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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

About This Project

Neighborhood interest in creating a historic district in King's Hill dates to the late 1970s, when the area was identified by neighborhood residents as a potential historic district. The King's Hill community of property owners, residents, volunteers, and historic preservation professionals collaborated to realize that potential. After a twenty-year effort and some funding support from the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), their goal was realized with the local designation of the King’s Hill Historic District in January 1991. Its listing in the National Register of Historic Places followed shortly after.

Like the effort to create a historic district, long-standing community interest in design issues in the King’s Hill area generated this project to develop design guidelines tailored for the King’s Hill Historic District. Soon after the district’s listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the King’s Hill community contacted the Bureau of Planning (BOP) to see if specialized design guidelines could be developed for the district. The BOP agreed that tailored guidelines would respond more sensitively and appropriately to design issues in the area than the general guidelines adapted from the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, which have been used as approval criteria since the adoption of the district. In May 2000, the BOP applied for and received a grant from the SHPO to develop such guidelines.

Work on the project began in September 2000. After conducting preliminary research, staff held the first two of four planned workshops for the project. The first two workshops were held in December 2000 and January 2001. The third workshop followed in March 2001. Notices for each workshop were placed in the Northwest Examiner. Notice of the workshops was mailed to property owners in the King's Hill Historic District, SHPO staff, Portland Historic Landmarks Commissioners, Goose Hollow Foothills League board members, and other interested neighbors identified by the office of Neighbors West-NorthWest. These neighbors included representatives of the Multnomah Athletic Club, the Zion Lutheran Church, and the First United Methodist Church. Comments compiled from the workshops were incorporated into a first draft of this document. The document was refined following the last workshop, which was held on June 19, 2001.

The King’s Hill Historic District Guidelines were adopted by Portland City Council on November 15, 2001, with an effective date of December 15, 2001. (See Appendix D.)
About This Document

The guidelines for the King’s Hill Historic District are intended to guide exterior alterations of existing buildings (including additions) and new construction. The guidelines are designed to maintain and preserve those qualities that make the King’s Hill Historic District a unique historic neighborhood. They promote the continued integrity and identity of the district in three broad areas, which are addressed under the following guideline headings:

- Area Character
- Pedestrian Emphasis
- Project Design

Design guidelines are mandatory approval criteria that must be met as part of historic design review. Developers of projects located within the boundaries of the district (see map, Appendix C) are required to explain, in their application, how their design meets each applicable guideline.

Modified guidelines based on the U.S. Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties have been the approval criteria in historic design review cases since the adoption of the King's Hill Historic District (see Appendix B). The guidelines in this document replace the modified guidelines. They also incorporate the intent of the U.S. Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (see page 8).

The King’s Hill Historic District Design Guidelines have been prepared to assist in applying the standards to all project work. They are intended to lead or guide the developer and designer. They are not meant to give case-specific advice, address exceptions or rare instances. It is recommended that the advice of qualified historic preservation professionals be obtained early in the planning stage of the project. Such professionals may include architects, architectural historians, historians, historical engineers, archeologists, and others who have experience in working with historic buildings.

Because some discretion is involved in interpreting the guidelines, it is recommended that those who are planning a project work with the Office of Planning and Development Review (OPDR) in designing the project.

Another important reference source for projects in the district is the National Register of Historic Places context statement. The context statement written for the King’s Hill Historic District was used as a primary source of information for developing these design guidelines. The historic context statement not only describes the history and character of the King’s Hill district; it is also referenced by design review staff in OPDR as part of the historic design review process for alterations and new construction. The context statement is appended at the back of this document (see Appendix A).

Design Review in Portland

In Portland, there are special areas and individual buildings that are important to the city’s character. The King’s Hill Historic District has been identified by the Portland City Council and the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission as an important historic resource. To ensure that new development and alterations contribute to the integrity of these areas, the city requires historic design review in the
King’s Hill Historic District. Figure 1 on page 6 illustrates the historic design review process.

Design review provides an opportunity for public evaluation of new construction and exterior changes to buildings and sites. The design review process is used to evaluate architectural composition, compatibility, and the quality of new construction and exterior changes. Building materials, landscaping, and location of parking are also elements considered during design review.

Design review ensures that:

- Special historical, cultural, and architectural features of a site or area are protected and enhanced;
- New development and changes enhance the surrounding area; and
- New development enhances the environment for pedestrians.

Historic design review is an important tool in meeting Portland’s Urban Design Goal, which is part of the Comprehensive Plan. It also may be used to implement goals of community, neighborhood, and area plans. In historic districts, historic design review can help ensure that development is compatible with and enhances the surrounding neighborhood.

How Design Review Works

The review process timeline varies relative to the scale of the proposal. Smaller proposals require minor reviews. They are reviewed initially without a hearing and the process typically takes about two months (Type II procedure). Larger proposals require major reviews. They are reviewed at a public hearing, and the process typically takes three to four months (Type III procedure).

Generally, projects of a lower cost are considered minor, and those of high cost are considered major. The threshold for Type III, major design review, is a dollar value identified in the Portland Zoning Code. The sum of all construction costs, shown on all building permits associated with the project, is used to determine project value and review type.

The Type II procedure is an administrative review process with notice and the opportunity to appeal the decision to a hearings review body. Projects reviewed by a hearings review body in the King’s Hill Historic District will be heard by the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission. The Type III procedure requires a public hearing before the Historic Landmarks Commission. The Commission’s decision may be appealed to the City Council. Projects reviewed through a Type III procedure are required to go through a pre-application conference. Projects reviewed through a Type II procedure may go through a pre-application conference but are not required to do so.

There is a fee for pre-application conferences as well as for the design review procedure. The Type II and Type III procedures are described in the Portland Zoning Code, Chapter 33.846, Historic Reviews.

Planners within the Office of Planning and Development Review (OPDR) and the citizens appointed to the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission conduct the historic design review process. The Landmarks Commission is a volunteer board and includes members with expertise in historic preservation. The members of the commission are nominated by Portland’s mayor and confirmed by the City Council.
Figure 1.

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS

- Projects that require Historic Design Review
  
  - Historic Design Review using the applicable set of design guidelines
  
  - Meets applicable design guidelines
    
  - Building permit process
  
  - Does not meet applicable design guidelines
    
  - Resubmit plans with alterations

- Projects that do not require Historic Design Review
General Considerations for Historic Design Review and Historic Design Guidelines in the King’s Hill Historic District

Design guidelines are mandatory approval criteria that must be met as part of design review. They also inform project designers, developers, and the community as to what issues will be addressed during the design review process. The guidelines state broader concepts than typical development standards in order to provide flexibility to designers, yet they are requirements. Applicants are responsible for explaining, in their application, how their design meets each applicable guideline.

The design review process is flexible; it is intended to encourage designs that are appropriate for their locations. For this reason, design guidelines are qualitative statements. Unlike objective design standards, which must be met in prescribed ways, there are typically many acceptable ways to meet each design guideline. It is not the City's intent to prescribe any specific design solution through the design guidelines.

During the design review process, the review body must find that the proposal meets each of the applicable design guidelines. Proposals that meet all applicable guidelines will be approved; proposals that do not meet all of the applicable guidelines will not be approved. If the review body approves the proposed design, they may add conditions to their approval if necessary to ensure the proposal's compliance with the guidelines. The review body would rather that applicants revise their designs to address deficiencies than have the City impose a solution through conditions. The review body may also address aspects of a project's design that are not explicitly covered in the design guidelines. They may find that such action is necessary to better achieve the goals and objectives for design review as embodied in the design guidelines specific to the district.

In addition to meeting the applicable design guidelines, development projects are subject to the development standards contained in the Portland Zoning Code. The design review or historic design review processes may include the approval of proposed modifications to development standards. The applicant must show that the development proposal meets the modification approval criteria stated in the Portland Zoning Code. Some development standards are not eligible for the modification process. These standards use an adjustment review process and must meet the criteria for an adjustment review.

A design guideline may be waived in the design review process under certain conditions. In some cases, a design guideline may be waived by the design review "decision maker." For example, an applicable guideline may be waived as part of the design review process when the proposed design better relates to the scale and character of its setting or better enhances the character of the district than would a project that complied with the guideline. If a waiver is requested, the applicant(s) must explain, in their application, how the project would enhance its setting or context in a better way than would be possible if each guideline considered for waiver was followed. Allowing waiver of one or more guidelines during the design review process reflects the city's concern that the guidelines not become a rigid set of requirements that stifle innovation.
Areas that overlap with the Central City Plan District must also meet Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines. Some portions of the King's Hill Historic District are located within the Central City Plan District. The map in Appendix C identifies the areas of King's Hill that overlap with the Central City Plan District. In that area, the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines are mandatory approval criteria for design review, augmented by the King's Hill Historic District design guidelines. For example, a proposal in King's Hill that overlaps with the Central City Plan District would have to meet both the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines and design guidelines adopted specifically for King's Hill.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are addressed in design guidelines for the district. To protect the character of King's Hill, exterior rehabilitation should conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards are a nationally recognized set of guidelines for historic buildings and buildings within historic districts. The guidelines in this document do not include the Secretary's Standards but incorporate their intent. The guidelines in this document also incorporate and replace the approval criteria for historic resources found in Section 33.846.140.C of the Portland Zoning Code (see Appendix B). Section 33.846.140.C has represented the approval criteria for historic design review cases since the adoption of the district in 1991.

Properties taking advantage of the Special Assessment Program, a financial incentive administered by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), are subject to review by the SHPO. For those projects, exterior and interior modifications are reviewed by the SHPO using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as criteria.

Changes to public right-of-ways are not ordinarily subject to design review. Maintenance, alterations, and changes in the public right-of-way that are consistent with City standards are allowed without design review.

Portland's Office of Transportation reviews the impact of developments and alterations on traffic, parking, and the public right-of-way. Office of Transportation staff identifies public improvements needed to support development projects and minimize potential negative impacts. Required improvements depend on the scale of the proposal and include, but are not limited to:

- new street construction;
- frontage improvements;
- sidewalks;
- street lights;
- traffic signals;
- signing; and
- pavement markings.

If development proposals seek to vary from the applicable City standards developed by Portland's Office of Transportation, projects in the right-of-way must first be approved by the Portland Office of Transportation and then by the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission. When their review is required, the Landmarks Commission will apply guidelines contained in this document as part of their review. Examples of these kinds of projects might include proposals for non-standard lighting or parking improvements.
Standards and guidelines for trees in the public right-of-way are determined by the Urban Forestry Division of Portland Parks & Recreation. Tree requirements for new development (on-site trees) are described in the Portland Zoning Code, Chapter 33.248. A list of street trees that are appropriate for planting in the district has been developed in consultation with Urban Forestry and the neighborhood. (See Appendix E.)

Mature trees line a street in the King’s Hill Historic District.

KING’S HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Background

The purpose of the design review process and of these guidelines is to ensure that new buildings, exterior alterations, and other improvements recognize and respond to the qualities that characterize the King’s Hill Historic District. Throughout this document, the guidelines make reference to the area’s character and/or require that the project be compatible. A key consideration facing those planning an alteration or development project is the nature of the area’s character-defining features.

As mentioned previously, King’s Hill was locally designated as a historic district then listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1991. Historic context documentation prepared as a basis for the National Register nomination describes the district’s characteristics and qualities and informs the design review process. The characteristics of the area that projects must respond to are incorporated in these guidelines and based on the district’s context statement.

The following background information, derived from the historic context statement of the nomination, highlights important characteristics and features of the King’s Hill Historic District. The context statement should be reviewed by those planning an alteration or development project. (See Appendix A.)
Setting and Boundaries

The King’s Hill Historic District lies to the west of the downtown core of the Central City Plan area of Portland. It is an irregularly shaped, five-block by seven-block area of mixed residential and commercial use located in southwest Portland. Situated on a slope, the district is bounded by W. Burnside Street to the north, SW 24th and SW 20th Avenues to the east, SW Canyon Road and SW Jefferson Street to the south, and Washington Park to the west. To the east is downtown Portland. (See map in Appendix C.)

The historic district boundary is based on historical, visual, and physical factors. Historical factors include early

Building Styles and Urban Character

King’s Hill is one of Portland's oldest residential districts. The district was primarily developed in a 60-year span between 1882 and 1942, the historic development period described in the National Register nomination. The buildings constructed during the historic development period establish the basis of the architectural character of the neighborhood.

The quality of building design and materials used in their construction define the King’s Hill Historic District’s built environment and its urban character. The longevity of these buildings (many are over 100 years old) is a testament to the quality and flexibility of their designs, as well as the durability of their construction. Together, these buildings contribute to the district’s atmosphere of quality and permanence; this tradition of design quality and permanent construction is the legacy of many of Portland’s fine architects and craftsmen.

The King’s Hill Historic District contains both commercial and residential uses. However, the majority of buildings within the district were designed as single- and multi-dwelling residences. Buildings were constructed in numerous styles between the 1880s and 1940s, including Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and Mediterranean styles. Although many different architectural styles and several building types are represented, there is a high degree of
consistency within the district in terms of building height, scale, and massing. (See Appendix A for the Historic Context statement.)

Late 19th and early 20th century residences are the predominant building type in the area. Although most of these are single-dwelling residences, the district is interspersed with numerous apartment structures, ranging from low- and medium-rise structures built during the historic period to modern-era high-rise structures. This wide diversity is in part due to developments that significantly altered the historic character of the district after the historic period (1882-1942). Between 1950 and 1970, several older, single-dwelling residences were demolished and replaced with apartment complexes, which were generally unsympathetic toward the existing historic buildings. These developments increased the urban density in the district, primarily in its center.

The district's urban density reflects a combination of elements and characteristics, both historic and more contemporary. While the district's primary significance is due to its concentration of historic buildings, the district also represents an urban environment with a character that has evolved since the area was first settled over one hundred years ago. This urban character is defined by a combination of elements, including a varied mix of building forms, styles, sizes, and materials. Other influences are the design, placement, and composition of architectural and landscape elements, streets, sidewalks and open spaces, and views of the surrounding environment. In a compact area like King's Hill, it is impossible to view one characteristic or feature of the district without seeing another, since they are likely to be adjacent to each other. Although the buildings that are considered significant and historic are the majority of structures in the district, they coexist alongside more contemporary structures. Thus, the resources in the district must be seen as contextual and interrelated. Exterior alterations and new construction affect not only individual sites but the historic fabric of the King's Hill Historic District as a whole.

Vacant, developable property in the King's Hill Historic District is relatively scarce. Despite the small number of vacant parcels, new construction on infill sites may have an effect on the district’s character in the foreseeable future. Over a longer period of time, it is important to consider the number of parcels that may be redeveloped and apply design standards that address the potential long-term impact on the district of multiple new developments. These guidelines encourage new construction that is compatible with the historic character and architecture of the district, but that does not attempt to mimic or imitate the older buildings.
**Significant People**

The King's Hill Historic District is significant not only for its buildings and landscapes but also for its association with significant persons. The original claim-holders of the area engaged in real estate investment early in the history of the district, selling off parcels of land in the area and amassing wealth from the sales. In the late 1880s, as the area became more accessible with improved transportation access, notable Portland figures moved into the area. Architects were employed to design stately homes in the popular styles of the period. Today, King's Hill retains a significant legacy of buildings constructed for Portland's prominent citizens by the city's leading architects. For more information, see Appendix A.

**Landscape**

The landscape is a strong unifying element within the district. The district is situated on a slope, affording views of Mt. Hood, Mt. Jefferson, and Mt. St. Helens in the distance to the east and northeast. This attribute is reflected in the inclusion of part of the district within a designated View Corridor (see map in Appendix C).

