

**IN THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF
PORTLAND OREGON**

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION
BY JASON HICKOX, UKANDU L.O.F.T. LLC, OF A TYPE 4 DEMOLITION REVIEW
FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE SOUTH PORTLAND HISTORIC DISTRICT
AT THE ADDRESS 118 SW PORTER ST**

LU 24-077225 DM

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

**ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON
FEBRUARY 5, 2025**

(APPROVAL of a Demolition Review)

IN THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION
BY JASON HICKOX, UKANDU L.O.F.T. LLC, FOR A TYPE 4 DEMOLITION REVIEW
FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE SOUTH PORTLAND HISTORIC DISTRICT
AT THE ADDRESS 118 SW PORTER ST**

LU 24-077225 DM

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings and conclusions of the City Council in this matter are set forth below.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant:	Ian Roll Gensler 811 SW 6 th Ave Ste 300 Portland, OR 97204 (971) 337-2317 ian_roll@gensler.com
Owner/Agents:	Jason Hickox Ukandu L.O.F.T. LLC 601 SW 2 nd Ave Suite 2300 Portland, OR 97204 (503) 276-2178 jhickox@ukandu.org
Owner:	Thidwick Management Co. 2905 SW 1 st Ave Portland, OR 97201
Site Address:	118 SW PORTER ST
Legal Description:	BLOCK 77 E 2' OF W 46' OF LOT 1, CARUTHERS ADD; BLOCK 77 TL 10200, CARUTHERS ADD; BLOCK 77 W 44' OF LOT 1, CARUTHERS ADD
Tax Account No.:	R140907790, R140907800, R140907810, R140907800
State ID No.:	1S1E10BB 10100, 1S1E10BB 10200, 1S1E10BB 10000, 1S1E10BB 10200
Quarter Section:	3329
Neighborhood:	South Portland NA., contact at landuse@southportlandna.org
Business District:	South Portland Business Association, contact Mark Eves at info@southportlandba.com
District Coalition:	District 4, contact Darlene Urban Garrett at darlene@nwnw.org
Plan District:	None
Other Designations:	Contributing Resource in the South Portland Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places on July 31, 1998.
Zoning:	CM2 – Commercial/Mixed Use 2 base zone with Historic Resource overlay

Case Type: DM – Demolition Review
Procedure: Type IV, following a public advisory meeting before the Historic Landmarks Commission there will be a hearing before City Council. The Historic Landmarks Commission may offer comments or suggestions, in the form of a letter or testimony, to City Council. City Council makes the final decision on this matter.

Proposal:

The applicant seeks approval to demolish a contributing (historically significant) house in the South Portland Historic District. The applicant, Ukandu, a non-profit serving families impacted by childhood and adolescent cancer, proposes to replace the house with an addition to the adjacent non-contributing building in order to create a campus at the site located at the intersection of SW 1st Ave and SW Porter St (118 SW Porter St/3015 SW 1st Ave). The expanded building will be named Ukandu Loft.

The total demolition of a contributing primary structure in a Historic District is subject to Demolition Review (per Portland Zoning Code 33.445.200.E.1) and it is processed through a Type IV land use review procedure (per Portland Zoning Code 33.846.080.B.3). The Type IV demolition review process involves:

- City Council hearing: City Council is the review body and makes the final decision.
- Historic Landmarks Commission advisory meeting: The Portland Historic Landmarks Commission has an advisory role.

Demolition review ensures the historic value of a building is considered and that there is an opportunity for the owner and community to consider alternatives to demolition. The replacement of the demolished house (an addition to the adjacent non-contributing building) will go through a Historic Resource Review which will be a Type III procedure decided by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

Type IV Demolition Review is required in order to obtain approval for demolition of contributing resources in historic districts.

Relevant Approval Criteria:

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

- 33.846.080.C Approval Criteria

The Portland Zoning Code is available online at <https://www.portland.gov/code/33>.

Procedural History:

- This application was submitted on September 5, 2024, and deemed complete on October 8, 2024.
- A Notice of Proposal was mailed on November 20, 2024 to surrounding neighbors and neighborhood associations, and the site was posted on December 6, 2024.
- A public advisory meeting with the Landmarks Commission was held on November 25, 2024. Based on that meeting, the Landmarks Commission wrote a letter to City Council in of support of the project and offered further advisory comments as testimony at the City Council hearing.
- The Staff Report and Recommendation to City Council recommending approval was issued prior to the hearing.

- The City Council held a hearing on the proposal on January 16, 2025, and unanimously voted to tentatively grant demolition review approval with the Portland Permitting and Development staff recommended conditions. City Council continued the matter to February 5, 2025, for adoption of findings and a final vote.

ANALYSIS

Site and Vicinity: The subject site lies within the South Portland Historic District, which was listed in the National Register of Historic Places on July 31, 1998. The district documentation was prepared by Michael Harrison, Thayer Donham, Cielo Lutino, Michael Meyers, and Liza Mickle on behalf of the City of Portland Bureau of Planning. The nomination was vetted by the State Historic Preservation Office and reviewed and accepted by the Keeper of the National Register.

The National Register defines a Historic District as "a geographically definable area, urban or rural, possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. In addition, historic districts consist of contributing and non-contributing properties. Historic districts possess a concentration, linkage, or continuity of the other four types of properties. Objects, structures, buildings, and sites within a historic district are usually thematically linked by architectural style or designer, date of development, distinctive urban plan, and/or historic associations."

The subject house located at 118 SW Porter St is a contributing structure in the South Portland Historic District. It is an approximately 930 SF, one-and-a-half-story bungalow style house built in 1908. The house sits on an approximately 10,600 SF site which it shares with a larger brick building located at 3015 SW 1st Ave. This non-contributing building is an approximately 4,405 SF, two-story brick building constructed in 1978, outside of the district's period of significance. The two buildings share a site situated at the intersection of SW 1st Ave and SW Porter St.

The bungalow is flanked by the commercial driveway for the non-contributing building on the east and the blank wall of the Cedarwood Waldorf School on the west (which sits on the property line). For the past forty years the property has been used as office space. A street facing, at-grade storage addition is thought to have been added during this transition of use. Until very recently 118 SW Porter was leased by the Cedarwood Waldorf School and used as overflow offices.

The subject house is described in the South Portland Historic District National Register Nomination as follows:

"The building has a modified rectilinear plan of 28' x 28' that narrows to a 23' x 6' section at the south end of the structure. It has a 28-foot frontage on SW Porter Street. It is a one and one-half story, wood frame structure with a concrete foundation and hip roof. Beveled horizontal wood siding sheathes the exterior. One-over-one, double-hung, sash, corniced windows predominate. Aluminum storm windows have been added. There is a hipped dormer on the north facade. There is a two and one-half bay, single story end porch and main entrance on the north facade. Three Tuscan order columns support the roof. It has a box cornice. There is one brick chimney. Alterations have included remodeling the kitchen and bathroom in 1987. The back porch was also enclosed that year.

Significance: This building is considered to be contributing within the district as a good example of a Bungalow style residence and is therefore significant as

part of the larger grouping of residential development that occurred in the South Portland area.”

The South Portland Historic District is a 31 block, 49-acre area. The district is a subset of the larger South Portland neighborhood, which developed as a multi-ethnic, walkable, and primarily residential suburb in the late 19th century. The district represents South Portland during the district’s period of significance, which stretched from 1876, the year the neighborhood’s oldest extant buildings were constructed, to 1926, the year that Ross Island Bridge construction resulted in a wave of displacement of area residents and businesses. The unique character of the South Portland Historic District recalls its period of significance through the area’s gridded street pattern and collection of 19th- and early 20th-century architecture, which is a combination of single-family residential buildings, and a handful of commercial and institutional buildings, and multi-family structures.

At the time it was designated in 1998, the historic district had 186 contributing buildings and 60 non-contributing. It currently has 182 contributing buildings and 93 non-contributing. Thus, the district has lost 4 contributing buildings since 1998, and 30 new buildings have been built (note: the numbers are approximate based on the data available). The area that eventually became this historic district was tremendously impacted by urban renewal in the 50s and 60s. Large portions of the neighborhood were decimated, and residents fought to get this district listed and preserve what was left.

