

TO: HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSON

THROUGH: LISA ANDERSON-OGILVIE, AICP, PLANNING ADMINISTRATOR

FROM: JAKE MORRIS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLANNER

**SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL STAFF REPORT FOR HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW
CASE NO. HIS26-05: PROPOSED PORCH EXTENSION 625 CHURCH
STREET SE- REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE**

ISSUE

Should the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC), approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposal to extend the porch on the front of the house located at 625 Church Street SE?

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the HLC open the public hearing on May 21, 2026 and continue it until June 18, 2026.

SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

The Historic Landmarks Commission held the public hearing on this proposal on April 16, 2026. Oral testimony was provided by the applicants (Lisa Taylor and Brian Judd) and Evan West (SCAN). After a request by SCAN to hold the record open for additional testimony, the HLC continued the public hearing until May 21, 2026 in order to provide the applicant with additional time to address the concerns brought up by the Commission as well as to provide additional time for interested parties to provide additional testimony.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO HLC AND NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

The applicant has not had sufficient time to develop an alternative design to better address concerns related to the scale of the extended front porch. Therefore, they are requesting that the HLC open the public hearing on May 21, 2026 and continue it until June 18, 2026 (Attachment 2).

TESTIMONY AND STAFF RESPONSE

Christine Chute, Chair, Historic Preservation, Parks and Gardens Committee, South Central Association of Neighbors submitted comments on May 5, 2026 via email (Attachment 3). Their concerns and the staff response are outlined below:

1. Insufficient Notice.

Ms. Chute and the SCAN HPPG Committee state that the land use notice was insufficient because the notice provided to SCAN did not list the specific applicable criteria but instead utilized a general reference to SRC 230.

Staff Response:

While the public notice of the application was provided to SCAN pursuant to SRC 300.620(b)(2)(B)(vii), which requires notice to be sent to any City-recognized neighborhood association whose boundaries include, or are adjacent to, the subject property, the mailed notice did not sufficiently address SRC 300.620(b)(2)(C)(vi) which requires the notice list the applicable criteria within SRC 230. In order to address this oversight, should the HLC grant the applicant's request to continue the hearing until June 18, 2026, historic preservation staff will mail a corrected notice on May 29, 2026 (20 days before the HLC hearing) and repost the site per 300.620(b)(3) in order to provide adequate time for additional comments.

2. SRC 203.065 does not apply to the proposal and SRC 230.025 specifically prohibits addition of a deck to the primary façade of a contributing house in the historic district.

Ms. Chute and the SCAN HPPG Committee state that SRC 230.065 does not apply because the proposed work does not involve preservation, restoration or rehabilitation activity and instead the standards in SRC 230.025 must apply. When the standards are applied to this proposal, it is clear that the proposed work is prohibited.

Staff Response:

SRC 230.065 states that in lieu of the standards for historic contributing buildings set forth in SRC 230.025 and 230.040, an applicant may make a proposal for preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation activity, regardless of type of work, which shall conform to the following guidelines. While Ms. Chute and the SCAN HPPG Committee are correct in that the proposed work is not a preservation or restoration activity, the proposed work does meet the definition of Rehabilitation as defined in SRC 230. *SRC 230.005 Definitions* states that *“Rehabilitation means the process of making possible a compatible use for a historic-contributing resource or individually listed resource through repair, alterations, and additions, while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.”* The applicant's proposal to expand the existing deck is rehabilitation under this definition, and therefore they are free to demonstrate that their proposal conforms to the Guidelines within SRC 230.065. It is the applicant's burden to demonstrate that the proposed alterations are necessary for the reasonable continued use of their property and further demonstrate that their proposal conforms to the Guidelines which include ensuring the character-defining features of the contributing resource continue to be conveyed.

Prepared by Jake Morris, Historic Preservation Planner

Application Deemed Complete: March 26, 2026

State Mandated Decision Date: October 22, 2026 (extension granted)

- Attachment:
1. Staff Report- HIS26-05,
 2. Applicant email requesting continuance, May 13, 2026
 3. SCAN testimony, May 5, 2026

FOR THE MEETING OF: April 16, 2026
AGENDA ITEM: 5.a.

