From:	Robert (Dave) Green
To:	pauloedgar@q.com; Trevor Martin
Cc:	Clint & Tori Goodwin - Canemah; Ron Bistline - Beavercreek & Canemah; Mo Carey; John M. Lewis; Laura Terway
Subject:	Re: Proposed Dave Green residence, 4th Avenue and Miller Street - Canemah, HR 16-02 Comments
Date:	Sunday, February 19, 2017 4:52:34 PM

Hi Paul,
You obviously committed significant time and attention in reviewing my plan and as such I believe your effort is deserving of a commensurate response so my effort will be to address the points you mentioned.
1. While the overall width is indeed it is 50' that is not unusual even in historic homes where a wing may have been added on one or both sides. As stated in my original design narrative my intent was to present a design that would reflect a typical historically sequenced development with the main residence (28' wide) constructed first followed by carriage house or garage (16' wide) and ultimately a subordinate connecting structure (6' wide). The historical precedent I noted was the Captain Miller house at 99E and Hedges which while not located in the currently more restrictive area south of 3rd is certainly a valid historic neighborhood example. For my own purposes and because of steep topography a compact footprint is crucial to this development and the connecting structure in this design is key to accomplishing that.
2. I concur that a steeper roof pitch would be more historically accurate for this architecture but would increase massing which has been identified as a concern. You may note at the end of my design narrative addendum I addressed this dilemma and I did call attention of this to the HRB at the November meeting essentially advising the members that I am fine with either - whichever they felt was the greater priority.
3. Some specific design details are yet TBD for appropriate scale and form and may ultimately be determined by mock up. With your interest in historic architecture I will welcome your input in that regard. Elevation drawings do not reveal the full width of valance trim as rendered as they are partially concealed by the soffit / verge reveal.
4. As I mentioned in my previous email to you I will be seeking approval for Milgard Ultra fiberglass windows which on the exterior are very similar to the Essence series or the Marvin Integrity product but will allow me to craft my own interior jamb extensions which is my preference. My personal choice is no grids sides and back and the single bar grids on the front both of which have historic precedent. The historic vertical proportion is maintained as able and departures are where interior elements such as kitchen cabinets preclude that. Also vertical alignment is maintained where not otherwise complicated by room layout. The front facade is detailed to replicate the Coburn house which does include the shouldered head trim, front door with oval glass and sidelites, and single gable window with flanking sidelites. It is understood that the 4 panel french door unit is a historic departure but because of the slope simply will not be publicly visible.
5. 1x8 dutch lap siding is the siding product specified and will be painted cedar or if funds permit, Boral a fire and moisture resistant product manufactured from fly ash.
6. The massing has been contemplated at length and presents 3 options for changing it: A - Reduce the roof pitch (see item 2) which I believe would be universally unacceptable architecturally. B - Raise the grade behind the house which I am confident would be un-acceptable to geo-tech, civil engineer, and those living behind on 3rd (and me) due to landslide hazard. C - Dramatically reduce the the depth of the building to further restrict the footprint which would so dramatically compromise interior layout that most would find it unacceptable.
The best approach I can conceive to mitigate is the vegetative screen proposed to conceal the lower portion. There is really no historical precedent to address this since as a matter of economics lots with this challenging of topography were simply passed by for development.
7&8. Geological concerns will be evaluated rigorously in subsequent geo hazards review, and as I mentioned in our conversation after the neighborhood meeting, as much as I hope they will prove manageable within my budget, I am aware that may ultimately prove to not be the case. My goal

is to secure HRB approval prior to proceeding with that next step to conclusively establish the footprint of the building.
Thanks again for your input - we are looking forward to one day being more than absentee landowners.
Regards - Dave

Robert D. Green, General Contractor
Dave Green
Cell: 503-805-1774
Phone: 503-760-6642
Fax: 503-760-6470

On Saturday, February 18, 2017 2:22 PM, Paul Edgar <pauloedgar@q.com> wrote:

Dave and Trevor, I have spent about a some hours going over the plans and proposal associated with: HR 16-02 and submit these following comments to the HRB, for the Feb 28th HRB Design Review meeting.