The district's topography also creates opportunities for siting properties on elevated lots. Numerous properties in the district were constructed well above street level and incorporate walls constructed of rock, basalt, and brick, along with concrete steps, paths, and rock gardens. These landscape features add to the ambiance of the area and give the district a strong sense of cohesion.

Mature vegetation characterizes the district's streetscapes, which are defined by historic trees, shrubbery, and formal gardens. High-canopy street trees form a visual border between the sidewalk and the street, as can be found on streets such as SW Park and SW St. Clair Avenues.

Although the King's Hill Historic District has experienced significant change over the past 50 years, many of the district's historic landscape features, such as the conifers along SW Vista Avenue and the street trees along SW Park Place, survive and help to maintain the district's character.
Zoning and Development

There are currently four zoning designations found in King's Hill, ranging from R5, a single-dwelling residential zone, to CX, a commercial zone. The R5 properties are found in the southern half of the district. There is also R1, medium-density residential zoning, in the northwest corner of the district. The relatively few CX-zoned properties are located on the southern border (near SW Canyon Road) or the northern edge (along W. Burnside St.). The balance of the district -- most of the north half and the eastern edge -- is zoned RH, a high-density, multi-dwelling residential zone (see map in Appendix C).

Zoning maps developed by the City of Portland show the King's Hill area had a mix of zones dating back to at least 1938. The earliest maps included low-density ("residential") and high-density ("apartment") zones along with a "business" zone. In 1946, 1950, and 1957, the residential and apartment zones were revised. The 1959 Zoning Code revisions allowed increases in the maximum height and number of stories allowed in the most intensive residential zone. The majority of apartment towers were built in the 1950s and 1960s under zoning requirements that differ from current development standards. During the 1950s and 1960s, variances to development standards were often granted.

There is some correlation between zoning and development patterns in King's Hill. Several distinct areas of the district share broad development characteristics. The north edge of the district is clearly defined by W. Burnside Street and the presence of commercial buildings aligning that street. A sharp rise in elevation defines the northwestern edge of the district, where a distinct area is defined by historic multi-dwelling structures. The eastern edge of the district is defined by a clear change in building type, style, and a drop in elevation. The southern boundary is defined by a sharp drop in elevation, below which is SW Jefferson Street and SW Canyon Road. In general, single-dwelling residences dominate much of the southern half of the district. Multi-dwelling structures are more common towards the center and the north half of the district, where there is a cluster of high-density development. The western edge of the district is defined by a change in land use and building type, age, and style, such as apartment complexes that do not contribute to the historical or architectural character of the district. At the center of the district, a number of high-rise apartments and condominiums form a high-density residential area.

The Fordham Apartments at 742 SW Vista Avenue are located at the northwest edge of the district, which is defined by historic multi-dwelling development.
KING’S HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
GUIDELINES

Framework of the Guidelines

The King’s Hill Historic District Design Guidelines are grouped into three categories: Area Character, Pedestrian Emphasis, and Project Design.

- **Area Character** guidelines recognize the special characteristics of the area and encourage development that respects these characteristics.

- **Pedestrian Emphasis** guidelines address design issues and elements that contribute to visual interest along the streets.

- **Project Design** guidelines address specific site and building characteristics and their relationship to the district’s historic character.

Using the Guidelines

Design guidelines are qualitative statements that address the desired character of development. Their qualitative nature provides flexibility for designers and developers of new projects and to suggest methods and solutions for preserving historic qualities of the King’s Hill Historic District. This flexibility must not be construed as rendering the guidelines merely advisory or otherwise diminish their legal effect as mandatory approval criteria.

Each design guideline has a title, background statement, guideline language, and examples of projects that have successfully met the guideline or exhibit qualities that the guideline addresses. Only the guideline language is adopted by ordinance. The background statement and examples are provided in this document to provide a context for the guideline.

The title is in ALL CAPS and uses an alpha-numeric prefix that relates to the three-section framework described on this page. For example, guideline **A 4 GATEWAYS** is the fourth guideline of the **Area Character** set of guidelines.

The Background statement outlines reasons for the design guideline. The background statement also provides clarification among related or similar guidelines and supports guideline language. The background text is not adopted by ordinance and may be adjusted and/or updated as new design issues arise.
The guideline language is presented in bold type following the word "Guideline." This language is adopted by ordinance and represents the approval criteria against which the design review staff make findings.

Examples are provided to illustrate each guideline. Each example is accompanied by text and a photograph that describe the way the guideline is, or could be, met. The examples should not be considered as the only possible design solutions. They are intended to stimulate new ideas and provide direction for designers and developers. The captions and examples are not adopted by ordinance and may be updated as new proposals are built.

Design Guideline Applicability

Not all proposals must meet all the guidelines. Development proposals vary in size, scale, and complexity. Large proposals, such as new buildings, face different design considerations than smaller proposals, such as exterior alterations or rehabilitation of a building façade. The set of applicable design guidelines is tailored to the size, scale, and complexity of the proposal.

The Design Guideline Applicability Chart on the following page identifies which guidelines apply to types of proposals.
If the project includes parking lot walls and/or fences, or signs and/or awnings, the guidelines identified for those project types must also be met. If the project includes only parking lot walls or fences, and/or signs and/or awnings, only the guidelines identified for those projects must be met.

### Table 1. DESIGN GUIDELINE APPLICABILITY BASED ON PROJECT TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA CHARACTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1 Historic Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2 Architectural Styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3 Historic Material, Features, and Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5 Historic Change to Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN EMPHASIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 1 Stopping and Viewing Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2 Embellish the Different Levels of Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 3 Landscaping of Off-Street Parking Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 1 Exterior Alterations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2 New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 3 Differentiate New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4 Integrate Barrier-Free Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 5 Building Context and Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 6 Site and Landscape Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 7 Elevated Lots, Fences and Retaining Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 8 Exterior Materials and Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 9 Window Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 10 Roof Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 11 Main Entrances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 12 Parking Areas and Garages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4 Gateways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects located near Gateways must also meet this guideline.

[1] If the project includes parking lot walls and/or fences, or signs and/or awnings, the guidelines identified for those project types must also be met.

[2] If the project includes only parking lot walls or fences, and/or signs and/or awnings, only the guidelines identified for those projects must be met.
AREA CHARACTER
A 1 HISTORIC CHARACTER

BACKGROUND

The district's buildings and their settings, including the relationship of buildings to each other, setbacks, walls, driveways, walkways, views, and the landscape, together create the character of the area.

The King’s Hill Historic District is an important city resource acknowledged as such by the Portland City Council and Historic Landmarks Commission. The district contains a concentration of historically significant buildings that were occupied by Portland citizens who shaped and guided the growth of the city over a period of 60 years, between 1882 and 1942. The King’s Hill Historic District is also recognized for its architectural character, containing a large number of significant architect-designed residences and a diverse collection of urban housing forms. The majority of buildings in the district were constructed during the historic development period (1882-1942) and establish the basis of the architectural character of the neighborhood.

The district's historic character is defined by the historic structures that have been classified as "contributing" (see map in Appendix C). The features of these buildings provide an architectural vocabulary that can be referenced in the design of new buildings and building modifications. This will help to insure that new projects are compatible with the historic character of the district.

The landscape is also a significant and historic part of the area's character. The landscape includes formal gardens, mature street trees, and plantings. There is an extensive system of mature street trees and parking strips in the King’s Hill Historic District. Many of the street trees in King’s Hill were planted as part of the original development and have grown to a grand size. Those trees are a valuable historic resource and should be maintained. Historically, the district’s parking strips were landscaped with grass, trees, and shrubs. These features help to unify the newer buildings in the district with the historic buildings and give the district its strong sense of cohesion.
GUIDELINE

Retain and preserve the diverse historic character of the King’s Hill Historic District.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Respecting architectural details of the district’s historic buildings. The porches, large columns, decorative brackets, sash windows, and roof dormers of buildings such as Max Lang Residence on 2188 SW Park Place, shown below, contribute to the district’s character.

These Italianate and Queen Anne style residences on SW Main Street, constructed in the 1880s, are the oldest buildings in the district and contribute to its diverse architectural character.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Rehabilitating buildings with attention to restoring their historic features. Renovations to the Ralph Hoyt Residence at 2188 SW Main Street, shown below, have respected the integrity of the historic building by removing alterations that did not contribute to the character of the building. Additionally, the siding was replaced in kind where it had deteriorated.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Respecting the identity of the district by incorporating site and building design features that reinforce the area’s historic and architectural significance. The Ardmore Condominiums on SW Vista Avenue, shown below, were constructed in the early 1990s. They incorporate height, scale, massing, and siting characteristics of other buildings in the district. The Ardmore development includes a historic building and retains elements of the historic landscape, such as the tree shown below.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King's Hill Historic District by:

D. Protecting significant historic buildings in the district. King's Hill has many distinctive historic buildings, such as the Envoy Apartments at 2336 SW Osage Street, shown below. These notable buildings help to define the historic character of the district.
A 2 ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

BACKGROUND

The King’s Hill Historic District contains significant examples of residential architecture in a variety of architectural styles. The works of locally and nationally known architects are represented in the district. The large number of these buildings sets the district apart from other Portland neighborhoods. Numerous examples of residential building types are represented from the late 19th and early 20th century, including high-style single-dwelling residences, such as the building shown on the right, smaller residences, and multi-family structures.

The north edge of the district is clearly defined by W. Burnside Street and the presence of commercial buildings aligning that street. In general, single-dwelling residences of two and three stories dominate much of the southern half of the district. Multi-dwelling, multi-storied structures are more common towards the center and the north half of the district, where there is a cluster of high-density development. Beyond the eastern edge of the district there is a clear change in building type and style.

Although many different architectural styles are represented within the areas of the district, there is overall consistency within the areas in such characteristics as building height, scale, and massing. These are broad architectural and stylistic qualities that should be considered in all development projects. Additions and exterior alterations that can be seen, entirely or partially, from the street will complement the architectural style of the existing buildings if they recognize these qualities. Additions or modifications to buildings should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and style of the historic resource would be unimpaired.

In all projects it is important to respect the architectural integrity of the buildings, as represented by their original materials and features.

The Historic Context Statement in Appendix A includes a detailed discussion of architectural styles and should be used as reference for exterior modifications to buildings in the King’s Hill Historic District.
GUIDELINE

Maintain the architectural integrity of historic building façades.

Respect the essential forms and styles of the historic buildings in the district.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Maintaining compatibility in exterior alterations or new construction, in particular with respect to the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of surrounding historic structures. This remodeled garage at 1034 SW Douglas Place is compatible with related historic structures in the district, sharing similar design features and materials, including the use of brick and stone.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Respecting the exterior characteristics of historic resources, such as design elements and materials. The Jacobethan style Lewis Residence, shown below, includes character-defining brick, wrought iron, and woodwork details that should be maintained.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Preserving the form and integrity of historic buildings, in particular their character-defining structural and architectural features. In the example shown below, defining features of the Rosenblatt Residence at 2359 SW Park Place include Colonial Revival elements and surface materials.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Rehabilitating buildings with attention to restoring their architectural integrity. The Edward King Residence at 806 SW King Avenue was rehabilitated and its architectural integrity restored in the early 1990s. From left to right, the photographs below show the building before and after rehabilitation.

Before rehabilitation

After rehabilitation
A 3 HISTORIC MATERIALS, FEATURES, AND COLOR

BACKGROUND

Most of the buildings in King’s Hill were constructed during the historic development period (1882-1942). The architectural styles of the King’s Hill neighborhood follow general trends occurring across the nation and in other areas of the city. The large number of "high style," architect-designed buildings, both single- and multi-dwelling, sets this district apart from other Portland neighborhoods. These buildings establish the architectural character of the neighborhood. Their features express an architectural vocabulary that can be used in designing new buildings and building modifications that will be compatible with the historic character of the district.

For example, wood was a predominant building material used for residential architecture in King’s Hill. It was used to produce siding, moldings, and decorative features. Character-defining wood features can be found on the primary facades of most buildings in the King's Hill Historic District. These include historic wood siding, cornices, brackets, window moldings, and main entries. Brick, stone, or narrow wood siding are characteristic exterior features of existing structures in the area.

The distinctiveness of buildings in King's Hill is dependent upon small units of construction, details, ornamentation, and color. Features such as eaves and cornices were historically designed not only with careful workmanship, but with attention to how they functioned in relationship to each other and to the elements. For example, shadow lines cast by eaves and cornices are themselves important design characteristics that should be considered in building projects.

Exterior rehabilitation can unknowingly alter or destroy a building’s distinctive architectural features. When windows, doors, porch posts and decking, siding, and eave details are replaced with materials that are incompatible with the architectural style or time period of construction, the integrity of the historic architecture is diminished. Such losses can compromise the character of the historic resource and diminish the historic integrity of the King's Hill Historic District. When original features have been removed, their restoration is encouraged. The Historic Context statement (see Appendix A) offers detailed descriptions of features and materials characteristic of architectural styles found in the district. To enhance compatibility with the district's historic character, the Historic Context statement should be used as a reference guide for rehabilitation projects.
GUIDELINE

During exterior rehabilitation, protect, maintain, and preserve historic materials, color, and architectural features.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Ensuring that exterior alterations to historic buildings protect and enhance the significant historic features of the resource. The characteristic features of this Colonial Revival residence in King's Hill have been maintained, preserved, and redefined upon completion of porch alterations. Extensions of the rear porch and bay window have been integrated into the building.

This photograph of a window detail on an apartment building in King's Hill provides an example of the materials and craftsmanship found in the district.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Rehabilitating buildings with attention to restoring their original historic features. Replacement features should match those original to the building or building style. The porch of this Queen Anne house in King's Hill was rehabilitated using characteristic design elements, such as siding, railings, and ornamental woodwork details.

C. Rehabilitating buildings with attention to restoring their original historic materials. Replacement materials should match those original to the building or building style. The Edward Boyce Residence at 909 SW St. Clair Avenue was rehabilitated and materials restored at the front entrance, highlighting the building's distinctive Prairie-style features.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Retaining the characteristic appearance of the district's historic masonry, such as the brick façade of the Town Club in King's Hill, shown below. Masonry that has historically been unpainted should remain unpainted to retain its characteristic appearance and to prevent damage to the material.
A 4 GATEWAYS

BACKGROUND

Gateways provide a sense of transition to or from different parts of the city into the King's Hill Historic District. For the most part, gateways are defined by public property. In the district, natural gateway opportunities are created by the area's topography and street grid. The formal design of the landing at the north end of the Vista Avenue Bridge and the change in the street grid at SW Salmon Street and SW King Avenue serve to identify two entrance points to the district. The sense of urban enclosure created by a set of historic multi-story apartment buildings along SW Vista Avenue south of W. Burnside Street and the formal garden at Washington Park’s Lewis and Clark Circle also create gateways into the district. Distinct gateway locations in King’s Hill are identified in the map on the following page and in Appendix C.

Gateway locations also provide adjacent buildings with opportunities for architectural statements that emphasize the local character of the area. The size and placement of traditional building elements such as arches, arcades, columns, fountains, or sculptural art contribute to the development of gateways. Landscape features such as street trees also provide an opportunity to strengthen gateway locations. New development at gateway locations has the potential to influence, enhance, or work in concert with adjacent buildings, streets, and open spaces, to reinforce the district's character. Special consideration of the specific site, gateway, and district qualities in project design is encouraged at gateway locations.
GUIDELINE

Strengthen the transitional role of the neighborhood's gateways.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Delineating entrances to the district at access points. The design of the Vista Avenue Bridge north landing, shown below, incorporates formal seating, planting, and lighting design elements that highlight the entry into the district.

