



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

Dan Ryan, Commissioner
Rebecca Esau, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portland.gov/bds

Date: 12/3/2021
To: Interested Person
From: Tanya Paglia, Land Use Services
503-865-6518 / Tanya.Paglia@portlandoregon.gov

NOTICE OF A TYPE II DECISION ON A PROPOSAL IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

The Bureau of Development Services has approved a proposal in your neighborhood. The mailed copy of this document is only a summary of the decision. The reasons for the decision are included in the version located on the BDS website <http://www.portlandonline.com/bds/index.cfm?c=46429>. Click on the District Coalition then scroll to the relevant Neighborhood, and case number. If you disagree with the decision, you can appeal. Information on how to do so is included at the end of this decision.

CASE FILE NUMBER: LU 21-073805 HRM – GARAGE EXPANSION / ADU CONVERSION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Tara Doherty | Tara Doherty Architect
1831 SE Knapp St | Portland, OR 97202

Owners: Erika Kohn and Aaron Kohn,
3425 NE Beakey St | Portland, OR 97212-2661

Site Address: 3425 NE BEAKEY ST

Legal Description: BLOCK 3 LOT 7-9 E 10' OF LOT 16-18, HISTORIC PROPERTY, POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL TAX, MAPLEHURST

Tax Account No.: R534500670
State ID No.: 1N1E25AB 03600
Quarter Section: 2734

Neighborhood: Beaumont-Wilshire, contact at info@bwnapdx.org
Business District: NONE
District Coalition: Central Northeast Neighbors, contact Alison Stoll at 503-823-2778.
Plan District: NONE
Other Designations: Historic Landmark – *Zimmerman-Rudeen House*, a house constructed in 1913 and individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places on 06/19/1991

Zoning: **R5h** – Residential 5,000 Single Dwelling Zone with Historic Resource Protection and Aircraft Landing Zone Overlays

Case Type: **HRM** – Historic Resource Review with Modification
Procedure: **Type II**, an administrative decision with appeal to the Landmarks Commission.

Proposal:
The applicant is seeking Historic Resource Review approval for a proposal to expand an existing, non-contributing, detached garage and convert it to an Accessory Dwelling Unit

(ADU). The primary house is the landmark *Zimmerman-Rudeen House*, and will not be altered as part of the project. The existing single-story garage is a non-historic feature. The proposal will add on to the garage to have a bigger footprint and a new second floor with an ADU. The square footage being added is 1142 SF total. The garage is located at the northwest corner of the property, set back behind the house and far from the property's street frontages along NE Beakey and NE 36th Ave.

Modification requests [PZC 33.846.070]:

1. Setbacks (33.110.220). Decrease the rear setback from 5' to 2'. While the existing garage structure is already located within this setback along the northern (rear) property line and all of the proposed expansion conforms with the 5' rear and side setbacks, the proposal expands the building envelope technically making it a larger building within the setback.

Historic Resource Review is required because the proposal is for non-exempt exterior alterations to a building that part of a Landmark property listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Relevant Approval Criteria:

In order to be approved, this proposal must comply with the approval criteria of Title 33. The relevant approval criteria are:

- Section 33.846.060.G, Other Approval Criteria
- 33.846.070 Modifications Considered During Historic Resource Review

ANALYSIS

Site and Vicinity: The subject lot is situated on the southeast corner of the block with NE Beakey Street to the south and NE 35th Street to the east. The primary house is the landmark *Zimmerman-Rudeen House*, constructed in 1913 and individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places on 06/19/1991. It is a Prairie style house designed by George Eastman for Fred and Lucile D. Zimmerman.

Per the National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form:

“The building is significant under criterion c as an excellent example of the Prairie style in northeast Portland. The residence displays many characteristics of this style in the porte-cochere, large overhanging eaves, plaster exterior, and massive rectangular pillars.”

“The exterior of the Zimmerman/Rudeen Residence exhibits many features that represent the height of the Prairie style: an overall emphasis on horizontal lines including windows grouped together with decorative belt courses; a low, hipped roof with overhanging eaves; large one-story porches supported by massive rectangular pillars; an inconspicuous front entrance; a massive fireplace chimney, and sparing use of ornamentation. The construction method of this building, wood framing with plaster and wood trim, was common to Prairie style houses as early as 1902.”

