



# OREGON CITY

## Community Development - Planning

221 Molalla Ave. Suite 200 | Oregon City OR 97045  
Ph (503) 722-3789 | Fax (503) 722-3880

**FILE NO.:** HR 16-06

**HEARING DATE:** Tuesday, September 27, 2016  
6:00 p.m. - City Hall  
625 Center Street  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

**APPLICANT/  
OWNER:** Alex Onishchenko  
P.O. Box 1812  
Clackamas, OR 97015

**LOCATION:** 3 1E 041AA Tax Lot 1501  
625 Avenue, Oregon City

**REQUEST:** Approval of a new single family residence in the Canemah National Register District. The applicant is additionally requesting a Preservation Incentive to allow for adjustments to the front setback. This application is based off the previously approved, but expired, HR 13-02 application.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends conditional approval

**REVIEWER:** Christina Robertson-Gardiner, AICP, Senior Planner

**CRITERIA:** **The criteria for new construction are set forth in Section 17.40.060 as follows:**

1. For construction of new structures in a Historic or Conservation District, or on a Historic Site, the criteria to be used by the Historic Review Board in reaching its decision on the certificate of appropriateness shall include the following:
  - a. The purpose of the Historic or Conservation District as set forth in Section 17.40.010;
  - b. The provisions of the Oregon City Comprehensive Plan;
  - c. The economic effect of the proposed structure or the historic value of the district or historic site;

- d. The effect of the proposed new structure on the historic value of the district or historic site;
- e. The general compatibility of the exterior design, arrangement, proportion, detail, scale, color, texture and materials proposed to be used in the construction of the new building or structure;
- f. Economic, social, environmental and energy consequences;
- g. Design guidelines adopted by the Historic Review Board.

### **BASIC FACTS:**

The Project includes the construction of a new single family residence in the Canemah Historic District. The proposed size of the home is 2,445 sq. ft. finished.

The applicant is proposing a vernacular style home with a main level, an upper level partially within the roof line, and a partial daylight basement level. In addition they are proposing a single car garage attached to the home with a covered breezeway. The main body of the home consists of a gable running front to back with upper level over on the left side of the building. Next to that they have the “addition” portion of the home that is set back from the main façade and is diminutive in scale to the main body. The garage is proposed to be accessed directly from the street and the applicant is requesting a “preservation incentive” to allow the garage within 3’ of the front property line.

The site is a 50’x100’ lot with an additional 35’ x 100’ vacated easement. It slopes to the rear with an approximate 20% slope. There is a large cedar tree on or near the west property line approximately 51’ from front property line. There is also an alder tree in the middle of the lot approximately 40’ from front property line. The rest of the lot is covered with brush.

The applicant is proposing a concrete drive to garage and a “hammer head” turnabout/parking space. The rest of the front of the lot will be landscaped with some terraced rockery walls to transition some of the slope from street to house. There will be a rear porch and patio below. The applicant proposes to do some fill and 4’ high rockery retaining wall at the rear of the house to create a useable yard area. This transition will be softened with some native shrubs as well. In order to minimize the impact on the adjacent property to the West, we propose to minimize any fill on the NW side of the house and garage, but add a loose hedge of native plants to reduce the overall visual height of the new building

The main roof pitches are 10:12 and 5:12 for the hipped porches. The main and upper level siding is 8” exposed cement board lap and 4” exposed cement board lap for the lower level. The windows are fiberglass and the trim is 1x4 with extended cap. All of the gables are adorned with a frieze board.

### **Proposed Areas:**

Main building area:..... 1333 s.f.  
Garage area:..... 345 s.f.  
Covered Porches and breezeway: 368 s.f.  
Paved drive:..... 625 s.f.

### **Previous Land Use Application**

This application was previously submitted and approved by the Historic Review Board in 2013 (HR 13-02). It was appealed (AP 13-01) by a neighbor and the City Commission denied the appeal and upheld the Historic Review Board approval in the summer of 2013. The staff memo of AP 13-01 and Notice of Decision are attached for reference. Mr. Edgar, the appellant for AP 13-01, submitted similar comments for this application. The Historic Review Board may choose to reference specific findings in the AP 13-01 staff memo or choose to support the findings in general as part of a motion for this application.