Asterisks on this map show gateway locations identified for the district. The map also is included in Appendix C.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Preserving landscape elements, such as mature trees, that are located at gateway areas. This historic Tulip tree is located at the southwestern boundary of the district on SW Murray Boulevard.

C. Anchoring the corners of a building site located at gateway areas. The Burkhardt Building marks the northwestern entrance to the district with a distinctive vertical element and roof shape, which provide definition and form to the site and gateway location.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Recognizing significant structures as contributing gateway elements. This is a view looking east under the Vista Bridge from the southwest edge of the district. The bridge structure itself creates a formal gateway to the central city and the King’s Hill Historic District.
BACKGROUND

The age requirement for federal historic designations is 50 years. In some eastern cities and states, historically significant buildings and districts have been in place for 100-200 years or more. Changing architectural styles and development patterns in those areas have altered the original state of buildings gradually over time, making it common for major alterations to have acquired historical significance. In more recently developed areas, given a fast-changing development market, buildings may become altered from their original state in a relatively short period of time. Market changes create an incentive for exterior alterations to buildings as well as internal modifications. Development markets accelerate the conversion of cultural and residential structures to commercial structures.

In the King’s Hill Historic District, the oldest structures date back to the last decades of the 19th century. Over the intervening years many single–dwelling structures have been converted to nonresidential uses. These changes may be considered historically significant in the future.

Many historic buildings can be adapted for new uses without seriously damaging their historic character, if the changes are made appropriately.
GUIDELINE

Alterations may take on historical significance over time. Preserve those portions or features of a building that define its historical, cultural, or architectural value.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Using consistency with façade treatments such as porches and windows to unify alterations that have taken place in the past. This modified side entrance in King's Hill provides access for a new use of the building.

The Lewis Residence at 931 SW King Avenue, constructed in 1893 as a single-dwelling residence, has been converted for nonresidential use.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Extending similar sheathing materials and window styles when a building is adaptively reused to unify new building elements with the original structure. This building has been adapted for commercial use. Modifications to the lower porch have been made using siding materials that match the rest of the building.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Maintaining architectural details or adding new design elements in the process of altering the intended use of the original structure. In this example, a new window style was introduced to the rear elevation of the building, providing added light to the interior. The new window links to the existing character by using proportions for the window panes that are similar to those of the historic windows.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Preserving changes that have acquired historic significance over time. The William and Anne MacMaster House, built in 1886, was remodeled by Whidden & Lewis in 1906. The project completely altered the original Italianate style. The building is now a significant example of Colonial Revival architecture.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Allowing for flexibility in modifying a structure to accommodate present as well as future uses. The garage addition to this Craftsman style house has been integrated into the building with unifying elements and design details at the porch and entrance. These elements include columns and railings at the porch and steps and colors that integrate the garage with the floors above.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

F. Preserving the character of the original building. This building in northwest Portland was constructed as a single-dwelling residence. It has served as a residential care facility and most recently was converted to multi-dwelling use. The side façade of the building was modified to accommodate an enlarged entrance, shown below.
PEDESTRIAN EMPHASIS
P 1 STOPPING AND VIEWING PLACES

BACKGROUND

In the King’s Hill Historic District, buildings predominantly orient to the street rather than to the rear yard or interior side yard. Primary entrances, large windows, and porches face the street, often from an elevated vantage point.

The magnificent views afforded by the area’s topography were a contributing factor in the early development of King’s Hill. Many of the residences constructed in King’s Hill were sited on steep terrain and were designed to complement the area’s topography. Retaining walls designed to surround residential buildings on these elevated lots are a defining historic feature of the district that should be retained. Walls should promote rather than conceal visibility from the streetscape.

Protecting and enhancing public views, as well as creating new views, helps to orient pedestrians moving through the King’s Hill Historic District and strengthens the physical and visual connections between these buildings and the adjacent sidewalk. In addition, small-scale views can be developed from the pedestrian environment into the interior public spaces of buildings, such as entry halls in multi-dwelling buildings.

Stopping and viewing places do not necessarily have to take the form of actual benches. They might be integrated as the edges of landscape planters or wide steps. Such public sitting places enhance the pedestrian environment, but they are not a requirement of these guidelines.

However, where potential seating for pedestrians is provided, it will be most successful when it is oriented to the active edge of the building, a nearby public open space, or at the corner. Other design elements such as special landscaping can also enhance stopping and viewing places and add texture to the pedestrian environment.

Views along existing streets are a valuable resource. Projects should determine whether an identified public view or potential view would be impacted. Potential views are generally those that are not especially important now because of vegetation within the right-of-way, but which may become important in the future.
GUIDELINE

Place buildings to provide stopping and viewing places that contribute to the district’s historic character.

EXAMPLES

*This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:*

A. Respecting and accommodating the existing grade treatment on a lot. Elevated lots are a defining characteristic of the King’s Hill Historic District and contribute to the pedestrian environment by providing a visual connection to buildings and landscaping above the sidewalk level.

These residences on SW King Avenue integrate landscaping and other design elements at the sidewalk level.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Incorporating seating opportunities in the design of planters and/or low walls. These elements flanking the main entrance to an apartment building on SW Park Place echo the historic character of the district's masonry retaining walls, continuing a pattern that contributes to the pedestrian environment.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Taking advantage of views to points of interest in the district, such as natural features, gateways, and historic buildings. This apartment building is sited on an elevated lot with views of the city and mountains, but it does not obscure views from the street.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Considering how rooftops will look from above and placing buildings and additions at locations on the site that reduce the impact new development will have on views of existing properties. This view of the King’s Hill Historic District, taken from the Vista Avenue Bridge, illustrates the variety of roof forms and how they are integrated in the neighborhood.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Placing new buildings and making site modifications in a way that reinforces the pattern evident in surrounding buildings. The newer walkway to this building in King's Hill is sited to blend with the sidewalk and promote views from the street.
P 2 EMBELLISH THE DIFFERENT LEVELS OF BUILDINGS

BACKGROUND

The topography of the King’s Hill Historic District is such that a significant portion of buildings can be viewed by the pedestrian. Multiple levels of the building may be visible from public spaces. Developing the different levels of the building with design elements will engage the pedestrian and create visual interest from nearby public areas.

Siting and building orientation should promote the connection between public and private spaces. New views can be created or enhanced through the placement of windows, balconies, or terraces of new buildings. Historically, buildings were embellished at the sidewalk level, as is shown in the example at right. Using rich and textured materials at the sidewalk level, in the landscape, and on the ground floor of buildings are appropriate ways of relating to the development process employed during the historic period of the neighborhood. Elements at higher building elevations that can add to visual interest for the pedestrian include, but are not limited to, belt-courses, cornice lines, and roof forms. In contrast, blank walls tend to dehumanize the pedestrian experience and detract from the identity of the district.

The distinctiveness of buildings in King’s Hill depends upon small units of construction, details, and ornamentation. Design elements should be chosen with an understanding of how they contribute to the established character of the historic district.
GUIDELINE

Embellish the different levels of a building that are visible from the streets or public open spaces.

Enhance the pedestrian network by forming visual connections from buildings to adjacent streets.

Incorporate building equipment, mechanical exhaust systems, and/or service areas in a manner that does not detract from the pedestrian environment.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Differentiating between the building façade at the sidewalk level and the floors above. The use of different construction materials at the sidewalk level and the development of balconies on the upper levels of these apartment buildings on SW Vista distinguishes one level from another and provides pedestrians with variety as they view the building and streetscape.

The corner of the L. A. Lewis Residence at 2164 SW Park Avenue forms a connection to the pedestrian network.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Incorporating design details that add visual interest to the primary, street-facing façade. The brick work, wrought iron details, and shrubbery give the Town Club entrance, shown below, a rich texture.

\[\text{Image of the Town Club entrance}\]

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Locating HVAC/service areas at the rear or side of buildings or design a screened area for them. Install mechanical and service equipment on the roof, such as air conditioning, transformers, or solar collectors, so that they are inconspicuous from the street. This property in northwest Portland placed its ventilation unit at the rear of the building.

\[\text{Image of the ventilation unit at the rear of the building}\]
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Respecting the steep topography of the district and the connections between public and private spaces. This property, sited on an elevated lot, provides a line of sight from the right-of-way to the main entrance, while at the same time maintaining privacy.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Orienting residential development to the sidewalk. These townhomes on SW Madison Street have developed good connections to the sidewalk by creating outdoor transition areas, placing large windows to face the street, and developing a vertical change in grade so that the houses' living space is above the sidewalk.
P 3  LANDSCAPING OF OFF-STREET PARKING LOTS

BACKGROUND

Surface parking lots were not part of the district’s original fabric. Their introduction has often diluted and disrupted the district’s character. The King’s Hill Historic District’s character is urban and built up. When surface parking is included in the district, an effort to enhance the sense of urban enclosure along the street should be made. Site details can be designed to reflect the district’s historic character. Shrubbery, retaining walls, and street trees can be used effectively in the development or redevelopment of surface parking lots. These features will screen and soften the impact of automobile areas.

These guidelines are intended to supplement existing Zoning Code requirements for parking lots. In King's Hill, new or redeveloped parking lots should be treated with sensitivity so that they will blend with existing development. This may include incorporating landscaping, fencing details, retaining walls, or other details and materials characteristic of the district. This should be done in a manner that integrates the lot edge into the composition of the site, as well as into the district as a whole.
GUIDELINE

Incorporate landscaping as an integral element of design in and around surface parking lots.

Use landscaping to enhance the site and unify it with adjacent sites. Define surface lots by creating clear edges.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Using landscape materials that provide shape, soften edges, create screens, and add life and color to the environment. This parking lot on SW Salmon Street incorporates elements that contribute to the environment, including a low rock wall, wrought iron fence, lighting, and trees and shrubs.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Providing a sense of edge along the street with a compatible fence or low masonry wall located near the sidewalk. This parking lot at Bishop Morris Place in northwest Portland is by the sidewalk and defines the sidewalk edge with a design that incorporates landscaping, masonry, and woodwork elements.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. When possible, integrating landscaping as a visual screen between pedestrian paths and automobile headlights in parking areas. This parking lot, part of the Wilcox Residence on SW King Avenue, includes a hedge as screening between the sidewalk and parking area.
PROJECT DESIGN
**D 1 EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS**

**BACKGROUND**

New or recent development in the King's Hill Historic District has often involved the rehabilitation and/or remodeling of existing structures, as well as construction of building additions. Development proposals involving buildings in historic districts require design sensitivity. During the design phases of a rehabilitation or remodel proposal, it is important to recognize and respect the architectural integrity of existing buildings.

As defined in the Zoning Code, exterior alterations can include changes to the façade of a building, additions to a building, and changes to landscaping and other structures on the site.

Exterior alteration of an existing building should respect and be compatible with the existing building's form and pattern. The alteration should also meet or improve the building's overall standard of quality. Rehabilitation work should not destroy distinguishing qualities of the original structure. Distinctive features created by skilled craftsmanship, which often predate mass-produced building materials, should be treated with sensitivity and, where neglected or obscured by previous work, be redefined.

Designing compatible additions to existing structures preserves the integrity of the structure and enriches the overall character of the district. Building additions that include distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship, both characteristic of older structures, strengthen relationships with the district's historic character. Additions to historic buildings will generally be compatible when they respect the older building's use of massing, scale, proportion, and materials.

Developing building additions that are compatible with the architecture of the original structure enriches the building's overall character. Additional stories may be acceptable if the added height complies with the height and density maximums in the Zoning Code, does not exceed that which was traditional for the style of building, and does not alter the traditional scale and proportions of the building's style. A frequent means of achieving this aim is to set the addition back from the street facade planes, so that the addition is less visible from the street. Horizontal additions may be acceptable when the traditional scale and proportion of the building style is maintained.
GUIDELINE
Exterior alterations should complement the resource’s massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Incorporating additions that echo the original building’s design. The Percy Bythe Residence at 2176 SW Main Street, shown below, incorporates an addition on the east façade that integrates with the original building's volume and design features, including windows and surface materials. The size, shape, and design features of the two-story addition blend successfully with the historic building.

These garages in northwest Portland have been modified to accommodate current use. The garages are compatible with the historic residences in size and scale and echo their distinctive architectural features.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Rehabilitating buildings with attention to restoration of historic features. Restoring the dormers on the Edward King Residence at 806 SW King Avenue, shown below, included surface repairs, weatherproofing, and painting to prevent physical deterioration.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Preserving the character of the original building. This residence on SW Madison Street incorporates an addition while preserving the features of the original building, including the roofline and building shape, that are significant in defining its architectural character.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Respecting the architecture of the existing building. On the right is an image of the Stratton Cornelius Residence at 2182 SW Yamhill Street after rehabilitation was completed. Work on the building included extensive rehabilitation of the façade. The image on the left shows the Stratton Cornelius Residence prior to renovation in the early 1990s.
D 2 NEW CONSTRUCTION

BACKGROUND

The term "new construction" is used here to include new development and exterior alterations as defined in the Zoning Code. This includes projects such as:

- New development on vacant sites;
- New buildings and structures on non-vacant sites (such as the addition of a garage); and
- Modifications to existing buildings and structures (such as changes to the façade of a building).

In a historic district, a fundamental consideration in the design of a new building or new construction in a historic district is to complement the local context of the surrounding buildings that contribute to the district’s character. The King’s Hill Historic District is made up of a diverse set of buildings characterized by the architecture of different periods of development. Buildings in the King's Hill Historic District exhibit design themes and/or details that, taken together, form a "design vocabulary." The design vocabulary of historic contributing structures in the existing context offers developers and established patterns to build upon. (See Appendix A.) These patterns include building proportion, scale, rhythm, and construction materials, as well as smaller-scale elements, such as window and/or door styles, color, and roof shape.

Many buildings in the area have balconies, bay windows, and porches. Designers can complement the historic district environment by using these and other features from the design vocabulary of the King's Hill Historic District. However, the design of a new building should not mimic or imitate existing buildings. Contemporary design for new buildings is appropriate when the design is compatible with the scale, color, material, and character of the district, in particular the buildings in the immediate surroundings of the proposal. A new building's design and how it incorporates into the existing context should be evaluated in terms of the building's proportion, scale, and the orientation of nearby buildings.

Designers and developers who propose significantly different building styles and/or materials must show that the new design builds on and complements the historic district’s character, without dominating or retreating from it. In general, the exterior materials, features, and construction techniques in new construction should reinforce the surrounding historic character. Where changes in scale and form are proposed, design features such as wall texture, materials, color, window proportions, and façade articulation should be applied to connect with the characteristics of the surrounding buildings.

Heights compatible with surrounding structures are encouraged. Similarly, setbacks should be compatible with adjacent and surrounding structures. In general, new buildings should relate most closely to adjacent and surrounding structures, in particular historic contributing structures. In doing so they will complement the local context of historic buildings and the district as a whole.

Landscaping for new construction should include plantings fronting the street, including street trees where appropriate. Street trees need not be one particular species, but should be compatible with the other vegetation on the street and be of a species approved for the district. A list of street trees that may be appropriate for the district is provided in Appendix E. The list is based on the historic context statement written for the King’s Hill Historic District.
GUIDELINE

Use siting, mass, scale, proportion, color, and material to achieve a coherent composition that adds to or builds on the characteristics of historic buildings in the immediate vicinity and the character of the King’s Hill Historic District as a whole.

