



City of Portland Historic Landmarks Commission

Design Advice Request

SUMMARY MEMO

Date: August 9, 2021
To: Amanda Donofrio, BDA Architecture & Planning, P.C.
From: Hillary Adam, Design / Historic Review Team
503-823-8953 | hillary.adam@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 21-052103 DA – Rosemont Commons Window Changes
Design Advice Request Memo – June 28, 2021

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. Following, is a summary of the comments provided by the Historic Landmarks Commission at the June 28, 2021 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: <https://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/record/14527012>.

These Historic 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 June 28, 2021. 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 II land use review process [which includes a land use review application, public notification and a Final Decision] 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 Type II Land Use Review Application.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Historic Landmarks Commission
Respondents

Executive Summary. *The Commission was supportive of vinyl replacement windows in this instance.*

Commissioners Present: *Minor, Foty, Roman, Moreland; Absent: Smith, Fuenmayor (provided comments)*

Summary of Comments. Following is a general summary of Commission comments.

Compatibility.

- While precedent was a concern for staff, one Commissioner noted that this is not a precedent create by the Commission, thus a precedent is not being established by allowing existing vinyl windows to be replaced with new vinyl windows; (the original land use review for the 2000 addition was an administrative Design Review).
- Another Commissioner noted that the subject building is an addition on an individual landmark site, not a property within a historic district, adding that vinyl windows within a historic district would have a greater negative impact than they would in this application.
- One Commissioner noted that the original wood windows on the landmark have lasted longer than the vinyl windows on the 2000 addition, indicating that historic wood windows are better quality and longer-lasting than vinyl windows. Another Commissioner wondered where all of the old vinyl windows go when they get replaced, wondering if they can be recycled.
- One Commissioner asked the rest of the Commission to articulate why fiberglass would generally be preferred over vinyl in historic resource reviews. The Commission responded that when vinyl windows were first introduced they had fins that were attached to the exterior plane of the wall which resulted in the windows being set outboard of the exterior siding, which is wholly incompatible with historic resources which feature in-set windows. While some vinyl windows now have fins that allow the windows to be recessed within the wall plane, there are still concerns with the aesthetics of vinyl windows such as rail heights, profile depths, and the fact that vinyl cannot be painted. It was also noted that vinyl windows cannot be fixed whereas windows of other materials could have individual failing elements replaced.
- The Commission indicated support in this case for the VPI vinyl windows, noting they are a high-quality, long-lasting product.

Details.

- The Commission was uncertain about whether it would be more appropriate to include applied muntins or not include them, noting it is difficult to judge without elevations that don't include muntins on the new windows. In general, the Commission noted that not having muntins would not negatively impact the Post-Modern character of the 2000 addition and it may be better for maintenance as well. They also noted that applied muntins on vinyl windows do not convey an authentic aesthetic and it could be appropriate to not include them. The Commission felt comfortable with staff determining the appropriateness of applied muntins during the Type II land use review.
- The Commission supported the applicant selecting a color that matches the tradition window sash color of the historic building, which at the June 28, 2021 DAR was referenced as "tan".

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Description and Questions
 - 2. Drawings
 - 3. Site Plan with Notes
 - 4. Revised Description and Questions
 - 5. Photos
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. Drawing Packet for June 28, 2021 (28 sheets)
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 1. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 2. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments: none
- F. Public Testimony: none
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff memo to Historic Landmarks Commission, dated June 17, 2021
 - 3. Approval Criteria
 - 4. Email from Commissioner Fuenmayor
 - 5. Staff Presentation
 - 6. DAR Summary