



City of Portland
Historic Landmarks Commission

1900 SW Fourth Ave., Suite 5000
Portland, Oregon 97201
Telephone: (503) 823-7300
TDD: (503) 823-6868
FAX: (503) 823-5630
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

A Guide to the City of Portland Historic Resources Review Process *Prepared by the members of the Historic Landmarks Commission – July 2016*

Historic Landmarks Commission

The Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) provides leadership and expertise on maintaining and enhancing Portland's historic and architectural heritage. The Commission identifies and protects buildings and other properties that have historic or cultural significance or special architectural merit. The Commission provides advice on historic preservation matters, and coordinates historic preservation programs in the City. The Commission is also actively involved in the development of design guidelines for historic districts. The HLC consists of seven volunteer members, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council, who serve a four-year term. The Commission includes a historian, and architectural historian, an architect, two members representing the public at-large, and two members experienced in either design, engineering, financing, construction or management of buildings, land development, archaeology, law, cultural geography or anthropology, or related disciplines.

The HLC reviews all Type III and IV major projects, as well as all appeals of Type II reviews. Projects are classified based on location in the city and valuation. Minor projects are classified as Type I, IX and II and go through an administrative staff-level review.

This guide is intended facilitate successful completion of Portland's Type III Historic Resource Review process. It intends to increase the level of predictability for applicants by clarifying how the Commission upholds the approval criteria. Applicants who utilize this document, and collaborate with Bureau of Development Services (BDS) Planning Staff throughout the process, will reduce the need for redesign, number of submittal packets, and hearings before the Commission. This document will be updated periodically.

BDS Planning Staff

BDS Planning Staff fully understand the approval criteria and how the current HLC upholds and emphasizes these criteria. The role of Staff is to help applicants move through the review process efficiently. Listen to Staff and heed its advice during Early Assistance and Pre-Application Conferences; for the HLC consistently agrees with criteria issues identified by Staff. Utilizing Staff suggestions can reduce the number of Design Advice Requests/ hearings.

Design Advice Request (DAR)

Design Advice Requests (DARs) are voluntary opportunities for applicants to meet with the HLC to seek its feedback on early schematic design. Scheduling a DAR session early in your project schedule is strongly recommended. For large and/or complicated cases, multiple DAR sessions are often appropriate. For new construction in historic districts, appropriate topics for early conversations include:

- massing and height options
- façade organization and floor heights
- windows and storefronts

- context-specific design responses
- ground floor program organization (entrances and service areas)
- material options

For alterations to historic buildings, appropriate topics for early conversations include:

- Horizontal additions
- Penthouses and visible rooftop equipment
- Exterior alterations such as new door and window openings, or changes to cladding/materials
- Window/storefront replacement

Also, identify any Modification or Adjustment requests under consideration and include these in your DAR materials and presentation.

The DAR process is not intended to be a comprehensive review process for all drawing submittals. Therefore, consider the issues you would like feedback on from the Commission and work with BDS Planning Staff to clearly identify these issues.

DAR Submittal Components

The Commission recommends the following be included in your DAR submittal and presentation.

New Construction

- A full set of drawings and renderings is not expected at this point.
- Provide options for massing, height, and façade articulation. At least three options are recommended. These can be sketches rather than full renderings. Even if you have a preferred scheme that you want to present in rendered form, we ask that you bring additional options that can be discussed.
- Provide context photos keyed to a map (limit to one or two pages).
- Provide photos of contributing buildings within the historic district that are influencing your design direction. Photos should be keyed to a map. Some text, labels, and/or comparison studies can be helpful if it is not self-evident how the scale, materials, windows, details, etc., of these contributing buildings are informing your design.
- Provide streetscape elevation studies that show how your proposed building fits into the scale of the neighborhood.
- For projects in districts where the surrounding context is not characterized by buildings with 100% lot coverage, figure-ground studies are needed to understand how the siting and lot coverage of the proposed building fits into the block.
- As necessary, include photos of new construction precedents that are inspiring your design or could help convey your design intent at this early stage. These examples do not have to be local. Please include addresses.
- Include information on the material palette you are considering. Physical samples can be brought to the presentation.