The Holtz Residence at 2370 SW Park Place, shown above, incorporates modifications that include gateway, lighting, and landscape treatments that contribute to the character of the property.
EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Respecting the size and scale of historic development. Generally, the district’s historic buildings are between two and six stories tall. These structures on SW Vista Avenue illustrate the characteristic variations in height of multi-dwelling structures.

B. Using a setback that respects the existing setbacks along the block. These residences on SW Park Place share a similar setback, along with uniform massing and scale characteristics. In combination, these elements contribute to the uniform appearance that is characteristic for that block.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Using a related system of exterior building materials that effectively integrates different building volumes. This example from a development project in King’s Hill illustrates how exterior cladding materials, windows, and design elements are used to integrate parts of a new building at different levels.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Incorporating design features from surrounding buildings or features common to a related set of buildings in the district. The Ardmore Condominiums at 1107-1109 SW Vista Avenue echo design elements found on Colonial Revival style buildings in the district, including roof, window, and main entrance treatments.
D 3 DIFFERENTIATE NEW CONSTRUCTION

BACKGROUND

This guideline encourages new construction that is compatible with the King’s Hill district's historical character and the architecture of the district, but which does not attempt to mimic or imitate older buildings.

The historic resources found throughout the King’s Hill district are a record of their time. When new construction is differentiated through the use of contemporary design elements it should also reflect historic site characteristics such as mass, size, scale, setback, material, color, and proportion.

Additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed in the process.

Contemporary development should be clearly differentiated so that the addition does not appear have been built with the original building or imitate the historic resource. New construction and additions to existing structures will be most successful when they both contrast with and complement the local context of existing buildings.
GUIDELINE

For development including new buildings and building additions, differentiate new construction from the historic structures while respecting primary site characteristics such as mass, size, scale, and setback.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Constructing new development that reflects the historic site design patterns of the district but is identifiably new. This development on SW Madison Street is a contemporary design with design and composition elements that respond to the district's past, including entrances, balconies, windows, and landscaping, and their relationship to the street.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Designing and installing replacement features on a historic building when the original features are missing. Replacements may be of a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building. In this example, new porch railings are being installed at an Irvington residence in keeping with the architectural character of the building.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Distinguishing between old and new portions of the development while maintaining a similar scale, proportion, and quality of construction. The newer three-story addition to the MacKenzie House (William Temple House) in northwest Portland, shown below at left, is stylistically distinct from the historic building but is compatible in scale and proportion.
D 4 INTEGRATE BARRIER-FREE DESIGN

BACKGROUND

Many exterior alterations and new construction projects must meet accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. It is often necessary to make modifications to a historic building to bring it into compliance with current accessibility code requirements.

Projects should be carefully planned and undertaken so that the addition of accessibility design elements do not result in the loss of character-defining spaces, features, and finishes. The goal is to provide the highest level of access with the lowest level of impact. Well-integrated, barrier-free design is best accomplished when it is addressed in the early stages of the design process. Advance planning ensures that the different elements that improve movement, such as ramps, are well integrated into a project's overall design concept.

Rehabilitation or adaptive reuse projects present unique challenges to designers and provide opportunities to distinguish the new interventions while maintaining the integrity of the original structure. Maintaining the primacy of the main entry is particularly important. The design interventions should address the need for access by all with the preservation of the building's historic materials and features. This challenge promotes creative solutions that respect the goals of preserving significant properties within the King's Hill Historic District.
GUIDELINE

Retrofit buildings or sites to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities using design solutions that preserve the architectural integrity of the historic resource. Such retrofits should utilize proportion and materials compatible with the historic building.

Design exterior alterations and new construction to minimize material loss and visual change to a historic building while ensuring equal access, to the extent practicable.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Making access modifications that provide independent, safe access and preserve defining architectural features. Bishop Morris Place at 2420 NW Marshall Street, shown below, includes an extended covered porch that combines accessibility features with design features in a coherent composition.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Respecting the primacy of the main entry by incorporating modifications that do not alter the characteristic features of the main façade or entry. The entrance of the Durham-Jacobs Residence at 2138 SW Salmon Street, shown below, includes a staircase to the second level, a safety modification that illustrates how entrances can be retrofitted without compromising their character.

C. Incorporating accessibility into building renovations or adaptive reuse projects. This ramp is part of a remodel of the entrance to a multi-dwelling structure in southwest Portland. The ramp has been successfully integrated into the overall design of the building's primary façade.
D 5 BUILDING CONTEXT AND COMPOSITION

BACKGROUND

The design of projects must complement the local context of existing buildings. The King’s Hill Historic District is made up of a diverse set of buildings characterized by the architecture of different periods of development. The historic buildings from these periods together with successful new development will contribute to the historic context of the district.

Within the district there are areas that share similar architectural characteristics. These areas often exhibit a common expression of design themes and/or details that distinguish the architecture from that found in other parts of the district. For example, areas of multi-dwelling residences, such as the buildings shown in the photo at right, share characteristics that are not found in areas of single-dwelling structures. Taken together, these characteristics form a "design vocabulary." In general, new buildings should relate most closely to the adjacent structures.

The design vocabulary of existing contextual buildings offers developers and designers a set of design characteristics to build upon. These characteristics include building proportion, scale, rhythm, and construction materials, as well as smaller-scale elements, such as window and/or door styles, color, and roof shape.

The scale and proportion of altered or added building elements and the relationship of voids to solids (for example, the relationship of doors and windows to walls and column elements) should be visually compatible with the traditional architectural character of the historic district. Blank walls on street elevations, especially on ground floors, unless there is a historically significant precedent for the blank wall, are discouraged.
GUIDELINE

In new construction, complement the characteristics of the site and architectural features of contextual buildings by borrowing from, and building on, the design vocabulary of the district’s historic buildings.

When adding to or altering the exterior of existing development, respect the character of the original structure as well as adjacent structures.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Integrating new construction with the existing fabric. The garage at 1034 SW Douglas Place, shown below, uses proportions, shapes, styles, and materials to complement the existing building on the site.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Orienting the principal building entrance to the sidewalk. The Ardmore Condominiums connect with the public right-of-way by steps and a walkway to the sidewalk.

D. Articulating the façade of new construction projects to add scale and modulation that are representative of neighborhood structures and create visual interest. New balconies and porches, for example, should reflect the scale of their historic counterparts in the neighborhood. This porch incorporates characteristic design elements of the Craftsman style and neighborhood porches, such as columns, railings, and woodwork details.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Designing exterior additions to historic buildings -- or adjacent new construction -- that will be compatible with the historic character of the site and will preserve the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape. The design of this garage addition in southeast Portland recognizes and builds on the proportion, scale, materials and orientation of the original building.

▼
D 6 SITE AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS

BACKGROUND

The building site, including its associated features, contributes to the overall character of a property. Site features include lawns, shrubbery, walks, fences, walls, terraces, topography, furnishings, and lighting. Successful project design incorporates these features to reinforce site and building design and add human scale to the outdoor environment.

Buildings should be sited and oriented to respect established patterns and to create a strong, concentrated urban environment throughout the district. The siting of new development and major additions should reinforce the development pattern of the district and add to its cohesive identity. The relationship of a new building to the street and to open spaces between buildings should be visually and environmentally compatible with adjacent buildings or similar building types.

Landscape features are a strong unifying element within the district. The district's streetscapes are characterized by large trees, elevated lots, mature plantings, and formal gardens. Exotic plantings, bedding plants, rock gardens, terracing, trellises, and clipped hedges were common landscape features in King's Hill during its early development period. Commonly planted shrubs in the district included azaleas, rhododendrons, laurel, and boxwoods. Complementing the vegetation and siting characteristics, masonry retaining walls, concrete steps and paths have been incorporated on properties throughout the district and add to the ambience of the area.

Along the streets, large street trees, like maples and horse chestnuts, were planted to provide shade. These features continue to define the area's landscape.

Planting design and plant materials enhance the environment for district residents and visitors and help integrate the district. When evaluating project designs in dense urban areas such as King's Hill, it is important to consider landscaping as an integral element of the project's design. To maintain pedestrian interest, natural and historic landscaping techniques should be used. Defining landscape characteristics, such as retaining walls, driveways, paths, terraces, lawns, trees and shrubbery, and topography and grading, should be compatible with existing features in the district and can be used to soften the impact of new construction.

Historic plantings, street trees, and retaining walls that respond to the district's past should be considered in remodeling projects and new development. Landscaping for new construction should include plantings fronting the street, including street trees where appropriate. (See Appendix E for a list of street trees that may be used.) Existing trees should be retained wherever practicable.
GUIDELINE

Site new construction to respect and complement historic development patterns in the King's Hill Historic District.

Incorporate landscaping as a design element that integrates with the built and natural environment.

When incorporating lighting, integrate it with mature plantings, landscaping, parking areas, and special district features.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King's Hill Historic District by:

A. Orienting the footprint of the building to maximize the visual and physical interaction between the public and private spheres. The residence at 2153 SW Main Street, shown below, occupies a corner lot, engaging the pedestrian from multiple vantage points.

This formal garden in the King's Hill Historic District incorporates masonry walls, trees, shrubbery, and water in a unified design.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King's Hill Historic District by:

B. Echoing the siting characteristics of the district's historic apartment buildings as models for new multi-dwelling buildings. This apartment building, constructed close to the sidewalk, respects the historic setback pattern of multi-dwelling structures, reflecting the historic development patterns of the district.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King's Hill Historic District by:

C. For new construction, incorporating plantings facing the street, including street trees. This development on SW Madison Street includes street trees.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Using landscape design elements that are common to the area’s design vocabulary. On this site, the landscape design was updated with trees, shrubbery, and ornamental plantings.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Incorporating an integrated lighting system into the project design. The entrance to a multi-dwelling structure in King's Hill, shown below, includes lighting at the pedestrian level that complements the building and site design.
**D 7 ELEVATED LOTS, FENCES, AND RETAINING WALLS**

**BACKGROUND**

Site features in the King's Hill Historic District historically have included landforms such as terracing and grading that accommodate the area's topography. Many of the district's residential lots are terraced above the street level.

The King's Hill Historic District Historic Context Statement (see Appendix A) identifies elevated lots and their related design treatments as a character-giving element. Architects, developers, and property owners throughout the district have used a variety of site design techniques to highlight and manage elevated lots. One of the most common treatments is to construct retaining walls. The earliest walls were constructed with basalt or brick. More recently, they have been constructed of concrete. The retaining walls have historically been used to divide the public and private realms. They typically have a low profile so as not to obstruct views of the yards around buildings. Private open space and front yards that abut the streets are important to the overall character of the district.

The grade changes in the district are dramatic and, depending on location, access is gained through the development of terraced walkways or shallow steps. Strategic siting of terraced walkways creates a sight line onto the property and enhances the character of the development.
GUIDELINE

Use changing grades and site elevation as design elements.

Site new buildings and make site modifications in a way that reinforces the existing pattern present in surrounding historic buildings and the topography.

Maintain existing garden walls at or near the property line. Replace retaining walls where they previously existed.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Maintaining site lines from the right-of-way to the front façade of the structure, especially the main entry. The main entry of this residence at 1150 SW King Avenue is clearly visible from a street.

The rear elevation of the Sichel Residence at 2343 SW Park Place shows the lot elevation and garden walls.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Respecting the topography of the area. This flight of concrete steps on SW 20th Avenue follows the steep contours of the land to connect with the residence above.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Maintaining the tradition of siting on elevated lots that engage the street. This is often accomplished through terraced landscaping and shallow steps used to access the residences, as in the example shown below, on 1135 SW Vista Avenue.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Promoting visibility from the streetscape by using low fences and garden walls, as in this example showing the edges of properties on SW Park Place.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Continuing the pattern of retaining walls in the development or redevelopment of buildings on elevated lots. This example of a historic retaining wall promotes visibility of the Theodore Wilcox residence and site from SW King Avenue.
D 8 EXTERIOR MATERIALS AND FEATURES

BACKGROUND

The built environment in the King’s Hill Historic District is defined by high-quality building design, materials, and construction techniques. Together, the district’s buildings contribute to an atmosphere of quality and permanence. Building designs and projects that successfully incorporate quality building materials and specify quality construction techniques should be emphasized in the district to complement the context of existing buildings.

Throughout the King’s Hill Historic District, buildings have been constructed with materials expressive of specific architectural styles from different time periods. For example, Colonial Revival buildings dating from the 1890s and early 1900s are finished with narrow weatherboard siding, while stucco was used as a finish material on Mediterranean style buildings dating from the 1920s. Across all architectural styles, the distinctiveness of buildings in King’s Hill is also dependent upon small units of construction, details, and ornamentation. Such features may include roofline and eave configurations, window construction details, and ornamental woodwork elements.

The scale and type of materials for new and rehabilitated structures should relate to the scale and type of materials used in structures of a similar architectural style. Materials should be chosen not only with an understanding of how they fit into the historic district, but also for their quality, permanence, and ability to weather gracefultly over time.

Remodeling projects should respect the building’s original architectural materials and details. New construction should replicate some of the materials and construction details of the historic buildings in the district. Foundations, exterior siding, windows, doors, and architectural details that are consistent with existing structures in the district will enhance the character of the area.
GUIDELINE

Retain or restore original exterior finishing materials.

Use materials and design features that promote permanence, quality, and visual interest.

Use materials and design features that are consistent with the building's style and with the existing vocabulary of the historic district.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Preserving the built materials that reflect the historic qualities of buildings and the skilled craftsmanship and high quality design characteristic of the early part of the 20th century. The columns and woodwork on this Colonial Revival building reflect the skilled craftsmanship seen in many King's Hill residences.

The features on a gable at 806 SW King Avenue were restored with appropriate materials and methods.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Articulating building facades to create visual interest through the use of exterior materials. The exterior of the Glen Eagles Apartment at 912 SW Vista Avenue, shown below, includes brick, wood, stucco, metal, and glass materials that create a high level of textural detail.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Retaining and preserving character-defining façade elements, such as vertical lines of columns and the horizontal banding of cornices. The primary facade of the Lowenson Residence on 2220 SW Main Street, shown below, retains strongly articulated features that define the building’s appearance.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Designing remodels or renovations to incorporate quality construction materials. This curved window bay on the rear elevation of the Judge Wallace McCamant Residence at 1046 SW King Avenue incorporates materials that reflect the Colonial Revival style, including multiple panes and woodwork details.

![Image of Judge Wallace McCamant Residence]

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Using cleaning processes and repair methods that are not destructive to surface materials. Some materials, such as masonry, are susceptible to damage by improper maintenance or repair techniques and by abrasive cleaning methods. The example below shows a chimney restoration project in King’s Hill that is using appropriate repair techniques, including restoration of the brick and mortar materials.

![Image of chimney restoration project]
D 9  WINDOW FEATURES

BACKGROUND

As one of the few parts of a development that serves as both an interior and exterior feature, windows are always an important part of the character of a building. Windows also comprise a considerable amount of the historic fabric of the wall and deserve special consideration. Windows not only provide for ventilation in the historic house; functional and decorative features of windows are important in defining the building's overall historic character. These features can include window design and arrangement, along with components such as frames, sash, and glazing. Other defining features that affect a building's historic appearance are shutters and storm windows. These features should be installed with sensitivity to the appearance of historic window openings, window design details, and the building's style.

