



**DRAFT**  
**CITY OF CORVALLIS**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**MARCH 10, 2015**

**Present**

Rosalind Keeney, Acting Chair  
 Tyler Jacobsen  
 Peter Kelly  
 Cathy Kerr  
 Charles Robinson  
 Mike Wells

**Staff**

Carl Metz, Associate Planner  
 Rian Amiton, Associate Planner  
 Daniel Miller, Deputy City Attorney  
 Mark Lindgren, Recorder

**Absent**

Lori Stephens, Chair  
 Kristin Bertilson, Vice Chair  
 Eric Hand  
 Jim Ridlington, Planning Comm. Liaison  
 Roen Hogg, Council Liaison

**Guests**

Kathy Seeburger  
 Josh Smith  
 Vicki L. Young  
 Rebecca Houghtaling

**Excused**

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

	Agenda Item	Held for Further Review	Recommendations
I.	Visitor Propositions		None.
II.	Public Hearings A. Stutz House (HPP15-00001) B. First Christian Church (HPP15-00002) C. OSU National Historic District (HPP15-00004)		A. Motion passed to approve the application as presented and conditioned. B. Motion passed to approve the application as presented and conditioned.  C. Motion passed to approve the application as presented and conditioned.
III.	Minutes Review- January 13, 2015		January 13, 2015 minutes approved as presented.
IV.	Other Business/Info Sharing a. May Historic Preservation Month Overview b. Oregon Heritage Conference, Coos Bay, April 22-24, 2015 c. CLG Grant Update d. HRC Window Training e. HRC Recruitment		
V.	Adjournment		Meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Attachments to the March 10, 2015 minutes:

A. Memorandum regarding OSU National Historic District (HPP15-00004), Written Testimony.

## **CONTENT OF DISCUSSION**

Given the absence of Chair Stephens and Vice Chair Bertilson, Commissioner Cathy Kerr moved and Commissioner Tyler Jacobsen seconded to nominate Rosalind Keeney as Acting Chair; motion passed. Chair Keeney opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. at the Downtown Fire Station Meeting room.

**I. VISITOR PROPOSITIONS:** None.

## **II. PUBLIC HEARINGS –A. STUTZ HOUSE (HPP15-00001)**

### **A. Opening and Procedures:**

The Chair reviewed the public hearing procedures. Staff will present an overview followed by the applicant's presentation. There will be a staff report and public testimony, followed by rebuttal by the applicant, limited in scope to issues raised in opposition and sur-rebuttal by opponents, limited in scope to issues raised on rebuttal. The Commission may ask questions of staff, engage in deliberations, and make a final decision. Any person interested in the agenda may offer relevant oral or written testimony. Please try not to repeat testimony offered by earlier speakers. It is sufficient to say you concur with earlier speakers without repeating their testimony. For those testifying this evening, please keep your comments brief and directed to the criteria upon which the decision is based.

Land use decisions are evaluated against applicable criteria from the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan. A list of the applicable criteria for this case is available as a handout at the back of the room.

Persons testifying either orally or in writing may request a continuance to address additional documents or evidence submitted in favor of the application. If this request is made, please identify the new document or evidence during your testimony. Persons testifying may also request that the record remain open seven additional days to submit additional written evidence. Requests for allowing the record to remain open should be included within a person's testimony.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

### **B. Declarations by the Commission: Conflicts of Interest, Ex Parte Contacts, Site visits, or Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds**

1. Conflicts of Interest. None declared.
2. Ex Parte Contacts. None declared. No rebuttals were made.
3. Site Visits. All Commissioners declared site visits. Commissioner Robinson stated that he knew the neighborhood well, and walked around the building, including the grassy strip in the rear to look at visibility of both front and rear. Commissioner Kerr looked at front and back of the house, and observed rear fenestration patterns. Commissioners Wells, Jacobsen, Kelly and Keeney reported that they drove by and had nothing in addition to relate.
4. Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds. No objections were made.

### **C. Staff Overview:**

Planner Rian Amiton stated the request was for three modifications: To partially enclose a recessed entryway; install a replacement rear-facing wood window; and to install functional wood shutters.

