



**City of Portland, Oregon**  
**Bureau of Development Services**  
**Land Use Services**  
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner  
Paul L. Scarlett, Director  
Phone: (503) 823-7300  
Fax: (503) 823-5630  
TTY: (503) 823-6868  
[www.portlandoregon.gov/bds](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** February 17, 2017  
**To:** Portland Landmarks Commission  
**From:** Mike Gushard, Land Use Services  
503-823-5091 – [mike.gushard@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mike.gushard@portlandoregon.gov)  
**Re:** 16-262033 DA – Tillamook Apartments  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo February 27, 2017

Attached is a drawing set for the Design Advice Request for an apartment addition to a contributing resource in Irvington Historic District. The proposed apartment addition is attached to the historic William Andersen House, a two-story vernacular Queen Anne style duplex at the corner of NE Tillamook and NE 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The proposed addition is 3-stories with a standing seam metal roof, stucco, and stained vertical wood. The proposal also includes a concrete stair entering the lot and a small hyphen with a side-gable roof that connects the new construction to the historic building. The review criteria are the Portland Zoning Code's other review criteria for Historic Resources Review Chapter 33.846.060.G. They are included with this memo.

Areas for discussion on February 27, 2017:

- 1) Differentiation versus Compatibility.** The proposal sits in a section of Irvington that is mostly single family homes and duplexes from the District's period of significance. These homes generally have varied, but traditional expression and detailing in the Queen Anne and Foursquare style. The proposal is for a new apartment building with large windows, vertical boards, and a very contemporary expression. The approval criteria for this site includes requirements that the development "Differentiate new from old" (Criterion 7) while not destroying materials that characterize the property. There are other Criteria that emphasize compatibility (Criteria 1, 8, and 10). Staff requests the Commission's advice on whether historic detailing and compatibility or a more contemporary expression are preferred for the site.
- 2) Alterations and Additions to the Historic Building.** The proposal is an addition to a contributing resource. This choice was made to achieve access to a Historic Preservation Incentive [33.445.610] that allows for additional density with no maximum in multi-dwelling zones. A previous iteration of the proposal was for a detached building that added density but because the incentive language explains that a building, as opposed to a site, can be expanded to achieve more density the applicant opted to propose an addition. Staff requests the Commission's advice as to how or if the project should alter the historic building. Currently, the attachment of the addition eliminates elements of the rear of the house. If an addition is allowable what is the appropriate relationship to the size and character of the historic building.
- 3) Height, Mass, and Scale.** The proposed addition is roughly the same height as the historic house on the site and only slightly narrower. Staff has previously advised the applicant that additions should be visibly subordinate to historic buildings. We request specific comments on how appropriate the proposed height, mass and scale are with regard to the historic house and the district. We also ask what the appropriate response would be for a new detached building on the site.
- 4) Materials.**
  - a) **Stucco.** Stucco is proposed as a primary material. For a land use application, the applicant will have to demonstrate the quality of this material with more information about the type of stucco and detailing of the joints. According to the Oregon Historic Sites Database 10% of the properties in the district include stucco. Staff requests guidance on the compatibility of this

## Design Commission Memo

material with the existing resource and, if approvable the Commission's opinion on what type of stucco and detailing would be approvable for the project.

**b) Vertical Wood.** The proposal includes vertical T&G stained gray as a major façade material. Staff requests commission's input on whether this material is compatible with the historic building and the district.

**c) Metal Roof.** Staff encourages the commission to provide guidance on the compatibility of a standing seam metal roof in the district.

**5) Street-side expression.** The site is in the the Residential 2,000 zone which requires a 10ft front-setback. This proposal technically faces the side of the lot which has lower setback requirements. The front wall plane is 6ft removed from the sidewalk but concrete walls that create planters face much of the NE Tillamook sidewalk. The summary description of the Irvington Historic District Nomination describes the neighborhood as "exemplified by tree-lined streets, uniform setbacks and similarity of scale and design in-house stock." Staff would like the Commission to discuss how the proposal addresses the streetscape.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Enclosures

Historic Resource Review

Correspondence from the neighbors