



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

Carmen Rubio, Commissioner  
Rebecca Esau, Director  
Phone: (503) 823-7310  
TTY: (503) 823-6868  
[www.portland.gov/bds](http://www.portland.gov/bds)

**Date:** June 2, 2023  
**To:** Interested Person  
**From:** Grace Jeffreys, Land Use Services  
503-865-6521 / [Grace.Jeffreys@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Grace.Jeffreys@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.

*If this case is appealed, the hearing for the appeal will be held Monday July 10, 2023 @ 1:30p.m. with the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission. This land use hearing will be limited to remote participation via Zoom. Please refer to the instructions included with this notice to observe and participate remotely. If a timely and valid appeal is filed by the end of the appeal period at 4:30pm on June 15, 2023, no supplemental mailed hearing notice will be sent.*

*If appealed, the appeal will be listed on the online Historic Landmarks Commission hearing agenda no later than 5pm on Tuesday, June 27, 2023. Online hearing schedules are available on the Historic Landmarks web page under Events <https://www.portland.gov/bds/landmarks>. Copies of the appeal filing will also be available by contacting the case planner, Grace Jeffreys (contact info. at top of page) on or after Tuesday, June 20, 2023.*

*This public hearing may be cancelled due to inclement weather or other similar emergency. Please view the public hearings agenda, which is frequently updated, at this link: <https://www.portland.gov/bds/landmarks>. You can also call the Bureau of Development Services at 503-823-7617, for information regarding cancellations or rescheduling. Cancelled hearings will be rescheduled for the earliest possible date. A renotification notice may not be sent. Please call the Case Planner, Grace Jeffreys (contact info. At top of page) for information regarding cancellations and/or rescheduling*

### **CASE FILE NUMBER: LU 22-192033 HR – 1627 SE 20<sup>TH</sup> AVE, SIDING, WINDOWS AND PORCH COLUMNS**

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Applicants/ Owners:** James and Kelly Barrett,  
1627 SE 20th Ave., Portland, OR 97214  
[jmbarrett@gmail.com](mailto:jmbarrett@gmail.com),

**Site Address:** 1627 SE 20TH AVE

**Legal Description:** BLOCK 21 LOT 7 TL 6400, LADDS ADD  
**Tax Account No.:** R463304790

**State ID No.:** 1S1E02DA 06400  
**Quarter Section:** 3232

**Neighborhood:** Hosford-Abernethy, contact Michael Wade at wade.michael@comcast.net

**Business District:** Hawthorne Blvd. Bus. Assoc., contact at explore@hawthornepdx.com  
**District Coalition:** Southeast Uplift, contact Matchu Williams at matchu@seuplift.org

**Plan District:** None  
**Other Designations:** Classified as a Non-Contributing but Compatible/Historic resource in the Ladd's Addition Historic District

**Zoning:** **R5**, Single Dwelling Residential 5,000 zone  
**Case Type:** **HR**, Historic Resource Review  
**Procedure:** **Type II**, an administrative decision with appeal to the Landmarks Commission.

**Proposal:**

The applicant seeks Historic Resource Review approval for exterior alterations to a house that is considered a Non-Contributing but Compatible/Historic Resource in the Ladd's Addition Historic District. The 1924 home, known as the Frank Reiner House, was built by Frank Reiner in the Twentieth Century Colonial Revival style with horizontal lap siding. The site also contains a contributing garage to the rear off the alley.

This review is for already completed exterior renovations which were recently made to the house without receiving a required Historic Resource Review approval prior to undertaking the work, and include:

- **Siding:** Newly installed 7-1/4" fiber cement lap siding with 6" exposure, which replaced non-original vinyl lap siding. Original siding was wood lap siding.
- **Windows:** Newly installed vinyl windows, which replaced a majority of vinyl windows including eighteen (18) vinyl eight-over-one hung vinyl windows and two (2) vinyl ten-over-one hung vinyl windows facing the street, and three small original wood divided lite windows at the basement level and two original wood divided lite windows on either side of the chimney.
- **Front Porch Columns:** Newly installed pair of 7-1/4" square columns clad with rough sawn laminated cedar, which replaced round wood Tuscan columns that were likely original.