### **Existing Public Utility Easements within the Vacated Apperson Street**



Existing Public Utility infrastructure exists within a portion of this property that was previously occupied by a public road known as Apperson Street. Oregon City Ordinance, No. 92-1003, vacates this portion of Apperson reserving a public utility easement over the area. However it also indicates that if the easement is reduced to less than the vacated area, the boundaries of the easement shall continue to 4th Avenue. Although this issue is beyond the purview of this appeal, staff will work with the applicant to either relocate these utilities or allow them to remain consistent with current or revised easement agreements.

#### 4. DRAWINGS

- |   |                  |                               |   |                                  |                           |
|---|------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
|  | ACER VARIETIES   | - MAPLES<br>1-1/2" TO 2" cal. |  | RHODODENDRON                     | -RHODODENDRON<br>2 gal.   |
|  | ACER VARIETIES   | - MAPLES<br>1-1/2" TO 2" cal. |  | ERICA SPECIES                    | -SCOTCH HEATHER<br>1 gal. |
|  | AZALEA VARIETIES | -XBYRY<br>AZALEA<br>1 gal.    |  | FRAGARIA VESCA<br>(GROUND COVER) | - WOOD STAWBERRY          |
|   |                  |                               |  | BASALT STONES                    |                           |

ALL BED AREAS TO BE COVERED  
WITH SMALL PEBBLE FIR MULCH





Notice of the proposal was sent to property owners within three hundred feet of the subject property and the Canemah Neighborhood Association. Additionally, the property was posted with a Notice of Land Use sign with details about the proposal. Transmittals were sent to various City departments and other agencies regarding the proposed development plan. Relevant comments from City departments are addressed in this report as appropriate.

- A. Comments from Canemah Neighbors as “Canemah Citizen Comments” - author unspecified but submitted in person by Paul Edgar. It is unclear if these comments are on behalf of the Canemah Neighborhood Association.
- B. List of supporters for the application submitted by Susan Borger.

#### **17.44 Geologic Hazards Overlay District**

The property is located within the Geologic Hazards Overlay District. A new-single family residence on this property will require review pursuant to this chapter. The applicant has chosen to obtain approval from the Historic Review Board prior to submitting for this review. This bifurcated process is allowed.

However, the applicant will not be able to submit for building permits until the required Type II Geologic Hazards Review has been approved. Additionally, any alterations that affect the exterior alterations of the building will require additional Historic Review.

**ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS:** The applicant needs to meet OCMC 17.40.010 and the Adopted Design Guidelines for New Construction (2006), Addition and Alterations and Demolition.

#### ***Regarding Criterion (1) - The purpose of the historic conservation district as set forth in Section 17.40.010;***

The Canemah National Register District has been in residential use since its settlement in the mid 1800's. New construction, meeting the adopted standards, can provide value to the district. This criterion has been met.

#### ***Regarding Criterion (2) -The provisions of the city comprehensive plan;***

##### *Section 5*

*Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas,  
and Natural Resources*

##### *Section 5*

*Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas,  
and Natural Resources*

Canemah. Canemah is an important example of a relatively intact riverboat town with architectural resources dating from the 1860s. Having evolved from a community for the elite of the riverboat industry to a workers' community, Canemah retains essentially the same sense of place it had in the latter half of the 19th century. Situated above the Falls of

the Willamette, it was an important portage town and the major shipbuilding center on the upper Willamette River.

*Present Status.* Canemah was listed as a Historic District in the National Register of Historic Places in 1977. The area was zoned in 1954 for industry along the river, commercial and multi-family along McLoughlin Boulevard, and multi-family along Third Avenue and portions of Fifth Avenue. In 1982, a majority of the area was rezoned as residential except for a small strip on McLoughlin Boulevard, which was rezoned to Historic Commercial. In the last 20 years, many homes within the district have been rehabilitated, but some have not been maintained to a level that ensures their significance and status as contributing structures. New construction and exterior alterations need to be reviewed for their long-term effect on the neighborhood and National Register Historic District status.

### Goal 5.3 Historic Resources

#### *Policy 5.3.1*

Encourage architectural design of new structures in local Historic Districts, and the central Downtown area to be compatible with the historic character of the surrounding area.

#### *Policy 5.3.8*

Preserve and accentuate historic resources as part of an urban environment that is being reshaped by new development projects

**Finding:** Staff finds that by following the adopted design guidelines for new construction, the proposed new construction, as conditioned, can be compatible and add long-term value to the district

### **Regarding Criterion (3) -The economic effect of the new proposed structure on the historic value of the district or historic site.**

**Finding:** The development will add value to the District in multiple ways. It will fill a need for residential dwelling units; it will also increase the vitality of the neighborhood.