Historic Resources

- Provide historic photos of the building and site.
- Provide photos of the building in its current condition, including photos of the areas to be affected by proposed work.
- Large horizontal additions should follow the new construction points above, with an added focus on how the addition relates to and is compatible with the historic building and, if applicable, the historic district as a whole.

- Plan, elevation, and sightline drawings for a rooftop addition, deck and/or new mechanical are needed. Material studies are also recommended for rooftop additions.
- If replacement windows/storefronts are being considered, please bring a detailed window condition assessment survey with clear, comprehensive photos. If you are hoping to get conceptual approval of a particular type of replacement window unit at your DAR, please bring full details, including side-by-side sections drawings of the historic and proposed replacements, and a window product sample.
- Include condition assessments for other materials proposed for replacement, and information about proposed materials if not the same as the existing/historic material.
- For some historic resources that have unique/atypical site or condition issues requiring major interventions, Commission requests that applicants bring their preferred design and alternative schemes that demonstrate exploration of other solutions. These alternatives can yield more productive discussions with Commissions if the preferred design is unsupportable.

DAR Presentations

Your DAR presentation should focus on introducing the Commission to the site and project with an emphasis on the above-referenced topics of conversation. The DAR is more casual than a hearing, so there will be plenty of opportunities for discussion and Q&A. To maximize the benefit of this time with Commission, please keep your presentation brief and on-point.

Concluding the presentation with a list of specific issues/questions you would like feedback on is helpful. Review this list and make sure you have received clear direction on each item before the conclusion of the DAR.

TYPE III Historic Resource Review

Submittal Packages

Strive for clarity in drawings. Coordinate with BDS Planning Staff on content of submittal components (see the Historic Resource Review Preferred Submittal Format at the end of this document). Keep the number of pages to the minimum necessary to present the required information without sacrificing clarity and readability.

Drawing packages should be specific for Historic Landmarks Commission review and not construction documents. Details that are provided need to be of sufficient size to easily convey their content to the Commission. Providing easily-discernible information can result in fewer questions, less discussion, and shortened hearings.

Your Presentation & Items to Bring with You

You will have no more than 15- 20 minutes to make your presentation. This is a strict time limit. A PowerPoint presentation or other form of visual communication is highly recommended. Please rehearse your presentation in advance so you are able to abide by the audible/visual timer. Large, highly complex projects may be allowed more time for presentations by approval of the Commission through a request to BDS staff made in advance.

Do not repeat staff information! We highly encourage the presentation time be used by the design team and relevant sub-consultants. Your presentation should focus on the design and issues that are germane to the land use process. There is no need for long introductions, extended discussions about project constraints, or community benefits that are not ultimately related to the approval criteria. Clarity and brevity are hallmarks of an effective presentation. Present the minimum amount of information necessary and have back-up information on hand to address Commissioner questions.

Consistency between the submitted Type III packet that the HLC reviews and your hearing presentation is critical when Commissioners are asking questions about drawings on specific pages – make sure the two are coordinated and in sync.

Physical material samples are required. Material samples must represent the correct texture and color of the specified material. The Commission discourages bringing multiple samples to convey different aspects of a single material (such as one sample for the stucco texture and a different sample of the stucco color). Masonry mock-ups with accurate brick size, color, and mortar are encouraged. Stucco and metal panel samples should be at least 12x12 inches. Window samples must show the frame, sash, meeting rail, and muntin profiles, as applicable to your design. Full-size window samples are strongly preferred and may be required for some projects. Plan ahead to get these from your rep/contractor in advance of your hearing date. If you absolutely cannot obtain a window sample that accurately reflects your specified unit, please work with Staff to come up with an acceptable alternative. Provide glass samples, especially if a low-e coating or reflectivity is proposed. If there is a glass spandrel condition, mock up the spandrel condition next to the vision glass condition.