The site is located at 529 NW 34<sup>th</sup> Street, and is a Historic/Contributing resource within the College Hill West National Historic District. He stated that no public testimony had been received to date.

D. Legal Declaration:

Deputy City Attorney Dan Miller stated that the Commission would consider the applicable criteria as outlined in the staff report, and he asked that citizens direct their testimony to the criteria in the staff report or other criteria that they feel are applicable. It is necessary at this time to raise all issues that are germane to this request. Failure to raise an issue, or failure to provide sufficient specificity to afford the decision-makers an opportunity to respond, precludes an appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals on that issue.

The failure of the applicant to raise constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval with sufficient specificity to allow the local government to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in Circuit Court.

E. Applicant's Presentation:

Owners Kathy Seeburger and Josh Smith related they'd been before the commission about a year ago with a previous application for the house. Mr. Smith noted the original owner was Swiss, so the name "Stutz" was originally pronounced in the Swiss fashion. He said the house desperately needed functional shutters.

Commissioner Robinson asked about the proposal to alter the entryway; Ms. Seeburger replied that it was needed in order to make the entry more usable and to enlarge the kitchen area. Mr. Smith noted the entry hallway currently has five doors that can strike each other, and this design would reduce the number to three doors.

Commissioner Kerr asked whether the milk delivery door would be reused; there is contradictory information in the application. Mr. Smith replied that the intent is to reuse it, though he wasn't able to insert it in the drawing, there is a reference to it in the text. Ms. Seeburger added that the proposal is to center the door, requiring possibly slightly reducing it in size, but they would like to reuse the door. Commissioner Wells asked whether the side door on the right of the entryway was proposed to be eliminated; Mr. Smith agreed that was true.

Commissioner Wells asked about the window change; Ms. Seeburger replied the proposed kitchen project sought to provide internal counter space; however, the window of the current breakfast nook was too low for that.

F. Complete Staff Report:

Planner Amiton stated the Stutz House was built in 1939 and is located within the College Hill West National Historic District. It is identified in the Historic Resource Survey as having Georgian Style Colonial Revival architecture and as a significant resource due to its good condition and high level of historic integrity. It lists the structure as having several standard features of Georgian style, including a side-gabled roof, a slightly overhanging second floor and classical detailing. New functional wood shutters were recently added following HRC approval in 2014, with matching dimensions and wood material, as depicted in original blueprints.

The entryway is currently recessed by about 9' 8" deep between the house and garage. The proposal is to alter the entryway by reducing it to between 4' and 5'6" deep, utilizing the existing door, reusing or matching vertical tongue-and-groove siding, and the existing exterior light fixture would be retained.

Another proposal is to replace an existing rear-facing window and add shutters to the new window, and replacing it with a smaller 6/6 double hung window, matching other rear-facing 6/6 windows, and framed by the functional matching wood shutters. The shutters would mimic those shown in the original blueprint, and although they would not precisely match, they would share many of the same design elements and materials.

The third proposal is to add functional wood shutters to the existing rear-facing garage window, matching other shutters on the rear of the house.

Some of the relevant LDC compatibility criteria include Facades. Regarding the proposal to bring the entry wall forward, since a specific dimension was not proposed in the application, staff recommended a Condition of Approval for the entryway to retain at least a four-foot recess from the front of the house to maintain a historic differentiation in the facade. The rear 6/6 double-hung window will match windows above and adjacent to it, and the window opening will be adjusted from its existing location so that it lines up horizontally and vertically with other 6/6 double-hung windows on the facade. New shutters for the replacement window and the rear-facing garage window will match existing western red cedar shutters, which largely mimic the shutters in the original blueprints of the house.

Regarding Building Materials, the proposed alteration would be made of new or reused wood, appropriate to the historic character of the house. The existing wood siding within the recessed entryway would be re-used or matched in-kind, as would the wood door and the wood milk delivery door. The new shutters on the rear-facing façade would be the same western red cedar as the recently installed shutters.

Regarding Architectural Details, the covered entryway existing elements would be re-used or replaced in-kind. The new rear-facing 6/6 double-hung window will feature 7/8" muntins to match existing windows, and the wooden trim to be replaced would be re-used. The proposed new shutters around the new window and existing garage window would match other recently installed shutters.

