

**CITY OF LA GRANDE**  
**Landmarks Commission Meeting**

**Regular Session**

**Thursday, September 8, 2022**

**La Grande City Hall**  
**1000 Adams Avenue**

**MINUTES**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Lindsay Costigan  
Cassie Hibbert  
Katie Boula  
Rod Muilenburg

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT EXCUSED:**

**DISCUSSION/DISPOSITION**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Kendra VanCleave, Secretary  
Mike Boquist, City Planner

**CITIZENS PRESENT**

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

HIBBERT called this Regular Session of the Commission to order at 6:08 p.m., and asked for Roll Call; a quorum was determined to be present.

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

No changes. The Agenda was approved as presented.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Consider Minutes from November 18, 2021 meeting.

HIBBERT commented she didn't recall the applicant attending.

MUILENBURG introduced the following Motion, with COSTIGAN providing the Second.

**MOTION:** I move that the November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Minutes be tabled to the next meeting to verify if the applicant was in attendance.

**NEW BUSINESS**




- a. *Consideration of Historical Appropriateness*  
*1214 1/2 Adams Ave, 01-HLA-21*  
*Randy & Shawna McKinnis (Remax)*

**USC:** Unanimous

HIBBERT asked for declarations and challenges, there were none.

HIBBERT asked for the staff report.

BOQUIST opened with the application for the replacement of an existing wood framed window with a new wood framed window of similar style. This is the first application under the newly adopted standards. The building is a historic contributing building and an alley project which uses Standards A and D.

	<p>If the site or property is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li> National Register</li><li> Historic Contributing</li><li> Historic Non-Contributing</li></ul>
If the work proposed will be visible from the street:	USE STANDARDS A AND C
If the work proposed is only visible from the alley:	USE STANDARDS A AND D

BOQUIST commented he outlined all the standards in the staff report for A and D but didn't create a specific finding response for each one, just the one he felt applied to the application. Will leave the rest of standards open for Commission Discussion and will fill in the blanks.

BOQUIST continued with the Standards he identified:

**A.3 BUILDING FAÇADE MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION:**

When designing alterations, respect the original style and design of the building, and retain original features and materials.

**A.6 RELOCATION OR DEMOLITION:**

Alternatives to demolition of a non-contributing historic building must be explored, including relocation and sale. partial demolition of a contributing building may be considered if necessary for a new addition.

MUILENBURG commented in looking at the door it has an archway and a load bearing lintel. It appears because of the mismatch bonding this is a former infill of a previous window and it may have an archway above it and concerned what is carrying that future window. BOQUIST responded that might be more of a building code issue.

HIBBERT commented to Rod's point its very hard to tell what's going on with the building with the picture submitted, but the photo does show the mismatch bonding above the window which would indicate not a historic window.

BOULA commented it looks like from the picture the previous window was taller but hard to tell in the photo submitted. BOULA continued that all of the guidance indicates try to restore and not replace. HIBBERT commented the email from the contractor indicated they are replacing the wood framed window that has out lived its life span with a new wood framed picture window. BOULA commented does that mean it's not usable. HIBBERT responded it does not appear to be a historic element and the applicant is proposing to use a product that aligns with the material standards. A suggestion might be to look at the structural integrity of the top of the window and be mindful of how that is being addressed and if there may be an opportunity to take it to the original height.

BOULA asked about the semi-circular feature on the top and how that should be addressed.

MULENBURG commented can't see it being historic and doesn't appear there is a lintel above and fears they are using the window as support.

HIBBERT stated to recommend to the contractor take a look and address appropriately. Additionally recommend giving them a copy of the preservation brief for the repointing. BOULA added to also recommend to not use the elastomeric paint.

BOULA asked if the language in the standards and guidelines regarding materials specifically not allowing just wood and hardi-plank is strong enough. BOQUIST commented the applicant is aware that she needs to use real wood and smooth surface. She modeled her application in proposing what is consistent with what the Commission has asked in the past.