New Information at Hearings

Commissioners review the materials submitted to the City during the week prior to the hearing. Do not submit day-of-hearing changes or revisions to your project and expect the Commission to respond during the hearing, or to vote to approve the project without having had sufficient time to review new information. If there are changes to the proposal close to the hearing date, BDS Planning Staff will decide on the best course of action. Substantive changes may require a revision to the staff report, which would trigger a follow-up hearing. It may therefore be better to reschedule your hearing and submit a revised package. If changes are minor, do not require staff report revisions, and are moving the design in a direction that is consistent with previous Commission direction, the Commission may review this new information on a case-by-case basis. (In those instances, physical drawings should be brought for Commissioners to review in addition to adding any new slides to your presentation.)

Additional Hearings and Submittal Packets

If returning for an additional hearing, focus your presentation on Commissioner comments and issues from the previous hearing and how the issues have been resolved. Do not repeat introductory context/location information. Clearly address each issue individually and include the prior design along with the new design proposal on the same page of the submittal and in the same slide image in your presentation. All changes made since the last hearing must be noted in the presentation and the drawings.

Conditions of Approval

It is not uncommon for a project to be approved with a few conditions of approval. However, please be aware that the Commission will not approve projects that require lengthy or complex conditions of approval. In particular, we do not use conditions of approval to correct/clarify errors and inconsistencies in drawings. Please do a thorough review before submitting your drawing packet to Staff. If your hearing results in Commission support, but numerous small changes are requested to get to a final approval, the Commission will ask the Applicant to revise the drawings and return at the next possible hearing date to finalize with a vote.

Concurrent Reviews with other Historic Review Bodies

For projects that are applying for Historic Tax Credits, Special Assessment, have a Restore Oregon façade easement in place, or are going through the Section 106 or ORS 358.653 process, we encourage you to begin these processes, or consult with the relevant review bodies before getting too far down the road in the land use process. Past applicants have been surprised to learn that these review bodies sometimes

have different, or additional, requirements that must be met. When concurrent reviews are not well-coordinated, it may result in additional hearings, or a second land use review.

Neighborhood Associations

Please make every effort to meet with the applicable neighborhood association and show consideration for their concerns. Certain types of land use proposals have a neighborhood contact requirement. Obtaining a letter of support and/or testimony from the neighborhood association is prudent. We highly recommend you reach out to the neighborhood association early in the process. That said, some applicants have mistakenly been under the impression that meeting neighborhood requests would lead to approval by the Historic Landmarks Commission. While it is important to seek its feedback and be responsive, the neighborhood association is not the land use review body.

Working with the Approval Criteria

The HLC does not work with only one set of Design Guidelines. Based on the location of your project, Staff will inform you of the hierarchy of relevant approval criteria. These may include historic district design guidelines or Zoning Code section 33.846.060.G.

We are providing guidance in this section to help applicants better understand key historic preservation concepts in the effort to reduce the number of hearings and re-design time.

Historic Character and Character-Defining Features

Historic district design guidelines and criteria in Section 33.846.060.G refer to “historic character.” Those features that define the character of a historic building can include its massing and height; roof form; fenestration patterns and types; door locations and types; entry sequence; exterior materials; details and ornamentation; historic landscaping; outbuildings; site improvements; utilitarian features such as water towers and loading docks, etc. Character-defining historic features should be maintained on historic buildings. When these features are beyond repair, replacement in-kind is preferred. For some materials or conditions that are difficult to replicate with original materials, there may be certain circumstances where an acceptable alternate material is approvable.

In a historic district, it is important to note that the resource is the entire district, not just the contributing buildings or a single site. The historic character of the district begins with the relationship between the buildings and their sites and the street layout. Consideration of the district's historic character might take into account view corridors, development patterns or setbacks, typical forms and proportions, landscaping, and smaller-scale issues as noted above for buildings.