Per the South Portland Historic District Design Guidelines:

“The neighborhood presently contains an array of residential, commercial, and institutional uses divided by several major transportation corridors including Interstate 405, Interstate 5, SW Naito Parkway, and SW Barbur Boulevard, as well as Highway 26 and the Ross Island Bridge ramps. South Portland was historically organized into the Lair Hill, Corbett, and Terwilliger sub-neighborhoods, all of which developed as primarily residential suburbs in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The South Portland Historic District represents the most complete, cohesive subset of this development remaining in South Portland today. The irregularly shaped district comprises 31 blocks in the Lair Hill and Corbett sub-neighborhoods, roughly bounded by SW Arthur and SW Meade Streets to the north, SW Barbur Boulevard to the west, SW Pennoyer and S Curry Streets to the south, and Naito Parkway and S Hood Avenue to the east. Through its extant historic fabric, including period vernacular architecture and a street pattern dating to the 1860s, the South Portland Historic District maintains the setting and feeling of the area as it existed around the turn of the 20th century.”

According to the National Register nomination, the South Portland Historic District is significant under Criterion A for “its associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history,” and Criterion C for “embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.”

The National Register nomination notes the following:

“As one of the oldest settlements in Portland, the South Portland Historic District deserves further recognition as a significant contributor to Portland’s history. Besides being one of the city’s first suburbs, the South Portland area also served as a gateway community to Portland for immigrants in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Primarily dominated by Jewish and Italian immigrants, South Portland was an inclusive microcosm of the greater Portland area—they even had a nominally denoted "mayor." Immigrants were able to gradually and comfortably acclimate themselves to their new country in the Lair Hill and Corbett neighborhoods. Community organizations were specifically set up to smooth the Americanization process, and soon Lair Hill and Corbett developed reputations as ethnically diverse, friendly neighborhoods.

The South Portland Historic District thus stands as an excellent example of a vibrant, minority gateway community that flourished from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It endures as an intact representation of a turn of the century working class neighborhood, with a number of Queen Anne style workers' cottages in the area. Given that context, the South Portland Historic District clearly reveals itself as an integral component to a study of Portland's history."

Zoning: The Commercial/Mixed Use 2 (CM2) zone is a medium-scale zone intended for sites in a variety of centers, along corridors, and in other mixed-use areas that have frequent transit service. The zone allows a wide range and mix of commercial and residential uses, as well as employment uses that have limited off-site impacts. Buildings in this zone will generally be up to four stories tall unless height and floor area bonuses are used, or plan district provisions specify other height limits. Development is intended to be pedestrian-oriented, provide a strong relationship between buildings and sidewalks, and complement the scale of surrounding residentially zoned areas.

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 stewards important resources for the use, education, and enjoyment of future generations.

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

- LU 10-119078 HDZ – Approval of a 6-square foot sign, 11-7/8 inches high and 72-3/4 inches wide. (3015 SW 1st Ave; R128940)
- LU 09-143497 HDZM – Approval for removal of two windows on the front elevation and replacement with a garage door; and construction of an accessibility ramp at the rear of the building and restriping of the parking lot to accommodate a parking stall for disabled users. Approval of a Modification to 33.266.130 G - Parking Area Setbacks and Screening. (3015 SW 1st Ave; R128940)
- 74-027400 VZ (Ref: VZ 005-74) – Variance to reduce the north (front) and west (rear) yards from the required 5' to 0' in order to erect a building and construct a parking lot. (3015 SW 1st Ave; R128940)

Agency Review: A "Notice of proposal in Your Neighborhood" was mailed **November 20, 2024**. The following seven Bureaus, Divisions and/or Sections responded with no objections and five of these included comments found in Exhibits E-1 to E-5:

- Portland Permitting and Development – Life Safety (Exhibit E-1)
- PP&D Public Infrastructure Development Review – Transportation (Exhibit E-2)

- Portland Fire and Rescue (Exhibit E-3)
- PP&D Public Infrastructure Development Review – Water (Exhibit E-4)
- Portland Permitting and Development – Urban Forestry (Exhibit E-5)
- Portland Permitting and Development – Site Development
- PP&D Public Infrastructure Development Review – Environmental Services (BES)

Neighborhood Review: A “Notice of Public Hearing” was mailed to neighbors on November 20, 2024 (Exhibit D-6). Signs notifying neighbors of the public hearing were posted on December 6, 2024 (Exhibit D-3).

The Historic Landmarks Commission heard and received five verbal testimonies in favor of the proposal at the November 25, 2024, advisory meeting (Exhibit H-3). Prior to the Historic Landmarks Commission advisory meeting on November 25, 2024, no written responses were received from either the Neighborhood Association or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

At the time the draft staff report and recommendation to City Council was submitted, December 24, 2024, no written responses were received from either the Neighborhood Association or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

Following the staff report, and prior to the January 16, 2025, City Council hearing, thirty-one written responses were received (Exhibit I-8 and I-9). At the January 16, 2025, hearing, nineteen people presented verbal testimony in favor of the proposal (Exhibit I-8 and I-10).

ZONING CODE APPROVAL CRITERIA

Historic Resource Review

Chapter 33.445, Historic Resource Overlay Zone, and Chapter 33.846, Historic Resource Reviews

33.445.010 Purpose of Historic Resource Overlay Zone

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 stewards important resources for the use, education, and enjoyment of future generations.

33.445.200.E Demolition of resources in a Historic District. Demolition of contributing resources within a Historic District requires demolition review to ensure their historic value is considered and that there is an opportunity for the owner and community to consider alternatives to demolition.

Findings: The site is designated a contributing resource within a Historic District. Therefore, demolition of the existing building requires demolition review approval.

33.846.010 Purpose of Historic Resource Reviews

This chapter provides procedures and establishes the approval criteria for all historic resource reviews. The approval criteria protect the region's significant

historic resources and preserve important parts of the region's heritage. The reviews recognize and protect the region's archaeological, cultural, historic, and architectural resources, ensure that changes to historic resources preserve physical integrity and historic significance, and provide incentives for historic preservation and adaptive reuse. The reviews also allow for community involvement and the potential for denial when demolition, relocation, new development, or alteration is proposed for certain historic resources.

33.846.080 Demolition Review

- A. Purpose.** Demolition review protects landmarks and contributing resources in districts. Demolition review recognizes that historic resources are irreplaceable assets significant to the region's architectural, cultural, and historical identity and their preservation promotes economic and community vitality, resilience, and memory. In the event that demolition of a historic resource is approved, demolition review also addresses the potential for mitigation of the loss.
- B. Review procedure.** Demolition reviews are processed as follows: through a Type IV procedure.
 - 1. Proposals to demolish an accessory structure are processed through a Type II procedure;
 - 2. Proposals to demolish a Conservation Landmark, National Register Landmark, contributing resource in a Conservation District, or contributing resource in a National Register District are processed through a Type III procedure;
 - 3. All other proposals to demolish a historic resource are processed through a Type IV procedure.
- C. Approval criteria.** Proposals to demolish a historic resource will be approved if the review body finds that one of the following approval criteria listed under 33.846.080.C is met. Only Criterion 33.846.080.C.1 is relevant to this proposal. Criterion 1 is as follows:
 - 1. Demolition of the resource has been evaluated against and, on balance, demolition has been found to be equally or more supportive of the relevant goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and any relevant area plans, than preservation, rehabilitation, or reuse of the resource. The evaluation must consider:
 - a. The resource's age, condition, historic integrity, historic significance, design or construction rarity, value to the community, and association with historically marginalized individuals or communities;
 - b. The economic consequences for the owner and the community;
 - c. The merits of demolition;
 - d. The merits of development that could replace the demolished resource, either as specifically proposed for the site or as allowed under the existing zoning;
 - e. The merits of preserving the resource, taking into consideration the purposes described in Subsection A; and
 - f. Any proposed mitigation for the demolition.