TO: Historic Landmarks Commission

THROUGH: Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director and Planning Administrator

FROM: Jake Morris, Historic Preservation Planner

HEARING DATE: April 16, 2026

CASE NO.: Historic Design Review Case No. HIS26-05

APPLICATION SUMMARY: A proposal to extend the front porch on the house located at 625 Church Street SE.

LOCATION: 625 Church St. SE

REQUEST: Class 3 Major Historic Design Review of a proposal to extend the existing front porch at 625 Church Street SE, a historic contributing property in the Gaiety Hill/Bushs Pasture Park Historic District in the RS (Single Family Residential) zone. (Marion County Assessor Map and Tax Lot Number: 073W27AC02400)

APPLICANT: Onpoint Fencing and Decking on behalf of Lisa Taylor

APPROVAL CRITERIA: Salem Revised Code (SRC) 230.065 General Guidelines for Historic Contributing Resources

RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE** the proposal with the following Conditions:

Condition 1: The applicant shall paint the entire porch assembly to match the existing porch.

Condition 2: The applicant shall construct the porch balustrade to match the existing one in both design and materials.

BACKGROUND

On March 4, 2026, the applicant submitted materials for a Major Historic Design Review for a proposal to repair and enlarge the existing porch located on the primary east façade of the residence located at 625 Church Street SE (**Attachment A**). The application was deemed complete for processing on March 24, 2026.

Notice of public hearing was sent by mail to surrounding property owners and tenants pursuant to Salem Revised Code (SRC) requirements on March 26, 2026. Public hearing notice was also posted on the property in accordance with the posting provision outlined in SRC 300.620. The City of Salem Historic Landmarks Commission will hold a public hearing

for the case on April 16, 2026 at 5:30 p.m. in **Community Room, Salem Police Department, 333 Division Street NE, Salem, OR 97301**

The state-mandated 120-day deadline to issue a final local decision, including any local appeals in this case is July 24, 2026, unless an extension is granted by the applicant.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting approval to modify the existing porch and balustrade. The current front porch has two separate sections, flanking the front entry of the house. The existing porches flank the north and southern sides of the projecting front entry and are currently 4' in depth by 13' in length and comprised of wood decking and characterized by a wooden rail supported by evenly spaced wooden rectangular balustrades. The existing do not currently extend beyond the projecting front bay of the historic resource. There is an existing wooden staircase with landing at the center of the resource, leading to the front entry.

The proposed new rectangular porch is proposed to extend across the entire front of the house, and will increase the depth of the existing porch deck by eight feet, projecting twelve feet from the main wall surface (5' 6" from the face of the projecting center entrance). The existing staircase will be removed and reconstructed at the center of the porch and will maintain the same dimensions as the existing staircase. A wooden balustrade is proposed around the perimeter of the porch to match the existing balustrade.

SUMMARY OF RECORD

The following items are submitted to the record and are available: 1) all materials and testimony submitted by the applicant, including any applicable professional studies such as traffic impact analysis, geologic assessments, stormwater reports, and; 2) materials, testimony, and comments from public agencies, City Departments, neighborhood associations, and the public. All application materials are available on the City's online Permit Application Center at <https://permits.cityofsalem.net>. You may use the search function without registering and enter the permit number listed here: 26 105433.

APPLICANT'S STATEMENT

A request for historic design review must be supported by proof that it conforms to all applicable criteria imposed by the Salem Revised Code. The applicants submitted a written statement, which is included as **Attachment B** in this staff report.

Staff utilized the information from the applicant's statements to evaluate the applicant's proposal and to compose the facts and findings within the staff report. Salem Revised Code (SRC) 230.065 General Guidelines for Historic Contributing Resources are the applicable criteria for evaluation of this proposal.

FACTS & FINDINGS

1. Historic Designation

Under Salem Revised Code (SRC) Chapter 230, no development permit for a designated historic resource shall be issued without the approval of the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). The HLC shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the application on the basis of the project's conformity with the criteria. Conditions of approval, if any, shall be limited to project modifications required to meet the applicable criteria.