Finally, quality new construction that is compatible with the historic nature of the district will add value to the district. Often historic property owners will choose to invest in the restoration and rehabilitation of their properties when new construction is allowed within the district.

### ***Regarding Criterion (4) The effect of the proposed new structure on the historic value of the district or historic site;***

The proposed height and massing of the building is sized as to not impact the abutting historic building. The applicant has utilized a design approach that breaks down the volume of the house into the detached garage and the side wing. The applicant has

attempted to nestle the house as close to the slop as practicable, thereby approximating a daylight basement.

The siting of the house and the Vernacular architecture were specifically chosen to be compatible with the historic Gothic Revival George & Martha Draper House at 707 4th Avenue.

The Applicant has proposed to place the one car garage within the front yard setback to allow for a shorter and less step driveway to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Other historic homes in Canemah, such as 207 4<sup>th</sup> avenue- has applied this approach.

Paul Edgar submitted concern over the location of the garage, specifically if the placement up to the street will further block the Draper house from public view. However, staff is uncertain if moving the garage 5 feet back will increase the public's view of the Draper house to a discernible measure that will justify the increase in the pitch and location of the driveway. Staff is supportive of the move to increase the setback of the garage if it can be shown that it will not adversely affect the pitch of the elongated driveway and it will not affect the dripline of the large cedar tree to the rear of the garage at the property line of the Draper house.

***Regarding Criterion (5) - Design Compatibility:***

The new building is of appropriate scale and proportion to blend with the properties of the District. The applicant has proposed a Vernacular Design, which is one of the approved design types for the district. Additionally, the applicant has chosen to break up the massing by the use of a set-backed side wing and a detached garage (attached by a breezeway)

The proposed materials, and architectural features, as conditioned, are acceptable and meet this criterion if the Conditions of Approval are met.

***Regarding Criteria (6) -Economic, social, environmental and energy consequences***

As described in Criterion 3, new construction and additions meeting adopted design standards can add economic and social value to the district. Compatible infill in an existing compact neighborhood reduces the need for further expansion of the city, which adds considerable savings to the cost of infrastructure.

**17.40.065 - Historic Preservation Incentives.**

**A. Purpose.** Historic preservation incentives increase the potential for historically designated properties to be used, protected, renovated, and preserved. Incentives make preservation more attractive to owners of locally designated structures because they provide flexibility and economic opportunities.

**B. Eligibility for Historic Preservation Incentives.** All exterior alterations of designated structures and new construction in historic and conservation districts are eligible for



historic preservation incentives if the exterior alteration or new construction has received a certificate of appropriateness from the Historic Review Board per OCMC 17.50.110(c).

**C. Incentives Allowed.** The dimensional standards of the underlying zone as well as for accessory buildings (OCMC 17.54.100) may be adjusted to allow for compatible development if the expansion or new construction is approved through historic design review.

**D. Process.** The applicant must request the incentive at the time of application to the Historic Review Board.

**Finding:** The owner is requesting a modification to the minimum required 10 foot front yard setback.

Staff generally supports request to place detached garage in a place that has the least amount of impact geographical and to neighboring historic structures. In this instance, the neighborhood has concerns over the impact to the view shed.

However, staff is uncertain if moving the garage 5 feet back will increase the public's view of the Draper house to a discernible measure that will justify the increase in the pitch and location of the driveway.

## **Design Guidelines for New Construction**

### **A. LOCATION**

- ☐ McLoughlin Historic Conservation District
- ☐ Canemah National Register Historic District
- ☐ Individually listed historic property outside of the districts
- ☐ What is the Immediate Context?
- ☐ The Block
- ☐ The Neighborhood
- ☐ What are the mix of existing appropriate historic styles?

**Finding:** The proposed development is located within the Canemah National Register District. The lot is currently vacant. The property abuts the historic 1876 Gothic Revival Draper House to the west and new construction built in 1979 to the east. Across the street at 606 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue is the Vernacular Mary and Josiah Howell Residence c.1885.

### **B. STYLE**

Determining the appropriate style is the important first step toward successfully designing a compatible building in the district. Decide which style direction to use from acceptable neighborhood styles and those in the applicable specific Historic District Design Guideline. The styles noted for the district have specific District modifications indicated

**Finding:** The applicant proposed to use a vernacular design. The style is commonly seen in the area, including multiple residences within one block of the site.

