when applicant desires a food presence. (In our previous discussions on food carts, the HRB was under the impression that all carts would be directly under the regular control of the participating restaurant/food establishment.) Also to be determined is how the food cart would enter and exit the property.

Fencing:

No application was presented for fencing and the applicant was unsure about what will be required by OLCC to secure the area when alcohol is consumed. The current fencing is an older wire, temporary type fence with metal stake posts which may not stand up to security or to current design standards for permanent fencing within the district. A fence application would be separate from the current application and would need HRB approval.

Landscape:

Most or all of the property on the site plan appears to be attached to the gallery building adjacent to the bank building. Depending on how many properties are involved, the landscape threshold for requiring a landscape plan to go before the Historic Review Board could be either \$2500 or \$5000. (Any fencing would not be part of the cost of landscaping.) The applicant does not have a firm figure as to what the costs will be for the design presented although it includes various surfaces such as compacted gravel, stone stairs, plantings as well as the expected soils/mulch, etc. and materials for the bocce court and chess board. It may be determined that a landscape plan application be required if the cost exceeds \$2500 in the area that is part of the gallery property, in which case the HRB would ask that an application fee be waived. The HRB found the attached plan to be approvable as is as long as the materials are specified.

Potential Need for Coverings:

No structures, covered pavilions, etc. are currently proposed. If proposed, those should be reviewed by HRB.

Tents and awnings that might be erected to cover various areas (although not awnings attached to a temporary food cart or umbrellas at tables) are a concern. The Historic Guidelines (now used as information only) previously regulated the use of tents and limited their use to two seven-day periods per year. The purpose of this was to limit the overuse of tents in a historically sensitive area and avoid a flea market appearance based on previous abuse by retailers and homeowners, where the tents never seemed to go down and became faded, unsightly and were a significant detraction from the buildings as well as encouraging the collection of various items under them. Anticipating that the winery/gallery might desire to use the garden area as a venue or sometimes cover the outdoor gallery area or a musical act, we believe the Planning Commission should work with HRB to devise suitable guidelines for tent/covering use that is practical for this type of occasional use yet still maintains control for the previous reasons. (The previous rules allowed for special events allowed by the city such as Aurora Colony Days.)

The Plan as presented:

The proposed plan does seem to be a good fit, both for the business and the historic commercial district. The HRB recognizes that the applicant has a history of providing quality work to previous projects. The applicant needs to demonstrate how they can comply with the code on details. It is also important that the rules be consistently followed within the entire historic district to avoid the issues that the code seeks to dispel.

Thank you for your consideration on these points.

Gayle Abernathy, Chairman