

Dayton Planning Commission
Minutes of meeting of August 10, 2017

Present: Gary Wirfs, Tim Parsons. Pam Horst, Ann-Marie Anderson, Carol Hatfield

Staff: Lisa Brosnan, Debra Lien

HPC Chair Judy Gerrard was also in attendance.

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm. There were no changes to the agenda and no public comment.

Approval of Minutes

Tim made a motion, seconded by Carol to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 9, 2017. The motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

Public hearing for a request for historic new construction at Brookside Cemetery. The applicant is the City of Dayton. Property owner is Dayton School District. File # Historic Repair/New Construction 20-17-03 (Hist. 2017-03)

The public hearing was opened by Chair Gary Wirfs. There was no conflict of interest or bias declared. Pam is on the Dayton School Board. Carol declared a site visit.

The public hearing procedures were read into the record. The criteria used for approval are 7.2.108, the Public Zone and 7.2.112 The Historic Property Overlay Zone. There were no objections to the notice that was sent or to the jurisdiction's right to hear the case.

Staff Report

City Planner Lisa Brosnan summarized the staff report. The proposal is to replace the existing sign with a historic interpretive marker. The existing sign is non historic and was installed approximately in 1995. There will be no damage to the cemetery or to the markers and monuments. The Cemetery is listed in the Dayton Historic Resource inventory. Installation of a new sign changes the appearance of the cemetery, so a public hearing is required.

The Historic Preservation Committee reviewed the application on July 19, 2017. Notice was sent out to all property owners within 200 feet of the property.

The decision criteria from section 7.2.108.04 were reviewed.

Decision criteria for Historic Alteration

Criteria 1. Use of the property is historically similar or new use requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

*Findings: A change of the use of the property is not proposed.
The HPC found this criterion does not apply.
Staff finds this criterion does not apply.*

Criteria 2. Historic character of a property is retained and preserved. The relocation of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.

*Findings: The existing sign that is being removed is not a historical feature of the site. A historical marker/interpretive sign will replace the non-historical sign.
The HPC found that this change would not have a negative effect on the historic character of the site.
The existing sign was constructed in 1995, and is not an historic attribute of the site.
Staff finds this criterion is met.*

Criteria 3. Use of property recognizes physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.

*Findings: No changes that would create a false sense of historic development are proposed.
The HPC found this criterion does not apply.
Staff finds this criterion does not apply.*

Criteria 4. Changes acquiring historic significance in their own right are retained and preserved.

*Findings:
The HPC found this criterion does not apply.
Staff finds this criterion does not apply.*

Criteria 5. Alterations preserve distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the property.

Findings:

The HPC found this criterion does not apply.

Staff finds this criterion does not apply.

Criteria 6. Historic features are repaired versus replaced. Where the severity of determined requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Findings: *The proposal is for replacement of a sign that has no historical significance.*

The HPC finds this criterion does not apply.

Staff finds this criterion does not apply.

Criteria 7. Use of chemical and physical treatments, if appropriate, are undertaken by the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

Findings: *The applicant is not proposing chemical or physical treatment to the existing resource at this time.*

The HPC finds this criterion does not apply.

Staff finds this criterion does not apply.

Criteria 8. Alteration, including new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, do not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.

Findings:

The HPC finds that, as the new interpretive historic marker will be made by SeaReach, a company experienced in the manufacture and installation of such signs, the HPC finds this criterion is met.

Staff finds this criterion is met, with recommended conditions of approval.

Criteria 9. New additions and adjacent or related new construction is undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment are unimpaired.

Findings: The addition can be removed in the future without damage to the surrounding site. The HPC finds that the new interpretive marker will be placed very close to the position of the current sign. The current sign is not historic. Replacement of the sign will not disturb any graves or monuments.

The HPC finds this criterion is met.

Staff finds this criterion is met, with recommended conditions of approval.

Criteria 10. The Planning Commission considers design guidelines recommended by the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Committee, such as applicable sections of the City's 1993 Advisory Guidelines or the U.S. Secretary of Interior's Standards; (<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/stand.htm>).

Findings:

The HPC reviewed the application and provided recommended conditions of approval for the subject application (See Attachment C). The HPC recommendations and conditions are summarized and included as recommended conditions of approval.

The HPC finds this criterion will be met at the public hearing scheduled for the August 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

Staff finds this criterion is met.

Criteria 11. The Planning Commission considers comments submitted by the Historic Preservation Committee.

Findings: Summary minutes from the July 19, 2017 Historic Preservation Committee's review of the subject application are included under Attachment C and the recommended conditions of approval are summarized in the findings and included as conditions of approval in this staff report.

The HPC finds that the comments and recommendations will be included as part of the staff report presented to the Dayton Planning Commission at the public hearing.

Staff finds this criterion is met.

Pam asked what the sign will look like. Judy Gerrard replied that its contents will be similar to the kiosk in the park.

There were no public comments, except Judy Gerrard said she was in favor of the change.

Gary Wirfs closed the public hearing.

PC discussion

Tim noted that the application met all the criteria and he thought the change is a good thing.

Motion to Approve

Pam made a motion to approve the application for replacement of an existing non-historic sign with a historic marker (file # HIST 2017-03) as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Ann-Marie and passed unanimously, 5-0.

Other Business

Lisa reported that starting sometime in 2018, the state legislature will require cities with populations over 2500 to allow accessory dwelling units in all zones. There was a small discussion about how the city could mitigate the effects of this legislation by code requirements for parking, setbacks, etc.

Lisa will send out information regarding how other cities handle this use.

There is no other current land use applications that will require Planning Commission action at present. There will be no meeting next month.

Motion to adjourn

Pam made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Tim and passed unanimously, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Vicki Durand
Community Development Assistant

**APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION
on May 10, 2018**

As Written **As Amended**