Because each of these elements has been completely replaced rather than repaired or maintained, Historic Resource Review is required for these non-exempt exterior alterations to an existing structure within a Historic District, per Portland Zoning Code 33.445.200.

**Relevant Approval Criteria:**

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

- [Ladd's Addition Conservation District Guidelines](#)

**ANALYSIS**

**Site and Vicinity:** The site is an irregularly shaped 4,200 square foot parcel at the northeasterly end of Block 21 of Ladd's Addition fronting SE 20th Avenue, one block south of SE Hawthorne. A one-and-one-half story residence with detached garage was built on the site in 1924.

- **House:** From the Ladd's Addition National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (the "National Register"), the house is listed as the Frank Reiner house, built in the "Twentieth Century Colonial" style (Exhibit G.3). At one and one-half stories, the house is modest, and the nomination notes that: *"The house and the one next door were built on speculation by carpenter Frank Reiner, and were used as rental units. In 1925 the tenants were Frank*

*Gillespie, a manager of Carbon Coal Company, and his wife, Estelle.*” The house is classified as a “Non-Contributing: Compatible/Historic” resource in the Ladd’s Addition Historic District. From the Nomination, the house is further described as follows:

*This rectangular one-and-one-half story building has a moderately-pitched gable roof with minimal boxed eaves, a boxed return cornice and composition shingles.*

- *There are two small gable-roofed dormers with boxed eaves on the front elevation.*
  - *A single-bay gable-roofed entry porch with a segmental-arched pediment, boxed eaves, return boxed cornice, Tuscan columns and a concrete stoop is centered on the front elevation.*
  - *The windows are primarily eight-over-one double-hung wood sashes; the recessed entry door has glazed sidelights, and is flanked by two large twelve-over-one double-hung wood windows.*
  - *The building has been sided with horizontal aluminum siding, which has obscured the window trim, and adversely affected the building’s historic character.*
- **Garage:** The site also contains a Contributing: Secondary garage to the rear facing the alley (Exhibit G.3). From the nomination, the garage is described as follows:

*The single-car garage on the alley has an eave-less gable roof with weatherboard siding, original doors and windows; it contributes in scale, mass and detail to the spatial order of the block’s alley.*

In 2020, the owners initiated a project to renovate their home which included replacement of the home’s existing failing vinyl siding and windows as well as deteriorating wood round front porch columns. The work was called into Code Compliance (#22-162371 CC), and a code compliance officer determined that Historic Resource Review is required before any additional work could continue.

**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 zones implement the comprehensive plan policies and designations for single-dwelling housing and provide options for infill housing that is compatible with the scale of the single-dwelling neighborhood. Generally, minimum lot size is 3,000 square feet with minimum width and depth dimensions of 36 and 50 feet, respectively, and a maximum density of 1 lot per 5,000 square feet of site area. For attached houses, minimum lot size is 1,500 square feet with minimum width and depth dimensions of 15 and 50 feet, respectively, and a maximum density of 1 lot per 1,500 square feet of site area.

The historic resource overlay zone protects historic resources that have been identified as significant to the history of the city and region. The regulations implement Portland’s Comprehensive Plan policies that address historic preservation. These policies recognize the role historic resources have in promoting education and enjoyment for those living in and visiting the region. The regulations foster awareness, memory, and pride among the region’s current and future residents in their city and its diverse architecture, culture, and history. Historic preservation recognizes social and cultural history, retains significant architecture, promotes economic and environmental health, and steward’s important resources for the use, education, and enjoyment of future generations.

Ladd’s Addition is Portland’s oldest planned residential community (1891) and one of the oldest in the western United States. Ladd’s radial street plan marked a dramatic break in Portland’s typical grid street pattern. With a formal symmetry echoing Renaissance cities and gardens, the radial streets converge at five formal gardens, which are the showpieces of the community. Parking strips are lines with mature street trees, green archways of elms and maples. The architectural character of Ladd’s Addition was established in the three decades following the turn of the century. Although the individual structures represent a variety of styles, including Bungalow, Mission, Tudor and Colonial Revival, they have a continuity of materials, scale, detailing, orientation and setback which creates a sense of architectural uniformity.