Regarding Scale and Proportion, the new rear-facing window would be a little smaller than the window it would replace, but would match the size of the adjacent 6/6 double-hung windows. The new shutters would match the existing shutters on the rear of the house.

Regarding the Pattern of Window and Door Openings, the new 6/6 double-hung window would align vertically and horizontally with other 6/6 double-hung windows. New shutters would frame the windows as the other shutters frame the windows. Staff found the proposal was consistent with applicable review criteria, and recommend approval with three Conditions of Approval, including two standard Conditions, and a third that the front-facing wall and door within the exterior entryway shall be recessed by no less than four feet.

- G. Public Testimony in favor of the application: None.
- H. Public Testimony in opposition of the application: None.
- I. Neutral testimony: None.
- J. Additional Questions for Staff: None.
- K. Rebuttal by Applicant: None.

- L. Sur-rebuttal: None.
- M. Additional time for applicant to submit final argument:  
The applicant waived the right to submit additional testimony and there was not a request for a continuance or to hold the record open.
- N. Close the public hearing:  
The Chair closed the public hearing.
- O. Discussion and Action by the Commission:  
Commissioner Jacobsen commented the only concern he had was regarding 2.9.100.04.g, the Pattern of Windows and Door openings, as relates to the rear-facing window, changing from a 9 lite to a 6 lite window, and moving it in response to internal space needs. It is compatible with other windows in the house. He had no issues with the proposed door or shutter changes. Commissioner Wells stated that he had a similar concern, but noted that the window is in the rear, so it is of lesser concern, and does line up.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Jacobsen moved to approve the application as presented and conditioned in the staff report and findings; Commissioner Wells seconded; motion passed unanimously.

- P. Appeal Period:

The Chair stated that any participant not satisfied with this decision may appeal to the City Council within 12 days of the date that the Notice of Disposition is signed.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS –B. FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH (HPP15-00002)**

- A. Opening and Procedures:

The Chair reviewed the public hearing procedures. Staff will present an overview followed by the applicant's presentation. There will be a staff report and public testimony, followed by rebuttal by the applicant, limited in scope to issues raised in opposition and sur-rebuttal by opponents, limited in scope to issues raised on rebuttal. The Commission may ask questions of staff, engage in deliberations, and make a final decision. Any person interested in the agenda may offer relevant oral or written testimony. Please try not to repeat testimony offered by earlier speakers. It is sufficient to say you concur with earlier speakers without repeating their testimony. For those testifying this evening, please keep your comments brief and directed to the criteria upon which the decision is based.

Land use decisions are evaluated against applicable criteria from the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan. A list of the applicable criteria for this case is available as a handout at the back of the room.

Persons testifying either orally or in writing may request a continuance to address additional documents or evidence submitted in favor of the application. If this request is made, please identify the new document or evidence during your testimony. Persons testifying may also request that the record remain open seven additional days to submit additional written evidence. Requests for allowing the record to remain open should be included within a person's testimony.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

B. Declarations by the Commission: Conflicts of Interest, Ex Parte Contacts, Site visits, or Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds

1. Conflicts of Interest. None declared.
2. Ex Parte Contacts. None declared. No rebuttals were made.
3. Site Visits. All Commissioners reported site visits. Commissioner Robinson stated that he drove and looked at the front and back and location of the signage; Commissioner Kerr concurred. Commissioner Wells related that he drove by and lives nearby. Commissioners Jacobsen and Keeney stated that they had nothing to add.
4. Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds. No objections were made.

C. Staff Overview:

Planner Amiton stated that the request is to install new signage above the front (north) and rear (south) entrances to the church, to be comprised of aluminum lettering painted in a dark bronze color. The site is located at 602 SW Madison Avenue, and is a Designated Historic Resource in the Corvallis Register of Historic Landmarks and Districts. He stated that no public testimony had been received to date.

D. Legal Declaration:

City Deputy Attorney Dan Miller stated that the Commission would consider the applicable criteria as outlined in the staff report, and he asked that citizens direct their testimony to the criteria in the staff report or other criteria that they feel are applicable. It is necessary at this time to raise all issues that are germane to this request. Failure to raise an issue, or failure to provide sufficient specificity to afford the decision-makers an opportunity to respond, precludes an appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals on that issue.