Because Approval Criterion 1 is the relevant approval criteria for the proposed project, the proposal has been evaluated against the following plans:

- 1. 2035 Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies document, adopted in 2020 [as amended through May 2023];**
- 2. Southwest Community Plan, adopted in 2000;**
- 3. Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill Policy Plan adopted in 1977**

Findings: During the city’s first Type IV Demolition Review, (LU 09-171258 DM – Demolition Review for the Kiernan Building aka Dirty Duck Tavern) the Kiernan Building case established the precedent of looking at the Comprehensive Plan and area plan goals comprehensively with the view toward which proposal offers the greatest public benefit. As the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to guide development in a manner that serves the public good, this way of assessing and balancing the goals of these plans can help determine the relative value of each goal as it is met, or not met, by each proposal.

Where there are multiple objectives, the Council must review the proposal against each objective. If a proposal is consistent with certain objectives but inconsistent with other objectives, the Council determines the weight to be given to each objective and evaluates whether, *on balance*, the proposal is consistent with the City’s goals.

The final findings for the Kiernan Building case noted:

“In order to be approved, the proposal must be evaluated against and, on balance, found to be in support of the Comprehensive Plan and other relevant area plans.

The Council has broad discretion in establishing how to balance the relevant goals given a particular proposal and that property’s location in a particular historic district. No code provision or city policy requires the Council to give equal weight in the balancing process to every Comprehensive Plan goal, nor does anything mandate that equal weight be given to every goal and policy found in other relevant area plans. The Council has the authority to give certain relevant goals and policies more weight and other relevant goals and policies less weight in reaching its final decision as to whether the proposal, on balance, supports the Comprehensive Plan and other relevant area plans.”

Chapter 1 of the Comprehensive Plan notes:

“When applying goals and policies to particular situations, such as specific development proposals or area plans, there may be competing or conflicting policies. Although it would be ideal to always meet each goal and policy, sometimes that is not possible, so proposals or situations must be judged whether they meet the goals and policies on balance. Even the strongest policies do not automatically trump other policies. Every decision is different, with different facts. The particular policies that matter more will change from one decision to another. There is no set formula — no particular number of “heavier” policies equals a larger set of “lighter” policies. In cases where there are competing directions embodied by different policies, City Council may choose the direction it believes best embodies the Plan as a whole. This approach recognizes that there are trade-offs and compromises and allows flexibility while still guiding land use and capital decisions. The Plan’s Guiding Principles provide an anchor or reference point to consider when making trade-offs and compromises.”

The City Council has reviewed the elements noted as “a through f” under Approval Criterion 1 against the relevant plans, and in this case, **have decided to give more credence to the City’s goals related to human health, equity, focused growth, and resilience over those related to historic preservation.** Under the unique circumstances of this project, the public benefit clearly outweighs the value of preserving the specific historic resource in question, and therefore shifts the balance of the approval criteria.

Evaluating the current proposal via a “balancing” test, the Approval Criteria are organized in the following way:

- **Pg. 10-18: Approval criteria met, or potentially met, by the proposal**
- **Pg. 18: Approval criteria not met by the proposal**
- **Pg. 19-21: Approval criteria not applicable to the proposal**

Approval criteria met, or potentially met, by the proposal

Comprehensive Plan

GOAL 1: THE PLAN

Related goals and policies:

POLICY 1.19: Area-specific plans: Use area-specific plans to provide additional detail or refinements applicable at a smaller geographic scale, such as for centers and corridors, within the policy framework provided by the overall Comprehensive Plan.

Findings: The proposal does not involve development, review, or coordination of the Comprehensive Plan. However, the project is in line with Policy 1.19 related to area-specific plans. See the findings below related to the two relevant area-specific plans: the *Southwest Community Plan*, and the *Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill Policy Plan*.

This goal and this policy are met.

GOAL 2: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Related goals and policies:

Goal 2.C: Value community wisdom and participation. Portland values and encourages community and civic participation. The City seeks and considers community wisdom and diverse cultural perspectives, and integrates them with technical analysis, to strengthen land use decisions.

Findings: Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan largely speaks to strong community involvement in land use processes, like this one, to promote comprehensive consideration from multiple perspectives. The applicant has complied with Title 33, Portland Zoning Code, which requires public notice, site posting, a public advisory meeting with the Historic Landmarks Commission and a subsequent City Council Hearing. Required notices were posted on the site and mailed to neighboring property owners and residents and the neighborhood association.

The project team also participated in a design advice request meeting with the Historic Landmarks Commission which was a public meeting that allowed an earlier opportunity for the public to find out more about the project and offer comments. If demolition is approved the Ukandu team and the public will have the opportunity to continue the conversation regarding the development through a type III historic design review process and public hearing.

This goal and policy are met.

GOAL 3: URBAN FORM

Related goals and policies:

Goal 3.A: A city designed for people. *Portland's built environment is designed to serve the needs and aspirations of all Portlanders, promoting prosperity, health, equity, and resiliency. New development, redevelopment, and public investments reduce disparities and encourage social interaction to create a healthy connected city.*

Goal 3.C: Focused growth. *Household and employment growth is focused in the Central City and other centers, corridors, and transit station areas, creating compact urban development in areas with a high level of service and amenities, while allowing the relative stability of lower-density single-family residential areas.*

Goal 3.D: A system of centers and corridors. *Portland's interconnected system of centers and corridors provides diverse housing options and employment opportunities, robust multimodal transportation connections, access to local services and amenities, and supports low-carbon complete, healthy, and equitable communities.*

Policy 3.6 Land efficiency. *Provide strategic investments and incentives to leverage infill, redevelopment, and promote intensification of scarce urban land while protecting environmental quality.*

Policy 3.11 Significant places. *Enhance and celebrate significant places throughout Portland with symbolic features or iconic structures that reinforce local identity, histories, and cultures and contribute to way-finding throughout the city. Consider these especially at: High-visibility intersections; Attractions; Schools, libraries, parks, and other civic places; Bridges; Rivers; Viewpoints and view corridor locations; Historically or culturally significant places; Connections to volcanic buttes and other geologic and natural landscape features; and Neighborhood boundaries and transitions.*

Policy 3.3 Equitable development. *Guide development, growth, and public facility investment to reduce disparities; encourage equitable access to opportunities, mitigate the impacts of development on income disparity, displacement and housing affordability; and produce positive outcomes for all Portlanders.*

Policy 3.4 All ages and abilities. *Strive for a built environment that provides a safe, healthful, and attractive environment for people of all ages and abilities.*

Policy 3.41 Distinct identities. *Maintain and enhance the distinct identities of the Inner Ring Districts and their corridors. Use and expand existing historic preservation and design review tools to accommodate growth in ways that identify and preserve historic resources and enhance the distinctive characteristics of the Inner Ring Districts, especially in areas experiencing significant development.*

Policy 3.8 Leadership and innovation in design. *Encourage high-performance design and development that demonstrates Portland's leadership in the design of the built environment, commitment to a more equitable city, and ability to experiment and generate innovative design solutions.*

Policy 3.89 Inner Neighborhoods infill. *Fill gaps in the urban fabric through infill development on vacant and underutilized sites and in the reuse of historic buildings on adopted inventories.*

Findings: The goals and policies in this chapter largely focus on the physical structure of the city and how people access services and other destinations. They speak to compact, interconnected centers and patterns of growth that equitably facilitate people’s ability to meet their own needs. The proposed project supports the relevant objectives in that it clusters an essential service in close proximity to related destinations which should facilitate access, reduce trips, and shorten trip lengths.

While one historic resource would be lost as a result of the demolition and replacement project, the organization’s proposed use of the site post-demolition will provide essential health and well-being services for the community, supporting Goal 3.A. These services which include support services for children with cancer and their families are a significant public benefit. The site is strategically sited for this use with a location in proximity with Oregon’s only pediatric cancer treatment facilities: It is an approximate 6-minute drive from Doernbecher Children’s Hospital and 11 minutes from Randall Children’s Hospital. Other multi-modal transportation options such as walking, biking and transit are also available, although limitations imposed by health issues require many utilizing the services of the organization to drive. The site’s proximity to regional medical treatment facilities and Ukandu’s existing relationship with the Southwest Portland’s cancer treatment community makes the location ideal for the proposed use.