**Land Use History:** City records indicate there are no prior land use reviews for this site.

**Agency Review:** A “Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood” was mailed **April 12, 2023**. The following Bureaus have responded with no issues or concerns:

- Life Safety Section of BDS (Exhibit E.1).
- Bureau of Parks-Forestry Division (Exhibit E.2).

**Neighborhood Review:** A Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood was mailed on April 12, 2023. A total of seven written responses have been received from either the Neighborhood Association or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

1. Julie Mumford, on April 14, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations (Exhibit F.1).
2. Robert and Karen Bugas, on April 14, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations (Exhibit F.2).
3. Kim Pengelly, on April 16, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations (Exhibit F.3).
4. Tom Jenkins and Mike Ebbs, on April 26, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed siding and windows, and suggested possible revisions to the columns (Exhibit F.4).
5. Walter Keutel, on April 25, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations (Exhibit F.5).
6. Barbara Weiss, on May 1, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations (Exhibit F.6).
7. Steve Carson and Daryl Harrison Carson, on May 2, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations (Exhibit F.7).

**Staff response:** *Staff appreciates the neighbors’ responses to the proposal and the insight into the context and history of the house. Because of the obvious deterioration of the past vinyl siding and windows, the responses received from neighbors were generally in support for these newly installed exterior renovations, with the exception of one response which suggested alternatives to the front porch column design (Exhibit F.4).*

## **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 located within the Ladd's Addition Historic District and the proposal is for a non-exempt treatment not requiring a new foundation. Therefore, Historic Resource Review approval is required. The approval criteria are the *Ladd's Addition Conservation District Design Guidelines – Exterior Rehabilitation*.

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

### **Ladd's Addition Conservation District Guidelines – Exterior Rehabilitation**

- 1. Façades Oriented to a Street.** In rehabilitating existing buildings, the architectural integrity of street-oriented façades should be maintained. Additions and structural alterations should be limited to the rear and side yard façades and be minimally visible from the street.
- 3. Exterior Siding Material.** Restoration and maintenance of original siding materials is encouraged. Materials used on additions should match or be compatible with the predominant

materials used on the original structure. Most single-family residences and duplexes in Ladd's Addition feature stucco, horizontal wood siding, wood shingles, brick or a combination of these materials. Most commercial and multi-family structures feature stucco or brick. The following materials are discouraged: plywood, used brick, shakes, exposed concrete block and metal.

**5. Front Façade Detailing.** Original entrances to buildings, front porches and projecting features, such as balconies, bays, and dormer windows should be retained or restored.

**6. Windows and Doors.** Original windows and doors, including trim, should be retained or restored. If repair is not feasible, new windows or windows on additions should match or be compatible with original windows in form, materials, type, pattern and placement of openings. On residences, the removal of original wood sash windows and replacement with aluminum sash is especially discouraged. Restoration of commercial storefront windows with large, fixed glass panes below and smaller glass panes above is especially encouraged.

**Findings for 1, 3, 5 and 6:** This house is classified as a "Non-Contributing/Compatible/Historic" resource in the Ladd's Addition Historic District. In 2020, the owners initiated a project to update this house, which included the replacement of the non-original failing vinyl siding and windows as well as deteriorating wood round front porch columns that were likely original. These external alterations were done without the required Historic Resource Review and the work was called into Code Compliance (#22-162371 CC). A code compliance officer determined that Historic Resource Review is required for this already installed work. Therefore, this review is for already completed exterior renovations made without Historic Resource Review.

Because these renovations affect all four facades, the findings for these guidelines have been grouped together and organized per element:

- Siding;
- Windows; and,
- Front porch columns.