The failure of the applicant to raise constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval with sufficient specificity to allow the local government to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in Circuit Court.

E. Applicant's Presentation:

Vicki L. Young stated she was a volunteer speaking on behalf of the church. The church brought a sign proposal forward in 2013, and now proposes modifying lettering of signs at the front and rear, and using longer lasting painted aluminum (instead of acrylic), which can be curved and painted to match building materials such as handrails and stained glass framing. She noted the pictures in the application did not reflect the actual size of the lettering, though the text was correct- the five-inch letters on the front and eight-inch letters on the rear would remain the same size, well within signage rules.

Commissioner Kerr asked whether the letters would be painted or anodized; Ms. Young replied that they would be painted.

F. Complete Staff Report:

Planner Amiton stated that the building was constructed in 1924 in Classic Revival Style. The Historic Resource Survey reports the building to be in good condition. Alterations in recent years include replacement or repair of windows, north entrance railings and construction of an enclosure around an exhaust duct, all of which received HRC approval, and have only negligibly impacted the historic integrity of the structure.

The request is for sign lettering. The proposal is for half-inch thick aluminum letters reading "First Christian Church" for both entrances, to be painted in dark bronze, matching the frame color of tempered glass window coverings and the handrail on the front steps. The proposal is a

modification to lettering approved in 2013 by the HRC permitting installation of ½” thick acrylic letters also painted dark bronze. He clarified that based on submitted graphics, the staff report erroneously stated that the previously approved lettering was slightly smaller than what is currently proposed; however, on further review, the current letters would be the same size, but the previously approved lettering was on a wider span than is currently proposed. It is reasonable to conclude that the HRC in 2013 intended to approve larger letters and span than is currently proposed; however, those previous meeting minutes don’t specify letter size. There is also a proposal in the narrative to alter some of the address numbering, but that is exempt from HPP requirements and HRC approval.

Regarding LDC compatibility criteria, staff found the proposed painted aluminum sign Building Materials to be compatible with the stucco exterior. Regarding Architectural Details, lettering will be attached to existing wood trim over the north entrance and to the face of the canopy extending over the southern entrance. All architectural and character-defining features will be retained. Staff found that the simple design of the lettering would not detract from the building’s appearance or character.

Regarding Scale and Proportion, the sign letters proposed for the north entrance are five inches tall and span almost 7.5’; and letters proposed for the south canopy are proposed to be eight inches tall and span about 11’ 9.5”. Staff found the dimensions and placement of sign lettering were appropriate for the building and consistent with the Scale and Proportion criterion. He summarized that staff found the proposal was consistent with applicable review criteria and recommended approval with Conditions of Approval.

- G. Public Testimony in favor of the application: None.
- H. Public Testimony in opposition of the application: None.
- I. Neutral testimony: None.
- J. Additional Questions for Staff: None.
- K. Rebuttal by Applicant: None.
- L. Sur-rebuttal: None.
- M. Additional time for applicant to submit final argument:  
The applicant waived the right to submit additional testimony and there was not a request for a continuance or to hold the record open.
- N. Close the public hearing:  
The Chair closed the public hearing.
- O. Discussion and Action by the Commission:

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Kerr moved to approve the application as presented and conditioned in the staff report and findings; Commissioner Robinson seconded; motion passed unanimously.

- P. Appeal Period:  
The Chair stated that any participant not satisfied with this decision may appeal to the City Council within 12 days of the date that the Notice of Disposition is signed.

## II. PUBLIC HEARINGS –C. OSU NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT – LIGHT POLES (HPP15-00004)

### A. Opening and Procedures:

The Chair reviewed the public hearing procedures. Staff will present an overview followed by the applicant's presentation. There will be a staff report and public testimony, followed by rebuttal by the applicant, limited in scope to issues raised in opposition and sur-rebuttal by opponents, limited in scope to issues raised on rebuttal. The Commission may ask questions of staff, engage in deliberations, and make a final decision. Any person interested in the agenda may offer relevant oral or written testimony. Please try not to repeat testimony offered by earlier speakers. It is sufficient to say you concur with earlier speakers without repeating their testimony. For those testifying this evening, please keep your comments brief and directed to the criteria upon which the decision is based.

