

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Newberg Public Library
Newberg, Oregon

Thursday, 7:00 PM

July 23, 1992

Approved at 8/20/92 P.C. Meeting

I. OPEN MEETING

Chair Russell opened the meeting.

II. ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

Jack Kriz
Mike McCauley
Mary Post
Carol Ring
Steve Roberts
Wally Russell
Elaine Smith
Don Thomas
Roger Worrall

Staff Present:

Dennis Egner, Planning Director
Sara King, Associate Planner

Citizens Present: 14

Chair Russell reviewed the testimony process for public hearings.

III. PUBLIC HEARING:

Request: Discussion and adopt recommendations relating to historic preservation to comply with DLCD's response to the City of Newberg Periodic Review Order

No abstentions or objections to jurisdiction were indicated.

Staff Report: Planning Director Egner requested that the Planning Commissioners identify their personal interest in any historic property.

Mary Post indicated she resides at 415 N. College, a secondary site on the inventory.

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 2

Roger Worrall indicated he owns a home at 215 N. Center which is in Concentration area A.

Mr. Egner reviewed the hearing process, the role of the Commission, the history of the historic preservation issues and the criteria. He noted that a staff report would be presented relating to each of 20 properties. He noted that the recommendations of the Planning Commission would be forwarded to the City Council for a final decision. He indicated that the goal of the hearing was to get the City through the Periodic Review process. He reviewed the existing ordinance and noted that the voluntary nature of the ordinance was not acceptable to the State. He reviewed the location of three possible historic districts and the landmark process. He noted that a survey included 184 sites, which include 9-10 sites which have since been demolished. He noted that the inventory now includes 115 sites. He noted that this hearing was to determine if any of these sites should be removed from Landmark designation through an economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) analysis. He then discussed the ESEE criteria upon which inclusion or removal from the Inventory should be based. He noted that there were three choices for addressing conflicting uses to the ESEE criteria: 1) preserving the site fully, 2) allow the conflicting use fully, and 3) specifically limiting the use in some manner. He noted that testimony on the 20 sites under discussion at this meeting needed to address the ESEE criteria.

Chair Russell asked if there were any ex-parte contact.

Commissioner Roberts declared a conflict with discussion relating to the site located at 401 N. Howard.

A. 503 N. College (site 26)

Mary Post abstained from participation in this discussion based on its proximity to her residence.

Staff Report: Mr. Egner reviewed the site using an overhead map and slides. He indicated that based on lot area, a duplex could be constructed on this site and currently, four dwelling units are on the site. He noted that there is no economic gain based on demolition to allow construction of a duplex on the site, no social benefit would be obtained by demolition, a negative environmental benefit would occur and there would be no impact relating to energy. He indicated that a letter has been received from Mel Sprecher relating to removal of this property.

No proponent or opponent was present to speak.

17

Planning Commission Minutes
July 23, 1992
Page 3

B. Friends Center, 200 S. College (site 32) and Friends Church, 307 S. College (site 34)

Staff Report: Mr. Egner reviewed the site using an overhead map and slides. He indicated that there appeared to be neutral economic and energy benefits, a positive social benefit, and a negative environmental benefit. He noted there was a conflict relating to expansion requirements of the Church.

Opponent: Mr. Macey, representing the Newberg Friends Church, indicated the testimony presented in 1990 and 1991 and the restrictions in the Zoning Ordinance be considered during the Planning Commission evaluation. He indicated that because of continued growth and development, the congregation has chosen to stay in their present location with expansion of the existing facility. He noted that the church has developed a tentative master plan for expansion. He commented that the existing building appearance would not change since the addition would be go onto the west side of the site. He felt that whatever was added would not detract from the historic appearance of the existing site. He indicated that approximately 22,000 sq. ft. would be added in addition to interior remodeling of the existing structures on the site. He noted that if the addition would not be allowed because of historic structure limitations, then the church would need to consider relocation to another area. He felt this would have a negative economic and social impact on the community. He felt that this could create a serious economic bind for the Church community. He reiterated that he would like the former testimony to be included in the decision making process.

Questions to Opponent: Mr. Macey was asked if City staff has reviewed the basic master plan. Mr. Macey indicated that the City has reviewed the plan and additional elevations would be given to the City in the near future.

Mr. Egner was asked if the master plan would cause conflict with the historic character of the building. Mr. Egner indicated that the plan did not currently appear to be detrimental.

