

To: Historic Landmarks Board  
From: James Reitz (AICP) Senior Planner  
jreitz@forestgrove-or.gov (503) 992-3233  
Re: February 26 Agenda  
Date: February 19, 2018

## Memorandum

**REMINDER:** *The meeting start time has been moved to 6:30 p.m.*

### ACTION ITEMS -

A. **CEP Application** – The application is not yet available, but it should be within the next 2 weeks. The deadline is likely to be early April. This meeting should be used to confirm who will be on the sub-committee. The entire Board will have an opportunity to review the application at the March 26 meeting.

B. **Photo Contest Planning** – Because of the late start last year, the Board requested that this item be moved up on the calendar. To help you plan, below are excerpts from the March and April 2018 meetings.

*The Board reviewed posters, a press release, the contest rules and contest release form submitted for review by Whalen Garfias. Tsur requested that staff have the release form reviewed by the city attorney; Reitz will follow-up. The City will host a webpage with the contest rules and release form, and will also post the contest on Facebook. The contest will run April 2-23 with preliminary judging planned for the April 24 HLB meeting. Community judges include Jim Flory of Pacific University and Carol Berget with the Forest Grove Camera Club. Richard Kidd was recommended as a third judge; Whalen Garfias will reach out to him. She will also reach out to the News Times to see if they would like to participate. (HLB Minutes of March 2018)*

*The Board noted that although not a lot of entries were received, this was the first year and fairly short notice was provided; we could expect better participation next year with more advance notice and publicity. Also, clarification of some parts of the rules, especially that they did not have to be current photos taken during the contest dates but could have been taken at some time in the past. Also, it could be published at other events throughout the year like at the Public Safety Open House and National Night Out, as well as yard signs during the FHFG's home tours. (HLB Minutes of April 2018)*

C. **Mock Design Review** – See attached staff report. The report is not exactly what would be provided for an actual application, in that staff is not making any recommendations. What is intended is to provide the Board with a realistic scenario that will provide you with an opportunity to practice procedures and discuss possible outcomes. George has again volunteered to act as applicant.

### INFORMATION ITEMS -

**Preservation Grants:** For FY 2018-19, the City Council awarded the Board **\$7,975**. Projects awarded to date are listed below. No new requests have been filed. There remains **\$181** available.

Address	Grant Award \$	Status
1619 Maple Street	1,000	Completed
2318 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	1,000	Completed
1419 Cedar Street	794	Completed
2303 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	1,000	Completed
2003 21 <sup>st</sup> Avenue	1,000	Completed
2038 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	1,000	Completed
1824 23 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue	1,000	Completed
2324 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	1,000	Completed
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,794</b>	

**Funding Opportunities:** Holly and Kelsey will report on their progress to date.

**SHPO Grant Request:** The SHPO grant application has been submitted. We are requesting \$10,000 to be used to contract with a consultant to prepare the downtown district nomination; \$1,200 to print 2,500 copies of the Clark District brochure; \$200 for annual NAPC dues ( for 2 years); and \$100 for HLB training. Due to increased demand, the most that could be requested was \$11,500.

**March Agenda:** CEP grant preparation, photo contest planning, window/door/garage door replacement policies

## 2019-20 CALENDAR - UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS

### **March 26, 2019**

- Review and finalize CEP grant application
- Discuss Select Stewart Award recipient
- Preservation Month / photo contest planning
- Window/door/garage door replacement policy

### **April 23, 2019 (fourth Tuesday)**

- Select Stewart Award recipient
- Preservation Month / photo contest planning (continued)

### **May 28, 2019**

- Historic Month Proclamation (May 13 CC meeting)
- Honor Stewart Award recipient (May 13 CC meeting)
- Honor photo contest winners (May 13 CC meeting)
- Review July-December 2019 Editorial Calendar
- Preservation Grant Application/Distribution Policy Review

### **June 25, 2019**

- National Night Out planning (August 6)
- Adopt July-December 2019 Editorial Calendar