The existing single-story garage is a non-historic feature located at the northwest corner of the property, set back behind the house and far from the property's street frontages along NE Beakey and NE 36th Ave. It has wood lap siding, minimal eaves and a double garage door, and was likely built in the 1950's. The garage structure is not part of the Historic Landmark designation.

Zoning: The Residential 5,000 (R5) single-dwelling zone is intended to preserve land for housing and to provide housing opportunities for individual households. The zone implements the comprehensive plan policies and designations for single-dwelling housing. Minimum lot size is 3,000 square feet, with minimum width and depth dimensions of 36 and 50 feet, respectively. Minimum densities are based on lot size and street configuration. Maximum densities are 1 lot per 5,000 square feet of site area.

The Aircraft Landing Zone “h” overlay provides safer operating conditions for aircraft in the vicinity of Portland International Airport by limiting the height of structures and vegetation. A height contour map is available for review in the Development Services Center.

The Historic Resource Protection overlay is comprised of Historic and Conservation Districts, as well as Historic and Conservation Landmarks and protects certain historic resources in the region and preserves significant parts of the region’s heritage. The regulations implement Portland’s Comprehensive Plan policies that address historic preservation. These policies recognize the role historic resources have in promoting the education and enjoyment of those living in and visiting the region. The regulations foster pride among the region’s citizens in their city and its heritage. Historic preservation beautifies the city, promotes the city’s economic health, and helps to preserve and enhance the value of historic properties.

Land Use History: City records indicate that prior land use reviews include the following:

- LU 02-145441 HR – Historic Resource approval for new French doors and a 217 SF deck addition to the rear of the Landmark house.

Agency Review: A “Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood” was mailed **October 20, 2021**. The following six Bureaus, Divisions and/or Sections responded with no objections and two of these included comments found in Exhibits E.1-E.2:

- Life Safety Division of the Bureau of Development Services (Exhibit E.1)
- The Bureau of Transportation Engineering (Exhibit E.2)
- Site Development Review Section of Bureau of Development Services
- Fire Bureau
- Water Bureau
- The Bureau of Environmental Services responded with the following comment:

“The proposed project will add greater than 500 square feet of new impervious area and will therefore trigger the requirements of the City’s Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM). It does not appear that approval of the requested historic resource will preclude the construction of adequately sized stormwater management facilities, therefore BES does not object to approval. However, BES will require a detailed stormwater management plan for this project during building permit review. Please refer to the Stormwater Infiltration and Discharge Hierarchy and submittal requirements in the SWMM: www.portlandoregon.gov/bes/swmm.”

Neighborhood Review: A Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood was mailed on October 20, 2021. No written responses have been received from either the Neighborhood Association or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

ZONING CODE APPROVAL CRITERIA

Chapter 33.846.060 - Historic Resource Review

Purpose of Historic Resource Review

Historic Resource Review ensures the conservation and enhancement of the special characteristics of historic resources.

Historic Resource Review Approval Criteria

Requests for Historic Resource Review will be approved if the review body finds the applicant has shown that all of the approval criteria have been met.

Findings: The site is within the Irvington Historic District and the proposal is for non-exempt treatment. Therefore Historic Resource Review approval is required. The approval criteria are those listed in *33.846.060 G – Other Approval Criteria*.

Staff has considered all guidelines and addressed only those applicable to this proposal.

33.846.060 G - Other Approval Criteria

- 1. Historic character.** The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. Removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that contribute to the property's historic significance will be avoided.
- 2. Record of its time.** The historic resource will remain a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings will be avoided.
- 3. Historic changes.** Most properties change over time. Those changes that have acquired historic significance will be preserved.
- 4. Historic features.** Generally, deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where practical, in materials. Replacement of missing features must be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- 5. Historic materials.** Historic materials will be protected. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- 7. Differentiate new from old.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. New work will be differentiated from the old.
- 8. Architectural compatibility.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will be compatible with the resource's massing, size, scale, and architectural features. When retrofitting buildings or sites to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities, design solutions will not compromise the architectural integrity of the historic resource.
- 9. Preserve the form and integrity of historic resources.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic resource and its environment would be unimpaired.
- 10. Hierarchy of compatibility.** Exterior alterations and additions will be designed to be compatible primarily with the original resource, secondarily with adjacent properties, and finally, if located within a Historic or Conservation District, with the rest of the district. Where practical, compatibility will be pursued on all three levels.