Mr. Macey expressed concern that if the site was listed as a historic place, then the church would be told what could be done with limited options. He felt there might even be a conflict with church and state. He felt that once listed, it would be difficult to get off again. He indicated that sanctuary renovation was planned but that much of the church would be retained in its historic nature. He indicated that the church has an architect working on the project that anticipates combining compatible materials so as not to detract from the existing structure. He felt that there was the possibility that inclusion under the ordinance could hamstring the Church development.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 23, 1992
Page 4

Chair Russell asked what would be occurring with the Friends Center. Mr. Macey indicated that there were no current plans to change its structure or basic look, only maintenance. He again indicated that there was a fear that once the building was designated, removal from the Inventory would be difficult.

Mr. Macey was asked if he was familiar with the ordinance and if he felt it restricted development. He indicated he was representing the Church and felt that it would be difficult to operate the facilities if they were placed on the list.

C. 701 E. Franklin (site 49)

Staff was requested to identify whether any of the sites were located within possible historic district Areas A, B or C.

Mr. Egner reviewed the site using an overhead map and slides. He indicated the site was located in Area A. He noted that the site had enough area to accommodate a tri-plex. He indicated that there could be a positive economic benefit by providing additional housing in the community, a neutral social benefit, a negative environmental benefit by impacting the character of the neighborhood, and the energy impacts were neutral.

Mary Post abstained from discussion relating to this site.

Opponent: Tom Bowen indicated he was the owner of the site. He noted that he has objected to inclusion of this site for over 5 years. He still would like his home excluded, primarily for economic reasons. He noted that his retirement plans are to develop the adjacent vacant site to the east into a garage, with possible conversion of the upper story into College student housing. He noted that he would not be able to modify the site if it were included. He indicated he had no plans for converting the unit to a tri-plex. He felt that any decision to revise the exterior of the site should be his and not subject to City determination.

Staff was asked if Mr. Bowen would be prevented from adding a proposed garage unit adjacent to the site or adding onto the existing unit. Mr. Egner indicated that the project would likely be processed through design review and the proposed ordinance would not restrict this kind of construction.

Mr. Bowen indicated that it might not be economically feasible to add onto the house using compatible material and he would like it to be his choice, not the City's. He would like the site removed from the list for economic reasons.

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 5

Chair Russell asked if exact replacement of material was required for remodeling or repair. Mr. Egner indicated that it was the intent of design review to make the repair as compatible as possible.

Mr. Bowen was asked about the age of portions of the building. Mr. Bowen indicated that the sleeping porch had been enclosed to prevent water damage in the kitchen.

D. VFW Hall, 111 S. Howard (site 59)

Mr. Egner indicated that it was originally the Christian Tabernacle, Area B in the downtown. He reviewed the site on an overhead map and slide. He indicated that the site was proposed to be demolished for a parking lot. He indicated that the economic impact was positive based on the need for additional downtown parking, but that social, environmental and energy impacts were negative.

Opponent: Les Beecroft, represented the George L. Wright Post of VFW who own and occupy the building. He noted that the building is used as the meeting place for the VFW post, ladies auxiliary, union meetings, and as a Wednesday fellowship hall. He noted that the structure has numerous problems including the need for a new roof, including rafters, and that bids to replace the roof have been outside of the VFW budget. He noted that trusses to replace the existing roof structure would revise the look of the building. He commented that the building is uninsulated and in need of new siding and windows. He indicated that discussions have occurred with the City relating to remodeling the site. He noted that discussions with the City have occurred relating to exchanging this for another site; however, the City also had no funds available. He noted that the site is not available for sale but, if a suitable building could be found for the VFW, they would be willing to exchange the site. He felt that use of the site for a parking lot would better serve the needs of the community. He requested that the site be removed from the list.

Mr. Beecroft was asked if at the time of building construction, whether it was anticipated that the structure would have a long life. Mr. Egner responded that the building was only ranked in fair physical condition.

E. Woodmar Hall - 414 N. Meridian (site 72)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead map and slide. This site is outside of the concentration areas, on the College Campus. He noted that the College has developed a master plan and has identified this site as the site of a new science building. He noted that a new science building would have a positive economic benefit, a positive social benefit, a neutral environmental benefit and a positive energy impact. Mr. Egner noted that Minthorne Hall on the George Fox campus is on the National Register of Historic Places.