### **C. SITING AND BUILDING FORM**

- C-1:** Review basic zoning requirements for New Construction for the particular site (R3.5, R6, MUC etc) to understand basic setbacks, lot coverage issues.
- C-2:** Review Siting, Building Form Principles and the Specific Historic District from Design Guideline. Note any requirements that are more specific than those found in the basic zoning.
- C-3:** Establish the Site Plan and the Overall Building Form. Is the use of the site and the building's placement on the site respectful of its context? Is the size, shape and bulk of the building consistent with the style chosen? Does it complement the neighborhood context? Is there too much 'program' for the site or style?

**Finding:** The development, as proposed, meets all of the zoning requirements for the site, with the exception of the front setback and the side garage setback with the inclusion of a breezeway. The applicant is requesting approval under 17.40.065 - Historic Preservation Incentive allowance to allow the front yard setback reduction.

The breezeway allowance falls under the Historic Review Board's determination of the definition of what constitutes an attached structure. The Community Development Division currently views breezeways as creating an attached structure when they are tied in by a common roof and wall. Attached structures must meet the underlying zoning setbacks. Alternatively, detached structures under 600 square feet are allowed within 3 feet of the interior side yard property line but cannot be attached by a breezeway. In this instance, the applicant has proposed a breezeway that is only attached at the roof. The Historic Review Board, though the Type III process, can choose to interpret the definition of attached in a different manner than the Community Development Division that allows the garage to be located at 3 feet from the property line with the inclusion of a breezeway. Staff will wait for direction from the Board on this issue. In 2013, the historic Review Board approved the applicant's request for a breezeway. As the make-up of the Board has changed since 2013- Staff is requesting that the HRB provide additional analysis and findings for this request.

The applicant in 2013 indicated that the revised survey of 2013 may affect the location of the garage and house thereby reducing the width of the breezeway between the house and the garage. Therefore, prior to building permit submittal, the applicant shall submit revised drawings that show the garage has a minimum separation of 5 feet from the main house to allow for adequate separation between the two building masses.

### **D. DESIGN COMPOSITION**

- D-1:** Design the building and site starting with primary design groups and major elements, such as wings, roofline, secondary portions, porches, window groupings, and dormers. Are these elements supportive or are they detractive to the historic district? Are they supportive of the style and building?
- D-2:** Review the design; Is it in good proportion and is the composition balanced?
- D-3:** Review the design and adjust to incorporate comments from the first review. Is the design representative of the style range and do the forms and individual features work toward a united design approach as viewed from the exterior?
- D-4:** Design the finer or more detailed portions of the building and site to fit within the framework established.

**Finding:** Staff finds that overall the application has submitted a Vernacular design that is compatible with the district by utilizing the topography, use of a detached garage and a side wing to reduce the massing.

The Design Guidelines for New Construction were written to allow property owners a clear path to approval if they could show that their proposal meets the adopted guidelines. Staff believes that as conditioned, these can be met.

## RESIDENTIAL BUILDING STYLES

### VERNACULAR

In the Canemah Neighborhood the most prevalent extant architectural style is Vernacular, built between 1867-1929. Important style characteristics as found on houses in the Canemah District to be used for new construction are noted below.



Built: 1867

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STYLE

#### Site

- No uniform front setback; South of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street: houses may face front or side depending on topography.
- Lots range from 50x100 to 100x100 and contain a single house.
- Properties edges often not defined; Where fenced, primarily picket or low slat at front with side or partial returns.
- Planting: South of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street: forest setting, native and ornamental plantings form visual screen and sense of privacy; Elsewhere on the more level portions: lawn and planted area around buildings.
- House Placement: to suit the existing topography and most level lot portion especially south of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.
- Retaining walls: stone, mortared or stacked basalt, or concrete south of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, especially in proximity with street.
- Garages: Not found historically; informal graveled or paved parking next to street or along house; New garages to be located along side or behind house. Where topography is a concern, locate garage offset from building primary façade, close to street with direct access.
- Accessory Buildings: detached, behind along side of house and located to allow use of particular function.
- Streets: South of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street: narrow, without curbs or sidewalks; casual pedestrian paths and connecting stairs are encouraged.

### Building Form

- Form easily allows additions and alterations such as increases in family size, activities or changing technology; generally smaller in size than McLoughlin.
- Shape: rectangular in plan, with smaller rectangular combinations to primary form; Rectangular or square form reinforced on façade. L-plan, T-plan options.
- Height: Maximum 1 ½ stories in height; Basement option.
- Proportions: Height (eave) to maximum width: 1:1 Height to Depth: can vary greatly.
- Roof: gable, of not less than 8:12 pitch, 10:12 and steeper are preferred. No cross-gable roofs; Possible wing or addition with lower ridgeline that is perpendicular or is offset.



