

City of Portland Bureau of Development Services

Staff Presentation to the City Council

Demolition Review LU 15-167566 DM Contributing Garage at 1609 SE 16th Avenue Ladd's Addition National Register Historic District September 10, 2015

Type 4 Demolition Review

- Pre-application Conference (March 2015)
- Public Notice of Historic Landmarks Commission meeting and City Council Hearing
- Posting of Proposal at site, includes Historic Landmarks Commission meeting and City Council Hearing dates
- Historic Landmarks Commission Public Meeting (July 2015)
- BDS Staff prepares a Recommendation to City Council
- City Council Hearing final decision



Demolition Review - Background Historic Resource Code Amendments [HRCA]

Phase 1 (June 2002) Resolution No. 36076 Phase 2 (October 2004) Ordinance #178832



Historic Resources Code Amendments Phase 2



Bureau of Planning Recommended Draft July 16, 2004 (Appendix 0 Reutsed September 15, 2004)

Exhibit A





- Refined the relationship between local and state historic preservation regulations and improved the clarity of the Zoning Code;
- Made Improvements to:
 - Zoning Code incentives;
 - Building Code incentives;
- Expanded and strengthened the City's demolition review regulations to protect more historic resources

Demolition Review gives the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed demolition of a historic resource and allows opportunities for alternatives to demolition to be explored. The City Council will review the proposal, hold a public hearing and either approve, approve with conditions, or deny demolition of the resource.

Precedents – 2010 Kiernan Building Demolition

- Demolition of contributing 1-story commercial building in New Chinatown/Japantown Historic District to be replaced with new 4-story Blanchet House of Hospitality on the same footprint.
- Approved





City Council noted that "a new proposed facility, encompassing low-income housing, a soup kitchen, and other related services... is the highest and best use of the site."

Council found that the proposal, *on balance*, met the majority of the approval criteria.

Precedents – 2014 Buck-Prager Building Demolition

- Demolition of contributing 1/8 block 3-story former hospital building in Alphabet Historic District to be replaced with new 4- to 6-story apartment building on half block.
- Denied





City Council noted that a new marketrate apartment building did not provide a significant public benefit to compensate for the loss of a historic resource.

Council found that the proposal, *on balance*, did not meet the approval criteria.

Precedents – 2015 Washington Park Reservoirs

- Demolition of Reservoir 3, Reservoir 4, and the Weir Building to be replaced with new underground reservoir with reflecting pools and restoration of remaining contributing
 - resources.
- Approved





City Council recognized the impact of geologic forces on the historic resources as well as the City's responsibility to provide the basic service of clean water and that the mitigation proposed was comparable to the magnitude of the loss of the resources. As such, Council found that the proposal, *on balance*, met the approval criteria.

Approval Criteria – Demolition Review

33.846.080 Demolition Review

Purpose.

Demolition review protects resources that have been individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places and those that have been classified as contributing in the analysis done in support of a Historic District's creation. It also protects Historic Landmarks and Conservation Landmarks that have taken advantage of an incentive for historic preservation and historic resources that have a preservation agreement. *Demolition review recognizes that historic resources are irreplaceable assets that preserve our heritage, beautify the city, enhance civic identity, and promote economic vitality.*

Review procedure.

Demolition reviews are processed through a Type IV procedure.

Approval Criteria – Demolition Review

Portland Zoning Code 33.846.080.C.2 Demolition Review

Proposals to demolish a historic resource will be approved if the review body finds that one of the following approval criteria is met:

- 1. Denial of a demolition permit would effectively deprive the owner of all reasonable economic use of the site; or
- 2. Demolition of the resource has been evaluated against and, on balance, has been found supportive of the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and any relevant area plans. The evaluation may consider factors such as:
 - a. The merits of demolition;
 - b. The merits of development that could replace the demolished resource, either as specifically proposed for the site or as allowed under the existing zoning;
 - c. The effect demolition of the resources would have on the area's desired character;
 - d. The effect that redevelopment on the site would have on the area's desired character;
 - e. The merits of preserving the resource, taking into consideration the purposes described in Subsection A; and
 - f. Any proposed mitigation for the demolition.