**Siding.** This review includes newly installed fiber cement lap siding, which replaced non-original vinyl lap siding.

**Non-original siding that was replaced.** Documentation of the siding that was replaced in 2022 is unclear and contradictory. At the time the house was listed in the National Register in 1988, it was described as having horizontal aluminum siding that adversely affected the building's historic character (Exhibit A.12 -Appx. A, p. 9):

*The building has been sided with horizontal aluminum siding, which has obscured the window trim, and adversely affected the building's historic character.*

A picture of the house (circa 1988, around the time of the nomination) shows what appears to be about a 7-8" exposure lap siding, but doesn't confirm the material (Exhibit A.12 -Appx. B). Seventeen years later, a February 2005 inspection report notes that "*the original siding on this residence has been covered with Vinyl Siding.*" It also notes that "*The condition of the vinyl siding is poor. The condition and detailing of the vinyl siding suggests that it was installed in the sixties.*" Based on Google Street images 2009-2019 (Exhibit G.6) and documentation from the owner (Exhibit A.15), this same deteriorating vinyl siding over original wood siding appears to have remained on the house until its recent replacement with the fiber cement siding that is part of the subject of this review. It can therefore be concluded that the nomination incorrectly stated the siding was aluminum, rather than vinyl.

The 2005 report also advised that the original wood siding had remained underneath the vinyl siding, and the exterior of the house could possibly be restored to its original condition (Exhibit A.12 -Appx. C):

*Almost all of the original siding is still sound. The nail holes and small areas of damage can be repaired with an exterior grade wood filler. There are a few trim*

*details that would also require restoration. An example of a trim detail that was removed for the vinyl installation can be seen on the house to the left of your residence. The bottom edge(s) of the walls have a detail known as a water table. This trim element protects the bottom of the siding and directs the water away from the walls. Many of the homeowners in your area have chosen this course of action. The costs involved are only slightly higher than the cost of replacing the vinyl with HardiPlank. The higher costs are offset by the favorable return on investment that come from restorations. Replacing the siding with vinyl or composite materials often fails to result in an increase equity.*

The 1988 nomination classified the house as a “Non-Contributing: Compatible/Historic” resource because it had been altered in such a way that it “does not contribute to the character of the district in [its] present condition.” The nomination points towards the non-original siding as the reason for this lower classification: “*The building has been sided with horizontal aluminum siding, which has obscured the window trim, and adversely affected the building's historic character.*” This classification also notes that “*Most of these resources, if restored, could be reclassified as contributing structures.*”

Therefore, it is unfortunate that prior to the 2022 full siding replacement, more investigation into repairing the original wood siding underneath was not undertaken, as Guideline 3. Exterior Siding Material specifically encourages “*restoration and maintenance of original siding materials...*”. Additionally, this work may have led to an opportunity to reclassify this house as a Contributing Resource, and thereby strengthen rather than further diminish the integrity of the house as well as the surrounding historic district. Without a more recent siding report however, it is difficult to determine how the original wood siding may have fared seventeen more years underneath failing and poorly detailed vinyl siding as described in the 2005 report.

**Newly installed siding.** The newly installed siding is 7-1/4” fiber cement lap with 6” exposure lap siding and fiber cement window casings without sills below the windows. This siding is 5/16” thick with a smooth texture finish (Exhibit C.11).

As noted above, Guideline 3. Exterior Siding Material specifically encourages “*restoration and maintenance of original siding materials...*”. In this case, the original siding has been removed, so its restoration is not possible. Guideline 3 then notes that replacement siding is expected to “*match or be compatible with the predominant materials used on the original structure*”. Based on the 2005 Siding Report, the original siding was likely a horizontal wood lap siding (Exhibit A.12, App, C). Because this already installed siding is fiber cement rather than wood, it does not *match* the materials found on the original structure. The proposed 5/16” thick fiber cement lap siding is typically not supportable in the Historic District because it lacks the depth and shadow lines of historic wood siding. In this instance, although it is missing the depth and therefore shadow lines, it has been installed with a reasonably moderate exposure of 6”, and it is a paintable material. Additionally, this house is considered Non-Contributing, and the installed siding is an improvement over the poor-quality and deteriorating vinyl siding it replaced as noted in the neighbors’ comments (Exhibits F.1-7). Staff finds that, in this code compliance case and because the original siding no longer exists, the replacement siding is similar enough visually to the horizontal wood siding featured in most of the original single-family residences in Ladd’s Addition to not further deter from the architectural integrity of the façade of the house nor the overall district enough to determine it should be replaced.