Built: 1875



Built: 1864

### Design Composition

- Lacks rigid system of exterior detailing that makes it a clearly definable architectural style; allows design flexibility and is inherently varied.
- Designed and built without assistance of a trained architect. Collaborative design evolved with homeowner and builder, based on familiar styles, features and products.
- Can combine features from other architectural styles popular during the historic period; simpler designs than McLoughlin.
- Porch: full or partial length at the front entry; if close to the ground, no railings; at main story only.
- Dormers: None.
- Materials: local, readily available.
- Windows: 1:1, double hung windows.
- Siding: horizontal board siding; typically shiplap, or channel; occasionally bevel.
- Ornament: Exterior decoration is modest, consisting of scroll-work brackets at the top of porch pillars, plain cornerboards and simple window trim. Most houses do not feature spindlework in the peaks of their gable roofs.
- Interior fireplaces and chimneys.



Built: 1885

### Spacing

*Maintain similar spacing to cont ext buildings and the neighborhood.*

*Canemah, South of 3rd: House spacing is more irregular, but privacy is to be maintained. Adjust the siting to preserve mature plantings. Houses closer than 15 feet to the lot line require visual screening from one another*

### Accessory Buildings

*Accessory buildings are subservient to the primary building and provide auxiliary use. They are to be located at less visible areas such as the side or back of the primary building. Where topography issues arise, detached garages may be located in the front yard if offset from the main façade*

### Roofs

*Canemah: cross gabled roofs; a secondary wing or addition with a perpendicular gable at the main roof ridgeline; allowable if it is a lower story or lower ridgeline*

### Breezeways and covered walkways

*Breezeways and covered walkways provide sheltered links between buildings and accessory structures. They can provide access to or separation from different building uses, as a means for reducing large building massing and to promote use of accessory buildings.*

*Mixed use commercial: breezeways may provide a means of connecting grouped smaller buildings. Canemah, South of 3rd: Use of breezeways or covered walkways by HRB approval.*

**Finding:** Paul Edgar, submitted comments relating to the size, placement, massing and design of the house was not compatible as submitted. Staff has included the relevant design guidelines above that speak to these comments.

With regard to roof pitch, the Canemah Vernacular Building Form Standards require a gable roof “of not less than 8:12 pitch with “10:12 pitch and steeper preferred.” All of the propose roof pitches for both the primary, addition and garage gable roofs are 10:12 pitch. Although a steeper roof pitch may be preferred, the HRB in 2013 acknowledged with the one and a half-story homes, there is some precedent for the 10:12 pitch and such a pitch was appropriate in this case. In 2013, The Board was additionally concerned that increasing the roof pitch to 12:12 would increase to height of the roof peak which would increase the overall mass of the building.

The proposed main body of the structure is 26 feet wide. The overall building width including the “L” addition is 22.6” feet wide. Considered with the garage and breezeway (if attached) the full front façade is 70 feet. The proposed property is one-and-a half stories tall from the street (but three-stories if considered given the slope). In 2013, the Historic Review Board found that the design broke up the massing by utilizing historic proportions for both the primary volume and addition.

In addition to Historic Guideline C-3 quoted above, Section 5 of the Character Guidelines, identifies particular design principles that, if followed, will result in compatible design. With regard to building size, the Guidelines call for a building width that “maintains a historic height to width ratio for the style.” The Guidelines note a preference for a “primary single rectangular form or with the addition of a subordinate rectangular form to create a wing, ‘L,’ or addition.” With regard to residential volume, the Guidelines contain a special reference to Canemah to “maintain historic residential massing.” Pgs. 38-40. In describing the characteristics of existing Vernacular resources in Canemah

The Guidelines state: “Lots range from 50 x 100 to 100 x 100 and contain a single house.” Other than this statement the Design Guidelines do not discuss appropriate Vernacular-styled building widths and set no limitations on them.

As quoted above, the Guidelines themselves suggest some precedent for locating a single house on a 100 foot, double-wide lot. Further, there is precedent for deviating from the tall and narrow Vernacular styles to acknowledge that when these houses were expanded, which happened frequently, the additions took the form of “L” shaped secondary extensions which had the affect of extending the width of the front façade. Nothing in the sections quoted above talks about evaluating building mass compatibility based on the overall amount of impervious surface.