Protecting and maintaining historic windows is essential to their long-term viability. Appropriate surface treatments and weatherproofing may avoid the need to replace windows. If historic windows are unrepairable, replacement windows should be compatible with original windows in form, materials, type, pattern, and placement of openings. Where a modification or addition is proposed for a historic building, new window openings will be most compatible when placed on rear or other non-character defining elevations, particularly if the windows are a contemporary style. The design should be compatible with the overall design of the building but need not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

Windows should be trimmed with wood, following the proportions and detailing that exists, or that is correct for the style of architecture. Storm windows that are historically correct for old houses are those that are made of wood. Other available options include interior storm windows and double-hung aluminum storm windows in colors that are compatible with historic architecture. Historically appropriate shutters are encouraged for buildings in the district.

On large buildings, such as multi-dwelling structures, windows framed with aluminum or other modern materials may be a suitable replacement for historic wooden sash provided wooden replacements are not practical, and the design detail of the historic windows can be matched. Historic color duplication, matching of the historic reveal, and duplication of the frame width, depth, and existing decorative details such as arched tops should all be components in modern replacements for windows used on historic buildings.
GUIDELINE

Retain and preserve window features that are important in defining the building’s historic character.

Replace, in kind, extensively deteriorated or missing parts of the window casement when surviving prototypes exist.

When in-kind replacement is not practical, replace with elements that recreate the window’s historic character.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Using windows and exterior finish materials that are compatible with those used on historic structures in the district. The Arnold Neate Residence at 2390 SW Madison Street, shown below, exhibits a variety of historic window styles.

The Walter S. Dole Residence at 1151 SW King Avenue presents a distinctive window design to the street.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Using a compatible substitute material that replicates historic components and design details, where replacement of wooden windows is not feasible. This may be particularly appropriate for multi-story buildings. The Cedar Hill Apartments at 839 SW Green Avenue, shown below, has character-defining windows that would require care in replacing.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Place windows of a building addition or modification on rear or other non-character-defining elevations. New windows or exterior storm windows may significantly affect a building’s appearance and must be compatible with the historic character of the building. The storm window shown below is an example of a compatible modification that could be placed on a character-defining elevation. The storm window is set into the frame and retains the appearance of the historic window profile.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Repairing and restoring windows, including divided lights, if applicable. Window frames and other woodwork elements on the windows of this building in the Irvington neighborhood are being restored as part of the renovation project.
D 10  ROOF FEATURES

BACKGROUND

The roof -- including its shape, features, and materials -- is an important design element of historic buildings. In addition, a weathertight roof is essential to the long-term preservation of the entire structure. Historic roofing reflects the availability of materials, levels of construction technology, weather, and cost.

Historically, the district’s rooflines have been embellished with detailed eaves, projecting cornices, bold parapets, and other sculptural elements. In the King’s Hill Historic District, these elements, along with the variety of roof shapes, make dramatic statements about the convergence of sky and building. Design elements at the rooftop enhance views from the street to the roof-sky transition. It is important that these views be considered when adding rooftop mechanical equipment and skylights on rooftops. These elements are effectively sited when they are set back from the primary façade and/or screened from view. Important architectural features of the original building related to rooftops and rooflines should be retained and preserved in the process of an exterior alteration. Replacement should match historic roof elements in their material, design, color, and texture.

Predominant roof forms along a street or in an area should be reinforced in designing a new structure.
GUIDELINE

Design roof features to be compatible with the detailing, scale, and pitch of historic roofs, consistent with the respective building's style.

Retain and preserve roof features that are important in defining the building’s historic character. Replace, in-kind, extensively deteriorated or missing parts of the roof and/or roof line when surviving prototypes exist.

When in-kind replacement is not practical, replace with elements that recreate the roof's historic character.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Respecting historic roof shapes and rooffline detailing. The roof shapes of a new structure should be considered in relation to existing roof shapes, with particular consideration to predominant roof forms in the immediate area. This new house in northwest Portland has a roof shape similar to roofs on Tudor and English Cottage style residences in the surrounding neighborhood.

Similar pitch in a series of buildings fosters a sense of unity and becomes a character-giving element of the street.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Repairing a roof by reinforcing the roof’s historic materials. Alternatively, an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair may be replaced. If the overall form and detailing are still evident, use the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the feature. These complex elements at the roof line of the Dougherty Residence at 1115 SW King Avenue, shown below, were rehabilitated with historically appropriate materials.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Designing additions to roofs so that they are inconspicuous from the streets and do not damage or obscure character-defining features. These additions may include residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights. The new skylights on this residence in King’s Hill are located inconspicuously.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Developing integrated rooflines and cornices. Many historic buildings in King's Hill, such as the Lewis Residence, shown below, have intricate rooflines or cornices that create shadows or silhouettes and provide visual interest.
D 11 MAIN ENTRANCES

BACKGROUND

Main entrances are often the focus of historic buildings. Together with their functional and decorative features such as doors, steps, columns, balustrades, and associated porches, they can be extremely important in defining the overall character of a building.

The front porch is a characteristic feature of entrances in many styles of historic architecture. Porches serve as the transition from the street to the interior of the house. Columns define the character and style of detailing of the porch, accented by trim details at the top and base of the columns appropriate to the style of architecture. Railings also define the porch space and make it an effective outside room.

In the King's Hill Historic District, entrances are important components of the buildings' design. For example, entrances on Colonial Revival houses, with their Classical style columns and pediments, echo the architectural elements and features of the larger building. Entrances to multi-dwelling structures in the King's Hill Historic District also have defining characteristics, including ornate design motifs.

Retaining and preserving entrances, along with their functional and decorative features, is important to the overall historic character of the building. Restorations may be based on historical or physical documentation, or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Entrances to new buildings and significant exterior modifications should continue the district's historic focus on distinct, easily identified, and grandly designed transitions.
GUIDELINE

Main entrances, including doors, porches, and balconies, should be prominent features, compatible with the detailing, style, and quality of historic main entrance features of nearby buildings.

Retain and preserve main entrance features that are important in defining the building’s historic character.

Replace, in kind, extensively deteriorated or missing parts of the main entrance when surviving prototypes exist. When in-kind replacement is not practical, replace with elements that recreate the historic character of the main entrance.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Replacing deteriorated or missing parts or features where there are surviving prototypes, such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, and stairs. The entrance to Charmain Manor at 815 SW Vista Avenue, shown below, offers an example of how entrances define the character of multi-dwelling residences in King’s Hill.

The entrance to the Fishburn Apartments on SW Green Avenue is a focus of the building. It has distinct design details and provides a clearly articulated transition from the street.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. The porch on this residence in the Irvington neighborhood was rehabilitated by replacing the wood balusters and railings and restoring the columns.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building. The porch on the Levi Hexter Residence at 2326 SW Park Place, shown below, illustrates some of the features that may require careful restoration on a historic porch, such as woodwork details.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

D. Designing enclosures for historic porches to provide for a new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building. This Colonial Revival residence includes a porch at the upper story that has been fully enclosed and converted for office use.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

E. Designing and installing additional entrances or porches to provide access for a new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings. Such alteration should be limited to non-character-defining elevations. This redefined street entrance and enclosed porch integrate successfully with the main building and add visual interest.
D 12 PARKING AREAS AND GARAGES

BACKGROUND

As automobiles became increasingly available in the early decades of the twentieth century, existing and newly platted residential sites were modified to accommodate the automobile. Historic districts such as King’s Hill reflect the evolution of the placement of the house, the garage, and parking areas on residential sites. Many sites in King’s Hill predate the automobile or were developed to accommodate early automobile types. On some steeply sloped lots, garages were built up to the front property line.

This "historic parking" is an important part of the district's character. The placement of new parking on historic sites should be sensitive to the character of the site. The photograph at right shows historic parking garages that have been remodeled successfully.

New parking for projects should be designed so that it is unobtrusive and to minimize the effect on the historic character of the setting. "Shared" parking can be planned so that several structures can utilize one parking facility rather than introducing multiple lots.

Surface parking lots are inconsistent with the objective of preserving and reinforcing historically significant landscape features. They are discouraged. Where surface lots are created, they should not be placed between a building's character-defining elevations and a street.
GUIDELINE

Design surface parking to be consistent with the design of the building it serves.

Modify historic parking structures to be compatible with the accompanying building by retaining their defining architectural characteristics.

Where possible, share parking areas to reduce disruption of the historic sidewalk landscape pattern.

EXAMPLES

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

A. Integrating new garages with the architecture of the accompanying residence, making them inconspicuous in size and appearance. This garage modification in northwest Portland incorporates a fenced deck and landscape elements that complement the residence.

The garage for the MacMaster House at 1041 SW Vista Avenue retains many of the attributes of historic garages in the district, including height and materials. Located at the side of the building, it does not diminish the visual prominence of the main entrance.
This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

B. Visually integrating off-street parking into the site design of each lot through landscaping and screening. This parking lot across from the Town Club on SW Salmon Street employs rock walls, wrought iron fences, and landscaping features to create interesting edges.

This guideline may be accomplished in the King’s Hill Historic District by:

C. Placing off-street parking to not diminish the visual prominence of the front walkway or entry to the main structure. This parking location on SW Cedar Street is designed to highlight the approach to the main entrance and screen the cars from the street.
APPENDIX A

National Register of Historic Places Nomination, Description and Context Statement

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

The following text is excerpted from Section 7 of the National Register nomination for the King’s Hill Historic District.

Physical Description
The King’s Hill Historic District is an irregularly shaped area of mixed residential and commercial use, located in southwest Portland, bounded by W. Burnside Street to the north, S.W. 21st and S.W. 20th to the east, S.W. Canyon Road and S.W. Jefferson Street to the south and Washington Park to the west. The district, encompassing 43 acres, is located in Township 1N, Range 1E, southwest quarter of Section 33, in Multnomah County, Oregon. A majority of buildings within the district are residential in design; both single family and multifamily. Recently some of the larger residences have been converted to commercial use; however, the neighborhood retains its affluent residential character. Notable Portland architects designed many of the buildings within the district. The historic landscape features contribute to the ambiance of the district. There are 133 buildings within the district and six vacant properties. There are 20 contributing structures (garages, etc.) and two noncontributing buildings within the district. Buildings within the historic period date from 1882 to 1942. There are 64 buildings dating from the primary period of significance (1882-1914); and 44 buildings date from the secondary period (1915-1942); Six historic noncontributing buildings; four compatible noncontributing buildings; and 15 noncompatible noncontributing buildings. Twelve of the buildings within the district have been previously listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The district is significant under criteria b and c for its association with citizens important to the development of King’s Hill and the excellent representation of architectural designs.

Setting
The King’s Hill Historic District is situated on a slope, on the west side of the Willamette River south of W. Burnside Street in Portland, Oregon. This neighborhood is located between the Nob Hill commercial area to the north, along W. Burnside Street, and Canyon Road, south of the district. The Vista Avenue Bridge, not included in the district, is the link across the canyon to the Portland Heights neighborhood. Washington Park lies behind the district, directly to the west. To the east is downtown Portland. The mature street trees which line many of the streets help to distinguish the district. The vistas from the district are also notable, with view of Mt. Hood, Mt. Jefferson, and Mt. St. Helens in the distance to the east and northeast. The King’s Hill Historic District contains both commercial and residential uses; however, a majority of buildings with the district were designed as multifamily and single-family residential.

Plats
The King’s Hill area was first settled in 1845 by Daniel Lownsdale. A portion of the Lownsdale’s property was sold to Amos Nahum King and his wife, Melinda, in 1852, when King filed for a donation land claim of the 513.01 acres. The section south of what is now W. Burnside Street (King’s Hill Historic District), was Amos’ portion of the land claim, the section to the north of W. Burnside Street was Melinda’s portion of the land claim, and was originally referred to as Melinda Heights. The area encompassed within the district contains a number of additions and divisions of property within the former land claim by King. The first division of land within the original King DLC was from Amos King to Arthur H. Johnson. A survey of King’s land conveyed to Johnson was recorded July 16, 1864. This area became known as “Johnson’s Addition,” platted in 1871, encompassing the northeast portion of the district. “Johnson’s Addition” included the area from W. Burnside, south, to what later became S.W. King’s Court, and from S.W. King Avenue on the eastern border, west, to Ford Street (S.W. Vista Avenue). Amos King donated land for B. Street (Burnside Street) for public use the same year that “Johnson’s Addition” was platted. “Johnson’s Addition,” was further subdivided into lots and blocks in March of 1883. The southeast portion of the Amos King Land Claim, called “King’s Addition,” was
recorded in April 8, 1871. This portion of land included the blocks from Chapman (S.W. 18th Street), to what was later King Street, and from Canyon Road on the south edge, to what is now S.W. Park Place. “Johnson’s Addition,” encompassing the northeast portion of the district, was platted in May of 1871. “Cedar Hill Addition” was platted in November 1890, an area which now includes S.W. Green Avenue and S.W. Osage in the northwestern portion of the district. “King’s Court,” located in the southeastern portion of the district, was a separate plat, added in April 1911. The “Ardmore Addition,” covering the southwestern portion of the district, was platted in November 1892. An amended plat of “Ardmore Addition” occurred on April 1903.

Topography and Boundaries
The irregularly shaped King’s Hill Historic District is a 5 x 7 block area, between Washington Park, W. Burnside Street, S.W. 20th Avenue, and S.W. Jefferson Street. The boundary is based on historic, visual, and physical factors. Historic factors include early and subsequential settlement patterns and building use. The visual factors include consistency in building styles, height, scale, materials, massing, and setback. The physical factors include the development of major streets, plat lines, and topography.

The north edge of the district is clearly defined by W. Burnside Street and the presence of numerous noncompatible, noncontributing commercial buildings aligning this street. A sharp rise in elevation defines the northwestern edge of the district. The Nob Hill shopping center, north of Osage Street, at the northwest edge, is comprised of historic buildings that have had major alterations and nonhistoric buildings. Thus this area is excluded from the district. The eastern edge of the district is defined by a distinct change in building type, style, and a drop in elevation. There is a distinct “working class” character to the Victorian buildings excluded from the district on this edge. The eastern boundary begins at the intersection of W. Burnside Street and S.W. King Avenue, and follows south along S.W. King Avenue to S.W. Yamhill Street, to include the Edward King House, one of the most significant buildings in the district. The boundary goes east along a portion of S.W. Taylor Street to S.W. 21st Avenue. It turns south at S.W. 21st Avenue and continues to S.W. Salmon Street, where it turns west to encompass three parcels along S.W. King Avenue, excluding vacant lots. The boundary then follows S.W. Main Street east, jogs in one tax lot, and then again goes southeast to S.W. 20th Avenue, along this street to one lot beyond the intersection of S.W. Madison Avenue and S.W. 21st Street. The southern boundary is defined by a sharp drop in elevation, below which is S.W. Jefferson Street and S.W. Canyon Road. A change in the building style and type at the base of the slope also determines this boundary. The southern boundary excludes the Vista Avenue viaduct, as it is more appropriately associated with the historical development of the Portland Heights neighborhood. The western edge of the district is defined by a change in land use and building type, age and style, such as large apartment complexes that do not contribute to the historical or architectural character of the district. Washington Park is also excluded from the boundary along the western edge of the district. The boundary turns east at S.W. Park Place and then north, excluding a noncontributing apartment building. The boundary then follows the north side of S.W. Cedar Street to S.W. Green Avenue, along this street, and then west to S.W. Cactus Drive, encompassing one contributing building on the west side of S.W. Cactus Drive. The boundary then turns east along the west side of S.W. Cactus Drive, to S.W. Osage Street and concludes at the juncture of W. Burnside and S.W. Osage Street.