### **July 23, 2019 (fourth Tuesday)**

- National Night Out planning (August 6)
- Chalk Art Festival planning (September 14)

### **August 21, 2019**

- Chalk Art Festival planning (September 14)
- Public Safety Open House planning (October 12)

### **September 24, 2019**

- Public Safety Open House planning (October 12)

### **October 22, 2019 (fourth Tuesday)**

- No items scheduled

### **November 26, 2019**

- No items scheduled

### **December 17, 2019 (third Tuesday)**

- Prepare annual report and presentation for January boards and commissions reception (not to exceed 5 minutes)
- Discuss 2020 work plan
- Prepare January-June 2020 Editorial Calendar

### **January 28, 2020**

- Review and adopt 2020 work plan
- Review and adopt January-June 2020 Editorial Calendar
- Photo contest planning
- Annual officer elections

### **February 25, 2020**

- Begin CEP application preparation
- Mock Design Review Hearing
- Photo contest planning



# Mock Historic Landmark Review Staff Report and Recommendation

Community Development Department, Planning Division

<b>Report Date:</b>	February 19, 2019
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 26, 2019
<b>Request:</b>	Demolition of a Contributing Resource to the Clark Historic District Construction of a new 4-unit apartment building
<b>File Number:</b>	311-19-00001X-PLNG
<b>Property Location:</b>	2125 18 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
<b>Legal Description:</b>	Washington County Tax Lot 1S3 6BB-100000
<b>Applicant:</b>	George Cushing, QUE Construction, Inc. 2700 SE 35 <sup>th</sup> Circle - Suite A, Portland, Oregon 97222
<b>Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Designations:</b>	High Density Residential (HDR) Residential Multi-Family High Density (RMH)
<b>Applicable Standards and Criteria:</b>	City of Forest Grove Development Code: §10.5.220 et. seq. <i>Procedure for Review of Proposed Work Affecting the Exterior of Landmarks</i>  City of Forest Grove Design Guideline Handbook: Focus Area Section V <i>Historic District Design Guidelines</i>
<b>Reviewing Staff:</b>	James Reitz (AICP) Senior Planner

## I. BACKGROUND

The home at 2125 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue was constructed c. 1920. It is a modest home of Vernacular architecture. It has about 1,200 square feet of floor area including a finished attic, and a porch along the entire front façade. Most of the exterior materials (siding and windows) are original. The front door has been replaced with a steel door (date unknown) and the porch columns have been replaced with pressure-treated and painted 4 X 4 posts (date unknown).

The site is located in the Clark National Register Historic District. No history of the house has been documented, but because the house still retains high integrity, it is considered a Contributing Resource to the district.

The building has not been individually landmarked by City ordinance. While it has not been individually landmarked, it is still subject to review because Development Code (DC) §10.5.220 includes "historic contributing building" within the definition of "historic

landmark". Therefore, the provisions of Forest Grove Code (FGC) §35.074 *Procedure for Removal of a Landmark Designation* applies, as do the provisions of DC §10.5.225 *Procedure for Review of Proposed Demolition or Relocation of Landmarks*.

This block – and much of the Clark District area – was platted in the late 1800s. Homebuilding continued sporadically over the decades from about 1880 to 1930. The homes on either side of and behind the site are also historic contributing buildings. All the homes on the same side of the street are 1 or 1 ½ stories in height, maintain high integrity, and all date from the 1920s.



Existing Home at 2125 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue

The site is also located in the RMH high-density residential district. This designation was adopted in 1980, decades after the neighborhood was completely built out. The RMH zoning district has a target residential density of 20.28 dwelling units per acre (DUA.) The lot is of sufficient area that it could be developed with up to four units, including off-street parking. The applicant proposes to do just that, by demolishing the house and clearing the lot.

## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

- a) Description of Proposal: The applicant is proposing to replace the existing structure with a 4-unit apartment building. A photographic rendering of the proposed building is below.