Land use decisions are evaluated against applicable criteria from the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan. A list of the applicable criteria for this case is available as a handout at the back of the room.

Persons testifying either orally or in writing may request a continuance to address additional documents or evidence submitted in favor of the application. If this request is made, please identify the new document or evidence during your testimony. Persons testifying may also request that the record remain open seven additional days to submit additional written evidence. Requests for allowing the record to remain open should be included within a person's testimony.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

### B. Declarations by the Commission: Conflicts of Interest, Ex Parte Contacts, Site visits, or Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds

1. Conflicts of Interest. None declared.
2. Ex Parte Contacts. None declared. No rebuttals were made.
3. Site Visits. Chair Keeney noted that there was not really a site to visit.
4. Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds. No objections were made.

### C. Staff Overview:

Planner Carl Metz stated the request was for approval to install Campus Standard Historic Style Light Poles along sidewalks, walks, and walkways throughout the OSU National Historic District as required by the LDC and as needed. The District is about 168 acres, bounded generally by Orchard and Monroe Avenue on the north, 11<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Streets on the east, Jefferson Avenue and Washington Way on the south, and 30<sup>th</sup> Street on the west. The District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

As of the writing of the staff report, staff had not received any public testimony; however, a couple days ago public testimony was received, and was included in the distributed staff memo, and he said he would describe it during his staff report. (**Attachment A**) He noted that it had not been forwarded to OSU Planning staff. That testimony requested that the lights be 100% cutoff fixtures and Dark Sky rated. The staff memo references LDC provisions that apply to light fixtures and how that relates to the proposed units.

D. Legal Declaration:

Deputy City Attorney Dan Miller stated that the Commission would consider the applicable criteria as outlined in the staff report, and he asked that citizens direct their testimony to the criteria in the staff report or other criteria that they feel are applicable. It is necessary at this time to raise all issues that are germane to this request. Failure to raise an issue, or failure to provide sufficient specificity to afford the decision-makers an opportunity to respond, precludes an appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals on that issue.

The failure of the applicant to raise constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval with sufficient specificity to allow the local government to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in Circuit Court.

E. Applicant's Presentation:

OSU Senior Planner Rebecca Houghtaling highlighted the three criteria in LDC Section 3.36.60.16, Exterior Lighting. She noted that sidewalks and walkways have different definitions within the OSU Zone. That Code specifies that "historic style light fixtures shall have poles and bases and associated pole-mounted equipment, such as banners, hangers, etc, and finished with neutral gray, black or other dark color".

She related that OSU and the HRC worked together in 2014 to revise portions of the LDC Chapter 2.9, with the intent to update the list of activities exempt from HPP and City staff review, including installation of campus standard historic style light poles. As part of that revision, LDC Chapter 2.9.70.h was adjusted to exempt accessory development less than 14' in height, including light poles. However, due to an oversight, it was not realized that these poles are taller than 14', thus exceeding the maximum allowable height permitted in the exemption in some areas within the District. She displayed a map showing placement of Historic Style Light Poles along walkways and sidewalks throughout the District.

Ms. Houghtaling highlighted the photos and illustrations of the light poles in Attachment A-11 in the packet, saying that OSU has used the Visco poles, bases and fixtures as the campus standard since 1991. The pole design is a Visco Series A with an iron base and a louver inside the globe that provides full light cutoff and meets Corvallis Dark Sky requirements. They are typically painted black and laid out straight along sidewalks and walkways within the OSU Zone. Campus areas with main thoroughfares and high volumes of traffic have poles that feature single or double-arm banners; she highlighted Attachments A-11 and A-13 in the packet with drawings and photos of banners.

She highlighted Attachments B-1 and B-2 to clarify a misunderstanding with City staff regarding pole total height. The campus standard historic style Visco light pole is twelve-feet tall, the finial globe, globe fitter and capital is 38 7/8", with a total assembled height of just over fifteen feet in height, which is why the request was for a sixteen foot total. In addition to Visco, there are also a smaller number of "Hall of Fame" Granville globes (also on Visco poles), which are 39 1/4" total, slightly higher, at 15' 3 1/4". The "Hall of Fame" globes are LED's installed face down with a full cutoff feature that also meets Dark Sky Code.

Ms. Houghtaling stated that OSU is requesting approval to install historic style light poles along sidewalks and walkways throughout the OSU National Historic District, and hope that within three years, if the HRC approves the request, that OSU will get an exemption for its historic style light poles.

Commissioner Robinson asked the total number of poles; Ms. Houghtaling replied that there were 652 standard historic style Visco poles and 12 Hall of Fame style poles campus-wide, with another

18 proposed (not all of these are within the Historic District). Commissioner Keeney asked if the request was for eighteen more poles; Ms. Houghtaling clarified that OSU was asking for an exemption for a three-year approval, so any project requiring a sidewalk or walkway would get automatic blanket approval for the poles, avoiding getting approvals for each one for the three-year period. She said City staff directed OSU to request a general application to avoid having to come back to install light poles as required by Code.

Commissioner Wells asked if there was Code for a maximum number of poles that would go in; Ms. Houghtaling replied that as a State institution, OSU had limited funds, so OSU did not install lights that were not required. Commissioner Keeney asked about placement in relation to sidewalks or walkways; Ms. Houghtaling replied that OSU is required to install lights adjacent to sidewalks and walkways; however, in some cases, due to presence of obstructions or underground utilities, they must be placed where there is space.

Commissioner Kerr asked if both types had a louver mechanism, so that the lights shine down. Ms. Houghtaling replied that it is an internal part of the fixture, not the lamping. The Hall of Fame globe is an LED light, inverted so it all shines down, while the Visco lights have louvers. Commissioner Keeney asked about the installation of other electrical-related equipment.

F. Complete Staff Report:

Planner Metz stated that the proposed fixture designs comply with LDC requirements and match HRC-approved fixtures located both within and outside the District. The applicant described the proposed light fixtures well.

Regarding the review criteria, Chapter 2.9 requires alteration or new construction activities to complement the architectural design or style of the primary resource; in this case, that would be the District. Relevant compatibility criteria include Building Materials- the primary fixture materials are steel, acrylic or glass, and brass or gold colored accents, which are materials used in existing light fixtures throughout the district, so as proposed and conditioned, staff found materials reflective and complementary to those found throughout the District.

Regarding, the poles are no more than twenty inches in diameter and will not exceed 16' in height. Most buildings in the District are at least two stories high and greater than sixteen feet tall, so as proposed and conditioned, staff found the size and proportions of the poles compatible with existing structures throughout the District, and Scale and Proportion and Height criterion. Similarly, pole heights do not exceed that of most existing District structures, and satisfies the criterion.

Regarding Accessory Development and Accessory Structures, the proposed fixture designs match existing light poles installed throughout the campus, including those already approved by the Commission. Staff found that they are visually compatible with architectural design or style of the District.

Regarding the written testimony submitted to staff, the staff memo discussed the applicable review criteria for development standards regarding shielding and Dark Sky provisions. OSU has its own requirement that the historic light fixtures have shielded luminaries that minimize uplighting and glare along sidewalks and walkways.

Section 4.2.80 states that light sources shall be concealed or shielded to the maximum extent feasible to minimize the potential for glare and unnecessary diffusion on adjacent properties. The LDC requires light sources be shielded or concealed, but does not specifically require that fixtures be full cut-off; however, the proposed Visco lights use an internal louver assembly to minimize

uplighting and the LED lights are directed downward. The globe fixtures are textured to obscure the light source and staff found that they appear to satisfy applicable LDC requirements. Compliance with these requirements will also need to be addressed at the time of permitting at Development Services Division. Staff found there were no applicable HRC-level HPP review criteria relating to new construction compatibility on properties outside the Historic District, and compatibility with adjacent properties or with the community at large is addressed through applicable provisions of the LDC. The light fixtures satisfy the requirements of the LDC and applicable review criteria of the HPP, so staff recommended approval, with five Conditions of Approval, with the last three reinforcing the design parameters of the light poles described within the submitted plans.

