

STAFF REPORT
CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO

PLANNING DIVISION

APPLICANT/OWNER:

John Benjamin Chessar

FILE NO:

LU 12-0005

APPLICANTS' REPRESENTATIVE:

Curtis Olson

STAFF:

Debra Andreades

TAX LOT REFERENCE:

Tax Lot 3800 of Tax Map 21E 10 CA

DATE OF REPORT:

March 9, 2012

LOCATION:

1125 Maple Street

PUBLIC HEARING DATE:

March 19, 2012

COMP. PLAN DESCRIPTION:

R-7.5

120-DAY DECISION DATE:

June 21, 2012

ZONING DESIGNATION:

R-7.5

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

McVey-South Shore

I. APPLICANTS' REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval of a Development Review Permit to construct an addition to an existing single family dwelling that is designated as an historic landmark.

II. RECOMMENDATION

Approval with conditions. The complete listing of conditions is provided on pages 11-12 of this report.

III. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

A. City of Lake Oswego Community Development Code (Chapter LOC 50):

LOC 50.08.005 - 50.08.055	R- 7.5 Low Density Zone Description
LOC 50.40.005 - 50.40.030	Drainage Standard for Minor Development
LOC 50.43.005 - 50.43.035	Hillside Protection
LOC 50.55.005 - 50.55.020	Parking
LOC 50.58.005 - 50.58.035	On-Site Circulation - Driveways and Fire Access Roads
LOC 50.64.005 - 50.64.035	Utilities
LOC 50.70.005	Non-Conforming Uses and Structures
LOC 50.77.007	Burden of Proof
LOC 50.79.025	Review Criteria for Minor Developments
LOC 50.79.040	Conditions of Approval
LOC 50.81.005 - 50.81.020	Review of Minor Development Applications
LOC 50.84.005	Appeal of Minor Development Decision
LOC 50.87.005 - 50.87.025	Compliance with Approved Permit

B. City of Lake Oswego Tree Chapter [LOC Chapter 55]:

LOC 55.08.020	Tree Protection Plan Required
LOC 55.08.030	Tree Protection Measures Required

C. City of Lake Oswego Solar Access Chapter [LOC Chapter 57]:

LOC 57.06.050 - 57.06.092	Solar Balance Point
---------------------------	---------------------

D. City of Lake Oswego Historic Preservation [LOC Chapter 58]:

LOC 58.02.005 - 58.02.165	Historic Preservation
---------------------------	-----------------------

IV. FINDINGS

A. Background/Existing Conditions:

1. The site is a 30,420-square foot lot located with frontage on both Maple Street and Lake Front Road, both local streets (Exhibit E1).
2. The site is zoned R-7.5 and is developed with a single family dwelling. The properties surrounding the site are also zoned R-7.5 and are developed with single family dwellings.
3. The existing house on the property was built in 1933. According to the Cultural Resources Inventory Field Form (Exhibit F-2), the house was designed by Richard Sundeleaf and constructed for Dr. Walter and Anna Black. The house is designated as an historic landmark, known as the "Black House", and was designed in the English Cottage style with stylistic elements borrowed from the Tudor Revival style. The house is significant as an excellent example of the physical integrity and craftsmanship of Sundeleaf's work.

V. PUBLIC NOTICE OF APPLICATION AND APPLICANTS' BURDEN OF PROOF

Applications for exterior alteration of an Historic Landmark are processed in accordance with LOC 50.79.010, 50.79.020, and 58.02.135.

A. Neighborhood Meeting:

No neighborhood meeting was required by LOC 50.77.025.

B. Public Notice to Surrounding Area of Minor Development:

The City has provided adequate public notice and opportunity to comment on this application, as required by LOC 50.82.020. One letter was received as of the date of this report (Exhibit G-200). The issues raised are addressed on pages 9 (*Time Period Consistency*) and 10 (*Restoration Possible*) of this report.

C. Burden of Proof:

Per LOC 50.77.007, "the applicant for a development permit shall bear the burden of proof that the application complies with all applicable review criteria or can be made to comply with applicable criteria by imposition of conditions of approval." The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to enable staff to evaluate the proposal. These documents are listed as exhibits at the end this report.

VI. LOC 50.79.020 - MINOR DEVELOPMENT

A. Classification of Application

LOC 50.79.020(2)(b) and 50.79.010(2)(b) describes the exterior alteration of an historic resource as a minor development.

LOC 58.02.015 also describes the exterior alteration of an historic landmark as a "minor development". The proposed exterior alteration is a "major alteration" because it is not a "minor alteration". (LOC 58.02.015). The minor development procedures found in LOC 50.81 are to be followed when reviewing "major alterations" that are subject to the City Manager's jurisdiction. LOC 58.02.090(5)(a).

B. Criteria for Review of Application

Per LOC 50.79.025, for any minor development application to be approved, it shall first be established that the proposal complies with:

1. The requirements of the zone in which it is located;

R-7.5 Zone [LOC 50.08.005 - 50.08.055]

The site is located in the R-7.5 zone. The applicant proposes to remodel and construct an addition to the existing single-family dwelling on the site. Single-family use is permitted outright in the R-7.5 zone. The matrix, below, illustrates the current R-7.5 zone requirements for setbacks, height, floor area and lot coverage relative to the proposed addition.

R-7.5Zone Standards and Analysis of Compliance [LOC 50.08.005- 50.08-055]		
Required		Proposed Additions
Front Yard	25 feet	32 feet (south-Maple St) 63.7 feet (north-Lake Front Rd.)
Side Yard <i>Structure ≤ 18 ft</i>	5 ft. min. width, total combined width of 15 ft.	129 feet (east)
<i>Structure > 18 feet</i>	10 ft.	55 feet (west)
Rear Yard	30 feet	NA*
Max. Base Height	35 feet (sloped lot)	34.9 feet
Lot Coverage	25%= 7,605 sq. ft.	3,505 sq. ft. =11.5%
Floor Area	Per LOC TABLE 50.08.042 (8,277 sf)	4,607sq.ft.

* The site is a through lot with frontages on Maple St. and Lake Front Road; therefore, there is no rear yard.

As illustrated on Exhibits E-3 through E-6 and outlined in the table above, the proposed addition complies with all of the site development limitations of the zone. In addition to the standards outlined above, the proposed addition must comply with the structure design standards listed, below.

Street Front and Street Side Setback Planes [LOC 50.08.045(1)]

The front profile of a structure that fronts on a street is required to fit behind a plane that starts at the setback line and extends upward to 20 feet in height, then slopes toward the center of the lot at a 6:12 pitch, up to the maximum allowed height at the highest point of the roof. As indicated on Exhibit E-7, a portion of the new gable is located outside that plane at the Maple Street frontage. Per LOC 50.08.045(1)(b), any individual roof form may penetrate the street front setback plane if it is less than one-third of the structure width. As indicated on Exhibits E-4 and E-7, the portion of the front gables that penetrates the front setback plane complies with the limitation at 15.2% of the width of the structure.

The front profile of a structure that fronts on a street on up-sloped lots is required to fit behind a plane that starts at the front yard setback line and extends upward 24 feet in height, and slopes toward the center of the lot at a slope equal to the slope measured from the lot line abutting a street to the most distant point of the dwelling for a horizontal distance of 10 feet, up to the maximum allowed height. This standard is applicable to the Lake Front Road elevation, because the lot slopes up at that location. As indicated on Exhibit E-7, the existing house with the new addition is behind the front setback plane along that frontage. This standard is met.

The garage on the site is non-conforming to this standard, but it is not being modified as a part of this application [LOC 50.70.005(3)]. Therefore, the standard is not applicable to this request.

Side Yard Setback Plane-Interior Yards [LOC 50.08.045(2)]

The side profile of a structure is required to fit behind a plane that starts at the side property lines and extends upward to 12 feet in height and slopes toward the center of the lot at a 12:12 slope, up to the maximum allowed height. As illustrated on Exhibit E-7, the existing house with the addition is behind the side yard setback plane. This standard is met.

It is unknown whether the garage on the site conforms or is non-conforming to this standard, but since it is not being modified, it may be maintained even if non-conforming [LOC 50.70.005(3)].

Side Yard Appearance and Screening [LOC 50.08.045(3)]

The side yard or side elevations of the addition must comply with at least one of three design treatments listed in this section.

The proposed addition complies with Treatment 1- Maximum Side Yard Plane [LOC 50.08.045(3)(a)], which requires that the side elevations of a structure be divided into distinct planes of 750 square feet or less. The largest side yard plane on the east elevation where the addition is proposed is approximately 152 square feet (Exhibits E-5 and F-1). This standard is met.

Garage Appearance and Location [LOC 50.08.055]

The garage shall not be located closer to the street than the dwelling, unless the exception criteria are met. There is an existing detached garage on the site which is non-conforming with regard to setbacks (Exhibit E-3), however, no work is proposed to this structure and a non-conforming garage may be maintained per LOC 50.70.005(3).

Conclusion

Staff finds that the house with the addition complies with all of the site development limitations and design standards required by the R-7.5 zone.

2. The Development Standards applicable to minor developments;

Drainage Standard for Minor Development - [LOC 50.40.005-50.40.035]

This standard requires that drainage alterations, including new development, not adversely affect neighboring properties. The determination of whether or not the application meets the drainage requirements of LOC 50.41 is under the review authority of the City Manager or City Engineer.

The Engineering staff has reviewed the proposal and made the following findings: this project shall be developed to maximize the amount of storm water runoff which is percolated into the soil and to minimize direct overland runoff into streets, drainage systems, and/or adjoining property. Storm water runoff from roofs and other impervious surfaces should be diverted into swale terraces, and/or water percolation devices on the lot when possible. Storm water management will be required for the impervious surfaces from the roof areas and new driveways.

The site generally slopes from the southwest to the northeast and from Maple Street down toward Lake Front Road. The applicant proposes to direct the roof drains from the new addition to a City approved infiltration trench, which will be located to the east of the new addition (Exhibit E-3). The Engineering staff finds this method of storm water management acceptable. The final details for the storm disposal design shall be submitted for review at the time of building permit application. This standard is met.

Hillside Protection [LOC 50.43.005 - 50.43.035]

Development shall be designed to minimize the disturbance of natural topography, vegetation and soils and cuts and fills. According to the City's Soil Map, the site is in a slide area. As a condition of approval, the Building Division will require a geotechnical report from a registered soils engineer with the building permit application. With this condition, this standard can be met.

Off-Street Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Access--[LOC 50.55.005-50.55.020]

As indicated on Exhibit E-3, the required parking space is located in the existing detached garage. This standard is met.

On-Site Circulation - Driveways and Fire Access Roads - [LOC 50.58.005-50.58.035]

This standard is applicable to all development proposing a new use or an increased use on a site when the development will result in the construction of or the increased use of private streets, driveways, or parking lot aisles. The Fire Department states that access is adequate for emergency vehicles and that hydrant location and water flow are adequate for a home up to 9,400 square feet. The existing house with the proposed addition will be 4,607 square feet. This standard is met.

Utilities - [LOC 50.64.005 - 50.64.035]

No changes to the existing utility locations are proposed.

3. **Any additional statutory, or Lake Oswego Code provisions which may be applicable to the specific minor development application;**

City of Lake Oswego Tree Chapter [LOC Chapter 55]

Tree Protection

The Code requires tree protection measures [LOC 55.08.030(1)]. The protective fencing shall be placed at the tree protection zone, which is the zone required to protect the critical root area necessary for the continued health of the trees. The applicants should propose the tree protection zone for each tree, for review and approval by City staff, on site. As required by LOC 55.08.030(7), no construction, excavation, root pruning or other activity shall occur within the tree protection zone unless directed by an arborist present on site and approved by the City.

There is a 36-inch Douglas fir approximately 15 feet from the disturbance area on the northeast side and a 16-inch cedar and 26-inch Douglas fir approximately 15 feet from the disturbance are on the southeast side of the addition which will require tree protection.

A note should be placed on the construction documents that informs the site contractors about the necessity of preventing damage to these trees, including bark and root zone, and that no materials should be stored or compaction occur within the root zones of the adjacent trees [LOC 55.08.030]. The contractor shall be subject to fines, penalties and mitigation for trees that are damaged or destroyed during construction. As a condition of approval, as required by LOC 55.08.02 and 55.08.030, a tree protection plan shall be submitted with the building permit plans for staff review and approval. Tree protection measures must be installed prior to issuance of any grading or building permits. Tree protection fencing consists of 6-foot high chain link fencing supported by 6-foot high metal posts, placed a maximum of ten feet apart.

City of Lake Oswego Solar Access Chapter [LOC Chapter 57]

All single-family structures in any zone are required to meet the Maximum Shade Point eight Standard [LOC 57.06.065], which protects structures located to the north of the site from shading. An exemption to this standard shall be permitted if the applicant can demonstrate that one or more of the conditions listed in LOC 57.06.070 exist based on substantial evidence. Per LOC 57.06.070(4)(a), an exemption is permitted if there is an insignificant benefit because the existing house with the proposed addition shades an undevelopable area. As indicated on Exhibits E-1 through E-3, the house with the addition would shade a public right-of-way to the north; therefore, the proposal is exempt from this standard.

