



City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Inspection Services - Land Use Services
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Dan Saltzman, Commissioner
Paul L. Scarlett, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 11, 2015
To: TIMBERRIDGE DEVELOPMENT *JOHN DUNCAN*
From: Puja Bhutani, Development Review
503-823-7226
Re: 15-196746 DA – New Single Family Residence
Design Advice Request Summary Memo August 24, 2015

Thank you for taking advantage of the opportunity to hold a Design Advice Request regarding your project. I hope you find it informative and valuable as you continue with your project development. Attached is a summary of the comments provided by the Landmarks Commission at the August 24, 2015 Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings. To review those recordings, please visit:

http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/search/rec?sm_class=uri_7547&count&rows=50

These Landmarks Commission comments are intended to guide you in further design exploration of your project. These comments may also inform City staff when giving guidance over the course of future related land use reviews. It should be understood that these comments address the project as presented on August 24, 2015. As the project design evolves, the comments, too, may evolve or may no longer be pertinent.

Design Advice Requests are not intended to substitute for other Code-required land use or legislative procedures. Please keep in mind that the formal Type III land use review process [which includes a pre-application, a land use review application, public notification, a Staff Report and a public hearing] must be followed once the Design Advice Request meetings are complete, if formal approval for specific elements of your project is desired.

Please continue to coordinate with me as you prepare your formal land use application, or if you desire another Design Advice Request meeting with the Commission.

This memo summarizes **Historic Landmarks Commission** design direction provided on February 23, 2015.

Commissioners in attendance on August 24, 2015: Brian Emerick, Chair; Jessica Engeman, Vice-Chair; Caroline Dao, Carin Carlson.

General Comments:

- The proportions, mass and scale for the proposed building is an issue. The height of the house could be supported; however the width of the house should be reduced.
- The house should be further pushed back from the front property line, and its front elevation should be aligned with the adjacent historic houses on the block.
- The house was raised too high on the lot and should be lowered by removing the tucked under garage.
- The tucked under garage is not approvable. A detached garage located towards the rear of the property is preferred.
- The partial front porch as proposed is not approvable and the rear porch should be scaled down.
- The Commission was supportive of the high quality materials proposed. They recommended a wooden front porch railing system, more balanced and intentional placement of windows on the side elevations, deeper eaves with exposed rafter tails, and concrete base.
- Stone could be used for the front retaining wall which should be stepped to scale it down, and terraced beds used to soften the front landscaping.

Height, Mass and Scale.

- The Commission was in consensus that the house was raised too high on the lot. One Commissioner was comfortable with lifting the house above the sidewalk but not as high as was being proposed. Another Commissioner thought that the existing grade at the front property line should be maintained and not further raised. They were comfortable with the raised grade after the first flight of steps but not beyond that.
- The Commission supported the Four Square style of the house, stating that it would be consistent with the diversity of architectural styles found in the Irvington neighborhood.
- The Commission was unanimously concerned about the proportions and the building coverage of the proposed house. The Commission thought that the width of the house should be reduced.

Location

- The Commission was concerned about how far forward the house was located on the site. They noted that the house should be located so that its front façade aligns with adjacent historic houses on the street.
- One Commissioner stated the height of the house and its location made it dominate the street, and that pushing the house back would help alleviate this. They also indicated agreement with the suggested location submitted by the ICA.
- Another Commissioner stated that they supported the height of the house provided that its street façade aligned with other houses on the street and that the tucked under garage was removed.

Sunken Garage

- The Commission unanimously agreed that the tucked under garage should be eliminated. They recommend providing a detached garage located at the rear of the property which would be more consistent with the existing neighborhood pattern.
- One Commissioner stated that there were very few tucked under garages in Irvington, and these usually existed on longer blocks in conjunction with lower 1.5 story residences in mostly English Tudor or Craftsmen style.
- The Commission observed that removing the sunken garage would also help scale down the house, and make it less dominating.
- Staff advised the applicant that garage's less than 24'x 24' could be within the setbacks, at zero lot line setbacks.

Porches**-Front**

- There were different opinions on the compatibility of the partial front porch. However, the majority believed that the front porch, as proposed, was not approvable.
- One Commissioner stated that while there were partial porches in the neighborhood, these tended to be recessed or infill porches. They noted that the samples provided by the applicant were not representative of the typical porches in the neighborhood. The recommended removing the front porch or revising it.
- Two Commissioners stated that a partial porch could work if it was included within the body of the main house, and not as a single story front element as proposed.
- One Commissioner stated that the proposed porch looked awkward with the way the roof sat over it.
- One Commissioner noted that they would recommend a full front porch.
- One Commissioner stated that they were comfortable with a front partial porch.

- Rear

- One Commissioner was concerned about the massing of the rear porch, especially given how close it was to the rear property line and high building coverage. They felt that this would not be in keeping with the character of the district and should be scaled down.
- One Commissioner agreed and stated that they would be supportive of a rear porch but that it should be scaled down.

Windows

- One Commissioner expressed their concern about the placement of windows on the side elevations, especially towards the front of these elevations. They recommended a more intentional and balanced location and sizing of windows so as to be consistent with the symmetrical and careful window locations and sizing on similar existing historical houses.
- The Commissioners did not support the clerestory window on the first floor of the north elevation, because it spanned both the main massing of the house and the “infilled porch” area.
- Two Commissioners agreed that the corner basement window on the left elevation was awkward and should be resolved.
- One Commissioner noted that the applicant should provide more window details including head, sill and jamb sections as well as manufacturers cut sheets.

Materials

- The Commission was supportive of the materials proposed including cedar siding and shingles, composition shingle roof and wood doors and windows.
- The Commission recommended using wood for the front porch railing. One Commissioner stated that they would be comfortable with the use of metal for the rear porch railing.
- The Commission recommended using concrete for the base of the building, noting that rusticated exposed stone bases were not typical for the Portland area. They recommended working stone into the retaining wall.
- One Commissioner suggested using a substantial trim board at the base to transition from the wooden siding to the concrete finish.
- The Commission was in consensus about providing deeper eaves and exposed rafter tails for the roof profile.
- One Commissioner suggested stepping the retaining wall, and using terraced beds to soften the front landscaping.

Cc: *Landmarks Commission
Respondents*

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. Cover Page
 - 2. Proposed Site Plan
 - 3. Front Elevation
 - 4. Rear Elevation
 - 5. Right Elevation
 - 6. Left Elevation
 - 7. West Elevation Perspective (side)
 - 8. West Elevation Perspective (front)
 - 9. South West Elevation Perspective
 - 10. North West Elevation Perspective
 - 11. South East Elevation Perspective
 - 12. North East Elevation Perspective
 - 13. Design Rendering- view to the north
 - 14. Design Rendering- view to the south
 - 15. Neighborhood footprint- 3 block radius
 - 16. Neighborhood footprint- close up
 - 17. Neighborhood study- references
 - 18. Neighborhood study- references
 - 19. Neighborhood study- references
 - 20. Neighborhood study- references
 - 21. Neighborhood study- references
- +D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
 - 5. Revised Posting notice as sent to applicant
- E. Service Bureau Comments: none
- F. Public Testimony
 - 1. Dean Gisvold, Irvington Community Association, 8/17/2015
 - 2. DAR Hearing Testimony sign-up sheet.
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff Memo to the Commission, dated August 11, 2015
 - 3. Staff Presentation to the Commission, dated August 24, 2015
 - 4. Applicant Presentation to the Commission, dated August 24, 2015
 - 5. DAR Summary, dated September 11, 2015