According to SRC 230.020(f), historic design review approval shall be granted if the application satisfies the applicable standards set forth in Chapter 230. The HLC shall render its decision supported by findings that explain conformance or lack thereof with relevant design standards, state the facts relied upon in rendering the decision, and explain justification for the decision.

2. Historic Significance

The Oregon Historic Site Record from 1986 describes the house as a one-story, rectangular bungalow of wood frame construction constructed c. 1920. Features noted in the description include the hip-on gable roof with open eaves and exposed rafters, composition shingles and a three-sided hip roof over a center front door. A historic image of the house taken in 1978 shows that it is set upon a low foundation, and the center projecting entrance is flanked by large window assemblies on both sides.

In 2004 an application for historic design review (HIS 04-09) was submitted by the then-owner to raise the foundation of the house, citing risk of flooding and pre-existing foundation deterioration at the rear of the house. Part of this application included installation of two new porches (on the south and north of the main entrance) to allow the French doors flanking the entrance to remain functional. The Historic Landmarks Commission decision required the initial design of the front porch to be revised to minimize impact on the house. The decision provided three alternatives: design the front porch to reflect its historical configuration based on physical or photographic evidence; design the front porch to reflect the style of the house based on similar houses in the area, or; design the front porch to reflect the style of 1920s cottages based on published historic plans and trade journals. The applicant subsequently corresponded with City staff. Finding no historic photographs taken prior to 1976, the approved design was based on features found on similar houses in the area. The approved design was all wooden construction with balconies approximately 4' deep flanking the existing center enclosed porch entrance, and a center staircase with a small landing in front of the entry door (**Attachment C**). This resource is recorded as historic contributing to Salem's Gaiety Hill/Bush's Pasture Park Historic District. The contributing classification was determined prior to the foundation elevation; however, several historic character-defining features remain intact, including the setback on lot, roof form, fenestration pattern, and roofing and siding materials.

3. Neighborhood Association and Public Comments

The subject property is located within the SCAN Neighborhood Association.

Neighborhood Association Comment: Notice of the application was provided to SCAN pursuant to SRC 300.620(b)(2)(B)(vii), which requires notice to be sent to any City-recognized neighborhood association whose boundaries include, or are adjacent to, the subject property. As of the date of completion of this staff report, SCAN provided comments including objection to the overall scale of the proposed porch alteration (**Attachment D**).

Homeowners Association: The subject property is not located within a Homeowners' Association.

Public Comment: Notice was also provided, pursuant to SRC 300.620(b)(2)(B)(iii), (viii), (ix) & (xiii), to all property owners and tenants within 250 feet of the subject property and all property owners within Salem's Gaiety Hill/Bush's Pasture Park Historic District. Signs were also posted on the subject property pursuant to SRC 300.620(b)(3)(A). As of the writing of this staff report, one public comment has been received (**Attachment D**).

4. City Department Comments

Building and Safety Division – Reviewed proposal and noted that a building permit was already applied for, and issued no additional comments regarding the proposal. No other City Department or Public Agency comments were received by the date of this report.

5. Public Agency Comments

No Public Agency comments were received by the date of this report

6. Historic Design Review

Salem Revised Code (SRC) 230.065 **General Guidelines for Historic Contributing Resources** are the criteria applicable to the evaluation of this proposal. Historic Landmarks Commission staff reviewed the project proposal and has the following findings for the applicable standards:

FINDINGS

230.065. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES. *In lieu of the standards for historic contributing buildings set forth in SRC 230.025 and SRC 230.040, an applicant may make a proposal for preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation activity, regardless of type of work, which shall conform to the following guidelines:*

(a) *Except as otherwise provided in this Chapter, the property shall be used for its historic purpose, or for a similar purpose that will not alter street access, landscape design, entrance(s), height, footprint, fenestration, or massing.*

Findings: The application proposes to continue to use the resource as a residence, its historic purpose. Staff recommends that the HLC find that the proposed use will not significantly alter street access, landscape design, footprint or massing of the house and that SRC 230.065 (a) has been met.