Architectural Styles
There are two historical periods of significance within the King’s Hill Historic District from which there are extant buildings. The first is from 1882, the date of the earliest remaining building in the district to 1914, after which there were several years of no new development. The second period of construction starts in 1915 and ends in 1942, which is marked by World War II and the last historic building date. During the first major building phase of the King’s Hill District, the Colonial Revival style was the most predominant. There are 64 buildings that remain from the first period. Buildings of the Historic Period styles were very popular during the second period of construction. Another large grouping of buildings are the American Renaissance style apartment buildings built between 1905 and 1930. The noncontributing post-World War II International style high rise buildings and significantly
different from the other multifamily buildings which date from the historical period and do not contribute to the historic character of the district.

The historic styles represented within the district include: Italianate (1) less than 1%, Queen Anne (10) 8%; Vernacular (1) less than 1%, Colonial Revival (22) 20%, Arts and Crafts (11) 10%, Craftsman (10) 9%, Shingle style (1) less than 1%, Commercial style (1) less than 1%, American Renaissance (9) 8%, Colonial (1910-1935) (12) 11%, Exotic (2) 1%, Mediterranean (11) 11%, French Renaissance (1) less than 1%, Norman Farmhouse (2) 1%, English Cottage (6) 5%, Tudor (4) 3%, Jacobethan (2) 1%, Half-Modern (1) less than 1%. The nonhistoric styles include International style (3) 2%, and Northwest Regional style (1) less than 1%.

Architects
Prominent Portland architects designed many of the buildings within the district including: Albert E. Doyle, Joseph Jaccoberger, Otto Kleeman, William C. Knighton, David C. Lewis, the firm of MacNaughton, Raymond and Lawrence, Richard Painter, Emil Schacht, the firm of Whidden and Lewis, and gardens by John Yeon. The tradition of architect designed buildings and grounds within the district has continued beyond the historic period with a number of notable contemporary architects and landscape architects contributing greatly to the later development of King’s Hill. Some of the historic buildings have recently undergone additions designed by architects sensitive to the original historic character of the property.

PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT OF KING’S HILL

Primary Period (1882-1914)
The development of the King’s Hill neighborhood mirrors the development of the city of Portland. Due to the irregular topography of the land, and its distance from the city center, King’s Hill was not the earliest residential area of Portland to develop. Early historic photographs of the area show only a few large homes on spacious lots. Most of these original early buildings have been demolished. The Amos King House, now demolished, was one of the first of the large, beautiful homes that graced the hillside. The house was surrounded by trees and located far from the city center. The first road through the area was known as “Tuality Road,” an extension of Washington Street. As the streets were later developed, they were named after many of Amos King’s family members and other important settlers of the area. Unfortunately, many of the King family street names have been changed.

It was the introduction of the electric cable cars along W. Burnside, S.W. Eighteenth and S.W. Jefferson in the 1890s which helped to further development of the area. The Multnomah Street Railway was founded in 1882 by E.J. Jeffery, son-in-law to Amos King. In 1890 the line was electrified and extended to 23rd Avenue. By August of 1892 the Portland Consolidated Railroad Company was formed. A small waiting station was constructed at the base of S.W. Vista Avenue (the site of what is now Ben Franklin Savings Building, #54).

Another change that occurred within the area at this time, was the construction of smaller, more modest homes at the base of the King’s Hill area to the east (not included in the district). In what is now known as the Goose Hollow neighborhood. Larger homes, for the more affluent citizens continued to be constructed on large lots further up the hill, the area presently known as King’s Hill. During the economic expansion between 1885 and 1893 the Portland population increased significantly. After the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition of 1905, another building boom occurred in King’s Hill as in other areas of the city. Many of the buildings within the district were designed by regionally renowned...
architects and landscape architects that had settled in Portland shortly after the exposition. As the growth of the city continued, the popularity of the neighborhood increased and the large lots in King’s Hill were subdivided. An early concern for the landscape is exhibited in the planting of street trees that date from the primary period of development.

A significant drop in the number of buildings constructed in the neighborhood after 1914 marks the end of the primary period of development. A total of 48% of the resources within the King’s Hill Historic District date from this first period.

**Secondary Period (1915 - 1942)**

During the secondary period of development, the number of multifamily residential buildings increased in the King’s Hill area and lot sizes became smaller. The area continued however, to attract professionals and prominent business people and the tradition of architect designed houses continued. King’s Hill became one of the elite suburban neighborhoods, which was by then walking distance from the ever-expanding commercial center. Public transportation also provided easy access to the area. The construction of the Vista Avenue viaduct (now known as the Vista Avenue Bridge) in December of 1926 provided a direct automobile link between Burnside Street and Portland Heights (MacColl, *The Growth of a City*, p. 59). The bridge also made the King’s Hill neighborhood more accessible and increased the traffic flow through the neighborhood. A total of 33% of the resources were built during this period.

**Modern Period (1943 – 1990)**

Over the last fifty years, zone changes and the dramatic increase in land values have had a significant impact on the neighborhood. Some of the older single-family residences have been demolished and replaced with noncontributing high-rise apartment complexes, resulting in an increase in the density of the neighborhood. Fortunately, many of the landscape features, such as the large sequoias along S.W. Vista Avenue, and the horsechestnut and maple street trees along S.W. Park Avenue survive and help to maintain the character of the district. Development, which occurred in the 1950s through the 1970s, was, for the most part, unsympathetic toward the existing historic buildings. The high-rise apartment buildings are noncompatible both in scale and style with a majority of buildings within the district. The commercial area along W. Burnside has crept into the district and as the maintenance costs of large single family homes have risen, more of the houses have changed to multifamily or office/commercial use. More recently, within the last decade, some of the vacant parcels within the district have been developed with multifamily residential buildings, which are compatible with the historic architectural character of the neighborhood. A total of 18% of the resources was built after the last historic period of development within the district or is classified as historic noncontributing.

**Landscape**

The landscape is a strong unifying element within the district. Two of the boundaries are sharply defined by natural landscape features—Washington Park on the west and a canyon along the southern edge of the district. Though the topography of the area is irregular, mature street trees form a visual border between the sidewalk and the street. Rock, basalt and brick walls, concrete steps and paths, and rock gardens are major features, which add to the ambiance of the area. Some of the earliest surviving vegetation planted in the area includes weeping cherry trees, sycamore, sequoias, horsechestnuts, elm and hawthornes, and big leaf maples. The oldest trees are over 100 years old. Some of the more recently planted street trees include lindens, locusts, sweet gums, birch, flowering plum, magnolias, and hornbeams. Shrubs include azaleas, rhododendrons, laurel, and boxwood. Though the population of the area has increased in recent years, extensive formal gardens remain with several historic properties. The Portland Garden Club #63, located at the corner of S.W. Vista Avenue and S.W. Main Street, houses beautiful plants on the large lot it encompasses. The Town Club #116, located at the intersection of S.W. Park Place and S.W. Salmon Street, is surrounded by a beautiful brick wall, which encloses elaborate gardens. The landscape helps to blend the newer noncontributing buildings with the historic buildings to give the district a strong sense of cohesion.
Zoning
The zoning within the King’s Hill Historic District includes RH (high density multi-dwelling residential and some commercial use) within the center of the district; RH, R1 (medium density multi-dwelling residential) and R5 (high density single dwelling residential) in the western and northern sections of the district, CX (general commercial and light industrial use) along N.W. Burnside Street and south of King’s Court, RH again along 21st and 20th, on the eastern edges of the district and R5 in the southern area of the district.

Existing Surveys
Many of the buildings within the King’s Hill Historic District were included in the 1984 Portland Historical Resources Inventory. There are 12 buildings within the district, which are individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The area was also included as part of a local historic conservation district nomination initiated in the summer of 1977 by the residents of Goose Hollow, a neighborhood located below King’s Hill. Action on the conservation district application was tabled indefinitely by the Portland City Council in November 1979, after numerous public hearings.

Classification of Properties
The properties within the King’s Hill Historic District are classified below. The criteria for determining the classification of buildings include building materials, style, building date, setback, roof shape, massing, and the extent of alteration. There are 64 primary contributing, 44 secondary contributing six historic noncontributing, four compatible noncontributing, 15 noncompatible noncontributing buildings, and six vacant lots within the district.

Primary Contributing
Structures built between 1882 and 1914, and which reflect the styles, traditions, or patterns of buildings typically constructed during this period represent the primary period within the district. The period extends from the construction of earliest extant building, the Frank Chown residence of 1882, until 1914, the year proceeding a notable decline in the construction.

Secondary Contributing
Structures built between 1915 and 1942 represent the secondary period of development within the district. The ending date, 1942, marks the last historical building date within the district. It also represents the conclusion of consistent architectural design within the district and the beginning of World War II. Generally, buildings constructed after 1942 conflict with the historic character of the district.

Historic Noncontributing
Buildings constructed during either the primary or secondary periods of development, which have been so altered over time that their original integrity and contributing elements have been lost or concealed, are classified as historic noncontributing.

Compatible Noncontributing
Buildings constructed after 1942, which are compatible architecturally with the significant structures and the historic character of the district, are classified as compatible noncontributing.

Noncompatible noncontributing
Buildings constructed after 1942, which are incompatible architecturally with the historic character of the district, are classified as noncompatible noncontributing.

Vacant
Properties are classified as vacant if there are no buildings sited on them, for example, vacant lots, gardens and parking lots.
CONTEXT STATEMENT

The following text is excerpted from Section 8, Statement of Significance, in the National Register Nomination for the King's Hill Historic District.

The King's Hill Historic District is locally significant under criterion b, for its association with significant persons; and under criterion c, for its large number of architect-designed high style residences and apartment buildings. Many of Portland’s most prominent architects are represented within the district. The district provides a continuum of architectural styles; a visual link with Portland’s past, enhanced by the magnificent trees which line the streets, and many original brick and stone retaining walls. Because of its irregular topography and steep terrain, the greatest amount of development within the King’s Hill Historic District, took place following the late 1880s, when the development of streetcar lines and the improvement of transportation corridors along S.W. Jefferson and West Burnside made the area more readily accessible. The original claim-holders of the area, Amos and Melinda King, Arthur H. Johnson and Henry Green, engaged in real estate early in the history of the district, selling off parcels of land in the area and amassing their wealth from the sale. As the area became more accessible, other notable Portland figures began to move up the hill, building stately homes in the popular styles of the period which reflected of their prosperity.

Earliest Phase of Development: King’s Hill to 1882

In 1844, when Asa Lovejoy and William Overton filed a claim for the site which was to become the city of Portland, it was little more than a clearing cut out of a dense forest on the west bank of the Willamette River. The site had been cleared of brush by trappers employed by the Hudson’s Bay Company, who used the clearing as a campsite when they traveled between Fort Vancouver and Oregon City.

In 1844, Overton sold his half interest in the site to Francis Pettygrove, an Oregon City merchant. Later that year, the first building was constructed in “the clearing” and in 1845, the name “Portland” was chosen for the townsite; the result of a celebrated coin toss between Lovejoy and Pettygrove.

Pettygrove and Lovejoy, anxious to develop their claim, hired surveyor Thomas Brown to lay out a grid of 16 blocks. It was under the direction of Portland’s early proprietors, that Portland’s relatively small blocks, 200 feet square, and street 60 feet wide, were established. While Francis Pettygrove was active in the promotion of the small townsite, Lovejoy remained more involved with his interests in Oregon City. Late in 1845, Lovejoy sold his half interest in the Portland site to Benjamin Stark, a cargomaster on the ship “Toulon.” The small townsite began to develop around the location of Pettygrove’s warehouse and wharf at the foot of Washington Street. Pettygrove’s wharf was instrumental in establishing Portland as a convenient port.

The King’s Hill neighborhood, located in the foothills at the base of the Tualatin Mountains (commonly referred to as the “West Hills”), about one mile west of the original Portland townsite, was at that time a dense forest of fir and Hemlock. A stream, which became known as “Tanner’s Creek” (or “Tanner Creek”), flowed down from the crest of the hills, through a deep canyon (now Canyon Road), carving an irregular path through the foothills and ending at the Willamette River. The steep terrain and the dense forest precluded much early development. The first white inhabitant to settle at the base of what came to be known as “King’s Hill” was early Portland “proprietor,” Daniel Lownsdale, who filed a claim in 1845. Seven years later, Amos Nahum King and his wife Melinda filed a donation land claim for 513.01 acres. The southeastern portion of this claim, at the base of the West Hills, is the location of the King’s Hill District.

By 1850 Portland had a steam sawmill, a flouring mill and a planing mill. The small wood frame buildings clustered around the waterfront were described as “of good style and taste, with which their white coats of paint, contrasted with the brown and dingy appearance of towns generally on the Pacific Coast.”
less generous individual characterized the town as “of the most shabby construction. There were at that time no brick buildings and only two or three frame houses which presented anything like an architectural appearance.”

By the 1870s many of the wood frame structures were replaced with brick buildings, often with cast iron facades which allowed for large glazed areas for the display of goods. Portland was a thriving port. The shipment of lumber from its sawmills, and wheat from the Tualatin Plains, established Portland’s reputation as a major shipping center on the Pacific Coast.

Throughout the 1850s Amos King’s claim remained undeveloped. For many years the residence and out-buildings of the King family were the only structures on the property. Transportation to this area was provided by a rough wagon route, located near present-day West Burnside Street, which was opened by Francis Pettygrove in 1845-46. This road was an extension of Washington Street, one of the first streets of the original townsite. During Portland’s earliest years, this rough road was the main route west. Known as the “Tuality Road,” it was surfaced with wood planks and led through the hills of what is now Washington Park towards the “Tuality” (Tualatin) plains. Because this route followed the well-drained crests of the hills, it was preferred over Canyon Road, a steep, muddy ravine, until the latter was improved with planks in 1851-52.

The California “gold rush” of the 1850s stimulated further growth as Portland became a distribution center for farmer’s goods which found ready markets in California. Oregon’s entry into the Union in 1859 provided further stimulus for growth as people began to settle in the valleys along the Willamette River.

In the 1860s Amos King began selling off his land which in the decades to follow established the family fortune. In July of 1864, King sold a parcel of land to Arthur H. Johnson, which would later become known as “Johnson’s Addition.” The boundaries of Johnson’s Addition were “B” Street (Burnside) on the north; King Street on the east; Ford Street (now Vista Avenue) on the west and southern boundary extended to what is now King’s Court. Because “King’s Hill” was a good distance from the boundaries of the city, Sanborn maps do not include this area until the 1890s, and then only the lower slope of the hill was included. Other early maps of Portland however, detail the development of this area as portions of the King claim were subdivided. A map of 1866 illustrates increasing development from the original townsite of Portland west towards the King claim, and on the north side of West Burnside, in Couch’s Addition. Several blocks had been laid out at the southeastern edge of King’s Donation Land Claim—this was “King’s Addition,” platted in 1871. The area included: Chapman Street, named for early Portlander William Chapman (S.W. 18th); Nartilla, for Amos King’s daughter Nautilla King Jefferey (the “r” was added to the street name) (S.W. 19th); and Stout Street, for Lansing Stout—a representative in Congress from Oregon 1859-61 (S.W. 20th). These names were changed during a major street renaming in 1933.

The Portland map of 1872 illustrates that the King’s Hill area was beginning to be developed. Adjacent to King’s Addition, the land where Amos N. King’s home was located remained intact up to King Street. Johnson’s Addition was laid out to include the area from Burnside, south to the narrow path which would become S.W. King’s Court and from King Street to Ford Street (later S.W. Vista Avenue). The area between King Street and Ford Street, where the Johnson farm was located, remained as one large parcel of land. Four blocks were platted from Park Avenue (so named because it led directly to “City Park”), Main Street and King’s Court, and from King Street, St. Clair and Ford Street. Two large parcels to the west of Ford Street were owned by the Green brothers. John Green owned the land to the south of Park, and Henry to the north of Park and extending to “B” Street.

