



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

Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner
Rebecca Esau, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 7, 2017
To: Mike Hubbell, Portland Development Group Investments LLC
From: Megan Sita Walker, Land Use Services
503-823-7294 / MeganSita.Walker@portlandoregon.gov
Re: 17-125622 DA – King’s Hill NSFR on Landmark Property
2nd Design Advice Request Summary Memo July 10, 2017

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 July 10, 2017 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 July 10, 2017. 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.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Landmarks Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Landmarks Commission** design direction provided on July 10, 2017. Commissioners in attendance on July 10, 2017:

- Carin Carlson
- Kristen Minor
- Annie Mahoney
- Wendy Chung
- Kirk Ranzetta
- Matthew Roman

Executive Summary – Key Issues. *Consensus direction of the Commissioners present was provided for the following key issues: 1) Scale and Compatibility of Development within the Landmark Boundary – the proposed development will be treated as an addition to a Landmark Property, and the bar for compatibility with both the Landmark and the District is set high. (2) Massing – the face of the proposed structure should be pushed back to align with the face of the Landmark; (3) Architectural Style – the proposal should read as a pure expression of the Colonial Revival style. Symmetry/hierarchy of facades, proportions, and detailing are critical to the successful expression of this style; (4) Materials – The bar for the material palette is set by the Landmark. The proposal should employ high-quality materials such as, all-wood windows, doors, and siding that match those of the Landmark with detail drawings to confirm.*

Summary of Landmarks Commission Comments

1) Scale and Compatibility of Development within the Landmark Boundary: At the 2nd DAR Hearing, Commission again discussed the relationship of the proposed development to the Landmark MacMaster House (1041 SW Vista Avenue). Commission clarified that the proposed development would be treated as an addition to the Landmark property.

- **Hierarchy of Compatibility.** In discussing the scale of the proposed development (Specifically, the proposal to locate a new single family residence within a Landmark boundary), the Commission stated, that in this particular instance, that compatibility on level 2 and level 3, that is compatibility with adjacent resources and the district as a whole, is better served by a single family house than an accessory structure or carriage style house. The Commission unanimously stated that given this particular situation, the success of the proposal would come down to the architectural details and the proposed development being subservient to the MacMaster House (pushed back to at least align with the prominent facade of the Landmark).
- **Lot Coverage.** Lot coverage was raised as a potential concern as it is not clear the relationship of the proposal to the MacMaster House and adjacent resources. Additional information is needed from the applicant to address Commission's concern. This concern is partially addressed in further Commission comments discussing the need to set the proposed structure back to align with the MacMaster House. A few Commissioners stated that to address this concern, documentation should be provided to show, with certainty, where the MacMaster House sits on the lot relative to the subject property and the proposed development (i.e., site surveys). Also, the applicant should provide an accurate figure of either the footprint/ building coverage or occupiable floor area of the Landmark as a reference.

2) Massing.

- **Align the face of the house with the face of the MacMaster House.** The Commission unanimously stated that pushing the proposed structure back so that the most prominent face of the structure aligns with the prominent facade of the MacMaster House will be critical to a successful proposal. This must be verified via the above-referenced site survey.
- **Roof form.** Roof form seems to be working and helps bring down the perceived mass of the proposal.
- **Recesses.** Simplify moves and focus on a clear expression of primary elements of Colonial Revival architectural, as noted below. The recess on the second floor of the north façade is not necessary and should be removed.

3) Architectural Style. *“What we see here is a contemporary design from the inside out, whereas, what we are looking for is a historic design from the outside in.” – KM*

At both the 1st and 2nd DAR Hearings, the Commission commented, that seeing as the Landmark Boundary is not proposed to be amended, the proposed design should be true to the Colonial Revival style of the primary resource, the Landmark MacMaster House. At the 2nd DAR Hearing, the Commission stressed that they are looking for a pure expression of the Colonial Revival style and that the applicant should study both the *formalities of the Colonial Revival style* and the *smaller order proportions* of the MacMaster House to generate a design framework that serves to inform the proposal. Commission encouraged the Team to explore options for treating the proposed development as a classical example of Colonial Revival style. Listed below are a few characterizing features of Colonial revival style homes that the Commission provided feedback on:

- **Symmetry and Alignments.** Symmetry, especially of the front façade, and the alignment of façade elements (i.e., individual/ groupings of windows) are formalities commonly expressed in the Colonial Revival style.
 - **The Entry.** A majority of the Commission found the off-centered porch/entry troubling, stating that the front entry should be dead center on a simplified facade. As an alternative, one Commissioner indicated that an option could be explored where a simple order was created (perhaps three (3) equal bays), where the porch element and the entry are justified to the north to align with the existing stairs. Chair Ranzetta stated that a side entry could also be explored as another option.
 - **Windows.** Windows should be vertically aligned and grouped where appropriate.
- **Hierarchy of the front façade.** The Commission stated that the front façade needs to be simplified and that it should have a clear hierarchy focused on one primary element, the front entry. Other façade elements should not detract from the primacy of the front entry.