(b) *Historic materials, finishes and distinctive features shall, when possible, be preserved and repaired according to historic preservation methods.*

Findings: The application proposal does not impact historic materials, finishes or distinctive features that are currently retained on the property. Staff recommends that the HLC find that 230.065(b) has been met for this portion of the proposal.

(c) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship significance shall be treated with sensitivity.

Findings: While the proposal will involve the significant expansion of the existing porch, resulting in this feature extending 5' 5" in front of the existing projecting bay of the resource, this alteration is removable, does not include a porch roof and will not obscure the projecting bay, which is the most distinctive stylistic feature currently associated with the historic character of the house. Staff recommends that the HLC find that 230.065(c) has been met for this portion of the proposal.

(d) Historic features shall be restored or reconstructed only when supported by physical or photographic evidence.

Findings: The applicant is not proposing restoration or reconstruction of historic features. Staff recommends that the HLC find that 230.065(d) is not applicable to the evaluation of this proposal.

(e) Changes that have taken place to a historic resource over the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a historic resource and its environment, and should be recognized and respected. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance should be recognized and respected.

Findings: The current porch and staircase are not original to the resource and was added in 2005. To be considered potentially significant, the current porch would need to have been added more than 50 years ago. Therefore, staff recommends that the HLC find that SRC 230.065(e) is not applicable to the evaluation of this proposal.

(f) Additions and alterations to a historic resource shall be designed and constructed to minimize changes to the historic resource.

Findings: While the proposal will result in the removal of the existing porch and stairs, these features are not original to the resource, and the sections which abut the original historic siding are limited, thereby minimizing changes to the resource. The proposal is using wooden elements to avoid changes posed by introducing new materials to the resource, and the porch is proposed to be finished to match finishes on the existing resource.

(g) Additions and alterations shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic materials and so that significant features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Findings: While the proposal will result in the extension of the porch flooring in front of the existing projecting bay of the resource, this alteration is removable, does not include a porch roof and will not obscure the distinguishing character defining features of the central projecting bay, thereby minimizing impacts to the resource. In order to ensure that the proposed new flooring and balustrade are compatible in design and to ensure the proposal better meets this Guideline, staff recommends the HLC approve the proposal with the following conditions:

Condition 1: The applicant shall paint the entire porch assembly to match the existing porch.

Condition 2: The applicant shall construct the porch balustrade to match the existing in both design and materials.

(h) Structural deficiencies in a historic resource shall be corrected without visually changing the composition, design, texture or other visual qualities.

Findings: The applicant is not proposing to correct any structural deficiencies. Staff recommends that the HLC find that this Guideline is not applicable to the evaluation of this proposal.

(i) Excavation or re-grading shall not be allowed adjacent to or within the site of a historic resource which could cause the foundation to settle, shift, or fail, or have a similar effect on adjacent historic resources.

Findings: The applicant is not proposing any excavation or regrading in the vicinity of the resource. Staff recommends that the HLC find that this Guideline is not applicable to the evaluation of this proposal.

Based upon the information presented in the application, plans submitted for review, and findings as presented in this staff report, staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission **APPROVE** the proposal with the following Conditions of Approval:

Condition 1: The applicant shall paint the entire porch assembly to match the existing porch.

Condition 2: The applicant shall construct the porch balustrade to match the existing one in both design and materials.

DECISION ALTERNATIVES

1. APPROVE the proposal as submitted by the applicant and indicated on the drawings.
2. APPROVE the proposal with conditions to satisfy specific guideline(s).
3. DENY the proposal based on noncompliance with identified guidelines in SRC 230, indicating which guideline(s) is not met and the reason(s) the guideline is not met.

Attachments: A. Vicinity Map
B. Excerpt from National Register Nomination and Historic Design Review Case HIS04-09
C. Applicant's Submittal Materials
D. Comments

Prepared by Jacob Morris, Historic Preservation Planner

Jake Morris

From: Judd Brian <judd@onpointfencing.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 8:33 AM
To: Jake Morris; Andrew Taylor; Lisa Taylor
Subject: [EXTERNAL]HIS26-05 Request for more time

ATTACHMENT 2

We have not had sufficient time to either put together a narrative response to concerns, or to develop an alternative design to better address concerns related to the scale of the extended front porch. Therefore we are requesting that the HLC open the public hearing on **May 21, 2026 and continue it until June 18, 2026**. The current state mandate review date has been extended to September 22, 2026 but we authorize an additional 30 days- to October 22, 2026 to ensure there are no procedural errors in this case moving forward.

Respectfully,

The Taylor Family

Onpoint Fencing & Decking

CAUTION! This email came from outside the City of Salem. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender. For guidance on identifying legitimate senders/emails, please review the IT Intranet Cyber Security Page.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

REGARDING: Class 3 Major Historic Design Review Case No. HIS26-05

AMANDA NO.: 26-105433-PLN

PROJECT ADDRESS: 625 Church St SE, Salem OR 97301

HEARD BY: Historic Landmarks Commission

SUMMARY

The Neighborhood Association renews its objection to the insufficient Notice provided on the ground that it does not contain a useful reference to applicable criteria as required by state law. In addition, SRC 230.025(h), which specifically prohibits adding a deck to the primary façade of a contributing house in the historic district, applies to this proposal. SRC 230.065 does not apply because the proposed work does not involve “preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation activity.”

I. The Notice was insufficient.

The Notice in this sort of proceeding “shall. . . [l]ist the applicable criteria from the ordinance” that apply to a proposed action. ORS 197.797(3)(b).¹ In laws, “shall” imposes a mandatory duty. Webster’s Third New International Dictionary at page 2085. The Notice was required to list applicable criteria from the ordinance that applied to this proposed deck.

The Notice provided to SCAN does not list the applicable criteria from the ordinance. Rather, it relies on SRC Chapter 230, an entire Chapter of the City Code, most of which has little or no bearing on this application to build a deck. At the time our comments were drafted, SCAN was unable to tell, based on the Notice, how the HLC would approach this application.

At the initial hearing, Commissioner Kaser questioned SCAN’s reference to the Notice’s failure to refer to applicable “standards.” SCAN could have avoided confusion by using

¹ ORS 197.797 provides, in part:

- (3) The notice provided by the jurisdiction shall:
- (a) Explain the nature of the application and the proposed use or uses which could be authorized;
 - (b) List the applicable criteria from the ordinance and the plan that apply to the application at issue;

the language of ORS 197.797(3)(b) to note the failure of the Notice to identify “the applicable criteria,” rather than complaining about the failure to identify applicable “standards.” In the general dictionary sense, of course, “standards” and “criteria” are the same, but the word “standards” has a more specific meaning within SRC Chapter 230. We regret the confusion created by not using the specific language of the relevant statute. The defects in the Notice remain.

A faulty Notice impairs the public comment process. The Oregon statute is designed to allow commenters to evaluate a proposed action under specifically identified criteria and to supply comments in response to those applicable criteria. The Notice must be mailed at least 20 days before the hearing date to allow time to gather information and prepare a reasoned response. ORS 197.797(3)(f). How are interested people, including neighborhood associations, supposed to prepare useful comments when the whole of SLC Chapter 230 is supposedly at issue?

II. SRC 230.025 expressly prohibits the addition of a deck to the primary façade of a contributing house in the historic district.

SRC 230.025 provides:

Modifications to historic contributing buildings in residential historic districts shall comply with this section.

[Subsections (a) through (g) omitted]

(h) Decks. Replacement and addition of decks in historic contributing buildings is allowed.

(1) *Materials*. The deck shall be constructed of wood, a wood composite, or a material available during the period of significance.

(2) *Design*. The deck shall:

(A) Be located off the rear of the resource.

(B) Not obscure any significant architectural features of the resource.

(C) Be of a reasonable size and scale in relationship to the resource.

(D) Shall not extend beyond the width of the existing footprint of the resource. (Emphasis added).

This provision applies. The application proposes a “modification” to a “historic contributing building” in the residential historic district that includes Gaiety Hill. The term “deck” is not defined in SRC Chapter 230, but we know a “deck” differs from a “porch” because the ordinance includes different standards for decks and porches. If they were the same thing, one standard would apply to both.