The new building would be 2 ½ stories tall, and would exhibit various architectural features including:

- Colonnaded second floor decks facing the street
- Front door alcove (i.e., no porch)
- Low-pitched roof
- Vinyl siding, windows, doors, columns and trim
- Single-hung windows, with fixed transom windows on the ground floor



Front façade of the proposed 4-unit apartment building

- B. Site Examination: The site is in the middle of the block on 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It is bracketed on either side by single-family homes 1-story tall. There is no outstanding landscaping. This segment of 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue has been fully improved to City standards.

### III. APPROVAL CRITERIA, FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This application is subject to three reviews: landmark demolition, landmark designation removal, and new construction design review. Taken in order -

#### Development Code §10.5.225 - PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED DEMOLITION OR RELOCATION OF LANDMARKS

Prior to the demolition or relocation, in whole or in part, of any landmark, an application and plans shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and action by the HLB under Type III procedures.

- A. In considering a proposal for demolition or relocation of a landmark, the HLB shall have the authority to allow the demolition or relocation, or to allow partial demolition or relocation, or to delay approval of the demolition or relocation. If

the HLB acts to approve the request, in whole or in part, issuance of a permit and the commencement of work shall be delayed until appeal periods have expired. The Board shall base its action on the following criteria, and shall delay approval of the demolition or relocation if it finds that:

1. The landmark is of such architectural, historic, or scenic interest that its demolition or relocation would be detrimental to the public interest; or

Finding: The home is of Vernacular architecture, and no history of the house has been documented.

2. The landmark is of such interest or significance that it is or could be included in the *National Register of Historic Places* or is on the *Oregon State Inventory of Historic Places*; or

Finding: The site is located in the Clark National Register Historic District. No history of the house has been documented, but because the house still retains high integrity, it is considered a Contributing Resource to the district.

3. The landmark has such unusual design, texture, or materials characteristics that it could not be reproduced or could be reproduced only with great difficulty or expense; or

Finding: The house is of Vernacular architecture that has retained high integrity, but with no unusual design, texture or material characteristics.

4. Retention of the landmark would aid substantially in the preservation of another designated landmark or in preservation of the character of the adjacent area.

Finding: The adjacent homes on either side of and behind the site are also Historic Contributing buildings in the Clark District. Removal of this building would not preserve the character of the area.

- B. If the Board acts to delay approval of the proposal, the demolition or relocation may be delayed for up to a maximum of 180 days from the Board's initial consideration of the proposal. The decision of the HLB may be appealed to the City Council in accordance with the appeal procedures for a Type III decision.
- C. If, at the end of the extended delay period, the owner of the landmark or his authorized agent has not withdrawn the application for demolition or relocation, the application shall be deemed approved, and any City permits required for such demolition or relocation shall be issued.

CONCLUSION: While the home is of Vernacular architecture, the architecture is representative of the period in which it was constructed. It – along with its neighbors – maintains its high integrity. Removal of the resource would not help preserve the character of the area.

Because the City does not have demolition denial authority, the question before the HLB is whether to impose the 180 demolition delay period described in (B) above.

If the building cannot somehow be incorporated into the current proposal (unlikely given that the proposed building and car park would consume all available space), and if the building cannot be relocated to a different site in the Clark District, then the HLB must also consider the following.

Forest Grove Code §35.074 PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL  
OF A LANDMARK DESIGNATION

- A. Removal of a designated landmark from the Register may be proposed by a property owner or his or her authorized agent, by the HLB, or by the City Council. An application shall be filed with the Community Development Department.

Finding: The property owner has requested that the building at 2125 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue be removed from the Register.

- B. Removal of a designated landmark from the Register is classified as a Type IV procedure, and is subject to all of the notice procedures and timelines outlined in the Development Code. Removal of the HL overlay designation requires two sequential public hearings before the following review bodies:
- (1) Historic Landmarks Board; and
  - (2) City Council.
- C. The HLB shall make its decision on the basis of the criteria contained in §35.072 (*below*) and shall make specific findings of fact as to whether the landmark has lost its historic or cultural value based on these criteria.
- D. If the Board acts to deny a request for removal of a landmark from the Register, no further action shall be taken unless the applicant files an appeal of the Board's action with the City Council.
- E. Within 60 days from the date of the recommendation by the HLB to approve a request to remove a landmark from the Register, the City Council shall conduct a public hearing to consider the request and recommendation of the HLB. Public notice shall be provided in accordance with Type IV procedures. Following the public hearing, the Council shall act to approve the removal of the landmark designation as requested, or to remove some portion of the landmark from the Register, or to deny the request. When removing a landmark designation from the Register, the ordinance shall amend the zoning map to remove the HL overlay zone from the property.