21

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 6

Opponent: Al Benkendorf, consultant representing George Fox College, 522 SW Fifth, Portland. He noted that Ed Stephens, president of the College, has previously testified as objecting to inclusion of Woodmar Hall on the inventory. He indicated that three other sites owned by the College are included in the inventory and the College has no objection to them. He supported staff conclusion that there would be a positive economic benefit in demolition of Woodmar and construction of a new science building. He noted that the site is more suitable for a new structure than preservation of the existing structure. He presented written findings of fact relating to the ESEE analysis and noted that Mr. Stephens had submitted an engineering report relating to the expense of bringing the existing building up to code, not even including restoration. He indicated that the science building would offer new job opportunities including construction jobs, and an expanded science department, thereby providing a long term economic benefit to the community. He further reviewed provisions for additional parking in an existing neighborhood, additional open space and social benefits.

Mr. Benkendorf was asked about confirmation of the economic impacts relating to repair and restoration. Mr. Benkendorf indicated that the expense previously noted included only funding for bring the building up to code, and did not include funding for restoration.

F. Newberg Graphic - 109 N. School (site 95)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead map and slide. He noted that the site is located in Area B. He indicated that the site could be used as a parking lot for bank expansion. He noted that this would be a positive economic benefit, demolition would have a negative social, environmental and energy benefit. He noted that in the conflicting use portion of the report on this site the value of the structure should be noted as \$114,000.

No proponent or opponent was present.

G. 303 E. Sheridan (site 99)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead map and slides. He noted that the site is located in Area A. He noted that there is enough land area on the site to construct a triplex. This would be a positive economic benefit, neutral social and energy benefits and a negative environmental benefit.

Opponent: Bill Piatt, representing Hazel Piatt, owner of the site. He indicated that the site listed has been nominated for historic designation and he respectfully declined the nomination. He noted that the site has been remodeled at least 7 times and that the historical integrity of the house has been altered. He noted that the "widows porch" has been extensively remodeled due to rain and water damage, an addition of bedrooms and

22

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 7

a laundry room, and removal of part of the wrap around porch do not lend to the historic value of the home. He indicated that the brick foundation is crumbling and underpinnings are rotting out. His mother is unable to financially maintain the house in its original state. He noted that replacement of the front porch roof has cost over \$7,000. He noted that an attempt to maintain the integrity of the exterior by using compatible material in a small area cost in excess of \$1,000. Specially made siding to more closely match would be even more expensive. He noted that the interior of the house has also been extensively altered. He noted that many of the required repairs cannot be replaced with historically compatible materials. He reiterated that it was not economically possible to place this home on the inventory at the present time. He felt that at some point in the future, the land could be used for a tri-plex to provide housing.

H. 1200 E. Sheridan (site 108)

Mr. Egner noted that the site is in Area A, across from George Fox parking lot. He reviewed the site on an overhead map and with slides. He noted that the site is zoned R-P with the opportunity for either offices or a multi-family unit. He noted that demolition and conversion would have positive economic and energy benefits, neutral social benefit and a negative environmental benefit. Mr. Egner noted there was a letter in opposition from Mona Gettman, owner of the site.

I. Springbrook School, 2404 N. Springbrook (site 113)

Mr. Egner noted that the site is not in any possible district. He reviewed the site on an overhead map and with slides. He indicated that the site is owned by Austin Industries and they have requested that the site be removed from the list. He noted that the site is zoned M-2 Industrial and would have a positive economic impact, a negative social impact, a neutral environmental impact and a positive energy impact. He noted that he had a phone conversation with Sonja Riijimaki relating to removal of this site.

Mr. Egner was asked if this site was included under any special district. He indicated that the site was a part of the Springbrook District, which requires implementation through a master plan which has not yet been presented.

J. Johnson Carpets, 204 E. First (site 131); Johnson Hardware, 206 E. First (site 132); Johnson Furniture, 208 E. First (site 133) and Johnson Annex, 300 E. First (site 136)

Mr. Egner noted that the sites are located in Area B. He reviewed the sites on overhead maps and with slides. He noted that the conflicting use for these sites would be alterations to the buildings. He noted that alterations would be an economic benefit, negative social and environmental impacts, and neutral energy impacts.