In the absence of a specific definition in the code, words carry their ordinary dictionary definitions. A “deck” is, among other things, “a flat floored roofless area adjoining a house or built as a structural part of it and, usu[ally] being open on one or more sides”. Webster’s Third New International Dictionary at page 585.² In contrast, a “porch,” is “a covered entrance to a building with a separate roof and often large enough to serve as an outdoor seating or walking space.” Webster’s at page 1766.³

The proposal here fits the common definition of a “deck.” The proposal consists of a flat roofless area adjoining the house. It has one or more open sides. Application of SRC 230.025 is mandatory (modifications “shall” comply). SRC 230.025. And, while a deck is sometimes permissible, it “shall” be located off the rear entrance. SRC 230.025(h)(2)(A). Simply put, no deck is permitted on the primary front façade of a contributing building in the historic district unless SRC 230.065 applies.⁴

III. SRC 230.065 does not apply to this application to build a new deck.

SRC 230.065 says, in part, "In lieu of the standards for historic contributing buildings set forth in SRC 230.025 and 230.040 an applicant may make a proposal for preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation activity, regardless of type of work, which shall conform to the following guidelines." (Emphasis added).

SRC 230.065 does not apply because, first, there is no evidence that the applicant did “make a proposal” under SRC 230.065 for "preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation activity." The applicant/homeowner refers solely upon SRC 230.025(d) (related to porches). Second, and perhaps more importantly, the deck proposal does not involve "preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation activity," which is the prerequisite for invoking the guidelines in SRC 230.065. Proposals under SRC 230.065 are limited to the specific types of activities listed – preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation – each of which is defined in SRC 230.005.

² Many of the definitions of “deck” pertain to ships or railroad cars or other things (e.g., cards) that obviously are not relevant to this discussion. Webster’s at page 585.

³ SCAN’s original comments explained that the provision upon which the homeowner/applicant relied, SRC 230.025(d) (“porches”), would allow not this construction as a “porch” because it is not original to the house.

⁴ The house at 625 Church St. SE already has a rear deck.

The deck does not fall within the definition of "preservation" because it is not necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, or materials of the house; it is new construction; and it is a new exterior addition. SRC 230.005 provides:

"Preservation means the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a historic resource. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the resource, generally focuses on the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not considered preservation; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project." (Emphasis added).

This deck project involves the new construction of an exterior addition. There is no evidence whatsoever that the deck is "necessary" to sustain the form, integrity, or materials of the house.

The deck does not amount to "restoration" because it would not restore anything that existed during the period of significance; it is brand new. SRC 230.005 provides:

"Restoration means the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a historic-contributing resource or historic-non-contributing resource as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project." (Emphasis added).

Rather than restoring something that used to exist, the large deck would be a completely new feature. Even if the deck might be considered a reconstruction of the existing balconies, those are not historic.

The deck does not involve "rehabilitation" because it does not make a compatible use possible. SRC 230.005 says:

"Rehabilitation means the process of making possible a compatible use for a historic-contributing resource or individually listed resource through repair, alterations, and additions, while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values." (Emphasis added).

For a project to “mak[e] possible a compatible use,” the “compatible use” must not be currently possible; the proposed activity must change the status quo by making the compatible use possible. The compatible use at issue here is a single-family dwelling. The proposed deck does not make that use “possible.” In fact, the house is currently being used as a single-family dwelling and on-going use as such is not endangered by lack of the deck. The proposed deck might, in the view of the applicant/homeowner, make the house more convenient or more pleasant, but that is insufficient to establish that the deck makes possible a use that is currently not possible.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the proposed deck is prohibited by SRC 230.025 and not permitted by SRC 230.065. If some other section of SRC Chapter 230 permits this construction, that section has not been mentioned in this proceeding. The HLC should deny the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Chute, Chair; Historic Preservation, Parks, and Gardens Committee; South Central Association of Neighbors (SCAN).

Address:

Email: cachute@gmail.com

Phone No.: 503-851-0322

Date: May 5, 2026, submitted via email to jjmorris@cityofsalem.net