Mr. Edgar comments indicate that the proposed 3-level home would overwhelms the historic houses next door and across the street. From the street this building is one and half stories consistent with the Canemah Vernacular style which includes a “basement option.” The HRB found, in 2013, that given the steep slopes, all three levels will not be visible from a public way. Thus, a one and a half-story structure extending across a 100 foot lot is compatible.

In order to meet the spacing guidelines identified above, staff recommends that the applicant supplement the proposed landscaping plan with additional mitigation/screening trees. Specifically, prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit an amended landscape plan that includes the following:

- 5 additional bushes with a mature height of 4-6 feet and two additional trees with a mature height of 30 feet or more planted within 30 feet of the west property line to better block the garage from the Draper House
- 5 additional bushes with a mature height of a minimum 4-6 feet along the east elevation to break up the massing of the day light basement

#### **E. SPECIFIC DESIGN ELEMENTS**

**E-1:** Design and choose specific design elements, products, and materials that are allowable and consistent with the design styling and framework established.

**E-2:** Does the design still fit the style's 'vocabulary'? Have extraneous or excessive details, ornamentation, or materials been chosen that detract from the neighborhood context?

**E-3:** Do specific elements comply with the guideline? Are materials, colors and finishes selected? Visible equipment? Landscaping and Plantings?

**Finding.** According to the applicant, the main roof pitches are 10:12 and 5:12 for the hipped porches. The main and upper level siding is 8" exposed cement board lap (Hardi-plank" or equal) and 4" exposed cement board lap (Hardi-plank" or equal) for the lower level. The windows are fiberglass ("Marvin" infinity series or equal) with either single hung or fixed units with 1x4 trim extended to the cap. All of the gables are adorned with a 8" frieze board. All building corners will have 1x6 trim. The roofing will be heavyweight composition shingles.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Historic Review Board created the design guidelines in 2006 to give a “safe harbor” for applicants proposing new development in the district. Understanding that alternative designs might be pursued in the district, they made sure to elaborate that these alternative designs can be approved if the applicant can prove that the new construction is compatible with the district. In 2013, the Historic Review Board agreed with the applicant in finding that there is compatibility and saw that the proposed new construction struck a balance between compatible infill and not creating a false sense of history.

Comments from neighbors contend that Vernacular style requires a tall and narrow single structure with skinny windows and a steep gable roof. While that is one design approach, it was not the one presented by the applicant. The guidelines envision multiple approaches to achieving a design that can fall under the architectural category of “Vernacular” and are considered compatible within the Canemah District. As witnessed by the various options employed in the guidelines, there is no one specific approach or concrete dimensions as requested by the appellant.

### **Recommended Conditions of Approval**

1. Prior to release of building permits, the applicant is required, apply for and gain approval of a Geological Hazards Overlay Review per OCMC 17.44.
2. The applicant shall acquire a ROW permit for all driveway and rockery work in the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue ROW through the Public Works Department.
3. Incised lumber or pressure treated wood shall not be used on any visible surfaces.
4. All railings, decking and stairs shall be finished to match the house body or trim.
5. The applicant shall utilize the following, unless an alternate has been approved by the Historic Review Board.
  - a. wood or fiberglass windows and doors. Fiberglass windows (Marvin Integrity or equivalent )
  - b. wood or a minimum 8-inch reveal smooth composite siding
  - c. simple vernacular styled lighting.
6. Based on direction from the Historic Review Board, the applicant may increase the front yard setback to the detached garage if it can be shown that the increase will not affect the dripline of the large cedar tree at the property line.
7. The applicant has indicated that the revised survey may affect the location of the garage and house thereby reducing the width of the breezeway between the house and the garage. Therefore, prior to building permit submittal, the applicant shall submit revised drawings that show the garage has a minimum separation of 5 feet from the main house.

8. Prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit an amended landscape plan that includes the following
  - a. 5 additional bushes with a mature height of 4-6 feet and two additional trees with a mature height of 30 feet or more planted within 20 feet of the west property to better block the garage from the Draper House
  - b. 5 additional bushes with a mature height of a minimum 4-6 feet along the east elevation to break up the massing of the day light basement.

#### **EXHIBITS**

1. Vicinity Map
2. Applicant's Submittal
3. Public Comments
  - a. Canemah Neighbors comments submitted by Paul Edgar
  - b. Statement of support from property owners submitted by Susan Borger
4. AP 13-01 Staff Memo
5. AP 13-01 Notice of Decision.