

TO: HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSON

THROUGH: LISA ANDERSON-OGILVIE, AICP, DEPUTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

FROM: KIMBERLI FITZGERALD, AICP, HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL STAFF REPORT FOR HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. HIS20-07 1677 CHEMEKETA ST NE: PROPOSAL TO REPLACE A DRIVEWAY, ADD A FENCE, GATE AND WINDOWS TO THE STIFFLER HOUSE

ISSUE

Should the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC), approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposal to replace a driveway, add a fence, gate and windows to the Stiffler House (c. 1895)?

SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

On January 15, 2020, the applicant submitted materials for a Major Historic Design Review for a proposal to replace a driveway, add a fence and gate and two windows on the east and west facades of the Stiffler House (1895). While at the time of application, the applicant was requesting approval for all of the proposed alterations, due to the delays caused by the pandemic, he has subsequently completed a portion of the work (driveway/window openings) and is now requesting retroactive approval for this portion of the work, and approval for the fencing and gates which have not yet been constructed. The public hearing on this case was held on May 21, 2020.

SUPPLEMENTARY FINDINGS

Due to Special Hearing Procedures during the COVID-19 Pandemic no public testimony was accepted on May 21, 2020. Written comments on the proposal were allowed up until May 28, 2020 at 5:00pm, however, no comments were received. The applicant had until June 4, 2020 at 5:00pm to submit final written rebuttal, and no additional comments were submitted by the applicant. Historic Landmarks Commission staff reviewed the proposal and recommends that the HLC find that the overall materials and the design of the proposal are compatible with the Stiffler House and the surrounding historic district and the proposal meets the applicable criteria in SRC 230.065.

RECOMMENDATION

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.

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.

Prepared by Kimberli Fitzgerald, AICP, Historic Preservation Officer