Regarding the three-year time frame for the proposal that was discussed, there is not necessarily a sunset period, though there are expirations for HPP's. That three-year period was not included in application materials. Planner Metz said that from a City staff perspective, after the first is implemented, they can continue to fill them as needed through Development. If the standard ever changes, they would have to request a new HPP, or the LDC could be altered to incorporate an exemption for light fixtures that exceed 14' but less than 16'. Regarding Commissioner Keeney's question about possible electrical-related accessory structures, he said it would possibly be addressed elsewhere in Chapter 2.9 for ground-level mechanical equipment.

G. Public Testimony in favor of the application: None.

H. Public Testimony in opposition of the application: None.

I. Neutral testimony: None.

J. Additional Questions for Staff: None.

K. Rebuttal by Applicant: None.

L. Sur-rebuttal: None.

M. Additional time for applicant to submit final argument:

The applicant waived the right to submit additional testimony and there was not a request for a continuance or to hold the record open.

N. Close the public hearing:

The Chair closed the public hearing.

O. Discussion and Action by the Commission:

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Jacobsen moved to approve the application as presented and conditioned in the staff report and findings; Commissioner Kerr seconded; motion passed unanimously.

P. Appeal Period:

The Chair stated that any participant not satisfied with this decision may appeal to the City Council within 12 days of the date that the Notice of Disposition is signed.

### III. MINUTES REVIEW:

#### **January 13, 2015-**

Commissioner Jacobsen moved and Commissioner Robinson seconded to approve the January 13, 2015 minutes as presented; motion passed.

### IV. OTHER BUSINESS/INFORMATION SHARING.

#### **A. May Historic Preservation Month Overview.**

Planner Metz stated he'd distributed the preliminary list of events, including tours, workshops, and a May 21 awards ceremony at the Independent School in Philomath. He said City staff were coordinating with Benton County staffer Chris Bentley and PreservationWorks. He noted that there was a need for volunteers for the tours, activities and the award ceremony and asked that Commissioners contact him.

He highlighted a May 16 Farmers Market booth; Commissioner Keeney explained a demonstration would focus on historic windows. She said that Chris Gustavson is a local area historic window guru, and will do hands-on work to a window, giving a chance for questions and dialog. There will be handouts on how to save historic windows and why one should do so. She will be on hand from 10 a.m. to noon and encouraged other Commissioners to also attend, since it will help gauge the questions and interests of the public.

She said she, B.A. Beierle and Chris Bentley and have volunteered to make a Footwise window display, and there will be a contest with a window styles "treasure hunt" to encourage people to look at historic windows in the community. She related that the City Council recently upheld the Commission's decision on fiberglass windows, with three Councilors voting in opposition to the decision.

Planner Metz said the event calendar was still in draft form, and encouraged Commissioners to volunteer at events and activities. He said that the Commission also needed to discuss nominations and awards. In the past, there have not been many nominations from the public, so Commissioners often made most nominations. He will email out a list of previous awards and categories. He asked for nominations within the next couple weeks, with a justification of why a nomination was worthy, with Commissioner discussion to follow.

#### **B. Oregon Heritage Conference, Coos Bay, April 22-24, 2015**

Planner Metz highlighted a tentative schedule of workshops and trainings for the conference, to be held between Wednesday and Friday, April 22-24 in Coos Bay, Oregon. The CLG grant, *if* it is approved, includes funding for some reimbursement for commissioners to attend trainings and conferences such as this. He said that he himself also hoped to attend.

**C. CLG Grant Update.** Planner Metz reported that the CLG grant was submitted to State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on February 27, 2015. The application reflects the HRC's January discussion, with \$10,000 set aside towards creation of a Historic Preservation Plan.

**D. HRC Window Training.** Commissioner Keeney asked if Commissioners were interested in participating in a SHPO window training during a regularly scheduled meeting time. She said the subject was, and would likely continue, to be controversial. Commissioner Wells suggested scheduling it when there was, say, only one hearing. Commissioner Keeney suggested inviting others to attend; Planner Metz said Open Meeting regulations would have to be followed. Commissioner Keeney will follow up with her SHPO contact.

**E. HRC Recruitment.**

Planner Metz related three members' terms are set to expire; they must reapply if they seek to continue serving. Commissioner Jacobsen elected to not re-apply, so there will be at least one vacancy, and Commissioners Stephens and Bertilson's terms will also be up.

