

Dayton Historic Preservation Committee Minutes of meeting of February 3, 2016

Present: Chair Judy Gerrard, Kelly Haverkate, Wayne Herring, Dave Hargett, Martha Goodrich

Staff: Debra Lien

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 pm. The order of the agenda was approved, and there was no public comment.

Approval of minutes of January 6, 2016

Kelly made a motion to approve the minutes as written, seconded by Wayne. The motion was approved, 5-0.

Review for request for Exterior Alteration at 304 Ferry St. File # Historic Alteration 2016-01

Kelly noted that since she is the property manager for this project, she is going to recuse herself from voting. She is here as the applicant.

Applicant testimony

This request is for **window** repair/replacement. There is additional deterioration on the building, but it won't be addressed now. They aren't ready to do a complete remodel now. The windows are in very poor shape. The windows will be placed in such a fashion that when they do the seismic upgrades in the future they can be pulled out for that work.

If the windows can't be repaired, they will be replaced by a firm in Portland who specializes in historic repair/replacement.

Paul Falsetto, project architect, will do an assessment of the project next week. Kelly will not have a budget until then. If the four upstairs windows on the front of the building don't use up all the CLG grant money, some of the windows in the back and on the side may be addressed as well. Prior grants used the criteria that the grant money be used for façade work, Here all are visible from the public right-of-way, even if not on the front for the building. She asked if the group needs to have a discussion about which windows can be rehabilitated by the grant. She noted this project will not include the transom windows or the stairs. She shared that the stairs do not meet current building code, but that will be addressed later. How they will deal with the stairs depends on how they utilize the

building. They may replace the second doorway in the front. The building was first created with two “storefronts”.

The architect feels the front windows should be single pane flats. Because of noise and smell considerations, the windows on the back and side likely will be double pane, thermal pane to ameliorate those issues, but in the style they are now. This answered Judy’s concern about not making them all the same. Kelly said her feeling is that they will replace them all. SHPO has not had a problem in the past approving when they replace rather than repair due to the quality of replacement materials and true replication.

Kelly reassured the group the openings will remain the same. She also said the concrete sills have already been refurbished. This was done when the brickwork was done.

Judy asked about the appearance of differing sizes for the windows on the back of the building. There was a general discussion about the windows on the back of the building, and how they are of several different sizes. The upstairs door to nowhere will have to be addressed at some point.

Judy said the “C” windows let a lot of light in. Kelly agreed.

Judy said the architect has done a fine job on the two other projects he has worked on (Harris Building and Baptist Church), so the group should have no concerns there for this project.

Judy said she feels since the windows on the back and the side can be seen from the right-of-way they should be included in this project. Using the grant money for the windows on the back and side seems appropriate for her.

Dave asked about the next budget cycle and what sort of projects could be included.

To go along with Dave’s question, Judy suggested that the Heritage Conference is a great opportunity for group members to network with attendees from other cities and ask how they spent their grant money.

Wayne said we need to use the current money for this project, he suggested we start contacting people this spring who might be interested in rehabilitation of historic homes for the next grant cycle.

Debra mentioned we could send out a survey to property owners to get a feel for who might be interested. Judy said if they are interested, they could participate in the grant. She cautioned we need to make sure they are aware this is a matching grant and any money they receive must be counted as income for tax purposes. This needn’t be put in the survey, but they need to be aware.

They group then went through the decision criteria in section 7.2.112.07, F, page 15 of the agenda packet.

1. Will mimic and restore what is there, criteria is met.
2. Based on application, met.
3. There will be no change. This criteria met.
4. N/A at this point.
5. Concrete sills are already done. Number of panes will be the same.
6. Yes, planned, if possible. Replacement if not.
7. None planned.
8. N/A
9. N/A
10. Guidelines were considered.
11. Information will be shared. Based on the criteria, the group feels the approval requirements in section D can be met.

Dave asked how we can know whether replacement will be done instead of repairing, because it is cheaper and easier. Who monitors this issue? Judy said the integrity of the architect for this project is above reproach. The company that will do the work has a reputation to uphold, also.

Kelly said SHPO reviews and approves the project; the windows aren't in good shape. After this project they will need to last another hundred years. Likely, after the assessment, the recommendation will be they need to be replaced. Judy said she feels confident in this situation that the review will be thorough and honest and was done with objective eyes.

Kelly said for the first CLG grant, one of the projects had a vinyl window put in, Kelly noticed it and told them it wasn't allowed. Joy Sears from SHPO noticed it also and said to rectify the situation, they would be allowed to frame the window in wood.

Motion

Martha made a motion to recommend that the request for exterior alteration be approved as a staff decision because the criteria have been met and that the CLG grant money be applied to this project. The group also recommended that the decision be handled as a staff decision and not as a public hearing before the Planning Commission. Wayne seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0. Kelly did not vote.

Other Business

Kelly talked about noticing Lone Star Barbecue covering the transom windows with a large sign. She made them aware of the façade improvements done under the previous

grant and told them about the requirements that no changes be made to repairs and restorations covered under the grant, for a period of five years.

The lights at the Francis Court project were discussed. Kelly said they will be toned down.

Kelly asked about the possibility of lights in the trees on Ferry St. Debra said this would be the responsibility of public works.

It was decided not to hold a meeting in March unless a new application requires it. We will meet in April but not May because of the Heritage Conference in Salem on May 4-6.

We need to start talking about the next grant cycle.

Dave asked what if the windows can't be done, will we lose the money? Judy said there will be costs associated with architect's fees, etc., that will use up a portion of the grant money. We may have to come up with some other project.

The project at 407 Church St. was discussed. No one on the committee was familiar with the contractors. There was concern over their deadline. Debra said they were made aware that the process would take time when they applied in December.

Adjournment

Kelly made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Martha. The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 by a vote of 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Lien
Community Development Specialist