Another important aspect of respecting the historic character of individual buildings and historic districts is following the hierarchy of design organization exhibited by older buildings. These buildings typically have higher levels of detail and finish quality on their primary, street-facing facades. Entries are typically prominent, or easily discernible. When a building has a mix of uses, the residential entry is typically differentiated from commercial entries. While primary elevations receive the most scrutiny by the Commission, the rear of a building is still important. Historic commercial buildings were often built to abut a lightwell in the middle of the block and thus, new construction should respect this organization and the functionality of the existing buildings. Single-family residential homes sometimes have historically-significant features at the rear, like sleeping porches, that should not be removed. Though an addition may be compatible at the side or rear of a residence, the addition should always remain visually secondary, so the building's original form and roof shape remain distinct.

Differentiation & Compatibility

Historic district design guidelines and 33.846.060.G refer to the concepts of “differentiation” and “compatibility.” These are the most-often discussed concepts during historic resource review, so it is important that applicants understand how the Commission evaluates projects in light of these two concepts, both of which are included in almost every set of historic approval criteria.

Differentiation

Differentiation involves distinguishing new construction from historic construction. Differentiation is required in order to prevent confusion between a historic resource and a replica. New construction typically has some inherent differentiation by way of modern construction techniques and materials, even when efforts are made to design new buildings that blend in with the historic environment. Differentiation should not be bold or highly apparent from a distance. The HLC encourages applicants to keep differentiation subtle from a distance, becoming more apparent as you get closer to the building. No differentiation should be made that would result in an incongruous appearance or diminish a historic district’s setting or sense of place. Furthermore, the HLC discourages highly-differentiated new construction because it is in direct conflict with “compatibility” approval criteria, as discussed below.

Scale is a factor in determining the appropriate amount of differentiation. Typically, the smaller the building or feature is in relationship to its historic counterparts, the more opportunities for differentiation. Proposed new buildings at a larger scale than what is typically found in the historic context are already differentiated by size or height alone, so efforts must be made to enhance compatibility through design and material selection—not to further increase differentiation.

New buildings that utilize a style and material palette similar to their historic counterparts might consider a permanent plaque or cast date stamp on the building’s primary facade to readily differentiate and communicate that the building is not historic.

Compatibility

The vast majority of Commission discussion is around the “compatibility” of an addition, alteration, or new building in a historic district. As such, we encourage applicants to focus their efforts on designing through the lens of compatibility. We offer this elaboration to help them better understand what this means in the world of historic preservation.

For those designing new buildings in historic districts, it is important to note that districts exist not just to recognize and protect the individual historic buildings within their boundaries. When it comes to districts, the sum is greater than the individual parts. Historic design review regulates all development within historic districts in order to protect the integrity of the district as a whole. With compatibility, we are aiming for harmony and wholeness in the historic built environment rather than contrast and incongruence. Infill buildings must appropriately support and enhance the contributing historic resources in the district, rather than attempt to be design statements that attract attention because they contrast with the historic environment. In the same way that demolition of contributing historic buildings erodes the historic character of a district, incompatible new buildings can equally obfuscate a district’s importance and rupture its sense of place. While compatibility is nuanced and evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the Commission, a helpful initial test for compatibility is to imagine quickly scanning the environment with your proposed building in place. If nothing would jump out as being out of context or attracting attention because of a conspicuous disparity with the district (factors ranging from scale to quality of materials), your design is likely on its way to being compatible.

It is important to note that old and new buildings are compatible when they share similar underlying principles of scale, proportion, composition, level of detail, materials, and craftsmanship that are typical of the setting. Designing for compatibility in historic districts is an exercise that is context-driven and is a

purposeful attempt to make a new building fit in and feel like it is “of this place.” That said, new buildings do not have to be copies of historic buildings to be compatible, and “fitting in” is not the same thing as uniformity. A new building can make a statement of its own identity without subverting the character of the district. As such, the Commission is actively seeking creative infill designs that are rooted in the historic district context.

For side additions or penthouses on historic buildings, the advice is largely the same. These pieces of new construction should harmonize with the old. Scale, visibility, and the impact on the design of the historic resources will all be important factors for consideration. Any building addition should share similar underlying design principles as well as a level of detail and quality of materials that is in keeping with the historic building. Even when additions have minimal visibility from the right of way, their effect on the historic resource is important and scale, roof form, design details, material selection, etc. must be considered.