Significant People
The following individuals were the earliest landowners of in the King’s Hill District.

Daniel Lownsdale: Daniel Lownsdale, a native of Kentucky and a tanner by trade, arrived in Portland in December of 1845 at the age of 42. He filed a claim for one square mile of land west of...
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Pettygrove and Stark’s claim—the Portland townsite. The abundance of hemlock trees on his land, and the proximity of Tanner’s Creek, provided the impetus for Lownsdale’s tanning operation. On this site, Lownsdale started the first tannery business in Portland in 1846. The Lownsdale Donation Land Claim, for which Lownsdale had “squatter’s rights,” included 500 aces. His tannery was located approximately where the Civic stadium is now located. An early map of the Portland Townsite, extending to the boundaries of Lownsdale’s claim, was drawn by Daniel Lownsdale in the 1850s and shows the initial grid of the Portland townsite. The “road to Tualatin Plains” extended west from Washington Street, far beyond the boundaries of the City past Lownsdale’s tannery and first house which was located directly adjacent to the road. Also shown on the map is Lownsdale’s “potato field.” By 1848, Lownsdale had sold the rights to the tannery to two individuals named Apperson and Balance. In 1849, rumors of gold in California lured Apperson and Balance from their new enterprise, leaving behind the land that would be named for Amos Nahum King. Lownsdale died in May of 1862 at the age of 59.

Amos Nahum King: Amos Nahum King, born April 22, 1822, in Madison County, Ohio, was the fifth of twelve children born to Nahum King and Serepta Norton King. Nahum King, a farmer and tanner, was born in New Salem, Massachusetts and Serepta in Albany, New York. Sometime prior to 1816 the Kings moved to Madison County, Ohio where ten of their children were born. In 1841 the family left Ohio and moved to Carroll County, Missouri, where they farmed and young Amos King operated a ferry across the Missouri River. When flood waters destroyed the family farm in the spring of 1845, Nahum King decided to move his family westward. The King family became one of thousands who traveled across the plains for the “Oregon Country” in 1845.

The Kings were in a party of about 66 wagons and 293 emigrants that journeyed on the “Overland Trail” from St. Joseph, Missouri. Their party was under the command of Capt. William G. T’Vault. After a trip of several months across the plains the wagon train arrived at Ft. Boise. Stephen Meek, a trapper who joined the wagon train at Ft. Boise, convinced approximately 200 families that by following him, he could save them many days worth of travel on their journey to the Willamette Valley. The King party was in a company of wagons that decided to follow Meek on an old trapper’s trail. Meek’s trail, over rugged terrain, strayed into the arid regions of central Oregon. The party moved slowly along the tortuous “Meek Cutoff.” There was a high incidence of sickness and fatalities as many in the party ran out of provisions and water. By the time the Kings reached The Dalles in October of 1845, 24 members of their party had lost their lives along the shortcut to the Willamette Valley. After recuperating from this arduous experience at The Dalles, the party constructed rafts made of logs to haul the emigrants, as well as their wagons, down the Columbia to the Cascades. Here the party proceeded in smaller boats to the townsite of Linnton. Tragedy struck the King family once again on the trip down river. John King, the eldest of the King children, his wife and two of their three children, were drowned in the Columbia River.

The King clan arrived in Linnton on November 1, 1845. From Linnton they made their way to Washington County, where they spent the winter of 1845-46. Amos King recounted that “Conditions of life were pretty hard then. I remember the first pair of shoes I ever had, after we got there. My father made them, and he tanned the hides by hand. I had gone barefoot from March till December of that year. Everybody then—in 1846—wore buckskin—buckskin coat, buckskin jacket and buckskin breeches—all homemade.”

At the end of a letter to her family in April 1846, Anna Maria King added “we have had two weddings in our family.” Both weddings occurred while the families were “wintering in” on the Tualatin Plains in Washington County. On March 8, 1846, Amos Nahum King and Melinda Fuller were married. Melinda and her family had traveled the same route as the Kings.

In April of 1846, the Kings and the families of Rowland Chambers and Lucius Norton left Washington County for Benton County, further south in the Willamette Valley. Several members of the King family filed donation land claims in and around a valley in

King’s Hill Historic District Guidelines
City of Portland, Bureau of Planning (December 2001)
Benton County known today as Kings Valley. Nahum, the patriarch of the King family, lived in King’s Valley until his death in 1856. Amos, choosing not to settle near his family, filed a claim near present day Corvallis, adjacent to the Willamette River. Continuing his earlier career as a boatman, he set up a business hauling freight and passengers on the Willamette River.

King quickly cornered the market and extended service to Yamhill. The trip took about two weeks. Because this was before the existence of the Oregon City locks, it was necessary for King and his crew to pack freight on their backs to avoid the Willamette Falls. “I was so prosperous that I had a crew of two in my bateau. When we reached the rapids we poled and pulled…Usually we didn’t stop long in Portland. There wasn’t much in Portland in those days.” But in 1849 Amos did stop in Portland. “Well, I stuck to that business for two years, and hard work it was, too. Then I came to Portland. I wanted to buy some blankets at Crosby’s store at Washington and First Streets and I had to hang around three days for a chance to get waited on…I bought the tannery from two partners who wanted to go to California…gold excitement was then at its height. I bought the whole outfit just as it stood—hides, leather in hand, tools—everything.”

The two partners were Apperson and Balance, who had purchased the tannery and adjacent land from Daniel Lownsdale the previous year.

**Amos King’s Tannery:** Amos N. King, who had learned the tanner’s trade from his father, began operation of the tannery soon after purchasing the land. On March 11, 1852, in accordance with the Donation Land Claim Act of 1850, Amos and his wife filed for a donation land claim of 513 acres, including portions of Lownsdale’s original claim. The boundaries of the King claim were roughly as follows: the northern boundary ran from a point between N.W. 21st and 22nd Streets on N.W. Lovejoy, west to Macleay Park near Cumberland Road. The eastern boundary ran southeast from N.W. 21st and N.W. Lovejoy to West Burnside near Trinity Place and followed 18th to Jefferson. The southern boundary extended along Jefferson to Canyon Road and continued due west to a point where Fairview Boulevard enters the Arboretum. The western edge went from this corner due north to the Cumberland Road-Macleay Park junction.

Like a majority of the earliest settlers in the Northwest, the King’s first residence was of log construction. The King’s “log cabin” was constructed “near what is now the corner of Yamhill and Stout Streets.” [Stout Street was renamed S.W. 20th in 1933.] It was in this log cabin that four of six children were born to Amos and Melinda. The first two children died in infancy. The children raised to adulthood were Nautilia (who married E.J. Jefferey), Lucy Ann (who married William White and later Alexander Lumsden), Nahum Amos and Edward.

Amos King operated his tannery for twelve years. The process of tanning hides required that the hides be left to cure in large vats for a period from six months to a year. “I cut the tan vats myself with a broadax…We ran our tannery by horse power and used homemade tools. The first real curry knife I had I paid fifteen dollars for. It was worth $2.50 in the states.” Amos’ son Nahum reminisced that his father had a “machine that looked like a cider mill” in which he would grind up hemlock bark used in the tanning process. Amos constructed enough vats “to cover an acre of land.” (When the athletic field for the Multnomah Amateur Athletic Club was constructed, these vats were simply filled and covered over; they are still buried under Civic Stadium.)

Amos King’s talents extended beyond the art of tanning and curing. He was a successful gardener as well. The Oregon Spectator carried the following notice in 1850: “Messrs. King and Fuller of Portland, have left at our Office a potato measuring 32-1/2 inches in Circumference one way, and 12-1/2 the other; weighing 3-1/2 pounds. This was not the largest one raised by them, but was selected for its beauty and simetry of form. Messrs. K. & F. not only manufacture good leather but Raise good potatoes.”

In 1900, a year before his death, Amos King was interviewed the Oregonian, as he was the only living person in Portland whose name had appeared in the first issue of the newspaper. In this...
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50th anniversary issue of the paper, King related another potato story: “I had planted some potatoes out in the woods with surprising Results...When Mr. Dryer came along and arranged to print his paper, I had something for him. It was a spud weighing 5-1/2 pounds...I gave it to Mr. Dryer and he caused glass to be put around it, and sent it to the states. It beat all the potatoes anybody had ever seen, until it went to England, where it struck a bigger potato, and that’s the last I ever heard of it.”

In 1856, Amos King built a large house in which he would live for the next 45 years. At the time of its construction, the King house was surrounded by trees and was quite a distance from the boundaries of the city. An unidentified newspaper clipping, c.19115, includes a photo of the rear of the King house. It was a large, handsome house with Classical detailing; wide frieze board, eave returns at the gable ends and corner boards. The exterior was surfaced with narrow weatherboard siding. The accompanying text states that the sills were hand hewn. The shingles covering the roof were “split from cedar blocks” and lasted for over forty years. It was likely a central hall type and composed of simple volumes.

The “L” shaped plan of the King house can be identified on Portland Sanborn maps. Some details of the house with its temple-like façade can be seen in a photo taken in 1904. It must have been a grand site on the wooded hill overlooking the small townsite of Portland. From Sanborn maps, it is apparent that the house was constructed long before the streets and neighboring buildings were constructed. The King house was oriented toward the points of the compass, with its front façade facing east (towards the city and Mt. Hood). Demolished in 1926, the Amos King house was located approximately where the U.S. Bank Building on S.W. 20th and Morrison is now located.

After operating his tannery for twelve years, Amos King began to amass a great deal of wealth by selling off lots from his claim. One of the most important purchases was made by the City of Portland. In 1871, the city purchased 40.78 acres at $800 per acre, for “public use.” This land, a heavily wooded area in the foothills of the Tualatin Mountains, was the core of what would become “City Park,” known today as Washington Park, Portland’s largest public park.

Amos turned his attention towards his property interests in his later years. City directories of the period describe him alternately as a “speculator” and a “capitalist.” He built a large number of houses, which he rented and leased in “King’s Addition.” He leased an area of land around S.W. Salmon and 18th Streets, the present site of the Multnomah Athletic Club, to Chinese gardeners. King was often seen by residents “spade in hand, correcting faults in a street improvement due to the carelessness of city workmen...during the heavy winter downpours he took good care that choked sewers did not cause damage by an overflow of water.”

Besides his lucrative real estate ventures, King also invested in the development of transportation in the area. He was a major stock holder in the Multnomah Street Railway, of which his son-in-law, E.J. Jefferey, was president. The original line begun in 1882, was a horsecar line that traveled west up Washington Street to “B” Street, and then into the hills.

Nahum Amos King described his mother, Melinda Fuller King, as “good hearted and jolly.” Melinda weighed 336 pounds in adulthood. “She was one of the strongest women I ever saw...she could pick up a fifty pound sack of flour by its ears and hold it out at arm’s length.” Following Melinda King’s death in 1887, her portion of the claim (located to the north of Burnside) was deeded to her heirs. The following year the King Real Estate Association was formed by Amos and Edward King and Nautilia’s husband, E.J. Jefferey, for the purpose of selling lots and to “improve property.” They named this tract of land in the hills of northwest Portland “Melinda Heights,” but the area was always referred to as “King’s Heights” and still is today.

Amos King died November 11, 1901, surrounded by family members in the house he was so proud to have lived in for 45 years. Today his name lives on in the additions he platted to the city; Amos N. King’s Addition, King’s Addition, King’s Second Addition and King’s Heights, and several street names—S.W.
King Street, King’s Court and Kingston Avenue. Other streets in the area were named for members of his family; however, these names have all been lost as a result of street name changes. Ella Street (now N.W. and S.W. 20th Place) was named for his granddaughter Ella Jefferey. Lucretia Place, now N.W. 22nd Place, was in honor of his eldest sister. (She did not accompany the Kings across the plains in 1845. She arrived in Oregon in 1853 with her husband Herman Halleck and settled in Benton County. Southwest 19th Street was originally named “Nartilla” Street for Amos King’s daughter. It has been suggested that the addition of an “r” in Nautilla’s name may have reflected a New England accent.

Nautilia King Jefferey: Amos King provided lots from his claim for his children and grandchildren. His eldest child, Nautilia, married E.J. Jefferey in 1867. Jefferey was a pioneer brick manufacturer in Portland. Edward James Jefferey was born in New York in 1835, of English descent. He settled in Portland in 1863 and married Nautilia King in 1867. His first brickyard was located between S.W. Yamhill and S.W. Morrison. Following his marriage, he moved the operation to 19th and “B” Streets, on the north side of “B,” where he also constructed their Second Empire style residence of brick. He operated the brickyard at this location until 1876, when he moved the operation to 23rd and “J” Streets (N.W. Johnson).

Nahum Amos King: The eldest son of Amos and Melinda, Nahum Amos King, married Martha Tucker in 1876. Nahum possessed the same pioneering spirit as his father. The morning after their wedding, Nahum and Martha left by wagon for Lake County, where Nahum purchased 1000 acres of land south of Silver Lake. Nahum became a successful cattleman and eventually owned 9000 acres of prime grazing land. He ranched in Lake County, Oregon for twenty years and then returned to Portland where he constructed a palatial residence on Salmon Street. This magnificent structure was demolished in the early 1950s and is now the site of a high-rise apartment building.

Edward King: The only remaining King residence is that of the youngest child, Edward, who stayed in Portland, where he assisted his father with his “real estate and financial affairs.” In 1880 he married Anna Brewer. They evidently lived in the original King home with Amos for many years. Their Colonial Revival style house, located at 806 S.W. King Avenue, was constructed in 1910-11. It is currently undergoing restoration.

Arthur H. Johnson: Arthur Harrison Johnson was born in 1820 in London, England, to Richard and Mercy Johnson. Arthur learned his trade from the elder Johnson who was a butcher. The family arrived in America in 1843 and settled on a farm in Waukesha County, Wisconsin. In the spring of 1852, Arthur Johnson arrived in Portland where he entered the butchering and retail meat business with Richard S. Perkins. Johnson established a slaughterhouse near what is now N.W. 23rd and Flanders, along a small stream. He operated out of two stalls in the New Market Building. In 1853, Johnson married Cordelia St. Clair (S.W. St. Clair is named for her), a pioneer of Washington County. After acquiring land from Amos N. King, the Johnson’s laid out subdivision—Johnson’s Addition, in 1871.

The Johnson residence, constructed c.1873, was located between S.W. Ford (now Vista) and S.W. St. Clair, the present-day site of the Vista Avenue Apartments designed by architect Pietro Belluschi. It was an elegant residence, with a mansard roof and cupola. The stable building had a cupola as well. The Johnson residence and out-buildings were demolished between 1926 and 1932. The Johnson estate is visible in a photographic panorama of Portland in 1903. Johnson died in 1894. Large, old sequoia trees mark the entrance to the Vista Avenue Apartments and may have been planted by Johnson.

Henry and John Green: Henry D. Green was born October 16, 1827, in Tompkins County, New York. Along with younger brother John and his friend Washington Irving Leonard, Henry Green arrived in Portland in 1852. When they first arrived, these entrepreneurs operated a wharf on the Willamette, adjacent Couch and Flander’s wharf, and acted as agents for the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. This was the beginning of several extremely successful ventures into by these two men.
In 1859 Washington Irving Leonard and Henry Green founded the Portland Gas Light Company. This operation was the third of its type on the west coast. The men imported coal from Vancouver Island to produce gas. The two gentlemen formed the Portland Water Company in 1862 and in 1865, along with John Green, they founded the Oregon Iron Company in Oswego, south of the Portland townsite. John and Henry Green were among the founders of the prestigious men’s club, the Arlington Club, chartered in 1881, and still in existence.

