

333 Broadalbin Street SW, PO Box 490, Albany, Oregon 97321-0144 | Planning & Building 541-917-7550

# **Notice of Decision**

#### Historic Review of New Construction

HI-21-24 December 9, 2024

# **Application Information**

Type of Application: Historic Review of New Construction to construct a 990 square foot garage

Review Body: Landmarks Commission (Type III review)

Property Owner/Applicant Corey Bontrager; 810 NW Scenic Wood Place, Albany, OR 97321

Address/Location: 606 6th Avenue SE, Albany, OR 97321

Map/Tax Lot: Linn County Tax Assessor's Map No. 11S-03W-07AB-05500 & 5600

Zoning: Hackleman Monteith (HM)

Overlays: Hackleman National Register Historic District

#### **Decision**

On December 4, 2024, the Albany Landmarks Commission **DENIED** the application described above. The Landmarks Commission based its decision upon consideration of findings within the staff report, public testimony, and review criteria listed in the Albany Development Code (ADC). The supporting documentation relied upon by the City in making this decision is available for review at City Hall, 333 Broadalbin Street SW. For more information, please contact Alyssa Schrems, project planner, at <a href="mailto:alyssa.schrems@albanyoregon.gov">albanyoregon.gov</a> or 541-791-0176. Staff report is available for review at <a href="mailto:albanyoregon.gov">albanyoregon.gov</a>/cd/projectreview paper copies can be made available by request.

Signature on file

Landmarks Commission Chair

Appeal Deadline: December 19, 2024

### **Appeal Procedure**

Appeal procedures are found in the Albany Development Code 1.410. The City's decision may be appealed to the City Council if a person with standing files a completed notice to appeal application and the associated filing fee no later than 10 days from the date the City mails the Notice of Decision.

# Landmarks Commission Findings of Fact and Conclusions

Within the Monteith and Hackleman Districts (ADC 7.270(1))

a. The development maintains any unifying development patterns such as sidewalk and street tree location, setbacks, building coverage, and orientation to the street.

- b. The structure is of similar size and scale of surrounding buildings, and as much as possible reflects the craftsmanship of those buildings.
- c. Building materials are reflective of and complementary to existing buildings within the district.

### Findings of Fact

- 1.1 <u>Unifying Development Patterns (ADC 7.270(1)(a)):</u> The Landmarks Commission found that the proposed structure would have a building coverage that far exceeds the coverage of other accessory structures in the Hackleman Historic District. Typical garages in the Hackleman District were found to be small two-car or one-car garages of a size between 200-400 square feet. The proposed garage at a size of 990 square feet would create a building coverage that is not compatible with surrounding properties. Based on these facts, the Landmarks Commission finds that this criterion is not met.
- 1.2 <u>Size and scale (ADC 7.270(1)(b)):</u> The Landmarks Commission found that the proposed size and scale of the garage far exceeds a typical accessory structure in the Hackleman Historic District. The Commission further found that the proposed structure would have a size and form that is larger than the primary structure on the property, which is not in keeping with the character of surrounding buildings. The form and height of the building would dominate the lot and be out of scale with the neighborhood. The Commission also determined that there was not enough information presented in the application to determine that the proposed structure would reflect the craftsmanship of surrounding buildings in the neighborhood or the primary structure on the property. Based on these facts, the Landmarks Commission finds that this criterion is not met.
- 1.3 <u>Building materials (ADC 7.270(1)(c)):</u> The Commission determined that there was not enough information presented in the application to determine if the proposed building materials are reflective and complementary to existing buildings in the district. The Commission was especially concerned with the lack of visual representation of the 12-foot garage doors that would dominate the front façade. Without knowing what these doors would look like, the Commission determined that the application lacked the necessary information to support approval. Based on these facts, this criterion is not met.

#### **Attachments**

A. Location Map