City of Lake Oswego Historic Preservation [LOC Chapter 58]:

The applicant proposes to construct an addition to the existing dwelling, which is an historic landmark (the Black House). The proposed addition is considered a "major alteration" as defined by LOC 58.02.015.

The Black House is a 2-story wood frame house built in 1933. The house has the prominent steeply pitched roofs, variety of dormers and cross gable roof forms with cedar shingles of the Tudor Revival style. The exterior surface materials are a combination of brick and beveled cedar siding and have multi-paned fixed and casement windows. Decorative features include carved brackets, leaded glass, some wood shutters and decorative finials (Exhibits E-4 through E-6 and E-12).

Per LOC 58.02.135(3), in order for a major alteration of a landmark to be approved, the reviewing authority must find that the following *criteria* are met:

- *The proposed alteration will not diminish the historical or architectural significance of the landmark; or,*

The historic landmark is a detached single family dwelling occupied by a family. The applicant states (Exhibit F-1) that the proposed addition is a reasonable alteration because it improves the floor plan of the kitchen/family room so that it increases its functionality to accommodate current living standards that make the kitchen a focal point (Exhibit E-8). The addition also allows an additional bedroom and bathroom on the upper floor, consistent with current living standards (Exhibit E-9). The applicant states that the addition will allow for an improved living environment that will encourage reinvestment and maintenance, thereby helping to preserve the resource in the future.

These modifications are accomplished without diminishing the historical or architectural significance of the resource on the exterior by repeating some of the design elements such as

the massing of cross cables, the steep roof pitches, the multi-paned windows, pegged window trim and the combination of brick and cedar bevel siding (Exhibits E-4 through E-6 and E-12). The match of materials on the exterior results in the addition appearing seamless without duplicating every detail; creating an addition that is complementary to the original structure without being a modern imitation of the original structure.

- *For alterations which diminish the historical or architectural significance, through an ESEE analysis, it can be shown that the benefit to the community of allowing the alteration outweighs the benefit to the community of preserving the resource in its present condition.*

Staff finds, as discussed above and below, that the proposed alteration does not diminish the historical or architectural significance of the residence. Accordingly, this alternative criterion is not applicable.

The following considerations are to be used as a guide in determining whether the proposed development complies with LOC 58.02.135(3):

- a. The use of the resource, the reasonableness of the proposed alteration, and the relationship of these factors to the public interest in the preservation of the resource, or alterations which diminish the historical or architectural significance may be allowed if, through an ESEE analysis, it can be shown that the benefit to the community of allowing the alteration outweighs the benefit to the community of preserving the resource in its present condition;*

Staff finds, as discussed above and below, that the proposed alteration does not diminish the historical or architectural significance of the residence. Accordingly, this guideline is not relevant.

- b. The significance of the resource and the community benefit to preserving it;*

As stated in the Cultural Resources Inventory for the dwelling, the Black House is significant as one of the best examples of Richard Sundeleaf's work (Exhibit F-2). The applicant wishes to preserve the dwelling as part of the historic inventory of Lake Oswego. Staff finds, as discussed above and below, that the proposed alteration does not diminish the historical or architectural significance of the residence. Accordingly, this guideline is not relevant.

- c. The physical condition of the resource;*

The Black House is in good condition but currently needs a replacement of the cedar shingle roof. The applicant states that the proposed addition will provide an opportunity to address the condition of the roof and enhance the physical condition of the resource (Exhibits F-1 and E-12). Staff finds, as discussed above and below, that the proposed alteration does not diminish the historical or architectural significance of the residence. Accordingly, this guideline is not relevant.

- d. The effect of requested changes related to the original exterior design, arrangement, proportion, detail, scale, texture, and/or materials; including the following:*

- (1) Retention of Original Construction: Distinguishing original qualities defining a*

structure's character shall not be destroyed. Removal or alteration of historic materials or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

The Cultural Resources Inventory lists the distinguishing features of the dwelling as cross gables, cedar shingles and dormers, multi-light casement windows, brick and cedar beveled siding, with decorative features that include carved brackets, leaded glass, wood shutters and a plank entry door (Exhibit F-2). The proposed addition does not remove or alter any of these architectural details and many of them are repeated in the proposed addition (Exhibits E-4 through E-6 and E-11 and E-12).

- (2) *Time Period Consistency: Structures shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis or which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be avoided.*

As discussed above, the proposed addition will match the roof form and pitch, as well as the materials of the existing structure, creating an historically accurate appearance. The applicant states (Exhibit F-1) that not all of the decorative details are reproduced on the addition in order to highlight some of the more special features of the original house. This results in an addition that corresponds to the original structure without creating a modern imitation of an earlier appearance.

- (3) *Visual Integrity/Style: Distinctive stylistic features, such as a line of columns, piers, spandrels, or other primary structural elements, or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a structure, shall be maintained or restored as far as is practicable.*

The proposed addition maintains the original architectural features of the existing dwelling, matching the materials and color. In addition, the new addition will contain elements that match some of the original decorative features. For example, the post and knee brace found at the existing entrance will be used on the covered porch of the new addition (Exhibits E-11 and E-12).

- (4) *Replacement or Addition Materials: Whenever possible, deteriorated architectural features shall be restored rather than replaced. In the event that replacement of an existing feature is necessary, or an addition is proposed, new materials should match those of the original structure, to the extent possible, in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities.*

As discussed above and in the applicant's narrative (Exhibit F-1), the proposed addition will match the existing house with regard to massing, color and materials; particularly the distinctive combination of brick and cedar beveled siding (Exhibits E-11 and E-12).

- (5) *Building Height: Existing building heights should be maintained. Alteration of roof pitches shall be avoided. Raising or lowering a structure's permanent elevation when constructing a foundation shall be avoided, except as required by Building Code or flood plain requirements.*

The proposed addition matches the main roof line and steep pitch of the gable roof forms of the existing house (Exhibits E-4 through E-6 and E-11 and E-12) and will match the existing height of the structure. The site is not located in the flood plain and no modifications to the existing foundation are proposed as a part of this application.

(6) Horizontal Additions: The scale and proportion of building additions, including the relationship of windows to walls, shall be visually compatible with the traditional architectural character of the historic building. Contemporary construction for alterations and additions are acceptable if the design respects the building's original design and is compatible with the original scale, materials, window and door opening proportions of, the structure.

The scale and proportion of the proposed addition is consistent with the existing structure with regard to the size of the windows, dormers and the steeply pitched roof forms. The windows in the new addition are multi-paned and have wide exterior trim like those on the existing house (Exhibits E-4 through E-6). The windows are similarly located just below the eave line, particularly in evidence on the north elevation (Exhibit E-6).

(7) Windows: Window replacements shall match the original windows in materials and appearance. The original number of window panes shall be maintained or restored when replacements are required.

The applicant states (Exhibit F-1) that the windows on the proposed addition will match the existing windows in frame profile, material, size of glazing pane and size/profile of muntin bars. This is in evidence on Exhibits E-4 through E-6.

(8) Restoration Possible: Except where Building Code precludes it, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the original structure could be restored.

The proposed addition is limited to the east side of the structure and has been visually connected seamlessly to the existing roof line (Exhibits E-4 and E-6). Therefore, the addition could potentially be removed in the future without impacting the essential form or integrity of the original structure.

(9) Signs, Lighting: Signs, lighting, and other appurtenances, such as walls, fences, awnings, and landscaping shall be visually compatible with the scale and traditional architectural character of the historic building.

No signage is proposed. The applicant states that exterior lighting will be compatible with existing lighting on the dwelling. The 3-foot high railing on the new porch of the addition is not found elsewhere on the dwelling; however, it is historically compatible with the period of the home because it is constructed of decorative wood slats as is typical in the Tudor Revival style. Although there is an existing 3-foot railing on the north elevation (Exhibits E-5 and E-6) which is an open iron railing, the railing on the proposed deck is compatible with it as the decorative portion on both are similarly located just under the horizontal rail.

- e. *Pertinent aesthetic factors as identified in Appendix A or the Historic District List of Contributing Resources for the subject property.*

There are no aesthetic factors identified in Appendix A or the Historic District List of Contributing Resources for the subject property.

- f. *Any design guidelines adopted by the Board.*

No design guidelines have been adopted by Historic Resources Advisory Board that affects the subject property.

Staff finds that the proposed additions and alterations will not diminish the historical or architectural significance of the historic landmark and may be approved.

4. Any conditions of approval imposed as part of an approved ODPS or prior development permit affecting the subject property.

There are no outstanding conditions of approval that affect the subject property.