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 8

Opponent: Mike Gunn, attorney, representing the Johnson family, owners of the sites. He noted the sites are on the fringe of Area B. He noted that there were few disagreements with the City analysis of the sites. He reviewed the use of the sites and noted that Naps new grocery store structure adjacent to the site was not of a historic nature. He felt that the economic impacts on the City for retention of the business would be positive; however, removal of existing exterior materials to expose the original structure would be cost prohibitive and alterations have already occurred. He felt there was no negative environmental impact as this block is not entirely composed of possible historic sites. He felt the environmental impacts of exclusion was minimal. He indicated it would be cost prohibitive for the owners to retain the underlying brick structure. He noted that the upstairs of the Rexall building has been vacant for many years and the Johnsons have plans to possibly convert the upstairs into apartments. This might require exterior alterations which would be limited by the historic designation. He reiterated that the surrounding structures are not historic in nature and removing the sites would not impact the historic nature of the downtown area.

Mr. Gunn was asked if he understood the historic ordinance and its impacts relating to remodeling the existing structures. He felt that it would limit the ability of the owners to remodel the sites and it would be cost prohibitive to retain the existing appearance of the buildings.

Staff was asked what the contributing classification in the inventory meant. Mr. Egner indicated that the first two sites were designated as contributing sites. He described the criteria which ranked the sites and noted that not enough point values were placed on these sites in the second evaluation to raise them to secondary sites.

Opponent: Leonard Johnson, property owner of the sites, indicated that at the time of its removal, the historic sign on the old Western Auto store was ready to fall off the building. He protested that the historic significance of the sign did not make the building historic.

Mr. Egner noted that the sign had been noted in the survey of the site as significant.

H. Krohns Appliance, 315 E. First (site 139)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead map and with slides, and he noted that the site was in Area B. He noted that the conflicting use would be alteration of the site and there would be a positive economic impact; negative social and environmental impacts and neutral energy impacts.

Opponent: Mrs. Krohn, owner of the site, requested that the site not be included based on economic disadvantage. She noted that the building is currently rented and the

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 9

renters agree also. She noted that the assessed value of the building from the assessor's office was listed as \$27,000. She indicated that the proposed value of the site was \$100,000 if both this site and the adjacent site which she owns were developed with a new structure.

She was asked if there had been any exterior modification to the building since its construction. She indicated there had not been but that the siding would likely need replacing in the near future.

J. Touch of Class, 606 E. First (site 152)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead and with slides, and he noted that the site was in Area B. He noted that based on possible alteration to the building, positive economic benefits, negative social and environmental benefits and neutral energy benefits would occur if the building were included. Mr. Egner indicated that the owner was out of town and could not attend the hearing.

No proponent or opponent was present.

K. Antique Store, 710 E. First (site 160)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead and with slides, and he noted that the site was in Area B. He noted that based on possible building alteration, there were positive economic benefits, negative social and environmental benefits and neutral energy benefits. He indicated that he had spoken with the owner who was unable to attend the hearing. He noted that there have been substantial alterations to the building and it had been scored at a lower level because of the alterations. Mr. Egner was asked about the significance relating to the site. He noted that descriptions relating to the inventory page pertaining to this property are not extremely detailed since the forms were primarily completed with untrained volunteers. Mr. Egner noted that the store front was not the original entrance and that the structure has evolved over the years. It also has substantial structural problems.

No proponent or opponent was present.

L. Hopp Insurance, 804 E. First (site 164)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead and with slides, and he noted that the site was in Area B. He indicated that there was a positive economic benefit, negative social and environmental benefits and neutral energy benefits. He noted that Mr. Hopp had submitted a letter opposing inclusion. He noted that the inventoried property was only the Hopp Insurance building.

25

Planning Commission Minutes
July 23, 1992
Page 10

No proponent or opponent was present.

M. 716 E.Fourth (site 182)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead and with slides, and he noted that the site was in Area C. He noted that the site was currently being used as the location of a day care facility and residence. He noted that the proposal was to expand the day care facility at this site. This would result in a positive economic benefit, a positive social benefit, a negative environmental impact and a neutral energy impact. He was asked if there had been substantial remodeling. He indicated that there have been substantial modifications in the last 5 years. It is also identified as a contributing resource. He was asked if expansion of the day care was an approved use in the zone. He indicated that it would require design review.

N. 401 N. Howard (site 58)

Mr. Egner reviewed the site on an overhead and noted that the site was in Area A. He noted that an ESEE analysis had just been completed. He commented that if a tri-plex were to be built, economic, social and energy impacts would be positive, while environmental impacts would be negative.