Applicable Plans include: Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies document -Oct 1980/Nov. 2011), Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Action Plan (1988); and Ladd's Addition Historic District National Register nomination (1988)

Zoning

- R5 Residential 5,000 Historic Resource Protection overlay zones
- Ladd's Addition Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places on August 31, 1988



Aerial View of District



Figure Ground of District



Site Photos









Site Photos

2015







BDS Staff Advice Request – Demolition Review

Staff requests advice from the Historic Landmarks Commission for the Demolition Review requested for a contributing resource: (1925) garage in the Ladd's Addition National Register Historic District.

The Ladd's Addition Historic District was created in 1988, as it was found to meet the following National Register listing Criteria:

- A Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B Association with significant persons in our past;
- C Embodiment of 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.

LADD'S ADDITION



Photos - Contributing garage









Proposed Replacement Development

 Construction of a new garage with 400 sf studio apartment above. (To be approved through a separate land use application.)



Proposed Replacement Development – July 27, 2015

 Construction of a new garage with 400 sf studio apartment above. (To be approved through a separate land use application.)

OPTION 1:







OPTION 2:



PEDIMENT SUPPORTED BY WOOD BRACKETS AND CONTINUOUS WOOD SIDING



Proposed Replacement Development – Revised

 Construction of a new garage with 400 sf studio apartment above. (To be approved through a separate land use application.)





Applicant response to the Approval Criteria

The proposed demolition of the detached garage is part of the rehabilitation of the property, which was in disrepair prior to the current owner's purchase.

The new garage with accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above, will respect the character of the neighborhood by relating in material, scale, and architectural detailing to both the main residence and the surrounding neighborhood.

The location of the proposed garage/ADU is consistent with the pattern of garages in Ladd's Addition.

The new ADU will provide a relatively affordable rental unit in a desirable close-in neighborhood.

The new ADU will be energy efficient.

Staff Findings

- The new ADU will provide a relatively affordable housing option in a desirable close-in neighborhood with few such options.
- The new ADU also provides the opportunity for potential use as a shortterm rental within the historic district, thus serving as an economic development tool for promotion of the district.
- The garage, when purchased, was in poor condition, described by the inspector as "leaning over". A later letter from the inspector indicated the garage would not survive relocation to the alley as was requested by the City.
- When considering the merits of the structure "to be preserved", staff considered the following: poor condition; the garage was built 14 years after the house; it was a utilitarian accessory structure of modest design; and its relatively improper location on the site, when compared to the rest of the district and the district's desired character, which required access across the front yard.
- The proposed garage and ADU respects the historic character of the site and reinforces the district's alley garage character.
- Construction of a new garage/ADU may have been possible without demolition.

HLC Recommendation

- On balance, the merits of the replacement with a new compatible ADU/garage better meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
- The large lot size of the subject property allows for a new structure to contain an ADU, provided it is appropriately-scaled, without compromising the historic residence or the district, but noted this would not necessarily be the case throughout this or other districts.
- Approving the demolition solely on the condition of the building, rather than on the merits as a whole, condones demolition by neglect. However, its deteriorated condition and the impracticality of moving the garage were considered within the context of the entire proposal, including the accessory nature of the building and its relative impact on the district compared to that of a primary residence or commercial building.
- Noted that the proposed design, as presented on July 27, 2015, was too large in scale and recommended changes to the design, including reducing the height and adding windows to the east façade of the garage.

Staff Report Summary

Staff believes the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Action Plan Policies are *met*:

Goal 2: Urban Development Goal 4: Housing Goal 5: Economic Development Goal 9: Citizen Involvement Goal 12: Urban Design

Policy 2: Housing

Policy 4: Livability, Identity, & Public Safety

Goal 3: Neighborhoods – Policy 3.4 under Goal 3 was found to not be met, however when considered against the language of the Goal, staff found that, on balance, this goal was met.

Staff believes the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Action Plan Policies are *not applicable*:

Goal 1: Metropolitan Coordination Policy 1: Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront Activities

- Goal 6: Transportation
- Policy 3: Transportation
 - Policy 5: Commercial/Industrial

Goal 8: Environment

Goal 7: Energy

- Goal 10: Plan Review and Administration
- Goal 11: Public Facilities

Staff believes that, on balance, the approval criteria are met.

end of Staff presentation