Initial Comments: Nice design, but when reviewed against Oregon City's Historic District "Building Guideline Code" there are some area's of major concerns (my opinion);

1. 50' width of continuous building mass/structure is not what is representative of Historic Structures, therefore it is not compatible. Yes, there are examples of mutilated buildings, but that exact point will be discussed in an appeal before the HRB where the HRB asked to have the garage separated with no-passageway roof. In your design the corridor is more than a passageway, making everything very problematic.
2. Pitch of the roof, to me, I would like the alternative of 12 - 12 pitch or even greater of 14 - 12 pitch, which enhances the Vernacular Look & Feel. Look at house at 707 4th Avenue which is an excellent example.
3. Valance molding under the from edge of roof should be 12" + in width.
4. Windows: Should be taller and more narrow to gain Historic Design Proportion. Mine and most other contributing Historic Canemah Houses have windows that are 3' x 6' and 4 over 4 lite (if still original) and have the bottom wood flair/molding. We had 16 replica wood windows built by Wooddale Windows in low-e glass, with divided lite all intermixed with the originals and visible from the street at our house at 211 5th Avenue. Another option is Milgard Essence Series which has affordable options (Kemp Windows) with double hung - fiberglass on the outside and wood inside, in combination with the ability to have nice raised grid divided lite appearance.
   a. The Loft Window, should not have side lite/windows, just one tall and narrow window.
   b. Front door should be in period with design appropriate and not have side lite windows or wood molding (to much mass in the design). Period windows in the doors were square or rectangular. Garage door

needs in period design improvements too. The roof over the front porch is not design compatible, should be peak roof. The design work above the Loft Window, is not a in period and compatible. Simple is better!

c. Other Front side view windows most easily seen from a street view should be proportional to area/historic design, tall and narrow and 4 over 4 lite would improve compatibility/appearance that the people view/see from the street which would create much more of a historic feel and historic district compatibility.

d. View Left side windows, should be directly more over each other in up and down locations (1st to 2nd floors) and more proportional in tall and narrow and divided lite is good, but not necessary where there is little street view.

e. View Right side windows, should also be tall and narrow in proportion and if smaller in size, example could be 24" x 48" or 28" x 56". Below the garage, bedroom the windows need to be double hung.

f. View Rear windows, more tall and narrow and not all of the glass next to & over the deck doors, just to modern. Consider clustering two windows and a separate door.

5. Siding Material, Dutch Lap appearance for Vernacular look is most appropriate and wood is best. Affordable engineered pre-primed - cedar (Dutch Lap) wood siding is on the street side - add-on from the remodel of my house at 211 5th Avenue.

6. This building mass will have the appearance of a full 4-story building, from the rear and sides. That appearance is in-appropriate and not compatible. Reducing the pitch of roof, hurts the front view, even worse.

7. Siting of the proposed building on this degree of slope (approximately 30%+) where DOGAMI has LIDAR identified the hillside as having both Deep and Shallow Landslides present on it, makes the site very difficult or un-buildable to me, but I am not an engineer. Extreme Rain/Water events have pushed water over this hillside and is under the ground at this site. It is just very difficult to control Storm Water without curbs from the street, at this site too. A steep down hill driveway off the street surface to the garage and front door would make controlling external storm water to this site very - very difficult.

8. Information has been provided to me, that reflects that there are NO relevant Landslide Insurance Policies - available (per the State of Oregon Department who is responsible for this type of Insurance) to protect the owner of the building, the City of Oregon City and the neighbors from any and all losses and liabilities, that can result from any activities and disturbances that enhance the probabilities of Landslide and Actualities of Landslide on these Landslide Prone Hillsides. This has major implication to all of the neighbors within Canemah, as this is a life & safety issue to all of us. Any induced Landslide, would also reduce all of our property values.

Paul Edgar, Canemah Resident

From:	Paul Edgar
To:	Robert (Dave) Green; Trevor Martin
Cc:	Clint & Tori Goodwin - Canemah; Ron Bistline - Beavercreek & Canemah; Mo Carey; John M. Lewis; Laura Terway
Subject:	Proposed Dave Green residence, 4th Avenue and Miller Street - Canemah, HR 16-02 Comments
Date:	Saturday, February 18, 2017 2:22:13 PM

Dave and Trevor, I have spent about a some hours going over the plans and proposal associated with: HR 16-02 and submit these following comments to the HRB, for the Feb 28th HRB Design Review meeting.