The Commission recognizes that some historic buildings require alterations to make them functional and economically viable. These can range from new door or window openings to major seismic and accessibility improvements. In considering the compatibility of the alteration, the Commission may consider some or all of the following:

- Location—whether the alteration is on a primary, secondary, or rear elevation
- Presence of historic fabric and character-defining features at the place of alteration and how those will be affected
- Effect on the overall design and character of the building
- Compatibility of the new materials being used
- The number/magnitude of alterations and how those will affect the resource’s integrity overall
- The reversibility of the alteration
- Documentation for any historic conditions that are proposed to be brought back

Scale

Scale is one of the primary considerations for compatibility and is applicable to both additions to historic buildings and new construction in historic districts. Penthouses are discussed in a separate section below but should generally be scaled to have minimal visual impact on the historic resource. Side or rear additions should not be of a scale that visually competes with the historic resource, nor should they result in the loss to significant historic materials.

Building scale is typically the first discussion point for new construction in historic districts. It is important for applicants to be aware that the height/FAR listed for their site in the Zoning Code is a maximum allowance. Historic Resource Review is a discretionary land use review and if a building’s proposed height and/or bulk are found to be incompatible with the district, the approval criteria cannot be met and the development will not be able to take advantage of the maximum height and FAR allowances listed in the Code. The best indicator of appropriate scale for new construction in historic districts is the existing context of historic contributing buildings.

Quality of Materials and Level of Detail

Applicants should note that the quality of materials and level of architectural detail are two important aspects of compatibility that must be addressed. Most extant historic buildings in Portland are characterized by long-wearing, permanent materials that were intended to be maintained in perpetuity. These materials include, but are not limited to, brick, stone, stucco, painted wood, and cast iron. New buildings should aim to have a level of material quality and craftsmanship that is harmonious with the material palette of the district. The Commission does not typically approve commercial projects with products that do not have a proven record of durability.

Likewise, historic buildings are typically characterized by a greater amount of detail than most contemporary buildings—detail that results in texture, shadow lines, ornamentation, pedestrian interest, and the breaking down of scale. Successful new buildings in historic districts will incorporate a level of detail and richness similar to their historic counterparts, although these details need not be historic replicas. This can be achieved through punched windows, high-quality storefronts and doors, richness and variety in exterior cladding materials, balconies and awnings that have design interest, etc. Applicants are encouraged to study design details and motifs found in the districts, reinterpreting them as necessary for incorporation into their proposed design.

Flat veneer brick/stone systems, fiber-cement cladding, and synthetic stucco have not been favorably received by the Commission. Metal cladding needs to be a high-quality finish and thickness to ensure rigidity and avoid “oil-canning” or “pillowing” of the exterior surfaces. Fiber-cement panels as a predominant siding material is not supported by the Commission. When approved, they have been limited in application to non-visible rooftop applications (such as cladding an elevator overrun). Vinyl windows and basic extruded aluminum storefronts are also not approvable for most projects.

Skidmore Old Town – Cast Iron

For applicants proposing work in Skidmore Old Town, special note should be taken of the importance of the District’s cast iron character. The updated design guidelines for this district provide for ways that new construction can reinforce and enhance cast iron themes. The Commission is looking for all new construction projects to address the District’s cast iron character and to utilize pieces from the cast iron artifact collections where possible. Applicants should note that Skidmore Old Town is a National Historic Landmark District—the highest level of designation in the National Register conferred on resources that have great importance at the national level. Because this district is a national treasure, the Commission is particularly sensitive to infill design compatibility.

Historic Window Replacement

Windows are character-defining features of a building, so the loss of original windows can negatively affect a building's character and integrity. The majority of windows must be truly beyond repair to obtain Commission approval for building-wide replacement, otherwise windows should be replaced on an as-needed basis only.