There was Commission discussion on the window install and trim. A preference for a more historically accurate install would be for an infill window, slightly set in and fitting within the brick surround, that does not include an exterior brick and might be a cost savings to the applicant.

HIBBERT directed the Commission to go over Standards A and D in the staff report and identify if the standard is satisfied or not applicable:

#### **'A' STANDARDS – EXISTING BUILDINGS**

##### **A.1 STOREFRONT REHABILITATION:**

Preserve, restore, or reconstruct missing primary features of a historic storefront. strengthen the historic pattern and proportion of storefront: **Not applicable**

##### **A.2 NEW ADDITIONS:**

Design new attached volumes or additions to visually match most of the characteristics of the original building and/or contributing buildings in the district. **Not applicable.**

##### **A.3 BUILDING FAÇADE MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION:**

When designing alterations, respect the original style and design of the building, and retain original features and materials. **Satisfied as the window is not affecting the historic fabric.**

##### **A.4 ACCESSIBILITY:**

ensure that building entries are accessible and accommodate universal design. **Not applicable.**

##### **A.5 DISASTER AND SAFETY PLANNING:**

Undertake seismic improvements and other disaster planning in the most unobtrusive way possible, and take steps to stabilize buildings that are vacant. **Not applicable.**

#### A.6 RELOCATION OR DEMOLITION:

Alternatives to demolition of a non-contributing historic building must be explored, including relocation and sale. partial demolition of a contributing building may be considered if necessary for a new addition. **Not applicable.**

### **'D' STANDARDS – WORK NOT VISIBLE FROM THE STREET**

#### D.1 MATERIALS:

Existing walls and wall finishes, if historic, should be maintained. new finishes will predominantly visually match historic materials found in the district, but new materials on new wall surfaces may be introduced. **Satisfied.**

#### D.2 WINDOWS:

New openings and new windows can add interest and flexibility. follow the general size, pattern, alignments, and proportion of nearby historic openings. **Satisfied.**

#### D.3 AWNINGS:

Use awnings or canopies to highlight a pedestrian seating area or entry. **Not applicable**

#### D.4 SIGNS:

Do not obscure decorative building features or historic signs. Use restraint in lighting and sizing signs. **Not applicable**

#### D.5 FENCES/ACCESSORY STRUCTURES:

Place accessory elements primarily to support the pedestrian experience. **Not applicable**

#### D.6 ROOFS & ROOFTOP ELEMENTS:

Limit the size and scale of new rooftop elements. **Not applicable.**

There was consensus from the Commission to approve the application as presented with four recommendations as discussed:

Recommendation 1: For the window installation, a preference for a more historically accurate install would be for an infill window, slightly set in and fitting within the brick surround, that does not

include an exterior trim that overlaps the exterior brick. Considering an inset window may result in a cost savings for the project.

Recommendation 2: Evaluate the existing header, if existing, or the need to install a header above the window for support. The brick above the window appears to be infill from an old opening. It is unclear whether this infill is structurally supported by a header over the window. If not, there may be downward pressure caused by this brick infill that may result in long-term conflicts with a window if not addressed.

Recommendation 3: Refer to National Park Service (NPS) Preservation Brief #2 regarding the repointing and repairing of brick for best practices and guidance on ensuring quality workmanship and longer-term solutions for repair and maintenance.

Recommendation 4: When painting the exterior of the building, please avoid using “elastomeric” paint. Such paint product tends to seal in moisture, not allowing a building to breath and moisture to escape and evaporate. This often results in significant building damage.

MUILENBURG made the following Motion, with COSTIGAN providing the Second

**MOTION:** I move that the Findings of Fact and Conclusions set forth in the Staff Report be adopted and that the Project be deemed historically appropriate and approved.

**USC:** Unanimous

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

There being no further business to come before this Regular Session of the Commission, HIBBERT adjourned the meeting at 6:45p.m. The Commission is scheduled to meet again in Regular Session, Thursday, October 13, 2022, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 1000 Adams Avenue, La Grande, Oregon.

**ATTEST:**

**APPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Kendra VanCleave, Department Secretary

Chairperson

DATE APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_: