



**DRAFT**  
**CITY OF CORVALLIS**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**SEPTEMBER 13, 2016**

**Present**

Lori Stephens, Chair  
Kathleen Harris  
Peter Kelly  
Cathy Kerr  
Charles Robinson  
Mike Wells  
Jim Ridlington, Planning Comm. Liaison

**Staff**

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

**Guests**

**Absent/Excused**

Kristin Bertilson, Vice Chair  
Rosalind Keeney  
Barbara Bull, Council Liaison

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

	Agenda Item	Recommendations
I.	Community Comments.	None.
II.	Public Hearing A. OSU Snell Hall (HPP16-00011) B. OSU Bates Hall (HPP16-00015)	A. Motion passed to approve as Conditioned. B. Motion passed to approve as Conditioned.
III.	Minutes Review- August 9, 2016	Approved as presented.
IV.	Other Business/Info Sharing A. Historic Preservation Plan Update B. HRC Recruitment	
V.	Adjournment at 7:21 p.m.	

**CONTENT OF DISCUSSION**

Chair Stephens called the Corvallis Historic Resources Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Corvallis Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room, 400 NW Harrison Blvd.

**I. COMMUNITY COMMENTS:** None.

## II. PUBLIC HEARINGS –A. OSU SNELL HALL (HPP16-00011)

### A. Opening and Procedures:

Chair Stephens 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 contained in the staff report.

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.
3. Site Visits. Commissioners Kelly, Harris, Wells and Robinson declared site visits.
4. Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds. There were no rebuttals or objections.

### C. Staff Report:

Planner Metz stated the request was to relocate two existing scuppers, install one new scupper, and remove one brick chimney on Snell Hall. One scupper is on the north elevation, and two are on the east. Snell Hall is located at 2150 SW Jefferson Avenue and classified as a Nonhistoric/ Noncontributing resource within the OSU National Historic District. No public testimony was received.

Snell Hall was constructed in 1958, outside of the District's period of significance. It is modern in design, and architectural features include large expanses of aluminum frame curtain walls, blue metal panels and brick veneer. It was originally built as a dorm and later converted to non-residential office and administration uses in the 1990s.

Two proposed scupper downspout nozzle modifications would place the nozzles about two feet lower than their current locations. The new scupper downspout is proposed for the east façade near the northeast corner. The applicant states the modifications are needed in order to comply with roofing building code requirements. He highlighted conflicting information in the application materials, summarizing that two scuppers are indeed proposed to be relocated, with one new additional scupper, where there currently is none. The chimney to be removed is located near the building's northeast corner, adjacent to the elevator penthouse, and the applicant states that it has not been used since the building was converted to office use.

Regarding Facades criteria, two existing scuppers are on otherwise unadorned brick portions of the facades. The relocated nozzles are proposed to be placed about two feet lower than existing locations. The proposed new location is also within the brick facade. No architectural elements will be affected by alterations. The scupper locations are visible from Jefferson Avenue and Benton Place, about 50' or higher above grade. Given their height and relatively small size, staff found the changes would be barely visible. The chimney is only visible from the secondary east facade. The chimney is largely utilitarian and not strongly related to the building's modern design. Staff found the proposed alterations consistent with compatibility considerations.

Regarding Building Materials, there are conflicting materials regarding the number of scupper downspout nozzles in the request in the application. It is not clear whether the applicant proposes to repurpose two existing nozzles and install one new nozzle, which may or may not match the other two existing scuppers. Given this, staff proposed Condition of Approval #3 to address unclear scupper design, requiring three matching nozzles, whether they match existing nozzle design or a newer design as presented in the application materials. Staff found that use of the newer nozzle design was consistent with the building design and consistent with previous approvals of similarly classified and designed buildings, such as the Pauling, Poling, and Cauthorn Buildings. Staff found the proposal met the criterion.

Staff found that no existing character defining elements would be affected by the proposed alteration and was consistent with the Architectural Details considerations. Staff recommended approval as Conditioned, including Condition of Approval #3, requiring that all three scuppers have matching design.

**D. Legal Declaration:**

Deputy City Attorney Daniel 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 Associate Campus Planner Sara Robinson introduced Project Manager Dustin Siever. The request is for relocation of two scuppers, installation of one new scupper, and removal of a chimney on Snell Hall. Snell Hall is a Noncontributing structure within the OSU National Historic District. It is near Contributing structures McAlexander Fieldhouse and Waldo Hall; and Noncontributing structures Goss Stadium, Valley Library and the Student Experience Center. The two relocated scuppers would be placed about two feet lower than their current location. With the scupper located on the north façade, OSU will either re-use an existing scupper spout or use a new scupper spout, and the existing location will be patched to match the existing brick façade. The east façade's relocated scupper would use a new scupper. OSU will re-use existing scupper spouts or a new one to match existing spouts, or using new scupper spouts on all scuppers; in any case, they will all match each other. She displayed a scupper spout detailed drawing.

The chimney proposed to be removed previously serviced a kitchen for dormitories, but was unused after the conversion to offices. It is proposed to be capped after its removal. The modifications are

being proposed due to reroofing, to meet building code requirements. The deteriorating utilitarian chimney is visible only from the east, and is not an integral part of the character or design of the building. All proposed modifications will not be very noticeable, since the building is about 60' tall.