VII. CONCLUSION

Based upon the information provided by the applicant and the findings presented within this report, staff concludes that LU 12-0005 complies with all of the applicable criteria or can be made to comply through the imposition of conditions.

VIII. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **approval** of LU 12-0005, subject to the following conditions:

- A. Approval of LU 12-0005 shall be valid for a 3-year period from the date of the Order granting final approval of the Development Review Permit, and shall be void if construction is not complete within that time period.**
- B. Prior to Issuance of any Building Permits, the Applicant/Owner Shall:**
 - 1. Submit final site and building plans for review and approval of staff that are the same or substantially similar to the site plan, floor plans, and building elevations illustrated on Exhibits E-3 through E-12, to the satisfaction of staff.
 - 2. Submit a storm water disposal plan (showing the proposed infiltration trench design and details) for Engineering staff approval. The infiltration system shall meet minimum setbacks of 5-feet from property lines, and 10-feet from building foundations.
 - 3. Submit a geotechnical report from a registered soils engineer for review and approval of the Building Official.
 - 4. Submit a tree protection permit application as required by LOC 55.08.020 and 55.08.030 for review and approval by staff, including off-site trees that are within the construction zone. The tree protection plan shall be attached to the construction documents or printed on the construction site plans, and shall include:

- a. The location of temporary tree protection fencing, consisting of a minimum 6-foot high cyclone fence secured by steel posts, around the tree protection zone, or as recommended by the project arborist and approved by the City.
- b. A note stating that no fill or compaction shall occur within the critical root zones of any of the trees, or that if fill or compaction is unavoidable, measures will be taken as recommended by a certified arborist to reduce or mitigate the impact of the fill or compaction. Such measures should be clearly outlined in the tree protection plan.
- c. A note that clearly informs all site contractors about the necessity of preventing damage to the trees, including bark and root zone. The applicant and contractor(s) shall be subject to fines, penalties and mitigation for trees that are damaged or destroyed during construction.
- d. A sign shall be attached to the tree protection fencing, which states that inside the fencing is a tree protection zone, not to be disturbed unless prior approval has been obtained from the City Manager.

C. Prior to any Construction Activity on the Site, the Applicant/Owner Shall:

1. Install all tree protection measures as required by the Condition B-4, above. The tree protection fencing shall be inspected and approved by City staff prior to commencing any construction activities.
2. Apply for and obtain an erosion control permit, and install all erosion control measures.

D. Prior to any Final Building Inspection, the Applicant/Owner Shall:

1. Request a final inspection by the Planning staff to assure that the dwelling complies with the approved final plans, per Conditions B(1), above.

Note:

1. Development plans review, permit approval, and inspections by the City of Lake Oswego Planning and Building Services Department are limited to compliance with the Lake Oswego Community Development Code, and related code provisions. The applicants are advised to review plans for compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations that could relate to the development, i.e., Americans with Disabilities Act, Endangered Species Act. Staff may advise the applicants of issues regarding state and federal laws that staff member believes would be helpful to the applicants, but any such advice or comment is not a determination or interpretation of federal or state law or regulation.

EXHIBITS

- A. **Notice of Appeal:**
(No current exhibits; reserved for hearing use)
- B. **Findings, Conclusions and Order:**
(No current exhibits; reserved for hearing use)
- C. **Minutes:**
(No current exhibits; reserved for hearing use)
- D. **Staff Report:**
(No current exhibits; reserved for hearing use)

E. GRAPHICS/PLANS:

- E-1 Tax Map
- E-2 Vicinity Map with Zoning
- E-3 Site Plan with Roof Plan
- E-4 South Elevation
- E-5 East Elevation
- E-6 North Elevation
- E-7 Setback Diagrams
- E-8 Main Level Floor Plan
- E-9 Upper Level Floor Plan
- E-10 Lower Level Floor Plan
- E-11 Color Renderings of Addition (4 pages)
- E-12 Color and Materials Board

F. WRITTEN MATERIALS:

- F-1 Applicants' Narrative
- F-2 Cultural Resources Inventory Form for the Black House

G. LETTERS

Neither for nor Against: (G1-99)

None

Support: (G100-199)

None

Opposition: (G-200+)

G-200 Letter from State Historic Preservation Office, dated March 5, 2012

Date of Application Submittal: January 27, 2012

Date Application Determined to be Complete: February 22, 2012

State Mandated 120-Day Rule (as extended by the applicants): June 21, 2012