Findings for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10: The proposed garage alterations will not detract from the historic character of the landmark *Zimmerman-Rudeen House* property, and no original historic features are being altered. The main house is the primary historic element of the property as the garage is considered a non-contributing building. The ADU proposal will create a dwelling that matches the primary house but is smaller and visibly subordinate to it. The project is a deferential alteration to a non-contributing garage using like materials and construction to synchronize with the original garage structure and the landmark house.

The primary 1913 house will not be part of the project and the existing single-story garage is a non-historic feature located at the northwest corner of the property, set back behind the house and far from the property's street frontages along NE Beakey and NE 36th Ave. The project will expand the footprint of the existing garage and add a second story for an ADU. The proposed alterations are compatible to- and respectful of- the architecture of the existing garage. The new garage/ADU structure will also be compatible with the primary residence in style and materials. The roof slope and hip shape match the house. It will feature stucco cladding and have the same belly band, base and other trim details as the landmark house. Wood windows and doors will also be compatible with the original. The eaves are generous on the new structure although downsized from the main house. This, along with the absence of the elaborate decoration that is on the front of the primary home, will be appropriate for this smaller, less important structure.

The visual impact of the ADU related alterations to the garage will be negligible as seen from the public right-of-way. The detached garage is located at the rear of the *Zimmerman-Rudeen House* property limiting its visibility from the street and adjacent properties. It is set back in the northwest corner of the property, as far from its two street property lines as possible. An existing carport attached to the primary house further obscures views of the structure from NE Beakey. With the proposed location limiting visibility from the street and adjacent properties, and with the two street facing elevations being sympathetic to the front and side façades of the primary house, compatibility with the historic property and the surrounding area is maintained. In addition, the property is not located within a Historic or Conservation District.

The contributing primary house will remain a physical record of its time, as will the non-contributing garage. The proposed alterations will not include conjectural additions to either building attempting to replicate historical elements of other buildings. No alterations to the garage have taken on historic significance which requires preservation. Historic materials will not be removed, and the project will protect any original materials that are not deteriorated. The expanded garage will be differentiated by from the landmark by being a separate structure that is similar in style to the primary structure but distanced over 25' and clearly of a different era. The existing primary residence will remain untouched, and if the changes to the garage structure were to be removed the integrity of the historic resource would be unimpaired.

While the proposal expands the garage's building envelope, the proposed scale remains appropriate for the neighborhood and is suitably subordinate to the contributing house. The architectural style and materials proposed are deferential to- and compatible with- the original garage structure, as well as with the contributing house, adjacent properties and the neighborhood. The proposed addition to the non-contributing garage will not detract from the historic character of the *Zimmerman-Rudeen House* and the integrity of the landmark will be preserved with the proposed alterations.

These criteria are met.

33.846.070 Modifications Considered During Historic Resource Review

The review body may consider modification of site-related development standards, including the sign standards of Chapters 32.32 and 32.34 of the Sign Code, as part of the historic resource review process. These modifications are done as part of historic resource review and are not required to go through the adjustment process. Adjustments to use-related development standards (such as floor area ratios, intensity of use, size of the use, number of units, or concentration of uses) are required to go through the adjustment process. Modifications that are denied through historic resource review may be requested as an adjustment through the adjustment process. The review body will approve requested modifications if it finds that the applicant has shown that the following approval criteria are met:

- A. **Better meets historic resource review approval criteria.** The resulting development will better meet the approval criteria for historic resource review than would a design that meets the standard being modified; and
- B. **Purpose of the standard.**
 1. The resulting development will meet the purpose of the standard being modified; or
 2. The preservation of the character of the historic resource is more important than meeting the purpose of the standard for which a modification has been requested.