Moving forward, a condition of approval had been added to ensure any future siding replacement will be more compatible with and therefore better maintain the integrity of the house and support the district:

**If a full siding replacement is proposed in the future, new siding shall be a lap siding with a maximum 6” exposure that is either wood or a minimum**

**5/8” thick fiber cement and new casings shall provide wood sills below window openings replicating a typical window detail original to the house.**

**Windows.** This review includes newly installed vinyl windows that replaced primarily non-original vinyl windows, as well as five (5) original wood windows.

**Non-original windows that were replaced.** The windows that were replaced appear to have included eighteen (18) vinyl eight-over-one hung windows, two (2) vinyl ten-over-one hung windows facing the street, two (2) wood divided lite windows either side of the chimney, and three (3) small wood divided lite awning windows at the basement level.

No window survey was provided of the windows that existed prior to the 2022 replacement. Therefore, staff has relied on other documentation provided. At the time of the district’s nomination in 1988, it was described as having double-hung wood windows (Exhibit G.3):

*The windows are primarily eight-over-one double-hung wood sashes; the recessed entry door has glazed sidelights, and is flanked by two large twelve-over-one double-hung wood windows.*

A photo of the house, circa 1988, appears to generally agree with this, as it shows dark painted double-hung wood windows with divided lite upper sashes that align with this description (Exhibit A.12 - Appx. B). One minor exception is that the divided lite pattern of the upper sashes of the ground floor front windows appear to be ten-over-one rather twelve-over-one.

Sometime after the 1988 photo was taken, it appears that most of these wood windows were replaced with vinyl windows. This assumption is based on a February 2005 Siding Report (Exhibit A.12, Appx. C), which describes the windows as vinyl, and notes their poor design “*The unusual configuration of the vinyl replacement windows provides ideal conditions for mold growth.*” (Exhibit A.12 - Appx. C). The applicant also confirmed that most of the windows recently replaced were these same windows, with the exception of two smaller ground-floor wood windows either side of the chimney on the north elevation and three basement wood windows on the south and west elevations (Exhibit A.15).

**Newly installed windows.** The newly installed windows are vinyl with acrylic caps. They are primarily full lite casements or fixed operation, with the exception of the four front windows which also include some type of divided lites along the top of the windows (Drawing on Exhibit C.3 and photos on Exhibit A.3). While the applicants initially proposed no changes to this proposal, they have included an alternate option for the replacement of the two ground-level street-facing windows with fiberglass windows “that would be exempt from Historical Resource Review” (Exhibits C.20-23). Staff notes that if this alternate option were to be pursued, the applicant would need to demonstrate compliance with all parts of the exemption listed in 33.445.200.D.2.v.(2), specifically that the window glass would need to be “recessed at least 2 inches from the outside edge of the exterior finish material”.

Guideline 6. Windows and Doors notes that “*Original windows and doors, including trim, should be retained or restored.*” In this case, none of the original windows remain except the two glazed sidelights at the front porch. The majority of the double-hung wood windows described in the nomination were replaced with vinyl prior to 2005, and then in 2022 all of the windows except for the sidelights either side of the front door were replaced with vinyl. So, unfortunately, repair of original windows is not possible.

The guideline further notes that “*If repair is not feasible, new windows or windows on additions should match or be compatible with original windows in form, materials, type, pattern and placement of openings.*” At the time of the nomination, the majority of the

windows were primarily eight-over-one double-hung, with the two large front windows ten-over-one double-hung. Paired windows, like those in the gable ends, featured a mull between the windows supporting them. The new vinyl windows do not match and are also not compatible with the original windows, as they differ in every way listed in the guideline (Drawings on Exhibits C.2-9, photos on Exhibits A.12, App. B and A.3):

- *Form:* The form of the new windows are full lite, singular glazed elements rather than a pair of double-hung with offset sashes, as shown in the wood windows in the 1988 photo.
- *Material:* The material of the new windows is vinyl, a non-paintable material, rather than wood as shown in the 1988 photo.
- *Type:* The type of new windows are casements, rather than the double-hung with a pair of offset sashes, as shown in the 1988 photo.
- *Pattern:* The pattern of the new windows is a singular lite without an offset upper sash with divided lites, as shown in the wood windows in the 1988 photo. Additionally, the windows at the second floor on the Side (south) elevation are a ganged set of three windows, rather than a pair of two windows with a framed mull between, which presents very different proportions from the original arrangement.
- *Placement of openings:* The placement of the frames of the new windows within the wall plane is flush with the outside wall, rather than the traditional recessed frames shown in the wood windows in the photo taken in 1988. In addition, the casings around the new windows are missing the traditional sill below the window frames, a functional and important detail in a window assembly.

