

**CITY OF SILVERTON
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MINUTES**

Silverton Community Center – Council Chambers – 421 South Water St.

Date: March 4, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

I. OPENING CEREMONIES – Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call

Chairman Palmer called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Present	Absent	
X	_____	Chairman Kyle Palmer
X	_____	Jason Freilinger
X	_____	Laurie Carter
X	_____	Jim Sears
X	_____	Dana Smith
X	_____	Matt Plummer
X	_____	Crystal Neideigh

Staff Present:

Agency Director, Christy Wurster; Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu; Assistant to the City Manager/HR Coordinator, Elizabeth Gray; and Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Angela Speier

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member Freilinger moved to approve the minutes from the meetings held on January 7, 2019 and February 6, 2019. Member Smith seconded the motion. Member Carter asked that the following statement be added to the February 6, 2019 minutes: “Mr. O’Day stated that most cities in Oregon give loans and very few give grants.” The members did not recall that statement being made. Staff will review the recording and bring back the minutes from February 6th for approval at a future meeting. The motion to approve the minutes from January 7, 2019 passed unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION

4.1 105 N Water Street Façade Improvement and Building Improvement Grant Request

Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu explained that before the Urban Renewal Agency (URA) is a grant application for a façade and building improvement for 105 N Water Street. The building is owned by Ben Johnston and was constructed in 1961. It is the only non-compatible non-contributing building within the Silverton Commercial Historic District.

Director Gottgetreu explained that the building went through the design review process to get the approval for the development code standards. One of the conditions is to connect the deck to the adjacent deck for the creek walk. That condition has been appealed and will be reviewed by the Planning Commission next week. The next review body would be the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

The façade improvement request is to increase the height of the building to 21 feet four inches with a new parapet wall that is brick façade materials with patterned brick accents and cast stone medallion accents above a new flat awning. A new cornice will be added. A new door and windows will be installed with a ceramic tile accent along the foundation. Three bids were received for the façade improvement with the low bid amounting to \$102,803, making the project eligible for the \$40,000 request.

The proposed building improvements are complete structural upgrades to the settling foundation area to reinforce the main floor and roof structure. A new roof, HVAC system, and creek side deck and railing will be installed. The grant request is for \$200,000 which requires a \$500,000 match. Three bids were received with the low bid amounting to \$756,422, making the project eligible for the \$200,000 request.

The Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (URAC) recommended the approval of the project with the contingency that a public access easement is provided. Director Gottgetreu explained that the creek walk idea is to have connected decks on the backside of buildings along the creek where someone could enter off the sidewalk near the Main Street Bridge and traverse down to the Le Pooch parking lot. He said that the URAC recommended the easement be provided not the connection of the decks, which can be looked at in the future using different urban renewal funds to facilitate that connection. The applicant has proposed a condition where an easement would be established when the easement to the South is made. The URAC felt that the cost of any improvements to allow access by connecting the decks should be the City's responsibility. A lot of the concern is around connecting the two decks physically in terms of the seismic code and tying two buildings together. The decks would need to be separate, but close enough that a person could pass between the two. There would need to be modifications to the existing railing to the south. The applicant has provided the City with easement language which is consistent with the URAC recommendation.

Member Sears asked if the proposed width of the deck is sufficient to provide the walkway area. Director Gottgetreu said that he believes the design is for an eight foot deck and the easement language is to provide the minimum ADA width along the western portion of the deck. He said the deck to the south is ten feet. There is a connection point from the sidewalk to the deck from the south end of the building, but there isn't an easement on the westerly portion of the deck to the south.

Member Smith said that the property to the south originally planned on a five foot deck, but the size increased in order to accommodate a five foot public easement along the outer edge. She would like to ensure that the proposed deck is wide enough to accommodate the future connection. She asked about the other conditions of approval, including bike parking and pedestrian amenities and where those would be located. Director Gottgetreu explained the pedestrian amenity would have to be provided in front of the building and the bike parking would need to be within 50 feet of the entrance. There is bike parking across the street that is sufficient to meet that condition and the code requires some sort of physical public amenity such as a bench or art.

Member Sears asked Director Gottgetreu to expand on the appeal. Director Gottgetreu explained that the applicant appealed the way the condition was written which they said was too general and vague. The applicant has since provided an alternative to the condition in the form of easement language.

Applicants: Mark Hoyt, Ben Johnston, and Blake Bural. Mr. Hoyt indicated that they toured the building today and there are significant structural problems in the basement with settling. This is not a structure that can be easily or economically recaptured without extensive upgrades. This proposal will do those upgrades to the structure and the façade, as well as improve the deck. The applicants said that they think there would be enough overlap to accommodate a connection. Mr. Hoyt said that they cannot attach to the building next door without the owner's consent. Currently, there is not an easement or legal authority to attach to the building. The recommendation of the URAC was to grant the easement, but that the creek walk should be publicly funded. He said none of the decks are the same height, thus there will be significant challenges in connecting the decks. The applicant doesn't feel that the opportunity should be foreclosed, but the connection should not be added as a requirement to this grant. This request is to improve the last nonconforming building in downtown Silverton, in which the criteria for both the façade and building improvement have been met. They have presented a condition that staff can support and that they will take to the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission agrees then the easement will

be granted, but will be an expense to the City, because it is a public easement granted for the public on private property.