Modification #1: Setbacks. Decrease the rear setback from 5' to 2'. While the existing garage structure is already located within this setback along the northern (rear) property line and all of the proposed expansion conforms with the 5' rear and side setbacks, the

proposal expands the building envelope technically making it a larger building within the setback. (33.110.220)

Purpose Statement: The setback regulations for buildings and garage entrances serve several purposes:

- They maintain light, air, separation for fire protection, and access for fire fighting;
- They reflect the general building scale and placement of houses in the city's neighborhoods;
- They promote a reasonable physical relationship between residences;
- They promote options for privacy for neighboring properties;
- They require larger front setbacks than side and rear setbacks to promote open, visually pleasing front yards;
- They provide adequate flexibility to site a building so that it may be compatible with the neighborhood, fit the topography of the site, allow for required outdoor areas, and allow for architectural diversity; and
- They provide room for a car to park in front of a garage door without overhanging the street or sidewalk, and they enhance driver visibility when backing onto the street.

Standard: 33.110.220, The required minimum side and rear building setback is 5'.

A. Better meets historic resource review approval criteria. *The resulting development will better meet the approval criteria for historic resource review than would a design that meets the standard being modified; and*

B. Purpose of the standard.

1. The resulting development will meet the purpose of the standard being modified; or
2. The preservation of the character of the historic resource is more important than meeting the purpose of the standard for which a modification has been requested.

Findings: Along the northern property line, the required minimum setback for a building is 5'. As is noted in the description of the Modification request, the existing setback is not being reduced by the expansion of additional building area, but rather the existing building is expanding in size, therefore triggering the need to modify this standard. The existing garage already exists within the north setback, sitting 2' from the north property line and thus already does not comply with the 5' setback standard. The Modification allows the existing portion of the garage to remain within the setback as is. This portion of the existing garage that will remain within the setback is only one story high and will remain so.

On balance, the proposal will be consistent with the purpose of the setback standard which largely pertains to limiting the impacts of full building walls extruding into setbacks. Because the existing condition within the setback already exists, access to light, air, and egress on the north side will remain the same as the existing condition. The new building areas fully conform with setback standards and the proposal reflects the building patterning in the area. The garage's continued occupation of only a small percentage of the linear footage of the north property line and its maintenance of 2' from that property line promotes a reasonable physical relationship between residences which is compatible with the neighborhood and allows for privacy and architectural diversity.

The proposed expansion is compatible in scale to the landmark house and large lot and maintains reasonable relationships between properties. The expansion in building area is toward the south and west rather than towards the north (where the existing setback encroachment is situated), thus the impact is concentrated away from the reduced setback. The westward expansion is towards a side property line, where the proposal maintains the required 5' setback from the property line and the southward expansion is towards the property's interior, where there will remain an ample 26' separation between the house and garage/ADU. There is also an abundance of space between the existing structure and any others on adjacent properties, thus maintaining light, air, separation for fire protection, and access for fire fighting. Windows and eaves on the

existing part of the garage that sits within the setback will be removed for better fire protection.

Generally, the proposed condition better meets historic resource review approval criteria than would a full demolition of the existing structure and a rebuild 5' from the rear property line. Maintaining the existing placement is more true to the historic placement of accessory structures for historic houses in Portland. Because the existing garage's placement within the setback will remain as is rather than building an entirely new structure outside of the setback, the Modification allows a reasonable expansion of an existing structure, thereby ensuring that an entirely new structure would not overwhelm the primary resource. The garage's conversion maintains the building's existing footprint and scale within the rear setback. While the building footprint and massing of the garage will expand, the expansion areas will fully meet zoning standards and the structure will remain significantly smaller than the house, and will remain a visually subordinate structure. Retaining the placement of the existing structure within the setback reflects the general placement of garages which often sit close to a rear property line. The proposed project better meets the Criteria 1 - Historic character, Criteria 2 - Record of its time, Criteria 3 - Historic changes, Criteria 8 - Architectural compatibility, and Criteria 10 - Hierarchy of compatibility.

Therefore, this Modification merits approval.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Unless specifically required in the approval criteria listed above, this proposal does not have to meet the development standards in order to be approved during this review process. The plans submitted for a building or zoning permit must demonstrate that all development standards of Title 33 can be met, or have received an Adjustment or Modification via a land use review prior to the approval of a building or zoning permit.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed alterations will preserve the historic significance of the resource, while allowing the garage to modernize in order to accommodate a new function. The proposed project is respectful of the landmark house, the non-contributing garage structure, and the neighborhood. The ADU is subordinate to the house in both its size and design and its location at the back corner of the site also contributes to its secondary status. The purpose of the Historic Resource Review process is to ensure that additions, new construction, and exterior alterations to historic resources do not compromise their ability to convey historic significance. This proposal meets the applicable Historic Resource Review criteria and therefore warrants approval.