Opponent: Bert Teitzel, owner of the property, indicated he was in favor of an ordinance which controls adjacent and new structures. He felt that not including historic district requirements in the ordinance would not protect his property. He noted his site is located in a narrow area of residential between industrial and commercial uses and he feels there should be better protection by way of a historic district. He noted that the site is no longer being operated as a bed and breakfast and the economic benefits have diminished. He also noted that the house has been altered substantially with steel siding and aluminum windows. He would like the house deleted from the inventory.

Staff Recommendation: Mr. Egner indicated his concern relating to removal of any site; however, he recommended that the Planning Commission remove the above documented sites and forward the remaining list to the City Council for adoption. He indicated that at a future time, discussion could occur relating to development of historic districts.

A member of the audience requested an opportunity to speak relating to historic districts.

Chair Russell indicated that the Commission was not currently considering historic districts.

Consensus of the Commission was to allow Mr. Soppe to speak.

26

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 11

Opponent: Robert Soppe, 709 E. Sheridan, indicated his site was a secondary property in Area A. He reviewed a letter he had submitted. He commented he enjoyed living in Newberg and its historic sites. He felt that doing an incomplete job with historic preservation was not beneficial. He felt that the owners of these sites did not have any compensation at all, only a mandate to retain the sites. He expressed concern that districts should be implemented. He felt that creating historic protection without districts was not a benefit at all. He noted that surrounding non-historic properties detracted from the historic sites and this could not occur in historic districts. He noted that 68 properties were excluded because they weren't in potential historic districts. He was concerned about the addition of regulations to private owners without additional protection available through districts. He felt that there was a very negative social impact resulting with enforcing specific requirements without monetary remuneration. He was concerned about what was considered "appropriate modifications" and who would define the criteria. He felt this project would be more successful by rewarding what was right and discouraging them for what was wrong. He felt that there should be information provided for what kinds of repairs would be appropriate.

Chair Russell indicated that the historic districts would be dealt with by the Planning Commission either through their initiation or through staff referral. He noted that those individuals requesting removal would have the opportunity to be reincluded.

Mr. Egner noted that if a district were put in place, homes within the area would automatically be included.

A 5-minute recess was called after which the meeting was reconvened.

Public Hearing Closed.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Thomas asked Mr. Egner if there were other church buildings of any significance similar to the Friends Church. Mr. Egner indicated there were not. Mr. Thomas felt the Friends Church should not be altered.

Mr. Egner reiterated the three options for dealing with resources.

Commissioner Roberts felt that the sites should not be removed in a blanket fashion. He felt each site should be considered individually.

Motion: Roberts-Worrall to adopt the staff recommendation to remove all the proposed properties from the list and to forward the recommendation to the Council. Vote on

57

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 12

Motion: Aye-Ring, Russell; Nay-Kriz, McCauley, Post, Roberts, Smith, Thomas, Worrall.
Motion failed (7-2).

Commissioner Roberts did not feel increased parking was a positive benefit. He also felt that increasing the housing density based on demolition is also not a positive benefit. He was concerned about considering alterations and landscaping as being irreversible. He did not feel this was a conflicting use. He felt the buildings should be considered for their long-term use and original construction life-span. He did not feel buildings which were originally intended to be short-term structures, should be considered for protection. He was concerned about the speculation relating to additional jobs being created as a result of new construction replacing historic sites. He took exception with the exclusion of tourism as an economic benefit. He felt the historic homes should be considered a tourist attraction which would benefit the community. He felt the buildings should be considered in three classifications: residential, commercial and institutional. He felt that a city-wide design review should be required.

Chair Russell suggested that those sites in commercial classifications should be considered first. The commission concurred.

Commercial sites were identified as sites 95, 131, 132, 133, 136, 139, 152, 160 and 164.

Mr. Egner indicated that the alterations listed under "Conflict" were considered to be extensive exterior alterations which would likely change the historic character of the site.

Commissioner Worrall felt that those sites in Area B, the commercial district in downtown should be discussed first.

Commissioners discussed the historic relationship of the sites in Area A.

Several of the commissioners felt that each site should be independently evaluated and that the districts should be considered.

Mr. Egner was asked if districts were implemented, what the exclusion process would be. He indicated that the process would be slightly different. He noted that design review requirements would be different in districts.

Chair Russell reminded the commissioners that this hearing was specifically related to deciding on specific sites, not to discuss historic districts at this time. He noted that historic districts should be discussed but this portion of the hearing should be completed first.