Forest Grove Code §35.072 CRITERIA  
FOR LANDMARK DESIGNATION.

The Historic Landmarks Board (HLB) may recommend to the City Council for designation as a historic or cultural landmark and for inclusion in the Historic Register any structure, archaeological or prehistoric site, or historic site, upon a finding by the Board that the subject property:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the history of the city, the county, the state, or the nation;

Finding: The site is not known to be associated with events that have made a contribution to the history of the city, county, state, or nation.

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons holding a significant place in the history of the city, the county, the state, or the nation;

Finding: The site is not known to be associated with the lives of persons that have made a contribution to the history of the city, county, state, or nation

(C) Embodies distinguishing architectural characteristics, in exterior design, of a period, style, method of construction, craftsmanship, or in use of indigenous materials;

Finding: The house is of Vernacular architecture that has retained high integrity, but with no unusual design, texture or material characteristics. The architecture is representative of the period in which the house was constructed and was built using indigenous materials. It maintains its high integrity.

(D) Is representative of the work of a designer, architect, or master builder who influenced the development and appearance of the city, the state, the Pacific Northwest, or the nation; and

Finding: The building is not known to be representative of the work of a designer, architect or master builder.

(E) In the case of proposed designation of a site, yields or may be likely to yield information in history, prehistory, or archaeology.

Finding: The site is not known to be a likely site that would yield information in history, prehistory or archaeology.

CONCLUSION: Criteria (A) and (B) do not apply, as the home is not known to have been associated with any historical person(s) or event(s). Criterion (D) does not apply, as the home not known to be representative of a designer, architect or master builder. Criterion (E) does not apply because the site is not known to have yielded nor would likely yield information in history, pre-history or archeology. The only criterion that may apply is Criterion (C): The home is of Vernacular architecture, it was constructed using indigenous materials, and it is representative of the period in which it was constructed.

If the building is demolished, its designation as a Landmark is moot.

If the building is relocated to a site within the Clark District, then it can retain its Landmark status. The applicant has indicated that this would be acceptable, since it would not conflict with the proposed development.

---

For the proposed new construction, the following review standards apply, pursuant to DC §10.5.220(D). The action of the Board to approve the application shall be accompanied by specific findings of fact indicating how each of the criteria in §10.5.220(D) are satisfied or, if the Board acts to disapprove the proposal, indicating how the proposal fails to satisfy one or more of the criteria.

### Development Code §10.5.220 PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED WORK AFFECTING THE EXTERIOR OF LANDMARKS

In acting on an application submitted pursuant to this section for work affecting the exterior of a landmark or construction of a new building within a district, the (HLB) shall approve the proposal if findings are made demonstrating that the following standards are met:

#### 1. General Review Standards

- a) Every reasonable effort shall be made in the proposal to provide a compatible use for the property which requires minimal alteration of the structure, or to use the property for its originally intended purpose.
- b) The distinguishing original qualities or character of the structure shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of historic material or distinctive architectural features shall be avoided when possible.
- c) All structures shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.
- d) Changes which may have taken place in the history and development of the structure shall be recognized and respected.
- e) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterizes the structure shall be treated with sensibility.
- f) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired if practicable; if not, they should be replaced in-kind. Where replacement of features is proposed, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

- g) Proposed surface cleaning, if any, of structures shall be undertaken with the least damaging means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.
- h) Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological landmarks affected by, or adjacent to, the landmark.
- i) A design which may be proposed for alterations and additions to the structure shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.
- j) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to any structures shall be done in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.
- k) Attempts to improve or enhance the exterior appearance of a landmark by installing decorative features, such as shutters, shall be avoided unless it can be established that the feature existed on the landmark at its inception.