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

Approval to expand an existing, non-contributing, detached garage located on the landmark *Zimmerman-Rudeen House* property and convert it to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).

Approval of the following Modification request:

Setbacks. Decrease the rear setback from 5' to 2'. While the existing garage structure is already located within this setback along the northern (rear) property line and all of the proposed expansion conforms with the 5' rear and side setbacks, the proposal expands the building envelope technically making it a larger building within the setback. (33.110.220)


Approvals per the approved site plans, Exhibits C-1 through C-10, signed and dated 11/29/2021, subject to the following conditions:

- A. As part of the building permit application submittal, the following development-related conditions (B through C) must be noted on each of the 4 required site plans or included as

a sheet in the numbered set of plans. The sheet on which this information appears must be labeled "ZONING COMPLIANCE PAGE - Case File LU 21-073805 HRM." All requirements must be graphically represented on the site plan, landscape, or other required plan and must be labeled "REQUIRED."

- B. At the time of building permit submittal, a signed Certificate of Compliance form (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/article/623658>) must be submitted to ensure the permit plans comply with the Design/Historic Resource Review decision and approved exhibits.
- C. No field changes allowed.

Staff Planner: Tanya Paglia

Decision rendered by:  **on 11/29/2021.**

By authority of the Director of the Bureau of Development Services

Decision mailed: 12/3/2021

About this Decision. This land use decision is **not a permit** for development. Permits may be required prior to any work. Contact the Development Services Center at 503-823-7310 for information about permits.

Procedural Information. The application for this land use review was submitted on August 4, 2021, and was determined to be complete on October 13, 2021.

Zoning Code Section 33.700.080 states that Land Use Review applications are reviewed under the regulations in effect at the time the application was submitted, provided that the application is complete at the time of submittal, or complete within 180 days. Therefore this application was reviewed against the Zoning Code in effect on August 4, 2021.

ORS 227.178 states the City must issue a final decision on Land Use Review applications within 120-days of the application being deemed complete. The 120-day review period may be waived or extended at the request of the applicant. In this case, the applicant did not waive or extend the 120-day review period. Unless further extended by the applicant, **the 120 days will expire on: 2/10/2022.**

Some of the information contained in this report was provided by the applicant.

As required by Section 33.800.060 of the Portland Zoning Code, the burden of proof is on the applicant to show that the approval criteria are met. The Bureau of Development Services has independently reviewed the information submitted by the applicant and has included this information only where the Bureau of Development Services has determined the information satisfactorily demonstrates compliance with the applicable approval criteria. This report is the decision of the Bureau of Development Services with input from other City and public agencies.

Conditions of Approval. If approved, this project may be subject to a number of specific conditions, listed above. Compliance with the applicable conditions of approval must be documented in all related permit applications. Plans and drawings submitted during the permitting process must illustrate how applicable conditions of approval are met. Any project elements that are specifically required by conditions of approval must be shown on the plans, and labeled as such.

These conditions of approval run with the land, unless modified by future land use reviews. As used in the conditions, the term "applicant" includes the applicant for this land use review, any person undertaking development pursuant to this land use review, the proprietor of the use or development approved by this land use review, and the current owner and future owners of the property subject to this land use review.

Appealing this decision. This decision may be appealed to the Landmarks Commission, and if appealed a hearing will be held. The appeal application form can be accessed at <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/45477>. Appeals must be received **by 4:30 PM on 12/17/2021. The completed appeal application form must be emailed to LandUseIntake@portlandoregon.gov and to the planner listed on the first page of this decision.** If you do not have access to e-mail, please telephone the planner listed on the front page of this notice about submitting the appeal application. **An appeal fee of \$250 will be charged.** Once the completed appeal application form is received, Bureau of Development Services staff will contact you regarding paying the appeal fee. The appeal fee will be refunded if the appellant prevails. There is no fee for Office of Community and Civic Life recognized organizations for the appeal of Type II and IIx decisions on property within the organization's boundaries. The vote to appeal must be in accordance with the organization's bylaws. Please contact the planner listed on the front page of this decision for assistance in filing the appeal and information on fee waivers. Please see the appeal form for additional information.

