

Members Present: George Cushing, MJ Guidetti-Clapshaw, Kaylene Toews, Holly Tsur (02 vacancies)
Member Excused: Jennifer Brent
Staff Present: James Reitz
Council Liaison: Richard Kidd
Citizens Present: 04

1. **Call to Order:** Tsur opened the meeting at 7:17 p.m. **The meeting minutes of October 27, 2015 were approved as submitted.**

2. **Citizen Communication:** None.

3. **Action Items / Discussion:**

A. Design Review: Olovson House at 2318 15th Avenue (Washington County Tax Lot 1S3 6CA-400). Applicants: Stephen and Molly Siebert. File Number: 311-15-000024-PLNG.

Tsur read through the procedures for design review. She then verified that there were no conflicts of interest or ex parte contacts on this request. Reitz then described the project, noting that two distinct requests were under consideration. The first request was to rebuild and enlarge the front porch of the house. He noted that the request appeared to comply with the Design Standards. The second request was to construct a new accessory building in the rear yard, to enable storage of a truck and camper on the property near the back property line. Reitz advised that the accessory building would comply with code requirements for height and setbacks, but some specific items would not be in compliance with the Design Standards and would therefore need to be reviewed by the Board.

Reitz advised that the building as submitted would have both metal siding and a metal roof. The staff report contained photos of other outbuildings in the Painter's Woods District; generally, there are no metal buildings in the District except for small garden sheds. The Design Standards stipulate that "new garages and accessory buildings shall be historically consistent with the primary building in style, size, materials and roof." Staff concluded that buildings erected in the Painter's Woods District during the historic period did not have metal siding or roofing, and recommended that this building be clad either with clapboard or droplap siding, consistent with other accessory buildings in the District. In the alternative, board and batten siding might be acceptable, as there is at least one example of that siding type in the District. He said that the applicants had offered to install landscaping between the building and the street, to obscure its appearance.

Tsur opened the public testimony portion of the meeting. Applicants Stephen and Molly Siebert were present to discuss their project. They expressed disappointment that they were not advised earlier of the design requirements during their search for a home to buy in Forest Grove. They were never advised that the Design Standards would not allow a metal building of the type they proposed. Among considerations they asked the Board to consider were the higher cost of composition roofing and wood siding. They also felt that metal siding and roofing would have greater durability and would be easier to maintain as there were several large trees that would drop leaves on the building and due to the low roof pitch and the building's height, metal roofing would allow easier removal of the leaves.

They also said that they had talked to various City employees during the purchase of the house and were not advised of the standards. In fact, they did not hear of this until they had prepared plans and brought them to the City for permits.

There being no one else who wished to testify for or against the proposal, Tsur closed the public testimony portion of the meeting and the Board began deliberations. They first discussed the porch rebuild project and felt that it would be acceptable as proposed. Tsur asked Reitz if this project would be renovation grant-eligible. Reitz replied in the negative, because it would be a new porch and not restoration of the original porch.

Deliberations then shifted to the proposed metal accessory building. All Board members expressed concern about the siding and roofing material, noting that prior to the Council's approval of the design standards, extensive efforts were made to make everyone in the districts aware of them, including local Realtors. Because they are now in effect, all new construction must comply with them.

Because the roof would not be readily visible from the street (since the gable end would face that way), Cushing asked whether that might be a factor the Board should consider. The concern of the Board though was that the adjoining neighbors would still have a view of it. Concern was also expressed that if approved, this might set a precedent for future similar requests.

The Board continued with a discussion of the siding, and although all agreed that horizontal clapboard siding was preferable, vertical board and batten siding would be an acceptable alternative, and might be less expensive.

Deliberations concluded with the Board noting that our historic neighborhoods are part of the appeal of this community and that the standards were adopted to protect the districts from unsuitable construction. The Board felt very strongly that there were not sufficient reasons to allow a deviation from the standards for this project.

Toews/Cushing to approve the porch project based on the findings in the staff report, and with the conditions noted below. Motion carried unanimously.

Toews/Cushing to approve the accessory building based on the findings in the staff report, and with the conditions noted below. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of the application shall include the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant shall be bound to the project description and all representations made by the applicant during the application and decision-making proceeding.**
- 2. The applicant shall comply with all applicable City building codes and standards.**
- 3. Gutters and downspouts on both the home and accessory structure shall be copper or painted sheet metal.**
- 4. The accessory building shall have roofing similar to the composition roofing on the house.**
- 5. The garage door, person door, and window trim on the accessory structure shall be painted consistent with the applicant's proposal.**
- 6. The accessory structure shall have either clapboard or droplap wood siding. In the alternative, the accessory structure shall be clad with board-and-batten siding.**
- 7. The yard north of the accessory structure shall be landscaped to screen the building from 15th Avenue.**

B. Renovation Grant Request: Anderson Building at 2001-2003 Main Street (Washington County Tax Lot 1S3 6BB-600) Applicant: Roman Ozeruga. File Number: 311-15-000025-PLNG. At the applicant's request, this matter was set over to the December meeting because he could not attend this evening.

- C. Strategic Plan Kick-Off:** Bernadette Niederer and Dave Pinyerd of Historic Preservation Northwest (HPNW) were introduced. They led the discussion of the proposed questionnaire to be sent out to determine the interests of the community. They noted that one of the first decisions to be made would be how the survey would be distributed – mail, online, or both. They said that a 5% response would be considered a great rate of return. The Board discussed whether just a paper questionnaire or some type of online response would be viable; and what type of online questionnaire should be used. It was the consensus of the Board that a questionnaire in the City utility bills and also in whatever online survey method the City uses would be preferable.

They noted that they had received the list of potential questions the Board had previously developed and had distilled them down to a two-page questionnaire. There followed a lot of discussion about what questions to ask and how to make them even more relevant. Among the topics discussed were questions about how to get more people involved with historical issues and the types of information we were looking for, that would inform our decisions about guardianship, preservation, education, and additional site surveys.

They felt that they now had a better idea of the types of questions the Board was looking to include in the survey. A timetable was discussed and the Board concluded that the questionnaire needed to be completed as soon as possible in order to get it distributed with the next cycle of utility bills. All were requested to get their suggested revisions to the consultants by the following Monday.

- D. Renovation Grant Policies:** Due to the lateness of the hour, this item was set over to the December meeting.

4. Old Business/New Business:

- Council Liaison Report: Kidd updated the Board on various items of interest, including an update on the Times Litho site.
- Tsur noted that Councilor Uhing was in the hospital; she requested that everyone sign a get well card.
- Tsur commented that she will be sharing her duties as Chair with other Board members, so that all can better understand the process.
- Tsur reminded everyone that January 21st is the date of the Boards and Commissions dinner and she needs pictures of grant-project homes from the past year for her presentation.
- Staff update: Reitz had nothing to report.
- Reitz reminded everyone that, consistent with past practice, the December meeting will be moved up a week to the 15th.

- 5. Adjournment:** The November 24, 2015 meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by George Cushing, Secretary