Finding: The General Review Standards listed above do not apply because the proposal is to demolish the existing building, not modify or remodel it.

The following criteria are applicable to the proposed new construction.

#### 4. Building Design

##### a) Height

- i. Height Limit at Eave or Parapet: The height from grade at the building line to the predominant roof eave that exists for historic buildings on the block face up to a maximum of 25 feet. Historic non-contributing buildings may be used if there are no historic contributing buildings on the block face.

Finding: The height from grade to the predominant roof eave would be 33 feet. This criterion would not be met.

- ii. Height Limit at Ridge: The height from grade at the building line to the main roof ridge that exists for historic buildings on the block face up to 10 feet above the allowable eave height.

Finding: The allowable eave height would be 35 feet. The proposed height from grade to the roof ridge would be 38 feet, or 3 feet greater than what is allowed. This criterion would not be met.

- iii. The maximum number of above grade stories is 2½.

Finding: The proposed building would be 2 ½ stories above grade. This criterion would be met.

- iv. The height or number of stories of the front portion of historic buildings may not be increased.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

- v. The ground floor of a historic building may be raised no more than 3 feet from its existing height.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

- vi. The maximum height from grade at the building line to the main level for new development is 4 feet.

Finding: The main level of the proposed building would be 2 feet above grade. This criterion is met.

- vii. Basements are allowed for all buildings. The site may not be substantially re-graded for basement use.

Finding: No basement is proposed. This criterion is not applicable.

#### b) Width

- i. The width of a new building front may not vary more or less than 20% from the range that exists for historic buildings on the block.

Finding: The width of the new building would 15% greater than the range that exists for the historic buildings on the block. This criterion is met.

- ii. The front width of historic buildings may not be increased more than 10%.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

#### c) Shape

- i. The overall primary building shape and that of additions must be representative of existing historic buildings on the block face.

Finding: The overall building shape would be similar to the existing historic buildings on the block face, but with greater massing due to the increased scale and height of the proposed building.

- ii. Additions to historic buildings shall be designed to be secondary to the main building.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

- iii. Oblique, skewed and non-orthogonal front walls are not allowed on the primary building.

Finding: No oblique, skewed or non-orthogonal front walls are proposed. This criterion is met.

- iv. Rounded walls or porches are allowed on secondary sides or additions.

Finding: A hexagonal porch is proposed on the primary elevation. Because it would be located on the primary elevation, this criterion would not be met.

d) Roof

- i. Roof forms for the main structure, additions and wings where visible are to be gabled or hipped. Shed roofs are not allowed for the main building portion. Parapets and non-visible roofs are not allowed for the main roof unless represented by historic buildings on the block. Other roof forms such as gambrel, clipped gable or clipped hip may be allowed upon review.

Finding: The primary roof form would be gabled. This criterion is met.

- ii. Roof shape shall be consistent with other historic buildings on the block in style, configuration and pitch.

Finding: The primary roof shape would be consistent in style, configuration and pitch. One of the secondary roofs would not be consistent, because conical roofs are not extant anywhere in the Clark District.

- iii. Roofs shall have a minimum 12-inch overhang or the average eave width of historic buildings on the block face.

Finding: The primary roof would have an 8-inch overhang, which would be less than the average eave width of 14 inches extant on the historic buildings on the block face. This criterion is not met.

- iv. Gable roofs shall have matching roof slopes.

Finding: The primary and secondary gable roofs would have matching slopes. This criterion is met.

- v. Porches or bays may have lower sloped roofs than that of the main roof. These roofs may be gabled, hipped, shed or more complex. Shallow stepped gable roofs: a maximum of two are allowed.

Finding: The second-floor porch roofs would have a slope matching that of the primary roof. This criterion is met.

- vi. The roof shape and slope of the main portion on historic buildings as visible shall not be changed.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

- vii. Roofing types not allowed where visible: Sheet metal, clay, concrete or metal tile, single-ply types.