Initial Comments: Nice design, but when reviewed against Oregon City's Historic District "Building Guideline Code" there are some area's of major concerns (my opinion);

1. 50' width of continuous building mass/structure is not what is representative of Historic Structures, therefore it is not compatible. Yes, there are examples of mutilated buildings, but that exact point will be discussed in an appeal before the HRB where the HRB asked to have the garage separated with no-passageway roof. In your design the corridor is more than a passageway, making everything very problematic.
2. Pitch of the roof, to me, I would like the alternative of 12 - 12 pitch or even greater of 14 - 12 pitch, which enhances the Vernacular Look & Feel. Look at house at 707 4th Avenue which is an excellent example.
3. Valance molding under the from edge of roof should be 12" + in width.
4. Windows: Should be taller and more narrow to gain Historic Design Proportion. Mine and most other contributing Historic Canemah Houses have windows that are 3' x 6' and 4 over 4 lite (if still original) and have the bottom wood flair/molding. We had 16 replica wood windows built by Wooddale Windows in low-e glass, with divided lite all intermixed with the originals and visible from the street at our house at 211 5th Avenue. Another option is Milgard Essence Series which has affordable options (Kemp Windows) with double hung - fiberglass on the outside and wood inside, in combination with the ability to have nice raised grid divided lite appearance.
    a. The Loft Window, should not have side lite/windows, just one tall and narrow window.
    b. Front door should be in period with design appropriate and not have side lite windows or wood molding (to much mass in the design). Period windows in the doors were square or rectangular. Garage door needs in period design improvements too. The roof over the front porch is not design compatible, should be peak roof. The design work above the Loft Window, is not a in period and compatible. Simple is better!
    c. Other Front side view windows most easily seen from a street view should be proportional to area/historic design, tall and narrow and 4 over 4 lite would improve compatibility/appearance that the people view/see from the street which would create much more of a historic feel and historic district compatibility.
    d. View Left side windows, should be directly more over each other in up and down locations (1st to 2nd floors) and more proportional in tall and narrow and divided lite is good, but not necessary where there is little street view.
    e. View Right side windows, should also be tall and narrow in proportion and if smaller in size, example could be 24" x 48" or 28" x 56". Below the garage, bedroom the windows need to be double hung.
    f. View Rear windows, more tall and narrow and not all of the

glass next to & over the deck doors, just to modern. Consider clustering two windows and a separate door.
5. Siding Material, Dutch Lap appearance for Vernacular look is most appropriate and wood is best. Affordable engineered pre-primed - cedar (Dutch Lap) wood siding is on the street side - add-on from the remodel of my house at 211 5th Avenue.
6. This building mass will have the appearance of a full 4-story building, from the rear and sides. That appearance is in-appropriate and not compatible. Reducing the pitch of roof, hurts the front view, even worse.
7. Siting of the proposed building on this degree of slope (approximately 30%+) where DOGAMI has LIDAR identified the hillside as having both Deep and Shallow Landslides present on it, makes the site very difficult or un-buildable to me, but I am not an engineer. Extreme Rain/Water events have pushed water over this hillside and is under the ground at this site. It is just very difficult to control Storm Water without curbs from the street, at this site too. A steep down hill driveway off the street surface to the garage and front door would make controlling external storm water to this site very - very difficult.
8. Information has been provided to me, that reflects that there are NO relevant Landslide Insurance Policies - available (per the State of Oregon Department who is responsible for this type of Insurance) to protect the owner of the building, the City of Oregon City and the neighbors from any and all losses and liabilities, that can result from any activities and disturbances that enhance the probabilities of Landslide and Actualities of Landslide on these Landslide Prone Hillsides. This has major implication to all of the neighbors within Canemah, as this is a life & safety issue to all of us. Any induced Landslide, would also reduce all of our property values.

Paul Edgar, Canemah Resident