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 13

Commissioner Thomas asked if there were numerous commercial structures still on the list. Mr. Egner indicated that it was likely the State would accept those remaining sites as an adequate number for protection.

Chair Russell polled the Commission relating to excluding the following sites: 59 (7 in favor); 95 (5 in favor); 131 (7 in favor); 132 (6 in favor); 133 (6 in favor); 136 (4 in favor); 139 (5 in favor); 152 (4 in favor); 160 (7 in favor); 164 (6 in favor).

Motion: Worrall-Thomas to recommend that sites 59, 95, 131, 132, 133, 139, 160 and 164 should be excluded as Landmarks.

Discussion on Motion: Commissioner Kriz expressed concern that any of these sites be excluded from Landmark designation based on a layman's view of the sites. He noted that the sites have been judged as historic by qualified experts.

Commissioner Post expressed concern that Krohn's Appliance be excluded.

Amendment to Motion: Smith-Worrall to withdraw site 139, Krohn's Appliance, from consideration for exclusion.

Vote on Amendment to Motion: Aye-Kriz, McCauley, Post, Smith; Nay-Ring, Roberts, Thomas, Worrall, Russell. Motion failed (4-5).

Vote on Motion: Aye-Roberts, Smith, Thomas, Worrall, Russell; Nay-kriz, McCauley, Post, Ring. Motion carried (5-4).

Motion: Roberts-McCauley to retain Site 136 and 152 on the Landmarks list. **Vote on Motion:** Aye-Kriz, McCauley, Post, Roberts, Smith, Thomas; Nay-Ring, Worrall, Russell. Motion carried (6-3).

It was the consensus of the Commission that the institutional resources be next considered.

Commissioners discussed the various attributes of the institutional sites proposed for exclusion.

Motion: Post-Smith to retain sites 32, 34, and 113 and delete site 72 from the Landmarks list. **Vote on Motion:** Aye-McCauley, Post, Roberts, Smith, Thomas; Nay-Kriz, Ring, Worrall; Abstention-Russell. Motion carried (5-3, 1 abstention).

The Commissioners then reviewed the residential sites on the list. Commissioner Post indicated she abstained from consideration of sites 26 and 49.

29

Planning Commission Minutes

July 23, 1992

Page 14

Commissioners reviewed the inventory material relating to each residence.

The Commissioners were polled relating to excluding the following sites: Site 26 (2 in favor), Site 49 (1 in favor).

Tom Bowen, 701 E. Franklin, commented that it was unfair of the Commissioners to consider only a few sites for exclusion relating to economic considerations. He felt the Commission was being hypocritical and if the Commission chose to expel him from the meeting they could; however, he felt he should have the opportunity to comment. He was extremely displeased with the actions of the Commission.

The Commissioners continued discussion and the straw vote relating to excluding the following additional sites: Site 99 (5 in favor), Site 108 (5 in favor), Site 182 (3 in favor), Site 58 (2 in favor).

Commissioners extensively discussed the ability for landowners to reverse remodeling modifications to restore the historic nature of various sites. Commissioners reiterated their concerns relating to the need to have established historic districts.

Motion: Thomas-Smith to retain site 26 and 49 on the Landmark list. **Vote on Motion:** Aye-Kriz, McCauley, Roberts, Smith, Thomas, Worrall, Russell; Nay-Ring; Abstention-Post. Motion carried (7-1, 1 abstention).

Motion: Thomas-Smith to retain site 58 on the Landmark list. **Vote on Motion:** Aye-Kriz, McCauley, Roberts, Smith, Thomas, Russell; Nay-Ring, Worrall; Abstention-Post. Motion carried (6-2, 1 abstention).

Motion: Worrall-Thomas to remove sites 99 and 108 from the Landmarks list. **Vote on Motion:** Aye-McCauley, Ring, Thomas, Worrall, Russell; Nay-Kriz, Post, Roberts, Smith. Motion carried (5-4).

Motion: Thomas-Post to retain site 182 on the Landmark list. **Vote on Motion:** Aye-Kriz, McCauley, Post, Roberts, Smith, Thomas; Nay-Ring, Worrall, Russell. Motion carried (6-3).

Motion: Roberts-Smith to include all the inventoried properties which have not been discussed at this meeting on the Landmarks list and to recommend that the City Council adopt the revised Landmarks list. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Egner then indicated that the Planning Commission could recommend, by the addition of a few sections, a revision of the existing ordinance which could include provisions for a historic district. He also indicated that if the Planning Commission is interested in