Finding: Roofing would consist of 3-tab asphalt shingles. This criterion is met.

- viii. Gutters and Downspouts:

- Types allowed: painted sheet metal, copper.
- Types not allowed: vinyl or plastic, except as a downspout receiver hub visible for a maximum of 12 inches above grade.

Finding: Vinyl or plastic gutters are proposed. This criterion would not be met.

- e. Dormers and Roof Features

- i. Dormers on all buildings shall match the existing building style, shape and relative proportion. Dormers shall intersect the main roof below the main ridge.

Finding: The dormers would intersect the main roof below the main ridge. It would match the building style and shape. This criterion is met.

- ii. New dormers are not allowed on a front-sloping roof of historic buildings.

Finding: This criterion is not applicable because the proposal would not affect an historic building.

- iii. A maximum of two dormers are allowed on the front of new development.

Finding: One dormer is proposed on the front elevation. This criterion is met.

- iv. The total area for all dormers on a particular slope is limited to 33% for gable-roofed dormers and 50% for shed-roofed dormers.

Finding: One gable-roofed dormer is proposed. As it would be less than 33% of the total area, this criterion is met.

- v. New decorative roof feature additions such as cupolas, towers, crestings, and railings are not allowed.

Finding: The proposed building would have a conical roof over one of the second floor decks. This criterion would not be met.

- vi. Chimneys on historic buildings: Retain and repair above the roofline.
- vii. Skylights are not allowed on the front sloping roof or on a visible side.
- viii. Solar panels, satellite dishes, and mechanical equipment are not allowed on the roof or walls of the front building portion. This includes the front and sides extending back 10 feet.

Finding: No skylights, chimneys, solar panels, satellite dishes or mechanical equipment visible from the street are proposed.

f. Porches

- i. New porches shall comply with the above requirements for spacing, setback, building form, shape, and roofs.
- ii. New front porches shall have access to the front street.
- iii. New porches on all buildings are to match the existing building style, shape and relative proportion.
- iv. Porches on historic buildings shall not be removed or relocated.
- v. New development (including accessory dwelling units) shall incorporate a porch or architecturally-defined entry for each main level unit unless sharing an existing porch or entry. The minimum porch dimensions are four feet by four feet and sixteen square feet per dwelling unit.
- vi. Porches shall have roofs and are to be integrated with the building and finished accordingly. They shall be consistent with the main building's style. Front porches and roofs shall serve the main level and be one-story in height.

Finding: The proposed building would have a conical roof over one of the second floor decks on the front elevation. This criterion would not be met.

- vii. Raised front and visible side porches require finished enclosures or skirting below their walk structure consistent with the main building style.
- viii. Front porches on historic buildings may not be enclosed.
- ix. Side porches serving the main or basement level are allowable. They are to be secondary but consistent in style and detail with the front porch.
- x. Porches above the main level on the front of the building are not allowed unless existing elsewhere on historic buildings on the block face.
- xi. New exterior stairs are allowed for ground floor entrances only.
- xii. Raised decks visible from the street are not allowed.
- xiii. Materials Not Allowed:
  - Exposed Structure: steel stair members, steel and concrete types of stairs.
  - Enclosure Members: cable, glass, or vinyl.
  - Roofing: metal roofs.

Finding: Vinyl siding is proposed. This criterion would not be met.

g. Front, Side and Rear Building Elevations

- i. The front façade orientation and access for historic buildings shall be maintained. The major defining features including entry, porches, roofline, bays and dormers shall be retained on the front and visible sides of historically contributing buildings.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

- ii. The front façade orientation and access for new buildings shall be consistent with historic building examples on the block.
- iii. Front Façade: New buildings shall avoid very flat, wide and tall front and visible side walls with minimal relief and level parapets. The front shall create relief by a limited use of projections and recesses such as a porch, bay, wing, or the roof slope.
- iv. Openings: New buildings shall have windows on the front and visible sides of habitable rooms at each level. Each room shall have a minimum of one window.