- F. Public Testimony in favor of the application:** None.
- G. Public Testimony in opposition of the application:** None.
- H. Neutral testimony:** None.
- I. Additional Questions for Staff:** None.
- J. Rebuttal by Applicant:** None.
- K. Sur-rebuttal:** None.
- L. 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.
- M. Close the public hearing:**  
Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.
- N. Discussion and Action by the Commission:**  
  
**MOTION:**  
Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the application as Conditioned, including Condition #3. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion; motion approved unanimously.
- O. Appeal Period:**  
Chair Stephens 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. OSU BATES HALL (HPP16-00015)**

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

Chair Stephens 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 contained in the staff report.

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.
3. Site Visits. Commissioner Kelly and Harris observed scuppers. Commissioner Robinson related her walked through the building and observed scuppers. Commissioner Wells related that he walked around the building
4. Objections on Jurisdictional Grounds. There were no objections.

**C. Staff Report:**

Planner Carl Metz related the request was to relocate six scuppers on the east elevation on OSU Bates Hall. The building is located at 110 SW 26<sup>th</sup> Street, within the OSU National Historic District, and is classified as a Nonhistoric/Noncontributing structure. No public comment was received.

Bates Hall was constructed in 1992, of modern or post-modern design, with a low profile terraced front façade, horizontal massing, and includes rectangular, triangular, circular and linear architectural features and accents. Other architectural elements that are found within the District include use of red brick, running bond and stacked bond soldier course brick work, symmetrical fenestration, contrasting window headers, and a contrasting masonry base.

The applicant requests relocation of six scupper downspout nozzles along first and second stories of the front facade. All subject nozzles are currently within a soldier course near the top of the respective floors. The proposal alteration would relocate existing nozzles just below their current locations within portions of the running bond brickwork. Applicants states the former locations would be filled with brick material to match and repaired as needed.

He noted the applicants originally applied to install two metal cage ladders on the same façade to provide access from the first story roof to the second, but they have since been removed and are not subject to this request.

Regarding the Facades criteria, staff found that the scupper downspout nozzles would continue to be visible on the front façade and that no primary architectural features would be affected by the proposal. Staff found the proposal was consistent with the Facades compatibility criteria.

Regarding Building Materials, the downspout nozzles are proposed to be relocated just below their existing locations. Vacated areas would be filled and repaired with brick material to match the material. Staff found that the use of existing nozzles and use of brick materials to match existing brickwork satisfied the criteria.

Regarding Architectural Details, while the applicant states no architectural details will be affected by the request, staff did not agree, finding that that the stacked bond soldier course (where nozzles are currently located) is indeed an architectural detail, similar to trim or ornamentation, and so found relocation of the nozzles from the soldier course to the running bond portion actually minimized or reduced negative impact on existing architectural detail, and that the alteration was consistent with the

criterion. Staff recommended approval as Conditioned.

**D. Legal Declaration:**

Deputy City Attorney Daniel 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 Campus Planner Sarah Robertson said the proposal was to relocate six scuppers on the east facade of Bates Hall. Bates Hall is a three-story modern style brick building constructed in 1992 on the north edge of the OSU National Historic District. She displayed the overhead view of Bates Hall's location in relation to surrounding buildings. The proposal would move the scuppers to positions just below their current location. Four are on the lower parapet and two on the second floor parapet. The scuppers are currently within the brick soldier course and OSU is proposing relocating them just below that course in the running bond portion, and patching existing the existing locations with material to match existing facades.

The original proposal included a proposal to modify roof access ladders, and they are still shown in some drawings, but they were removed from the application. She displayed a detailed drawing of a scupper. The impetus for the alteration is reroofing the building in a way that meets building code regarding drainage. Existing scuppers will be re-used. Project Manager Dustin Siever explained that the re-design is only for overflow conditions, in which the standard drain has clogged, creating ponding, with additional weight on the roof. The existing drains work fine, but do not meet current mechanical code, and this proposed alteration improves overflow conditions. Commissioner Stephens said the Commission's concern is with how it looks from the outside.

**F. Public Testimony in favor of the application:** None.

**G. Public Testimony in opposition of the application:** None.

**H. Neutral testimony:** None.

**I. Additional Questions for Staff:** None.

**J. Rebuttal by Applicant:** None.

**K. Sur-rebuttal:** None.

**L. 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.

**M. Close the public hearing:**

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

**N. Discussion and Action by the Commission:**

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Kerr moved to approve the application as Conditioned. Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion; motion approved unanimously.

**O. Appeal Period:**

Chair Stephens 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 –AUGUST 9, 2016**

**August 9, 2016-** Commissioner Kerr moved and Commissioner Robinson seconded to accept the minutes as presented; motion passed unanimously.

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS/INFORMATION SHARING.**

**A. Historic Preservation Plan Update.**

Planner Metz reported that the consultant hired to conduct the development of the Historic Preservation Plan has completed the groundwork document. The first public workshop is scheduled for the evening of October 19. October 20 is tentatively scheduled for a meeting between the HRC and the consultant (on a Thursday morning). A project oversight committee will shepherd the final document, and ensure that all testimony is given fair weight in the final document. There will also be three stakeholder small group sessions held on October 20 with the consultant: preservation advocates, neighborhoods and residents, and business and development communities.

He said staff are still looking for participants in stakeholders groups and encouraged Commissions forward suggestions to him, with contact information. He said a second outreach effort will be in early 2017, with a third to view the final product, to be completed around May of 2017. Commissioner Harris asked if Commissioners were allowed to simply observe the stakeholder meetings; Planner Metz replied that he'd check with the consultants.

**B. HRC Recruitment.**

Planner Metz related that applications (available online) will be accepted until September 19 to fill the vacancy on the Commission. Commissioner Harris asked about application criteria. Planner Metz explained that the criteria are not hard and fast, and are just a guideline- the worst case is that an application may not be appointed.

**V. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.