Window replacement requests are not granted solely for energy-efficiency reasons when windows are in repairable condition. Repairing windows rather than discarding them is a highly sustainable act. Fixing the leaks around older single-pane glazing can significantly reduce heat loss. Maintenance, weather-stripping, and ensuring that hardware is in good working order also improves the performance of older windows. When wood sashes are robust enough, they can be routed out to accept insulated glass. Alternately, storm windows can be added.

Floor Heights

The Commission highly discourages the reduction of ground-floor floor heights to a level that is inconsistent with proportions found in the district. While many historic buildings have exceptionally tall first floors that are impractical for modern buildings, infill construction in historic districts must respond to these district design precedents and make their ground floors proportionally taller than their upper floors.

Blank walls at the property line

When infill buildings result in a large area of blank wall on an interior property line, applicants must mitigate the negative effects of this on the district. Solutions to vet with the Commission include a mural or other details that have design interest and wrapping the primary façade material on the secondary elevations.

Penthouses

For new construction, the Commission often has concerns about the top story of a building being a penthouse story, particularly when the amount of recess is minimal and the penthouse remains fairly visible. In general, the Commission looks for new buildings to be massed similar to their historic counterparts, which rarely employed the stepping back of a top floor. However, this does not mean that the Commission will approve height that is incompatible with the district. Penthouses may be approvable when sightlines can be minimized.

Penthouses on both historic and new buildings must be designed to appear integrated with the primary building form. Highly differentiated materials or inferior quality materials are not approvable. On historic buildings, penthouse additions should be simple and compatible, showing design deference to the historic building without appearing like a box sitting atop the building. For all penthouses, cornice bands and other details are recommended so that the penthouse does not look like a design afterthought. In terms of color, penthouses that relate to the main building's color palette are more successful than those using a "Portland gray sky" color.

Mechanical & Utilities

Rooftop mechanical systems must be organized and located to minimize their views from within the district or the exterior of the historic building. The Commission is not in favor of using screening as a means to hide mechanical and every attempt should be made to avoid the need for screening. However, when screening is unavoidable and/or required by Code, the design of the screen should be simple and not call attention to itself. Typically, the screen should be the same color as the body of the building.

The Commission often has concerns about adding rooftop mechanical on top of penthouses, creating a tiered "wedding cake" look. Sightline drawings from multiple vantage points are necessary to determine if mechanical on a penthouse can be approved. If a height modification is being requested, there should be no additional equipment on top of the area requiring the modification.

Through-wall HVAC units may not be approvable on historic buildings or new construction in historic districts.

For new construction, gas meters should be located within the building and transformers within underground vaults. For historic buildings, efforts should be made to locate these items out of sight (inside/below ground). When this is not feasible, meters should be neatly organized and located on secondary or rear elevations. Transformers should be located where they have the least impact on the historic resource.

Automobiles/Parking Garages

For larger commercial or multi-family projects (not single-family residential), locate automobiles entirely within the building structure and wrap them with active uses to eliminate their negative impact to the ground floor. Within a walkable city, commercial garage entries and loading bays along with their associated service doors often create extended dead space adjacent to public sidewalks. The Commission is interested in minimizing the length and impact of these zones. Applicants need to clearly identify the materiality of these doors/gates, their scale and placement. Screen the glare from interior lighting through garage doors (use doors with tight perforated metal or translucent glass) and include cut-offs or internally-directed light fixtures. The Commission prefers garage and loading doors to be at the exterior wall.

Below-grade parking is far preferred, but when above-grade parking is proposed, buildings should be mechanically ventilated and screened with the predominant building materials and architectural elements.

Modifications and Adjustments

While it is common for the Commission to approve staff-recommended modifications, applicants must demonstrate how the approval criteria is better met by the Modification or Adjustment request, as detailed in the Zoning Code section 33.846.070 (Modification approval criteria), and 33.805.040 (Adjustment approval criteria).