4) Materials.

- The proposed development should *match the material quality* of the Landmark MacMaster House *and should employ exceptional detailing*. The Commission specifically called out the need for quality materials such as all-wood siding and all-wood windows that match the detailing (i.e., fenestration, profile/ location in the wall plane) as the windows on the MacMaster House.

5) Other Design Comments.

- **Proportions & Detailing.** Many Commissioners said that the design presented was ill-proportioned and that they were concerned with the proposal having poorly executed or awkwardly proportioned detailing. The quality of detailing should be consistent with the quality of detailing seen on the MacMaster House while having proportions appropriate for a smaller scale of development. The Commission stated that it might be helpful to simplify the proposal and focus on the second order of detailing seen on the MacMaster House (i.e., the detailing around the entry portico) as a reference for detailing at a more appropriate scale.
- **Treatment of Corners.** One Commissioner commented that the proposal needs to have consistency in the approach to how the corners of the building are treated. If corner boards are proposed, they should be at all corners. If pilasters are proposed, they should be consistently applied with careful attention paid to the proportion of these elements.
- **Execution of Dormers.** A few Commissioners commented that the success of the dormers would depend on how they are detailed. Specifically, questioning how the transition from roof plane to dormer would be executed, noting that a metal roof may lead to a more successful detail. Those Commissioners directed the applicant to look for examples of how to achieve this transition in a way that minimizes the appearance of flashing.
- **Stair window.** On the North Elevation, the stacked double hung windows should be revised to a single window. Two Commissioners noted that they had seen good examples of long stairwell windows from the period of significance for the District.
- **Bay Element.** A majority of Commissioners commented that the flat bay over beveled bay was awkward and that the bay windows should be the same on the first and second floors.
- **Chimney.** The westernmost projecting bay on the south façade, housing the fireplace, seemed out of place. One Commissioner directed the team to consider doing a brick chimney instead which is more characteristic of the District.
- **Railings.** A few Commissioners commented that the railings shown need to be more substantial.

- **Balcony.** A few Commissioners were not in support of the balcony condition; this element should be removed to simplify the front façade.

6) Further study needed:

- Documentation of where the MacMaster House sits on the lot relative to the proposed development. The relationship of the proposed development to the MacMaster House must be substantiated. Commissioners requested that documentation confirming where the Landmark sits on the lot, and documentation of the footprint/ building coverage of the MacMaster House be provided. Alignment with the MacMaster House is critical.
- Careful study of the MacMaster House is needed if the Landmark Boundary is not amended and the proposal to locate a new structure within the boundary is pursued. Additional documentation to review the proposal, such as an accurate Site Plan, façade studies, and detail drawings. (e.g., Site Plan, façade studies, details, etc.).
- Context studies of the District are needed to address overall compatibility with the King's Hill Historic District; highlighting critical patterns found in the District relative to setbacks, proportion of building area to total area of the site, massing, and the variety of architectural styles seen in the District.
- Figure ground study of adjacent lots to show the proportion of the building footprint to the lot and explore how massing is broken down in the District.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 1. Project Description (included in previous LU case)
 2. Site Photos
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 1. Original Drawings (1st DAR Drawing Packet)
 2. Revised Drawings (2nd DAR Drawing Packet)
- 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
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 1. Bureau of Environmental Services
- F. Public Testimony
 1. Linsay Ergenekan (1st DAR Hearing on May 8, 2017)
 2. Linsay Ergenekan (2nd DAR Hearing on July 10, 2017)
- G. Other
 1. Application form
 2. Staff Memo to the Commission dated May 1, 2017
 3. Staff Presentation – 1st DAR Hearing
 4. Applicant's Presentation – 1st DAR Hearing
 5. Staff Memo to the Commission dated July 3, 2017
 6. Staff Presentation – 2nd DAR Hearing
 7. Applicant's Presentation – 2nd DAR Hearing