Although the proposal does not preserve a contributing resource that is part of the fabric of the South Portland Historic District, the integrity and continuity of the historic district will not be significantly diminished by the demolition of this one resource. The bungalow’s integrity has been diminished by the erosion of its historic residential context, and it does not have unique historic significance beyond its contribution to the fabric of the district. It is not associated with any architect or builder identified in the National Register nomination for the district. The building is not singularly identified as being associated with a historically marginalized individual or community, nor is it connected to a historically significant person.

The remodeled and expanded non-contributing building will employ innovative design solutions to be accessible to those of all ages and abilities. It will accommodate Ukandu’s unique approach to providing a full calendar of first of its kind, wrap-around services for communities and families impacted by childhood cancer. The design will create the appropriate balance of area, adjacency, and program support.

Finally, the proposed replacement structure will increase the intensity of development on the underutilized site compared to the current bungalow and surface parking while advancing equity and Portland’s leadership in the design of the built environment.

On balance, these goals and policies are met.

GOAL 4: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

Related goals and policies:

Goal 4.A: Context-sensitive design and development. *New development is designed to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change.*

GOAL 4.B Historic and cultural resources. *Historic and cultural resources are identified, protected, and rehabilitated as integral parts of an urban environment that continues to evolve.*

Goal 4.C: Human and environmental health. *Neighborhoods and development are efficiently designed and built to enhance human and environmental health: they protect safety and livability; support local access to healthy food; limit negative impacts on water, hydrology, and air quality; reduce carbon emissions; encourage active and sustainable design; protect wildlife; address urban heat islands; and integrate nature and the built environment.*

Goal 4.D: Urban resilience. *Buildings, streets, and open spaces are designed to ensure long-term resilience and to adjust to changing demographics, climate, and economy, and withstand and recover from natural disasters.*

Policy 4.2 Community identity. Encourage the development of character-giving design features that are responsive to place and the cultures of communities.

Policy 4.3 Site and context. Encourage development that responds to and enhances the positive qualities of site and context — the neighborhood, the block, the public realm, and natural features.

Policy 4.28 Historic buildings in centers and corridors. *Identify, protect, and encourage the use and rehabilitation of historic resources in centers and corridors.*

Policy 4.46 Historic and cultural resource protection. Within statutory requirements for owner consent, identify, protect, and encourage the use and rehabilitation of historic buildings, places, and districts that contribute to the distinctive character and history of Portland’s evolving urban environment.

Policy 4.48 Continuity with established patterns. Encourage development that fills in vacant and underutilized gaps within the established urban fabric, while preserving and complementing historic resources. Policy 4.50 Demolition

Policy 4.50 Demolition. Protect historic resources from demolition. When demolition is necessary or appropriate, provide opportunities for public comment and encourage pursuit of alternatives to demolition or other actions that mitigate for the loss.

Policy 4.6 Street orientation. Promote building and site designs that enhance the pedestrian experience with windows, entrances, pathways, and other features that provide connections to the street environment.

Policy 4.60 Rehabilitation and adaptive reuse. *Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings, especially those of historic or cultural significance, to conserve natural resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment.*

Policy 4.69 Reduce carbon emissions. *Encourage a development pattern that minimizes carbon emissions from building and transportation energy use.*

Findings: While preservation of the structure was encouraged early in the review process, more investigation into the structure’s potential significance, along with a thorough alternatives analysis of adaptive reuse options, eventually led to support for demolition and replacement. This included a thorough exploration of the organization’s unique needs to understand why adaptive reuse of the existing contributing building would not facilitate the radically inclusive approach of the services they provide.

The goals and policies of this chapter encourage preservation and adaptive reuse of historic structures, and this proposal, in contrast, includes the demolition of a historic resource. However, the merits of the structure to be preserved must be considered. In this case, the bungalow does not have unique historic significance beyond its contribution to the fabric of the district.

The significance of the structure, relative to many other contributing resources, is minor: it is not architecturally rare or outstanding, and its previous occupants

were not associated with a significant person or underserved communities. The house is erroneously tied to the historic name, *the Lucretia Nasts House* in the historic district nomination. Research by the applicant found that the earliest occupants of the house at 118 SW Porter (originally 226 Porter) were likely Carl (or Karl) and Minnie Schmidt and their children. Thus, the house should have been named for Karl and Minnie Schmidt rather than Lucretia Nasts. Based on the research, it appears the Schmidt family lived at 118 SW Porter for a couple of years followed by a succession of other tenants. The house was likely a rental. Karl Schmidt may have worked at a saloon on Grand Ave in southeast Portland.

The naming of the residence was most likely a clerical mistake confusing 262 Porter St, where Ms. Nasts may have lived, for 226 Porter St (now addressed as 118 SW Porter St), where the Schmidt family lived. To further complicate matters, the historic name which most likely should be associated with the subject house, *the Karl and Minnie Schmidt House*, was incorrectly tied to the concrete building next door, directly to the west of 118 SW Porter Street (part of the Cedarwood School). That building is erroneously named *the Karl and Minnie Schmidt Building*.

It is one of 52 contributing buildings in the district that are characterized as bungalows. The property is not associated with any known event or institution identified in the National Register nomination. Nor is the house associated with an architect, builder, or any other individual identified as notable in the district. The building is not singularly identified as being associated with a historically marginalized individual or community.

The property is no longer used as housing as it was during the district's period of significance. It has functioned as office space for more than 40 years. The bungalow's historic integrity has been diminished by the erosion of its historic residential context. It is now located adjacent to larger commercial and institutional buildings rather than other residential structures. Overall, the integrity and continuity of the South Portland Historic District will not be significantly diminished by the demolition of this one resource.

Earlier in the review process, staff and the Landmarks Commission requested that alternative ways to fit the organization's program on the site without demolition be investigated thoroughly, as adaptive reuse would spare the contributing resource from demolition. In their narrative, plan set, and presentations at the advisory meeting with the Landmarks Commission and the City Council hearing, the applicant demonstrated that the demolition and addition were required to meet the unique programmatic needs of the organization. This includes floor plans that reflect the unique operational model of Ukandu which involves prioritizing the experience of kids and their families.

The applicant team demonstrates in their submittals that the adaptive reuse of the existing resource has a series of obstacles to accessibility with only inelegant and inequitable solutions. They note the physical and neurological disparities that exist in the community and the need to overcome these challenges with an intentional design. For the proposed use, demolition removes accessibility compromises allowing the design to more specifically meet the needs of the community.

Per the applicant's narrative:

"Cancer can create physical, cognitive, and emotional barriers. Designing spaces to be accessible despite these barriers minimizes the need for special accommodations and in turn makes everyone feel welcome. Broadly this means incorporating design solutions through context analysis that allow different groups to have the same quality of

experience and minimizing barriers where necessary, such as floor to floor transitions that remind the community of their limitations. It starts with a welcoming arrival that is the same for all community members reducing stress and setting a supportive tone.

Hallways and entrances are easy for all community members to navigate, improving accessibility for those with mobility restrictions or neurological impairments. Providing a diversity of spaces immediately accessible to all users through a thoughtful balance of adjacency and separation provides access to both quiet spaces to gather thoughts and recharge and social infrastructure and gathering spaces to support strong human connections. Special attention is given to people who may be disproportionately impacted by physical and social barriers and focus on making their path throughout the building consistent with other members of the community is prioritized. Finally, by providing access to nature, landscapes, and familiar outdoor experiences, as well as access to light and air throughout, the space can help promote well-being, reduce stress and anxiety, improve cognitive function, and enhance mood.”

“The project seeks to create a positive experience for everyone, regardless of their abilities, through thoughtful construction of the built environment, and challenges the idea that accessible design is an add-on. These principles set out a way of thinking about the built environment to create a more comfortable experience for all. Wherever possible, design should be accessible to people with a wide range of abilities, in a secure, safe, and comfortable manner, address the segregation of populations based on ability, and discourage stigmatization. Some buildings are more adaptable than others. Despite efforts to incorporate the building 118 SW Porter into the design, the physical and economic barriers are too great to meaningfully adapt it to meet the inclusive principles of accessibility described above.