As noted in the applicant's narrative (Exhibit A.11, pp. 6-7), City Council has also articulated the following definition of compatibility: "*Compatibility occurs when a proposal is capable of existing together in harmony with its context, and shares principles of scale, proportion, composition, level of detail, materials, and craftsmanship with the historic resource.*" Nw. Dist. Neighborhood Ass'n v. City of Portland, LUBA No. 2019-003, at p. 9 (Sept. 9, 2019). The "historic resource" in this context is "the entire District, not just the contributing buildings or a single site."

While this house is considered Non-Contributing, and these windows replaced deteriorated vinyl windows, the new vinyl windows do not "match" the original windows. Additionally, they are also not "compatible" with the house or the historic district, because they have little in common with what appears to be the original windows shown in the 1988 photo, and instead differ in multiple ways: *form, materials, type, pattern and placement of openings*". They also differ in "*principles of scale, proportion, composition, level of detail, materials, and craftsmanship*", as City Council later defined compatibility. Because of this, they actively diminish the architectural integrity of the house and of the overall district.

In this case, unfortunately, these non-compatible vinyl windows have already been installed. At a minimum, however, the windows that are most visible to the street on the front (east) and south (side) elevations must be changed to be more compatible and better maintain the integrity of the house and the district by at least having the same *form, type, pattern and placement of openings*. Since this is not a contributing resource, fiberglass, as a paintable material, can be considered a compatible enough replacement for the wood *material*, as is supported by the exemption to Historic Resource Review in 33.445.200.D.2.v.(2). The following conditions of approval have, therefore, been added:

**The windows on the front (east) and side (south) elevations shall be fiberglass, be a hung operation with a pair of offset sashes, and have divided or simulated divided lites in the upper sashes with a pattern to match those show on the original elevations (Exhibits C.2, 4, 6 and 8). The window glass shall be recessed at least 2" measured from the glass to the outside edge of the exterior finish material.**



**The windows at the second-floor on the side (south) elevation shall be a pair of hung windows separated by a fully framed and cased mull to match the original window opening pattern, as depicted on the original elevation (Drawing Exhibit C.4).**

Moving forward, a condition of approval had been added to ensure that any future window replacement will be more compatible with and therefore better maintain the integrity of the house and support the district:

**If new windows are proposed in the future, the new windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or fiberglass, be a hung operation with a pair of offset sashes, and have divided or simulated divided lites in the upper sashes with a pattern to match those show on the original elevations, including reconstruction of the wood mulls between originally paired windows (Exhibits C.2, 4, 6 and 8). The window glass shall be recessed at least 2” measured from the glass to the outside edge of the exterior finish material.**

**Front Porch Columns.** This review includes a pair of already installed square front porch columns, which replaced round wood Tuscan columns that were likely original.

**Existing columns that were replaced:** The nomination describes the front porch columns as Tuscan (Exhibit G.3):

*A single-bay gable-roofed entry porch with a segmental-arched pediment, boxed eaves, return boxed cornice, Tuscan columns and a concrete stoop is centered on the front elevation.*

The 1988 photo also shows round Tuscan style columns (Exhibit A.12, App. B), and it is likely these are the same wood columns the applicant recently replaced. The applicant has stated that they replaced the existing columns to address significant rotting that had occurred at the base of the existing columns, which resulted in a risk of lack of support for the portico above.

No survey or photographic evidence has been provided to document this, and it is unfortunate that prior to this replacement, more investigation into repairing the original round wood columns was not undertaken first. *Guideline 1. Façades Oriented to a Street* and *Guideline 5. Front Façade Detailing* both emphasize the importance of retaining and restoring original features, especially at the front facade, to maintain the architectural integrity of street-oriented façades. If indeed the existing columns were beyond restoration and repair, their replacement should have matched the existing round wood Tuscan style columns shown in the 1888 photo (Exhibit A.12, App. B) to maintain the architectural integrity of street-oriented façade.

**Newly installed columns.** The newly installed front porch columns are a pair of 7-1/4” square columns clad with rough sawn laminated cedar. The applicants also propose an alternate option to install round columns with a Tuscan cap and base, and their narrative describes these as fiberglass (Exhibit C.19).

This house is Non-Contributing and the likely original round wood Tuscan columns have already been removed. Additionally, the already installed modest square-clad columns are not dissimilar enough from other porch columns in the district to consider them to be damaging to the “*architectural integrity of the front street-facing façade*” of the house or the district enough to determine they should be replaced.

### **Summary**

In summary, staff finds that decades ago the original lap wood siding was covered with vinyl siding and most of the original wood double-hung windows were removed and

replaced with vinyl windows - work which was incompatible with the house and the surrounding historic context. More recent work replaced that vinyl siding and what remained of the original wood siding underneath, those vinyl windows, and the likely original round wood front porch columns. With the conditions listed above, the proposal will be compatible enough with the character of the home and with the historic district to meet the applicable approval criteria and ensure that future work will be more compatible with the character of the home and with the historic district.

*With the following conditions of approval as listed above and below, these guidelines are met:*

- **If a full siding replacement is proposed in the future, all new siding shall be a lap siding with a maximum 6" exposure that is either wood or a minimum 5/8" thick fiber cement and new casings shall provide wood sills below window openings replicating a typical window detail original to the house.**
- **The windows on the front (east) and side (south) elevations shall be fiberglass, be a hung operation with a pair of offset sashes, and have divided or simulated divided lites in the upper sashes with a pattern to match those show on the original elevations (Exhibits C.2, 4, 6 and 8). The window glass shall be recessed at least 2" measured from the glass to the outside edge of the exterior finish material.**
- **The windows at the second-floor on the side (south) elevation shall be a pair of hung windows separated by a fully framed and cased mull to match the original window opening pattern, as depicted on the original elevation (Exhibit C.4).**
- **If new windows are proposed in the future, the new windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or fiberglass, be a hung operation with a pair of offset sashes, and have divided or simulated divided lites in the upper sashes with a pattern to match those shown on the original elevations, including reconstruction of wood mulls between originally paired windows (Exhibits C.2, 4, 6 and 8). The window glass shall be recessed at least 2" measured from the glass to outside edge of the exterior finish material.**

## **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 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.

With the conditions of approval listed, some parts of this proposal are compatible enough to not negatively impact the integrity of house and the district as seen from adjacent streets. Some parts of this proposal – siding and columns - have been shown to meet the applicable Historic Resource Review criteria.

Other parts of this proposal – the windows - are not compatible and do negatively impact the integrity of the house and the district as seen from adjacent streets. For these elements, staff has added conditions of approval to require immediate changes to the most visible portions of

the house – the east and south facades, while requiring that future changes to the rest of the house come into compliance in the future.

### ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

**Approval** of the following:

- Replacement siding: Already installed 7-1/4” fiber cement lap siding with 6” exposure (Details Exhibits C.11-12), as outlined in Condition D.
- Replacement columns: Already installed square wood-clad columns (Exhibit C.3, Details C.10).
- Replacement windows, as outlined in Conditions E, F, and G.

**Approval** per the approved site plans, Exhibits C1-C2, C4, C6-C13, and C16-C23, signed and dated May 31, 2023, subject to the following conditions:

- A. As part of the building permit application submittal, the following development-related conditions (B through G) 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 22-192033 HR." 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.
- D. If a full siding replacement is proposed in the future, all new siding shall be a lap siding with a maximum 6” exposure that is either wood or a minimum 5/8” thick fiber cement and new casings shall provide wood sills below window openings replicating a typical window detail original to the house.
- E. The windows on the front (east) and side (south) elevations shall be fiberglass, be a hung operation with a pair of offset sashes and have divided or simulated divided lites in the upper sashes with a pattern to match those show on the original elevations (Exhibits C.2, 4, 6 and 8). The window glass shall be recessed at least 2” measured from the glass to the outside edge of the exterior finish material.
- F. The windows at the second floor on the side (south) elevation shall be a pair of hung windows separated by a fully framed and cased mull to match the original window opening pattern, as depicted on the original elevation (Exhibit C.4).
- G. If new windows are proposed in the future, the new windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or fiberglass, be a hung operation with a pair of offset sashes and have divided or simulated divided lites in the upper sashes with a pattern to match those shown on the original elevations, including reconstruction of wood mulls between originally paired windows (Exhibits C.2, 4, 6 and 8). The window glass shall be recessed at least 2” measured from the glass to outside edge of the exterior finish material.

**Staff Planner: Grace Jeffreys**



**Decision rendered by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **on May 31, 2023**  
By authority of the Director of the Bureau of Development Services

**Decision mailed: June 2, 2023**

**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 October 11, 2022, and was determined to be complete on April 6, 2023.

*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 October 11, 2022.

*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 request that the 120-day review period be extended. Unless further extended by the applicant, **the 120 days will expire on: August 4, 2023.**

**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 June 16, 2023. The completed appeal application form must be emailed to [LandUseIntake@portlandoregon.gov](mailto: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, an appeal hearing will be held at 1:30pm on Monday July 10, 2023 – please see the front page of this notice for additional information.*** 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 **June 16, 2023** 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 Statement
  1. Original Narrative
  2. Original Drawings
  3. CC photos
  4. CC email chain 2022-09-01

5. Email re cladding replacement prior to 1990s 2023-01-08
  6. Photos of existing windows before replacement
  7. Narrative - INC response 2023-03-09
  8. Background - Appendices A-J 2023-03-09
  9. Drawings - Appendices K-N 2023-03-09
  10. Email request to not deem complete 2023-03-16
  11. Revised Narrative 2023-04-06
  12. Revised Background - Appendices A-P 2023-04-06
  13. Revised Drawings – Appendices Q-T 2023-04-06
  14. Additional Cutsheets – Appendices S-T 2023-04-10
  15. Email response from owner 2023-05-23
- B. Zoning Map (attached)
- C. Plans/Drawings:
1. Site Plan (attached)
  2. Street Elevation (East) – original (attached)
  3. Street Elevation (East) – proposed
  4. Side Elevation (South) – original (attached)
  5. Side Elevation (South) – proposed
  6. Rear Elevation (West) – original
  7. Rear Elevation (West) – proposed (attached)
  8. Side Elevation (North) – original
  9. Side Elevation (North) – proposed (attached)
  10. Cutsheets - Columns
  11. Cutsheets – Siding
  12. Cutsheets – Trims
  13. Cutsheets - Soffit
  14. Cutsheets – Windows - front
  15. Cutsheets - Windows – front enlarged sections
  16. Cutsheets - Windows – sides & rear
  17. Cutsheets - Windows – sides & rear enlarged sections
  18. Cutsheets - Windows – sides & rear enlarged sections
  19. Cutsheets – Columns – Alternative Option
  20. Cutsheets – Windows – front - Alternative Option Picture window
  21. Cutsheets - Windows – front enlarged sections - Alternative Option Picture window
  22. Details – Alternative Option window installation
  23. Details – Alternative Option window installation
- D. Notification information:
1. Mailing list
  2. Mailed notice
- E. Agency Responses:
1. Life Safety Review Section of BDS
  2. Bureau of Parks, Forestry Division
- F. Correspondence:
1. Julie Mumford, on April 14, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations.
  2. Robert and Karen Bugas, on April 14, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations.
  3. Kim Pengelly, on April 16, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations.
  4. Tom Jenkins and Mike Ebbs, on April 26, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed siding and windows, and suggested possible revisions to the columns.
  5. Walter Keutel, on April 25, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations.
  6. Barbara Weiss, on May 1, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations.
  7. Steve Carson and Daryl Harrison Carson, on May 2, 2023, wrote in support of the already completed exterior renovations.
- G. Other:

1. Original LU Application
2. State Historic Preservation Form (SHPO)
3. Pages from Ladd's Addition NP Nomination
4. Incomplete letter 10-21-23
5. 180-day letter 3-6-23
6. Staff photos 3-28-23

**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)**