Member Carter said she thinks the creek walk is impractical, unrealistic, unnecessary, an intrusion on private business and does not think it is a good idea. She asked Mr. Johnston if the grant was not available would he be able to proceed with the project. Mr. Johnston said that the grant is going to push the project over the edge to make it happen. She said that she is interested in alternative energy and asked if he has considered solar panels. He said he would be open to that, but would like to get the initial project started and work with a future tenant on their energy consumption. Mr. Bural said there is room for it; the only thing would be analyzing the loading of the roof. Mr. Johnston explained the construction challenges they are going to be facing throughout this project. They have been through three design renditions to try and make it pencil out and the grant is needed to help ease the budget shortfall. He said that it is going to be an amazing project when it is completed and something that he and his kids will be proud of when it's done.

Member Smith said the creek walk has been a vision for a number of residents for a long time and she feels that the deck needs to be designed in a way to be able to make the connection in the future. She said that it should be designed wide enough and they should have in mind how to transition the change in elevation. Discussion ensued on the creek walk concept and how this project is an integral first step in the process, as well as some of the risks that need to be thought through when making the connection. Mr. Hoyt stressed that if the URA doesn't approve the grant due to the design of the deck then the project might not pencil out. Member Smith asked that the applicant build the deck with sufficient depth to make the connection possible in the future. Mr. Bural explained that currently the deck is five feet, the design calls for a ten foot deep deck, so he believes that there should be sufficient depth of the deck for a future connection. He said that the corners align better than what is showed in the materials, but the deck will not extend as far out as the deck to the south, because the buildings are staggered. Additional surveying will need to be performed in order to know the difference in elevation.

Member Carter said in other communities that have creek walks they are typically concrete pathways that are built outside of the private property area. Member Smith indicated in Silverton the walkway would be on private businesses with a public easement. Member Carter said she sees that as an intrusion on private businesses. She asked about having a path closer towards the foundations at creek level so the private businesses would not be impacted.

Member Freilinger said the proposal in front of them is a compromise that can allow the URA to go into two different directions down the road after the design and engineering details regarding the creek walk are further explored. He indicated as long as the deck has sufficient depth to accommodate the possibility in the future. He does not want to see the URA not take advantage of the opportunity to improve this into a very desirable building in the downtown.

Member Smith made a motion to approve both applications contingent on the width and/or depth and proximity of the new deck to the existing deck at the property to the south, so that a transition can be made and that the deck is designed for the dimensions that it takes to do that. The new deck would need to be sufficient in width and proximity over the creek to accommodate the transition between the decks and the future five foot easement. Member Sears seconded the motion. Member Sears said that this is consistent with the applicant's presentation. Member Smith is looking for assurance that the new deck would accommodate the future connection and that the design is not going to change. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 405 N Water Street Façade Improvement and Building Improvement Grant Request

Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu explained this is a grant request for both a façade and building improvement. 405 N Water Street is the current location for Bazaar Americana, a local retail business. The proposed façade improvement is to restore a historic bay window in the front of the building. Three bids were received for the improvements with the low bid being \$21,833 making this project eligible for up to a \$10,916.50 grant with a \$10,916.50 match.

The building improvements are to renovate the interior of the structure by adding a new ADA bathroom and commercial kitchen. The kitchen equipment would not be considered an eligible expense. He

reviewed the bids for the ADA bathrooms, and the eligible portion of the kitchen. He explained that the total eligible building improvement expenses are \$32,200.50 with a \$32,200.50 match.

The URAC recommended the URA approve up to \$10,000 for the façade improvement and approve up to \$32,500.50 for the building improvements.

Applicant: Tom and Darlene O'Connor 3955 Edison Road. Member Sears said on the plans it states residence and asked if this operates as a residence. Mr. O'Connor said that it is not a residence and that no one is living in the building. Ms. O'Connor explained that in order to have a residence upstairs it would need to be retrofitted to include a sprinkler system. She said that they researched the house and discovered that the bay window used to be there and they are performing renovations that highlight the history of the house.

Member Freilinger made a motion to approve the \$10,000 façade improvement grant and the \$32,200.50 building improvement grant. Councilor Carter seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

Member Plummer asked if a moratorium could be placed on accepting new applications until after the URA and URAC meet to discuss changes to the grant and loan criteria. Staff indicated that there are no applications pending at this time and the date for the joint work session is scheduled for April 15, 2019. Member Plummer made a motion to place a moratorium on accepting urban renewal grant and loan applications until after the April 15th discussion with the URAC. Member Freilinger seconded the motion. Member Smith inquired about the timing of the modifications which would likely need to be approved by resolution at the May URA meeting. Member Plummer amended his motion to change the date to the URA meeting in May and Member Freilinger was agreeable to that change. Chairman Palmer explained why he doesn't see this motion as necessary and feels that the City should continue to accept applications. Director Gottgetreu said that if the URA wishes to review the applications based on the new guidelines that come out of the April 15th meeting, then the application should be tailored to meet the yet to be determined criteria and program. He wouldn't want to see someone prepare an application based on the outdated criteria and have to resubmit it. There was no further discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Member Freilinger made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Chairman Palmer adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/Angela Speier, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk