

**SUPPORT
PROPOSAL**

PROPOSAL OF CURTISS ON BEHALF OF BUCHANAN
FOR DEMOLITION OF GARAGE, LADD'S ADDITION LU 15-167566 DM

IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO CITY COUNCIL, **PRINT** YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND EMAIL.

NAME (print)

ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE

Email

NAME (print)	ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE	Email
✓ KIRK RANZETTA	HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION	Kirk.ranzetta@aecom.com

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Redfish, LLC - Keith J. <redfishllc@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 8:24 PM
To: Council Clerk – Testimony; Bonnie Harold
Subject: Testimony on the Demolition Review, September 10, 2pm
Attachments: Good afternoon demolition hearing.docx

Please find testimony on the referenced hearing attached.

Thank You

Keith

Keith Jensen
Redfish Contractors, LLC
503.307.2353

www.redfishllc.com
Oregon CCB License #178164

Written testimony on the Demolition Review scheduled for Thursday, 2pm, September 10.

September 9, 2015

Good afternoon.

I would like to comment on the policies involved in making improvements to garages in a historic district. I am the contractor on a different project in the Irvington Historic District.

My client would like to enlarge his garage and add an ADU. His garage is a contributing resource to the house which is a contributing resource to the Irvington Historic District.

We can use the existing building by replacing the foundation with basement walls.

In practice this is considered a demolition by the planning department for the purposes of chapter 33. However, there is no definition of demolition in chapter 33.

Because it is considered a demolition this construction requires a Type 4 review, which includes over \$10,000 in fees and appearance before the city council.

It would be an improvement to have a definition of demolition available so that clients and contractors could design their projects without demolishing the building. The definition of demolition could be less strict than currently defined by the planning department. For instance: Chapter 24 includes a definition of demolition and major alteration. Under this definition, my client would be performing a major alteration and would require a less expensive review.

The project proposed today by Ryan Buchanan is a garage/ADU combination. This is a small project. However, it is undergoing a large, expensive review.

I propose that spending citizen's money and staff time and your time on a type 4 review for small projects is not appropriate.

A second improvement to the code would be a definition of small projects to allow for a smaller review. This would make better use of your time and the home owners' time and money.

Thank you for your consideration.

Keith Jensen

Redfish Contractors LLC

PO Box 13176

Portland, OR 97213

redfishllc@gmail.com

503.307.2353