Finding: The new building's front façade orientation and openings would be consistent with the historic buildings on the block face. The front façade would be more embellished with architectural details (columns, transom windows, and a conical roof above a second-floor deck) than is extant on any historic building on the block face.

- v. Rear Elevation: Unless specifically denoted as significant, the rear and non-visible side elevations of historic buildings may be altered. Those alterations must be consistent with the overall building design and use products and materials noted as acceptable in the Standards.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

h. Outbuildings and Garages

- i. New garages and accessory buildings shall be historically consistent with the primary building in style, size, materials, and roof.
- ii. Replacement garages: Retain and repair over replacement for both structure and materials.
- iii. Location and Orientation: Where an alley exists, locate the garage for alley access. Garages and outbuildings shall be located in the rear. Garages may be located in the side yard or may be attached if recessed behind the primary building face by a minimum of six feet and if meeting the side yard setback and spacing requirements.
- iv. Garage Doors: Total width is limited to 1/3 of the primary building face width if facing a street. Height is limited to eight feet. Construction, style and materials shall be consistent with the main building. A

maximum of one double garage door or two single doors facing the street is allowed per 50 feet of lot width. There is no width constraint if the garage faces an alley.

- v. Carports and Breezeways: Carports are allowed where consistent with the building style and age. Breezeways may be used for connection to garages, carports or outbuildings. Design of these structures must be consistent with the primary building in style, size, construction, materials and detail.
- vi. Materials and Types Not Allowed: Flush, open grate-mesh, and mostly glass garage doors.

Finding: No outbuildings, garages or carports are proposed.

i. Exterior Siding and Decorative Architectural Details

- i. Historic buildings and landmarks shall retain and repair existing siding, architectural features, and details.
- ii. Replacement siding, moldings, and other decorative architectural details shall match the material, pattern, detail and dimension of either the existing or the original siding or material.

Finding: The proposal is for a new building, not modification of an existing historic building. This criterion does not apply.

- iii. Front and visible sides of new buildings shall have the following minimum wall trim: window and door casings, top of wall to roof overhang on gable sides.
- iv. Siding Patterns Allowed: A maximum of three wood siding or shingle patterns and types; may also have one type of masonry or plaster.
- v. Siding, decorative architectural details and exposed materials that are not allowed:

- Aluminum or metal; vinyl; scored plywood; sheet siding.
- Alternative engineered siding not matching original profiles.
- Plastic, foam or polymer trim.
- Cultured stone or synthetic masonry.
- Use of stains and clear finishes is acceptable only for doors and sidelights, and utility structures.
- Mill or clear finish aluminum or stainless steel is not allowed as an exposed finish.

Finding: Vinyl siding with vinyl trim is proposed. This criterion would not be met.

- vi. Removal of non-historic features or reconstruction of historic features, with documentation, is allowed on historic buildings and landmarks.

Finding: This criterion is not applicable to new construction.

j. Doors and Windows

- i. Original openings on visible sides of historic buildings shall be retained.
- ii. New main and upper level window or door openings on front or visible sides of historic buildings are not allowed.
- iii. New basement windows or doors are allowed on side walls.

Finding: The above criteria are not applicable to new construction.

- iv. New window types and materials not allowed at front-facing or visible sides: sliding glass units, glass block, vinyl, fiberglass, between glass grids, commercial-type windows.

Finding: The new windows would be vinyl. Because vinyl sashes were not available during the historic period of the Clark District, this criterion is not met.

- v. New or replacement windows and doors on historic buildings shall match the style, configuration, dimensions, and materials of existing or originals. Not Allowed: Window shapes other than rectangular.
- vi. Retain and repair existing historic window and door parts and trim. Wholesale replacement of windows or sash in good condition on historic buildings is not allowed.
- vii. New or replacement windows and doors on historic buildings shall match the style, configuration, dimensions, and materials of existing or originals.
- viii. Storm windows are acceptable on interior or exterior. If on the exterior they shall match the window shape, style, basic configuration, and shall be a comparable color. Exterior storm doors are allowed.