Modifications for additional height have only been granted when the requested height is compatible with scale of the historic district. In the past, additional height has been given in select cases to accommodate certain roof features or functions, or to allow for a more appropriately-scaled ground floor height—not to provide another story on the building. If a height modification is being requested, there should be no additional equipment on top of the area requiring the modification.

A request for a modification to the Ground Floor Window Standard is usually accompanied by additional modifications to the Active Ground Floor Use guidelines. Removing active ground floor use and/or transparency and proposing in their place parking spaces, display windows, or back of house functions (e.g. electrical, generator, sprinkler rooms) or bike parking rooms is not supported by the Commission.

When supported by the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT), Modifications and Adjustments to required loading spaces have been approved by the Commission.

The Commission is opposed to sidewalk dedications in historic districts comprised of contributing buildings with full-lot coverage.

Historic Resource Review Submittal Format

The following is the format for Type III and large Type II Historic Resource Review submittals. A consistent submittal format provides predictability for applicants before the land use review begins. Utilizing this format will provide consistency among the numerous submittals reviewed by BDS Planning Staff and the Historic Landmarks Commission before and during hearings increasing efficiency.

Please adhere to the following format:

- One staple in upper left corner (not bound)
- Label all sheets at lower right corner: *Land Use Review # (LU 16-____HR, plus other reviews M, AD) Exhibit C.xx*
- Provide one electronic copy (disc, flash drive or link via email)
- Labeling and notes on the drawings should be at least 12-point type
- Review all color quality in the submittal as it should accurately represent the colors intended.
- Revisions to the submittal made after a prior hearing should be illustrated and clearly marked in a side by side comparison.
- Conduct a thorough review before submitting your drawing packet. Errors or inconsistencies in your drawing set may result in an additional hearing, as the Commission cannot correct these oversights through conditions of approval.

11" x 17" FORMAT:

Architectural drawings & cut sheets - "C" Exhibits (number consecutively C.1, C.2, C.3,):

- Title Page
- Table of Contents
- C.1,... Site Plan
- C.x Floor and Roof Plans (roof plan should show all rooftop elements, including mechanical)
- C.x Elevations (B/W and color, and without shade or shadows. If the project is close to or touching its neighbors, include street-facing elevations in their immediate context, including adjacent buildings.)
- C.x Building Sections (Include some depicting relationships to adjacent buildings.)
- C.x Sightlines (Sightline drawings from relevant vantage points. Vantage points should remain consistent between submittals.)
- C.x Building Details (for all window types, storefronts, canopies, balconies, signage and their attachments, etc. Control joints, seismic joints, and other visible construction details such as exposed fasteners must be clearly noted on the drawings.)
- C.x Materials / Colors (Clearly identify each and every building material by name.)
- C.x Landscape Plans
- C.x Lighting Plans
- C.x Civil Plans
- C.x Cut Sheets (only pertinent product info like thickness, finish, color, dimensions)

Appendix (number consecutively APP.1, APP.2, APP.3,...):

- APP.1, Renderings (day and night) in context. Must be simple and not enhanced, marketing-type images. Avoid dramatic lighting effects
- APP.x Vicinity and Context
- APP.x Examples of Material. Provide photos of your proposed materials. Addresses of other

local buildings where your proposed materials are used may be very helpful, especially if the materials have been in place for more than a few years.

- APP.x Massing / Design Concept
- APP.x Miscellaneous diagrams (FAR, ground floor windows, clear vs. spandrel panels, height, Modifications, Adjustments, etc.)
- APP.x Responses to DAR (diagram)

8.5" x 11" FORMAT (word.doc):

- Project team and Project cost
- Project narrative
- Zoning summary
- Response to Design Guidelines
- Modifications and Adjustments requests & approval criteria responses
- Response to DAR (narrative)
- Sustainable features/green technology / LEED goals, etc.

Thank you for taking the time to review this important Guide to the City's Historic Resources Review Process.

Signed, the 2016 Portland Historic Landmarks Commission



Kirk Ranzetta, Chair



Paul Solimano, Vice Chair



Matthew Roman



Jessica Engeman



Kristen Minor



Carin Carlson