“Program spaces in the Loft include radically inclusive activity spaces for children, teens, and families; community spaces; therapy and counseling offices; outdoor community spaces; parking; and operational offices. Design of these spaces prioritizes the needs of children and families who may have been compromised by their cancer and treatment regimen, with particular focus on providing a generosity of experience that benefits everyone.”

Relocation of the house was also considered earlier in the review process. Staff and the Landmarks Commission requested that a potential relocation be researched as an alternative to demolition. This option was explored by the applicant together with the neighborhood, and no parties came forward with interest in taking ownership of the relocated building. City Council is satisfied that the option was explored and that it is not viable. Relocation of the building without funding from a receiving party would be a large, undue economic and logistical burden on the non-profit organization. In addition, the house is not as architecturally or socially significant as other historic buildings that have been relocated in the city in recent years.

Regarding goals and policies related to carbon emissions, Council notes that the existing brick building, while non-contributing, is the larger of the two buildings on the site. Rather than tearing down and replacing this brick building with a new larger building, the non-contributing brick building will be remodeled and retained. In retaining a large building from 1978, waste is reduced, and the embodied carbon of this building is not lost. To further prevent wasted

materials, which represent embodied carbon, Council has added a condition of approval which will require that the bungalow be deconstructed rather than demolished. The deconstruction should be performed by a certified deconstruction contractor consistent with the city's deconstruction of buildings code chapter 17.106 and the materials salvaged, reused, recycled, through sale to a local salvage building material retailer or donated to a local building material non-profit organization.

Regarding goals and policies related to context and community identity, the proposed replacement structure will respond to the district's design guidelines by respecting the form of the identified building typology and its relationship to the existing building's proportions and materiality as originally built. New design treatments will exhibit fine-grained texture and depth in cladding and architectural features. Furthermore, the addition will address the contextual relationship of setbacks and patterns present on the block face, and characteristics typical of the building's non-residential typology. The replacement structure will increase the intensity of development on the site while building on the attractive qualities that distinguish the area.

Zoning Code section 33.445.200 E.3 lays out rules for when a demolition permit can be issued following a Type IV demolition review. It notes that a permit for a new structure may be required as a condition of the demolition review. Allowing a demolition without a permitted replacement could set a dangerous precedent. Were a historic resource demolished without a replacement built that has a higher public benefit, it would be contrary to the approval criteria previously discussed. A condition of approval would help protect against a situation such as occurred with the Yamaguchi Hotel where a historic resource was demolished without a replacement. On the other hand, the subject bungalow does not have historic importance comparable to the Yamaguchi Hotel, and this proposal has plans well underway for replacing the demolished building with an addition to the adjacent non-contributing brick building. To strike a balance, a condition of approval is recommended to include land use approval of a replacement building/addition as a safeguard. The recommended condition does not take the extra step of requiring that the new structure also be fully permitted prior to allowing a demolition permit for the bungalow.

Regarding goals and policies related to the public have an opportunity to have a voice in demolition, the findings under "Goal 2: Community Involvement" above discuss the public outreach and participation process associated with demolition review. As noted, the project has had a Design Advice Request meeting and an Advisory meeting with the Portland Landmarks Commission – both public meetings. The public was allowed to provide written and verbal testimony at the DAR and advisory meetings and will be able to do so again at the City Council hearing.

Overall, because of the contributing house's relatively minor significance, small size, poor condition, changed setting, and the public benefit of the use post-demolition, the loss of this contributing resource in the South Portland Historic District meets goals and policies of this chapter on balance, and the proposed replacement structure will be made to be compatible with the character of the South Portland Historic District through Historic Resource Review, as evaluated by the Historic Landmarks Commission. Given the unique needs of the community it serves, the facility proposed to replace the bungalow will provide a significant public benefit to compensate for the loss of a historic resource.

On balance, with the following conditions of approval, these goals and policies are met:

- *The land use review for the replacement structure must be approved, and its appeal period must have passed, before a demolition permit is issued.*
- *The house must be deconstructed by a certified deconstruction contractor consistent with the city's deconstruction of buildings code chapter 17.106 with the goal of diverting most of the building materials from landfills. The materials shall be salvaged, reused, recycled, through sale to a local salvage building material retailer or donated to a local building material non-profit organization.*

GOAL 6: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Related goals and policies:

Goal 6.A Prosperity. *Portland has vigorous economic growth and a healthy, diverse economy that supports prosperity and equitable access to employment opportunities for an increasingly diverse population. A strong economy that is keeping up with population growth and attracting resources and talent can:*

- *Create opportunity for people to achieve their full potential.*
- *Improve public health.*
- *Support a healthy environment.*
- *Support the fiscal well-being of the city.*

Goal 6.B: Development. *Portland supports an attractive environment for industrial, commercial, and institutional job growth and development by 1) maintaining an adequate land supply; 2) a local development review system that is nimble, predictable, and fair; and 3) high-quality public facilities and services.*

Goal 6.C: Business district vitality. *Portland implements land use policy and investments to ensure that commercial, institutional, and industrial districts support business retention and expansion; encourage the growth of districts that support productive and creative synergies among local businesses; provide convenient access to goods, services, and markets; and take advantage of our location and quality of life advantages as a gateway to worldclass natural landscapes in Northwest Oregon, Southwest Washington, and the Columbia River Basin, and a robust interconnected system of natural landscapes within the region's Urban Growth Boundary.*

Policy 6.7 Competitive advantages. *Maintain and strengthen the city's comparative economic advantages including access to a high-quality workforce, business diversity, competitive business climate, and multimodal transportation infrastructure.*

Policy 6.17 Short-term land supply. *Provide for a competitive supply of development-ready sites with different site sizes and types, to meet five-year demand for employment growth in the Central City, industrial areas, campus institutions, and neighborhood business districts.*

Policy 6.56 Campus institutions. *Provide for the stability and growth of Portland's major campus institutions as essential service providers, centers of innovation, workforce development resources, and major employers.*

Policy 6.59 Community amenities and services. *Encourage campus development that provides amenities and services to surrounding neighborhoods, emphasizing the role of campuses as centers of community activity.*

Findings: *The proposed demolition and replacement building will achieve a higher and better use of the site given its location in close proximity to regional medical treatment facilities. It will allow the non-profit applicant organization, Ukandu, to expand their services and create a small campus. The expansion of*

their facilities will provide much-needed, innovative support to families – an immense public good.

The new development would help fill gaps in services that support research and medical institutions in the quality of service and education they provide.

Ukandu works in partnership with OHSU and the Knight Cancer Institute’s Community Partnership Program and research initiatives. Based on research they have partnered on, gaps in services for families navigating a childhood cancer experience were identified. They determined that families need a safe space where they can connect outside of the hospital. The proposed facility is intended to fill that gap.

The site is located in proximity with Oregon’s only pediatric cancer treatment facilities: the site is an approximately 6-minute drive from Doernbecher Children’s Hospital and 11 minutes from Randall Children’s Hospital. The proposed use in this location provides access to services for families and facilitates creative synergies in the medical sector. The new building will better meet the inclusive needs of the people it serves, providing mental health spaces in a smaller scale, non-hospital location.

The proposed development supports an innovative service provider directly related to the existing health and wellness employment center. The proposed replacement structure represents innovation in the medical sector. It will be a first-of-its kind business model and delivery method, focused on holistic, wrap-around care for each member of the family navigating a childhood cancer journey. The space will provide community connection in a new environment, addressing gaps in services for families navigating a childhood cancer experience. For these reasons, the intentions of Goal 6.A in improving public health and helping children in the community to achieve their full potential are met. Policies

The approval criteria include a consideration of the economic consequences for the owner and the community. Ukandu’s foundational tenet of radical inclusivity necessitates the removal of barriers, physical and financial. The charge of the new program space, to be called the Loft, is to enable all people to experience their space equally, confidently, and independently. The incompatibility of the adaptive reuse approach where both buildings would be saved and reused, with the proposed use, limited usable area, and existing conditions make it difficult to underwrite an insurance policy without substantial investment and resolution of unknown construction complexity, including lowering the building. This financial and logistics burden would undoubtedly yield compromises in program and experience – an imperfect fit to Ukandu’s operational model. This financial burden would compromise the ability of Ukandu to be inclusive and accessible to the degree required.

These goals and policies are met.

GOAL 7: ENVIRONMENT AND WATERSHED HEALTH

Related goals and policies:

Goal 7.A: Climate. *Carbon emissions are reduced to 50 percent below 1990 levels by 2035.*

Policy 7.4 Climate change. *Update and implement strategies to reduce carbon emissions and impacts, and increase resilience through plans and investments and public education.*

Findings: As noted in the findings under “Goal 4: Design and Development” above, the existing brick building is the larger of the two buildings on the site.

Since the applicants could not achieve their desired program by connecting the two buildings, they found a need to demolish one of the buildings. Rather than tearing down and replacing the existing two-story brick building with a new larger building, it will be remodeled and retained. In retaining a large building from 1978, waste is reduced, and the embodied carbon of this building is not lost. To further prevent wasted materials, which represent embodied carbon, Council has added a condition of approval which will require that the bungalow be deconstructed rather than demolished, and that the materials be salvaged, reused, recycled, or donated to entities involved in such activities consistent with the city's deconstruction of buildings Code Chapter 17.106 with the goal of diverting most of the building materials from landfills.

As noted in the findings under "Goal 3: Urban Form" above, the proposed project clusters an essential service in close proximity to related destinations which will help to facilitate access, reduce trips, and shorten trip lengths. This may contribute to reduced carbon emissions.

On balance, with the conditions of approval outlined in "Goal 4", these goals and policy are met:

GOAL 10: LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND ZONING

Related goals and policies:

Goal 10.A: Land use designations and zoning. *Effectively and efficiently carry out the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan through the land use designations, Zoning Map, and the Zoning Code.*

Findings: This goal notes that land use designations are used to carry out the Comprehensive Plan. 118 SW Porter Street is in the Commercial Mixed Use 2 (CM2) zone, and there is a swath of CM2 through the area around the house. This zoning limits single family development to sites of 1,450sf or less. The CM2 zone is a medium-scale, commercial mixed-use zone intended for sites in a variety of centers and corridors, mixed-use areas served by frequent transit, or larger areas zoned for multi-dwelling development. Generally, the uses and character of this zone are oriented towards retail, commercial office, and multifamily residential. The maximum height is 45' increasing to 55' (5 stories) with bonus provisions in some areas. The FAR is 2.5:1, increasing to 4:1 with bonus provisions.

Wedged between a commercial driveway and school annex on the east and west, the subject building is no longer in an ideal location for residential use and its zoning limits single family development. Demolition provides an opportunity to provide greater site capacity, site efficiency, and infrastructure better suited to the proposed use and the existing zoning.

On balance, this goal is met.

Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill Policy Plan

Policy A. Preserve the existing residential neighborhoods by maintaining the existing dwellings and stimulating compatible housing development and supporting services.

Findings: See findings under "Goal 4: Design and Development" above.

On balance, with the conditions of approval outlined in "Goal 4", Council finds this policy is met:

Lair Hill Goal 2. Preserve light and air by limiting building height to three stories.

Findings: This proposal is for a building demolition. However, it is tied to a proposal (a Type III Historic Resource Review proposal that will be decided by the Historic Landmarks Commission, LU 24-088091 HRM) to develop an addition to an adjacent two-story building. The addition is proposed to be a single story with below-grade parking.

With condition of approval “C”, this goal is met.

Southwest Community Plan, adopted in 2000

Policy 1. Land Use and Urban Form. Enhance Southwest Portland’s sense of place as a community and a collection of distinct neighborhoods. Accommodate Southwest Portland’s share of regional growth while protecting the environment in all areas. Encourage the realization of compact, transit and pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use centers while responding to the need for a range of housing types and prices. Outside of the mixed-use areas, allow infill housing opportunities which increase neighborhood diversity, stability and home ownership while limiting redevelopment.

Findings: See findings under “Goal 3: Urban Form” above.

This policy is met.

Policy 3. Citizen Involvement. Ensure that the policies and objectives of the Southwest Community Plan are used to guide the collaborative actions of the city and Southwest citizens for the next 20 years. Involve citizens integrally in the Southwest Community Plan from concept through evaluation and revision.

Findings: See findings under “Goal 2: Community Involvement” above.

This policy is met.

Policy 4. Economic Development. Maintain and build upon Southwest Portland’s position to attract and support economically viable neighborhood and regional employment centers. Foster businesses and commercial developments that are compatible with the desired scale and character of each center. The most desirable businesses include those which predominantly provide family-wage jobs.

Findings: The proposed development is compatible with Southwest Portland’s positive qualities with clear public benefit as an innovative service provider and community member directly related to the existing health and wellness employment center and more appropriate to the mixed-use zoning of the site. The project will help fill gaps in services that support research and medical institutions in the quality of service and education they provide. The organization provides services to communities impacted by childhood and adolescent cancer free of charge.

Because the proposed addition will be evaluated through Historic Resource Review, it will ultimately be compatible with the district per the South Portland Historic District’s design guidelines and respond to the adjacent building scale and massing, creating a more consistent block face.

This policy is met.

Goals and policies not met by the proposal

Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill Policy Plan

Policy B. Reduce vehicular traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Findings: Approving the demolition will facilitate an intensification in use on the site, and thus the vehicular traffic through the neighborhood is highly likely to increase. Transitioning from a small bungalow used as office space, to a large addition to the adjacent building that will create a campus building with more interior space for the non-profit will be a significant draw to the site, and likely will increase vehicular trips.

However, Council notes that the block and immediate neighborhood is already in transition. As noted under the findings for “Goal 10: Land Use Designations and Zoning” above, wedged between a commercial driveway and school annex on the east and west, the subject building is no longer in an ideal location for residential use, and its zoning limits single family development. It is zoned CM2, a medium-scale, commercial mixed-use zone intended for sites in a variety of centers and corridors, mixed-use areas served by frequent transit, or larger areas zoned for multi-dwelling development. Generally, the uses and character of this zone are oriented towards retail, commercial office, and multifamily residential.

Demolition provides an opportunity to provide greater site capacity, site efficiency, and infrastructure better suited to the proposed use and the existing zoning.

As noted in the findings under “Goal 3: Urban Form” above, the proposed project clusters an essential service in close proximity to related destinations which should facilitate access, reduce trips, and shorten trip lengths.

While this policy is not met, Council does not believe that, on balance, it makes the proposed project unapprovable.

Goals and policies not applicable to the proposal

Comprehensive Plan

GOAL 5: HOUSING

Findings: As the proposal in question impacts a structure that has not been in residential use for over forty years, and no new housing is included with this proposal, the policies and objectives of this goal do not specifically relate to the proposal. *This goal is not applicable.*

GOAL 8: PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Findings: This proposal is for private development and does not involve public facilities. *This goal is not applicable.*

GOAL 9: Transportation

Findings: The proposal does not involve development of the transportation system. *This goal is not applicable.*

Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill Policy Plan

Policy C. Control development and improvements in the Macadam Corridor.

Findings: This proposal is not located along the Macadam Corridor. *This goal is not applicable.*

Lair Hill Goal 1. Encourage the maintenance of the present broad mix of people in terms of income, age, life styles, and race.

Findings: As the proposal in question impacts a structure that has not been in residential use for over forty years, the policies and objectives of this goal do not specifically relate to the proposal. *This goal is not applicable.*

Lair Hill Goal 3. Improve pedestrian and bicycle linkages with Corbett and the Central Business District.

Lair Hill Goal 4. Create sidewalks along both sides of Barbur Blvd and pedestrian access across Barbur to Duniway Park and the YMCA.

Findings: The proposal does not involve development of a transportation system. *These goals are not applicable.*

Lair Hill Goal 5. Encourage mixed use residential, including the possibility of public housing, and commercial uses in the area north of Lair Hill Park and along First Street between Hooker and Porter Streets.

Findings: This proposal is not located in the areas noted. *This goal is not applicable.*

Corbett Goal 1. Preserve the mixed balance of predominantly residential uses and businesses and offices now existing.

Corbett Goal 2. Retain the existing number of low- and medium-income housing units through tax incentives and government assistance as it becomes available.

Corbett Goal 3. Ensure pedestrian and bicycle accessibility to public transit and the Central Business District.

Corbett Goal 4. Encourage the retention and rehabilitation of existing dwellings.

Corbett Goal 5. Change the zoning in accordance with Planning Commission recommendations.

Corbett Goal 6. Adopt recommend capital improvements.

Terwilliger Goal 1. Retain and enhance Terwilliger as a primarily low single-family duplex) density residential neighborhood; do not expand A2.b zone.

Terwilliger Goal 2. Encourage construction of housing for the elderly.

Terwilliger Goal 3. Encourage retention of existing business interests to provide local employment and services.

Terwilliger Goal 4. Minimize the impact of Johns Landing development on the existing neighborhood.

Terwilliger Goal 5. Minimize the barrier that Macadam and its proposed improvements create between the neighborhood and the riverfront.

Terwilliger Goal 6. Provide safe pedestrian and vehicular access to Willamette Park.

Terwilliger Goal 7. Discourage through traffic in the neighborhood.

Terwilliger Goal 8. Discourage zone changes or conditional use permits in residentially zoned land for parking lots or structures.

Terwilliger Goal 9. Retain Terwilliger School as a K-6 school.

Terwilliger Goal 10. For geologic stability and as a buffer to the Salem Freeway, keep land between Corbett and Freeway as undeveloped open space.

Terwilliger Goal 11. Adopt recommended Planning Commission traffic and circulation goals.

Findings: This proposal is located in the Lair Hill area, not the Corbett or Terwilliger areas. *These goals are not applicable.*

Southwest Community Plan, adopted in 2000

Policy 2. Public Facilities. Ensure adequate public facilities for both existing and new development through equitable funding mechanisms.

Findings: This proposal is for private development and does not involve public facilities. *This policy is not applicable.*

Policy 5. Housing. Provide a variety of affordable housing choices adequate to meet the needs of current and future Southwest residents. Regard the existing housing stock as one resource to meet this need. Encourage development of housing types that will increase home ownership opportunities for Southwest residents.

Findings: As the proposal in question impacts a structure that has not been in residential use for over forty years, and no new housing is included with this proposal, the objectives of this goal do not specifically relate to the proposal. *This policy is not applicable.*

Policy 6. Parks, Recreation and Open Space. Enrich neighborhoods and the Southwest community as a whole with ample, accessible, and well-maintained parks and open space. Preserve and enhance the natural habitat features of Southwest Portland's parks and open spaces. Ensure a wide range of recreational opportunities for Southwest citizens.

Findings: The proposal is not related to the parks and open space system. *This policy is not applicable.*

Policy 7. Public Safety. Enhance the level of community responsibility for a secure and safe living environment through shared efforts of residents, public agencies, institutions, and businesses. Maintain a high level of public safety and security for residents, employees, and businesses.

Findings: As the proposal in question is of a relatively small scope, and the safety of the public is unlikely to change as a result of the proposal, the objectives of this goal do not specifically relate to the proposal. *This policy is not applicable.*

Policy 8. Transportation. Provide a balanced, multimodal transportation system in Southwest Portland that encourages increases in transit use and pedestrian accessibility and connectivity, discourages non-local traffic in residential areas, manages congestion, and focuses on improving and maintaining arterial and local streets.

Findings: The proposal does not involve development of the transportation system. *This policy is not applicable.*

Policy 9. Watershed. Protect and enhance Southwest Portland’s environment and natural resources on a watershed by watershed basis. Integrate stormwater management into land use planning and development in a way that prevents net degradation of water quality, aquatic, streamside and riparian habitats and ecosystems, and plant and animal habitats throughout the stream corridor.

Findings: As the proposal in question is of a relatively small scope, and impacts on the watershed are likely to be very limited, the objectives of this goal do not specifically relate to the proposal. *This policy is not applicable.*

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

In previous demolition cases, City Council indicated that in order for a Demolition Review to be approved, the replacement development must provide a significant public benefit in order to make up for the loss of the historic resource. As each of those cases were unique with regard to the historic resources in question and the development proposed as their replacement, so is this case. In this case, a clear public benefit has been successfully conveyed, meriting approval of the request for demolition.

The non-profit applicant organization, UKANDU, serves families impacted by childhood and adolescent cancer. The proposed development would enable Ukandu to expand their wraparound supportive services to the full calendar year to better meet the needs of communities impacted by childhood and adolescent cancer, all in direct proximity to the larger cancer care ecosystem of Southwest and Inner Portland. The replacement of the resource would better provide accessible spaces with a generosity of experience that benefits everyone, providing equitable access and limiting the number of transitions that remind the community of their limitations. The project creates an opportunity to provide a place where kids can focus on being kids in the face of misfortune, hardship, and adversity.

As is noted in the approval criteria listed on page 7, one must consider the merits of preserving the resource, taking into consideration the that historic resources are irreplaceable assets significant to the region’s architectural, cultural, and historical identity and their preservation promotes economic and community vitality, resilience, and memory. While the bungalow in question is listed as a “contributing resource”, not all resources contribute the same quality or magnitude of significance to a district. In this case, the bungalow does not have unique historic significance beyond its contribution to the fabric of the district. It is not architecturally rare or outstanding, and its previous occupants were not associated with a significant person or underserved communities. Its historic integrity has been diminished by the erosion of its historic residential context. It is now located adjacent to larger commercial and institutional buildings rather than other residential structures. The integrity and

continuity of the South Portland Historic District will not be significantly diminished by the demolition of this one resource.

Council and the Historic Landmarks Commission are satisfied that alternative ways to incorporate the applicant's program on the site without demolition were thoroughly investigated before pursuing demolition. The applicant sufficiently demonstrates that demolition of the contributing resource and new building addition are required to meet the unique programmatic and economic needs of the organization.

The design of the addition is a mitigating factor to the loss of the resource. Its evaluation through Historic Resource Review will help compensate for the loss of the charm and craft of the bungalow with a compatible design that features detailing and classical features. The condition of approval for deconstruction rather than demolition is an added mitigation measure. Further, the proposed development mitigates the loss of the resource by replacing the use with a space that will provide community connection in a new environment, addressing gaps in services for families navigating a childhood cancer experience and will further the goals of an organization that is a first of its kind resource within the medical community, elevating the potential for treatment and research.

On balance, the public benefits achieved by allowing demolition of the contributing resource and construction of the proposed addition to an existing non-contributing building for use by Ukandu outweigh the loss of a resource that contributes to the South Portland Historic District.

CITY COUNCIL DECISION

It is the decision of Council to:

Approve demolition of a contributing house in the South Portland Historic District located at 118 SW Porter St.

The approval is per the approved plans, Exhibit C-1 through C-13, and subject to the following conditions of approval:

- A. A finalized demolition permit must be obtained to document the approved project. As part of the permit application submittal, the following development-related conditions (B through E) must be noted on the site plans or included as a separate sheet in the numbered set of plans. The sheet on which this information appears must be labeled "ZONING COMPLIANCE PAGE - Case File LU 24-077225 DM". 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 permit submittal, a signed Certificate of Compliance form (<https://www.portland.gov/ppd/documents/design-and-historic-resource-review-approvals-certificate-compliance>) must be submitted to ensure the permit plans comply with the Design/Historic Resource Review decision and approved exhibits.
- C. The land use review for the replacement structure must be approved, and its appeal period must have passed, before a demolition permit is issued.
- D. The house must be deconstructed by a certified deconstruction contractor consistent with the city's deconstruction of buildings code chapter 17.106 with the goal of diverting most of the building materials from landfills. The materials shall be salvaged, reused, recycled, through sale to a local salvage building material retailer or donated to a local building material non-profit organization.
- E. No field changes allowed.

APPEAL INFORMATION

Appeals to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA)

This is the City's final decision on this matter. It may be appealed to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), within 21 days of the date of the decision, as specified in the Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.830. Among other things, ORS 197.830 requires that a petitioner at LUBA must have submitted written testimony during the comment period or this land use review. You may call LUBA at 1 (503) 373-1265 for further information on filing an appeal.

EXHIBITS (not attached unless indicated)

Applicant's Statement:

1. Original project narrative and plan set – NOT APPROVED/reference only
2. 120-day timeline extension
3. Updated plan set – NOT APPROVED/reference only
4. Revised Narrative
5. Revised Narrative
6. Updated plan set – NOT APPROVED/reference only
7. Staff Report Plan Set with Appendix
8. Appendix
 - Cover sheet
 - Table of contents
 - Introduction
 - Organization and project information
 - Organization and project information
 - Organization and project information
 - Site
 - Site Context - Cancer Treatment Community
 - Topographic Survey
 - Context – Site Photos
 - Context – Site Photos
 - Context – Site Photos
 - Context – Site Photos
 - Context – Surround Building Photos
 - Context – Surround Building Photos
 - Zoning Summary
 - Historic district
 - Historic district
 - Property history
 - Property history
 - Property history
 - Project Evolution – Inclusive design
 - Project Evolution – Project design drivers
 - Project Evolution – Design for Accessibility and Inclusion
 - Project Evolution – Program
 - Project Evolution – Program Adjacencies
 - Project Evolution – Diagram– Two building campus (attached)
 - Project Evolution – Program– Two building campus
 - Project Evolution – Diagram – Boardwalk cloister
 - Project Evolution – Program – Boardwalk cloister
 - Project Evolution – Diagram – The Connector

- Project Evolution – Program – The Connector
 - Project Evolution – Diagram – The Tower
 - Project Evolution – Program – The Tower
 - Project Evolution – Diagram – Top and Bottom
 - Project Evolution – Program – Top and Bottom
 - Project Evolution – Diagram – Porter Island
 - Project Evolution – Program – Porter Island
 - Project Evolution – Final proposal
 - Proposed building rendering
 - Proposed building rendering
 - Building relocation
 - Building relocation
 - Demolition Review
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - Demolition Review approval criteria
 - End Page
- B. Zoning Map (attached):
- C. Plans & Drawings:
1. Project Evolution – Alternatives analysis diagrams (attached)
 2. Project Evolution – Alternatives analysis diagrams
 3. Project Evolution – Diagram – Final proposal (attached)
 4. Project Evolution – Program – Final proposal
 5. Existing site plan (attached)
 6. Proposed site plan (attached)
 7. Proposed floor plans
 8. Proposed north elevation (attached)
 9. Proposed east elevation (attached)
 10. Proposed building sections
 11. Proposed elevation details
 12. Proposed elevation details
 13. Proposed elevation details
- D. Notification Information:
1. Request for response
 2. Posting letter sent to applicant
 3. Notice to be posted
 4. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 5. Mailing list
 6. Mailed notice
- E. Agency Responses:
1. Portland Permitting and Development – Life Safety
 2. PP&D Public Infrastructure Development Review – Transportation
 3. Portland Fire and Rescue
 4. PP&D Public Infrastructure Development Review – Water
 5. Portland Permitting and Development – Urban Forestry
- F. Letters: See Exhibit I-9
- G. Other:

1. Original LUR Application
2. South Portland Historic District National Register Nomination
3. Oregon Historic Site Record - Karl & Minnie Schmidt Building
4. Oregon Historic Site Record - Lucretia Nasts House
5. Oregon Historic Site Record - 3015 SW 1st Ave
6. Pre-Application Conference Summary, EA 24-037799 PC
7. Design Advice Request Summary Memo, EA 24-056451 DA
8. Incomplete Letter
9. Applicant Materials forwarded to the Historic Landmarks Commission
10. Staff Memo to the Historic Landmarks Commission for Advisory Meeting
- H. November 25, 2024, Landmarks Commission Advisory Meeting:
 1. Staff Presentation to Historic Landmarks Commission Advisory Meeting
 2. Applicant Presentation to Historic Landmarks Commission Advisory Meeting
 3. Historic Landmarks Commission Advisory Meeting Verbal Testifier Sheet, 11/25/2024:
 - 1) Abby Culbreth, verbal testimony in support
 - 2) Sean McMahon, verbal testimony in support
 - 3) Michael Schwartz, verbal testimony in support
 - 4) Amy King, verbal testimony in support
 - 5) Brian Bella, verbal testimony in support
 4. Historic Landmarks Commission Advisory Meeting Summary
- I. January 16, 2025, City Council Hearing:
 1. Staff Report and Recommendation to Portland City Council, dated December 24, 2024
 2. Historic Landmarks Commission Letter to Portland City Council, dated December 16, 2024
 3. Memo to Council, dated December 24, 2024
 4. Economic and Community Development PPD Briefing – Mayor’s Briefing Memo, dated December 24, 2024
 5. Impact Statement for Requested Council Action, dated December 24, 2024
 6. Staff Presentation to Portland City Council, dated January 16, 2025
 7. Applicant Presentation to Portland City Council, dated January 16, 2025
 8. Written and Verbal Testimony List, dated January 16, 2025
 9. Written testimony submitted between the close of record at the HLC hearing and the close of record at City Council:
 - 1) Stanley Penkin, written testimony in support, 1/10/2025
 - 2) Harold Goldstein, written testimony in support, 1/11/2025
 - 3) Richard Maxwell, written testimony in support, 1/13/2025
 - 4) Marcie Walsh, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 5) Tim Terich, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 6) Susan Stark, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 7) Johnna Loreen, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 8) Kellia Holzworth, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 9) Shannon Pujol, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 10) Miles Holzworth, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 11) Laura Ward Collins, written testimony in support, 1/14/2025
 - 12) Patrick Ryan, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 13) Joanna Abels, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 14) Heidi Bruno, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 15) Christopher Brooks, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 16) Kay Yancey, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 17) Beard, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 18) Coral Strickland, written testimony in support, 1/15/2025
 - 19) Linh Doan, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 20) CJ McNulty, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025

- 21) Deborah Nicholson, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 22) Gloria Bissmeyer, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 23) Amy Robinson, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 24) Dr. Jason Glover, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 25) Haley Orr, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 26) Iraida Hermann, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 27) Jon Fischer, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 28) Nick Sherbo, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 29) Amber Nelson, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 30) Lisa Achim, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
 - 31) Dave Achim, written testimony in support, 1/16/2025
10. Verbal Testimony at City Council Hearing, 1/16/2025:
1. Sean McMahon, verbal testimony in support
 2. Michael Schwartz, verbal testimony in support
 3. John Russell, verbal testimony in support
 4. Kay Yancey, verbal testimony in support
 5. Steven Kassing, verbal testimony in support
 6. Jean Cripps, verbal testimony in support
 7. Ian Holzworth, verbal testimony in support
 8. Kate McMahon, verbal testimony in support
 9. Abigail Culbreth, verbal testimony in support
 10. Lisa Kolve, verbal testimony in support
 11. Bridget Bell, verbal testimony in support
 12. Monica Loomis, verbal testimony in support
 13. Nick Sherbo, verbal testimony in support
 14. Rick Bruno, verbal testimony in support
 15. Emily Harnden, verbal testimony in support
 16. Nicholas McCullar, verbal testimony in support
 17. Sage Palmer, verbal testimony in support
 18. Kristin Scheible, verbal testimony in support
 19. Scott Mears, verbal testimony in support
11. January 16, 2025, City Council Hearing Recording:
<https://www.youtube.com/live/rdhBTLWNXAM>
- J. February 5, 2025, City Council Hearing:
1. Second Read Economic and Community Development PPD Briefing – Mayor’s Briefing Memo