Finding: The above criteria are not applicable to new construction.

- ix. Windows and doors on new buildings shall be appropriate to the style of the building and as found on historic buildings the block face. This includes their design, materials, pattern, grouping, and configuration.

Not allowed: window shapes other than rectangular, vertically asymmetric, individual window division or configuration.

Finding: With the exception of the fixed transom windows, the new windows would be similar in style and dimensions to those found on historic buildings on the block face; they would be single-hung, similar to the double-hung windows in the adjacent homes. The new windows would not match the materials however, as the new windows would be vinyl, while the existing windows all have wood sashes. Because vinyl sashes were not available during the historic period of the Clark District, this criterion is not met.

- x. Glazing on visible building sides and front shall be clear. Reflective or tinted glass or films are not allowed; decorative or stained glass replacement is excepted. Obscure glass is allowed at bathrooms.
- xi. Doors and Sidelights: New decorative or stained glass is allowed.
- xii. New door types not allowed: Flush metal doors, metal and glass storefront or commercial-type doors.

Finding: The proposed windows and doors would comply with the above standards. These criteria are met.

k. Foundations

- i. On historic buildings: Repairs and replacements shall match the original foundation appearance, materials and height at visible faces. A new foundation may have a veneer matching the original masonry but installed over structural concrete, concrete block unit [CMU], or steel.
- ii. Retain or repair existing porch and entry steps, and foundation openings including windows, doors, and vents on historic buildings.
- iii. New or replaced foundations and footings shall meet current structural and seismic requirements.
- iv. Original solid masonry foundations may have non-visible concrete or metal support.
- v. Visible foundations for new buildings shall match the range of visible heights of historic buildings on the block face and may be CMU or concrete.
- vi. Below grade or otherwise hidden foundations, piers and footings may be concrete or other materials.

Finding: The new foundation would be poured concrete. It would match the visibility of the historic buildings on the block face. This criterion is met.

SUMMARY: The proposed new construction would not comply with the above standards because -

- The proposed height from grade to the roof ridge would be 38 feet, or 3 feet greater than what is allowed.
- While the overall building shape would be similar to the existing historic buildings on the block face, its much greater massing due to the increased scale and height of the proposed building would dwarf its neighbors.
- A hexagonal porch is proposed on the primary elevation.
- The primary roof would have an average eave width of 8 inches, less than the 14 inches extant on the historic buildings on the block face.
- Vinyl or plastic gutters are proposed.
- The proposed building would have a conical roof over one of the second floor decks on the front elevation.
- The new building's front façade would be more embellished with architectural details (columns, transom windows, and a conical roof above a second-floor deck) than is extant on any historic building on the block face.
- Vinyl windows, siding and trim are proposed.

CONCLUSION: Because the proposal does not comply with the standards listed above, the HLB could only approve the proposal by applying the guidelines listed in the Design Guideline Handbook - Focus Area 5 Historic District Design Guidelines. To do so, the HLB would need to prepare findings that the design objectives of the Clark Historic District were adequately addressed and that the deviation from the standards would result in a higher quality development than would result under a strict interpretation of the code.

#### IV. ALTERNATIVES

The HLB has three decisions to make, as to whether to:

- Impose a 180-day demolition delay of the existing building; and
- Remove the building's landmark designation; and
- Approve the new design, either as submitted or with conditions.

As noted above, the HLB may only delay demolition; the City does not have demolition denial authority. The HLB should advise the applicant of what the desired outcome of this delay would be.

If the home is demolished, its designation as a Landmark becomes moot. If the home is relocated to a site within the Clark District, it can retain its designation.

If the HLB concludes that the proposed new building design is generally acceptable, it can then direct staff to prepare specific findings and possible conditions of approval for consideration at a future meeting.

#### V. LIST OF EXHIBITS

The following exhibits were received, marked, and entered into the record as evidence for this application at the time this staff report was written. Exhibits received after the date of this report will be marked beginning with the next consecutive letter and will be entered into the record at the time the hearing is opened, prior to oral testimony.

No exhibits.