If you are interested in viewing information in this file, please contact the planner listed on the front of this notice. The planner can email you documents from the file. A fee would be required for all requests for paper copies of file documents. Additional information about the City of Portland, and city bureaus is available online at <https://www.portland.gov>. A digital copy of the Portland Zoning Code is available online at <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/zoningcode>.

Attending the hearing. If this decision is appealed, a hearing will be scheduled, and you will be notified of the date and time of the hearing. The decision of the Landmarks Commission is final; any further appeal must be made to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) within 21 days of the date of mailing the decision, pursuant to ORS 197.620 and 197.830. Contact LUBA at 775 Summer St NE, Suite 330, Salem, Oregon 97301-1283, or phone 1-503-373-1265 for further information.

Failure to raise an issue by the close of the record at or following the final hearing on this case, in person or by letter, may preclude an appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) on that issue. Also, if you do not raise an issue with enough specificity to give the Landmarks Commission an opportunity to respond to it, that also may preclude an appeal to LUBA on that issue.

Recording the final decision.

If this Land Use Review is approved the final decision will be recorded with the Multnomah County Recorder.

- *Unless appealed*, the final decision will be recorded after **12/17/2021** by the Bureau of Development Services.

The applicant, builder, or a representative does not need to record the final decision with the Multnomah County Recorder.

For further information on your recording documents please call the Bureau of Development Services Land Use Services Division at 503-823-0625.

Expiration of this approval. An approval expires three years from the date the final decision is rendered unless a building permit has been issued, or the approved activity has begun.

Where a site has received approval for multiple developments, and a building permit is not issued for all of the approved development within three years of the date of the final decision, a new land use review will be required before a permit will be issued for the remaining development, subject to the Zoning Code in effect at that time.

Applying for your permits. A building permit, occupancy permit, or development permit may be required before carrying out an approved project. At the time they apply for a permit, permittees must demonstrate compliance with:

- All conditions imposed herein;
- All applicable development standards, unless specifically exempted as part of this land use review;
- All requirements of the building code; and
- All provisions of the Municipal Code of the City of Portland, and all other applicable ordinances, provisions and regulations of the City.

EXHIBITS

NOT ATTACHED UNLESS INDICATED

- A. Applicant's Submittal
 1. Applicant's original written statement and response to approval criteria
 2. Applicant's original Modification write-up
 3. Original plan set – NOT APPROVED/reference only
 4. Applicant's written response to Incomplete Letter
 5. Applicant's revised written statement and response to approval criteria, 9/17/2021
 6. Applicant's revised Modification write-up, 9/17/2021
 7. Window cutsheets
 8. Door cutsheets
 9. Garage door cutsheets
- B. Zoning Map (attached)
- C. Plans/Drawings:
 1. Site Plan – Existing and Proposed (attached)
 2. Proposed Garage Main Level Floor Plan
 3. Proposed Upper Level Floor Plan
 4. Existing Primary House South (front) and East (south) Elevations
 5. Proposed Garage South (front) Elevation (attached)
 6. Proposed Garage East (side) Elevation
 7. Proposed Garage North (rear) Elevation
 8. Proposed Garage West (side) Elevation
 9. Existing Garage Elevations (attached)
 10. Window Details
- D. Notification information:
 1. Mailing list
 2. Mailed notice
- E. Agency Responses:
 1. Life Safety Division of the Bureau of Development Services
 2. The Bureau of Transportation Engineering
- F. Correspondence: None
- G. Other:
 1. Original LU Application
 2. Incomplete Letter
 3. Oregon Historic Site Record
 4. National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form
 5. Historic Resource Inventory City of Portland
 6. LUS Division Refund Request Form for Unnecessary Modification Request

The Bureau of Development Services is committed to providing equal access to information and hearings. Please notify us no less than five business days prior to the event if you need special accommodations. Call 503-823-7300 (TTY 503-823-6868).