**V. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.



## MEMORANDUM

Date: March 10, 2015

To: Historic Resources Commission

From: Carl Metz, Associate Planner - Community Development Department *CM*

Re: OSU National Historic District (HPP15-00004), Written Testimony

Staff received an email from a citizen on March 7, 2015, requesting that the proposed light pole fixtures be "100 percent cutoff, dark sky rated." This memorandum includes a copy of this written testimony. The proposed light poles are subject to **Land Development Code (LDC) Sections 3.36.60.16 and 4.2.80**, which speak to shielding or dark-sky provisions. The most pertinent language of these provisions is provided below:

### Section 3.36.60.16 – Exterior Lighting

- b. OSU historic style light fixtures with shielded luminaires that minimize uplighting and glare shall be used along sidewalks and walkways.

### Section 4.2.80 - SITE AND STREET LIGHTING

Pursuant to City Council Policy 91-9.04, "The City of Corvallis is interested in well shielded, energy efficient street lighting sources that direct the light source downward where it is needed, not up or sideways where it is wasted and causes glare, light trespass, and bright skies."

All developers shall submit a proposed lighting plan for approval that meets the functional security needs of the proposed land use without adversely affecting adjacent properties or the community. This criteria is satisfied upon compliance with the provisions listed below and shall be substantiated by the applicant's submittal of the necessary information to demonstrate compliance, such as information including but not limited to manufacturers' specifications:

- d. **Light sources shall be concealed or shielded to the maximum extent feasible to minimize the potential for glare and unnecessary diffusion on adjacent property. Compliance with this provision shall be demonstrated by ensuring that, when evaluated from a point four ft. above the ground, bulbs of light fixtures are not visible from adjacent property.**

As described above, the LDC requires light sources to be shielded and/or concealed, but there is no requirement for fixtures to be full cut-off. The proposed Visco lights utilize an internal louver assembly (**see Attachment A.12 of the March 3, 2015, staff report to the HRC**) to minimize uplighting, and, according to the applicant, the proposed Granville II globe LEDs (**see Attachment A.12**) are directed downward to minimize uplighting. Additionally, the globes' surfaces are textured which obscures the light source. Staff's preliminary assessment of the proposed lights finds that the lights appear to satisfy applicable LDC requirements. Compliance with applicable LDC requirements will also need to be addressed at the time of permitting through the Development Services Division (**see Condition of Approval #2**).

Further, **LDC Sections 2.9.100.04.b.2 and "3"** require that a proposed alteration or new construction subject to HRC-level HPP approval be found to be compatible with the affected designated historic resource (in this case the OSU National Historic District). Determination of compatibility requires the consideration of 14 elements such as building materials, height, scale, and proportion per **LDC Section 2.9.100.04.b.3**. The compatibility considerations that most strongly apply to the issues being raised are *Site Development* and *Accessory Development/Structures*. The *Site Development* consideration language refers to compliance with applicable LDC requirements, and the *Accessory Development/Structures* consideration language states that the new construction should be visually compatible with the architectural design of the resource. As discussed above, the proposed fixtures comply with LDC requirements and, as discussed in the **March 3, 2015, staff report to the HRC**, the proposed light poles match the design of other period style light poles found throughout the OSU National Historic District, including those previously approved by the HRC. Staff find that there is no applicable HRC-level HPP review criteria that relates to the consideration of a proposed new construction's compatibility with properties located outside of the affected resource area (aka OSU National Historic District), and that compatibility with adjacent properties, or with the community at large, is addressed through the applicable provisions of the LDC.

**Metz, Carl**

---

**From:** Bob Hazleton  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 07, 2015 3:22 PM  
**To:** Metz, Carl  
**Subject:** 30th and Washington Light

I saw a notice at 30th and Washington about antique street lights.

I would simply ask that these and all street light be 100 percent cutoff, dark sky rated.

I have seen too many light around town that send light every which way.

Thanks,

Bob Hazleton  
Volunteer Coordinator  
Corvallis Half Marathon

**RECEIVED**

MAR 07 2015

Community Development  
Planning Division

SCANNED  
Date: 3/09/15 By: cm