In 1863, Henry Green (1827-1885) married Miss Charlotte Jones (1838-1926). In 1879, the Greens constructed a magnificent residence “at the head of B Street,” (West Burnside) on land purchased from King and later platted as Cedar Hill Addition” in November of 1890. The Green residence, complete with large hot-houses for growing exotic plants, was located on Cactus Drive where it joins Cedar Street at the edge of Washington Park. S.W. Cedar Street, a narrow, winding road, was the original drive to the Green estate, and S.W. Green Avenue is named for the family. The Greens were known for throwing lavish parties. Their grandson, John Reed, was an early Northwest “radical.”

Primary Period of Significance: 1882-1914

The city of Portland embarked into a period of optimism at the beginning of the 1880s. The introduction of rail lines into the city had a profound effect on growth as the population increased 70 percent between 1880 and 1883. The year 1883 marked the arrival of the first transcontinental train, which arrived at the rail terminus in East Portland in September. Soon after the arrival of Henry Villard’s rail line, Portland was hit by a recession when Villard’s empire collapsed. The City recovered and commercial construction in the urban core boomed. Posh neighborhoods of Italianate mansions developed along the west Park Blocks and in Couch’s Addition, north of Burnside and beginning at approximately 17th Street. These were the first “elite” neighborhoods of Portland. King’s Hill was slower to develop because of the difficult topography; however, the introduction of street car lines in the 1890s would soon spur the development of the King’s Hill neighborhood.

The few families who did occupy the King’s Hill prior to the 1890s were several of Portland’s wealthiest inhabitants. To the south and east of King’s Hill, was a working class neighborhood known as “Goose Hollow.” The two areas contrast sharply in architectural character. The small wood frame dwellings of the Goose Hollow neighborhood are constructed close together on small lots. Most of these residences are in the vernacular Queen Anne Cottage style.

Prior to the 1890s, subdividing of the large parcels of land within King’s Hill proceeded at a slow pace. The topography of the hill impeded much development. The block at the southeast corner of Johnson’s Addition was divided into separate lots and a new road, “Johnson Street” (later Wayne Street and today S.W. Yamhill), extended to the east from Ford Street to King Street.

In 1890, H.W. Scott published a History of Portland, Oregon, which included detailed descriptions of the city of Portland at the time. In this book he describes the King’s Hill area. “B Street, running up from Couch’s Addition is the natural boundary of the North Portland on the south, following for the most part the
depression of Tanner Creek, and further on to King’s Creek. Between this and Jefferson Street, some ten blocks, the land has, owing to the irregularities of the ground and the little winding vale of the creek, been left lying in large, and often irregular blocks, some of which contain an area of as much as five acres. The lay of the tract is romantic and delightful in the extreme. The creek forms a sunken valley, with little meadows on either side, which have been, and to some extent are still occupied by the Chinese for garden purposes. ... Upon the west side the hills climb rapidly, but not abruptly out of the cleft, growing steadily, and confidently toward the Heights. ... the big plats, grassy and set with small trees, lie wide, with but few houses but those present large and stately. That of Mrs. Gaston on the first swell and a cluster near form a handsome group. On the northern side of this hill front, a tract of some five acres is occupied by the residence and gardens of Mrs. H.D. Green, the house whose delightful architecture and adornment is almost submerged in a wealth of trees. Her large hothouse, filled with the finest of exotics, are a mark for the sun. ... Scott goes on to describe the residences: “For ten blocks back—16th to 26th Streets—or even farther, and from about N Street southward to Jefferson or some twenty streets, the region is, by popular consent—and still more by prevailing prices—forever dedicated to dwellings of wealth and beauty. The streets here are, for the most part, well paved and delightfully ornamented, but not overshadowed by trees. ... The general spirit of this portion of town might be distinguished from the streets or avenues of other cities, in that the separate houses appear to be built independently and with reference only to their own needs and entirety. ...”

During the 1890s, Portland’s increase in population continued as well as an expansion of its boundaries. The separate townships of “Albina” and “East Portland” were annexed by the city of Portland in 1891. In spite of a major depression in 1893, Portland’s growth continued through the 1890s. Indeed, during the period from 1890 to 1900, Portland’s “growth rate was the third fastest of major American cities.”

Sanborn maps from 1901 detail the development which had taken place in King’s Hill up to this period. To the north of the Cedar Hill area, along Washington Street (now West Burnside, formerly “B” Street), streetcar shops and car “barns” were surrounded by small one and two story wood frame dwellings. Further east, the edges of Washington Street remained undeveloped. Heavy residential development had taken place on the block bounded by S.W. Park Place and Wayne (now S.W. Yamhill Street) and King Street and St. Clair Street. The area was full of large residences—of which only a few remain today.

On the lower slopes of the hill, the north side of S.W. Salmon was populated with “Chinese shacks” and vegetable gardens. The blocks of what is now “Ardmore Addition” (platted in 1903) were laid out and several new streets cut through, included “Macleay” (now S.W. Ardmore Avenue).

By 1900, the citizenry of Portland embarked onto an era of boosterism, with its highlight—the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition and Oriental Fair. Over 400,000 visitors from all over the country attended the fair. The success of the fair, both in profit and in achieving status for the city, contributed to record growth in the years 1905 to 1913, when the population of the city nearly tripled.

This period was also one of major residential development in King’s Hill. The “King’s Court Addition” was platted in 1911. The biggest change in the district occurred along the northern edge, closest to the streetcar lines at West Burnside, below Cedar Hill where a series of apartment buildings were constructed along S.W. Vista Avenue. The small wood frame dwellings around the car barns on West Burnside were later replaced with commercial structures. By 1915, the block bounded by S.W. King and St. Clair Streets, Wayne (S.W. Yamhill) and West Burnside, was filled with apartment buildings and wood frame “flats.” These multifamily buildings at the edge of the district, were designed for the middle-to-upper class.
Appendix A

Architecture

No buildings from the earliest phase of development of King’s Hill survive. The oldest remaining building is the Frank R. Chown Residence (1882), which marks the beginning for the primary period of significance in the district. The architectural styles of the King’s Hill neighborhood follow general trends occurring across the nation and in other areas of the city. The large number of "high style," architect-designed buildings, sets this district apart from other Portland neighborhoods. The most popular style used in the King’s Hill neighborhood during the primary period of significance was the Colonial Revival, with 22 remaining examples.

The Italianate Style (1855-1890): The Italianate style, inspired by the elaborate villas and palaces of the Italian Renaissance, evolved during the Victorian era. Technological advances, such as machine-cut nails, standardized lumber and the development of the jig-saw, resulted in a proliferation of heavily ornamented buildings in the “Italian Style.” Characteristic elements of the Italianate style include: low-pitched hipped or gable roofs, projecting eaves with decorative brackets, vertically proportioned windows, often with segmental or round arches, bay windows and wood ornamentation which simulates stone quoins and keystones. The Frank R. Chown residence, #134, at 2030-2032 S.W. Main is the earliest building in the district and the only surviving example of the Italianate style in the King’s Hill Historic District. The intact Chown residence is notable for its bracketed cornice and slender pilasters which frame the windows of the two projecting bays.

Queen Anne Style (1880-1900): This late Victorian era style was introduced to America during the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, where the British Government buildings, became extremely popular as residential styles. The availability of pattern books helped to further popularize the style. Characteristic elements of the Queen Anne style are: varied roof shapes in combination, including hipped, gable and conical roofs on towers or turrets, corbelled chimneys with clustered flues, irregular plan and massing, varied window shapes, often incorporating "art glass," a variety of surface textures through the use of horizontal siding, patterned shingles and carved wood panels and decorative Eastlake elements. There are several examples of the Queen Anne style in the King’s Hill neighborhood, including: the Levi Hexter residence (1892-93), #35, located at 2326 S.W. Park Place, notable for its variety of surface textures and delicately carved ornament and irregular massing: the Percy Blyth residence (1901), #82, located at 2176 S.W. Main Street, notable for its front-facing gambrel roof with elegant Palladian window, and engaged tower with conical roof; the Theodore Wilcox residence (1893), #98, located at 931 S.W. King Avenue, notable for its massive first story of random coursed ashlar of red sandstone, off-center entrance spanned by massive sandstone lintel, and delicate, carved foliate designs in the gable ends; the Stratton-Cornelius Residence (c.1891), #102, located at 2182 S.W. Yamill Street, notable for its undulating shingle surface, varied textures and carved pediment with scallop shell motif.

The Shingle Style (1895-1900): The Shingle style, a later variation of the Queen Anne style, emerged in New England and fashionable East Coast resorts around 1895. This style was popularized by the pre-eminent New York architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White. The Shingle style often incorporates Queen Anne elements, but its dominant feature is a tight skin of wood shingles. The only example of the Shingle style in the King’s Hill neighborhood (and a late example of the style), is the residence of architect Emil Schacht (1902-03), #46, located at 2188 S.W. Vista Avenue. The Schacht residence is notable for its intersecting gable roof; the upper portion of the gable which projects over carved brackets and the graceful swan’s neck pediment which adorns the second floor windows of the front façade.

The Colonial Revival (1890-1915): The 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition engendered a fierce pride in the young nation. The exhibit included buildings replicating the Colonial period, including revolutionary era styles such as the Georgian and Federal styles. The “order, restraint and elegance of Colonial architecture” appealed to Americans anxious to establish their own “style.” The pre-eminent New York architectural firm of
McKim, Mead and White was inspired by the details and massing of Colonial American architecture, thus, the “Colonial Revival” was born. Whidden and Lewis, the Portland architectural firm with strong ties to McKim, Mead and White, have been credited with bringing the Colonial Revival style to Portland; however, the availability of architectural journals likely helped to spread the influence of this style in Portland as well. Architectural characteristics of the Colonial Revival style are: gambrel, low-pitched hipped and gable roofs, classical entablatures, rectangular form with symmetrical façade, central entrance or portico, one-over-one double hung sash windows, dormers, bays and Palladian windows, ovals with keystones, fanlights, transoms and sidelights, narrow weatherboard siding, and decorative elements inspired by classical architecture. There are many fine examples of the Colonial Revival style in the King’s Hill neighborhood, particularly on S.W. King Avenue. Examples include: the Mackenzie residence, #81, at 1131 S.W. King Avenue. The style of the Mackenzie residence reveals the influence of Federal style Colonial buildings of the northeast. It is notable for its modillioned cornice, wood quoins and entrance portico supported by Tuscan columns; the Dougherty residence, #82, at 1115 S.W. King Avenue, notable for its double-story portico with colossal paired Ionic columns and central dormer window with broken pediment and carved urn; and the Gauld residence, #131, at 1150 SW King Avenue, notable for its central pediment and modillioned cornice, architrave moldings of the windows and elegant entrance portico with modillioned cornice supported by paired Tuscan columns.

**Arts and Crafts (1900-1920):** The Arts and Crafts movement, which originated in England with designer William Morris, was a movement which rejected classically derived design in favor of elements found in medieval design and architecture. This movement, a reaction to industrialism and mechanization, celebrated the crafts. English architects such as Philip Webb, C.F.A. Voysey and Sir Edwin Lutyens, were inspired by this philosophy which soon spread to the United States. Characteristic elements of the Arts and Crafts style include: steeply pitched gable roofs, often with intersecting or double gables, prominent chimneys, asymmetrical composition, casement and sash windows with multiple panes, stucco, shingle, brick or horizontal siding, and simplified English vernacular elements such as simulated half-timbering and simulated thatched roofs. Examples of the Arts and Crafts style in the King’s Hill neighborhood include: the Goldsmith residence, #26, at 1025 S.W. Ardmore, notable for its steeply pitched double gable roof, stucco surface and recessed entrance flanked by flat pilasters and round arch; the Ransom residence, #31, at 2331 S.W. Madison Street, a large residence with hipped roof and hipped roof dormers, with delicate ornaments at the pinnacle, carved brackets, quatrefoil patterns and use of geometric patterns of brick with stucco infill on the chimney and porch piers; the Lowenson residence, #65, at 2220 S.W. Main Street, notable for the ornate bargeboards and half-timbering of the front-facing gable and porch gable roof, the oriel window supported on carved brackets; and the Dole residence, #122, at 1151 S.W. King Avenue, notable for its shingled surface, steeply pitched double gable roof, ornate window hoods and the entrance recessed behind a Tudor arch.

**Prairie School (1900-1925):** The originator of the “Prairie School,” Frank Lloyd Wright, was influenced by the writings of English philosopher John Ruskin; his mentor, Chicago architect Louis Sullivan, and vernacular Japanese architecture. Wright’s theory of “organic architecture,” was that a building should be designed in sympathy to the environment, and with its interior and exterior “functional” in design. Characteristic elements of the Prairie style include: low pitched hipped roofs with wide overhanging eaves, rectangular composition with horizontal, low to the ground massing, casement windows often arranged in bands, brick or wood frame construction, balconies, terraces, extended walls and roof overhangs. The only example of the Prairie style in the King’s Hill neighborhood is the Edward Boyce residence (1906-07), #61, located at 909 S.W. St. Clair. The Boyce residence has the characteristic low pitched roof and horizontal emphasis of the Prairie style. The buff-colored brick and cast stone ornament are of subtle earth tones.

**Craftsman Style (1900-1925):** The Craftsman style, which emphasized simplicity of design, honesty of materials and fine craftsmanship, was inspired and popularized by the journal The Craftsman, published by Gustav Stickley from 1901-1916.
Stickley was influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement. Characteristic elements of the Craftsman style include: low-pitched gable or hipped roofs with wide, overhanging eaves and exposed brackets, rectangular composition, double hung windows with multiple panes in the upper sash, dormer windows with gable, hipped or shed roofs, wood frame construction, often with shingle siding, and porches, verandas, sunrooms, often supported by tapered, boxed porch posts. Examples of Craftsman style residences and apartment buildings include: the Kohn residence, #45a, at 2324 S.W. Cactus Drive, notable for its simplicity of design, with massive steeply pitched side-facing gable roof and wide over-hanging eaves with large brackets; the Elizabeth Spencer Apartments, #108, at 731 S.W. King Avenue, also restrained in ornamentation, with low pitched hipped roofs with wide over-hanging eaves and exposed brackets.

The American Renaissance (1890-1915): The American Renaissance style was begun as a reaction against the "picturesque" movement and called for a return to design based on the Orders and classical precedent. A major impetus for the style was the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The great "White City" was a coordinated effort of the greatest American designers at the time, and including a series of imitations of Classical Architecture. This style was particularly favored for large buildings, for example, civic buildings. Characteristic elements of the American Renaissance style include: flat roof, often with decorative parapet; sculptural ornament and balustrade; bilateral symmetry; rectangular windows with keystones or lintels of a different material; the "Union Jack" or grillwork to decorate windows; smooth, dressed stone or brick over concrete form. The American Renaissance style was used for many apartment buildings in the King's Hill neighborhood, including: the Cedar Hill Apartments, #45b, at 839 S.W. Green Avenue, notable for its decorative cornice with modillions, pedimented entrance hood and elegant carved consoles which support two story bay windows; the Belvoir Apartments, #49, at 751 S.W. Vista Avenue, notable for its decorative parapet, modillioned cornice with dentil course and large brackets, stone keystones which contrast with the brick volume of the building and the rusticated base; the Marshall Apartments, #109, at 711-715 S.W. King Avenue, a seven story brick apartment building with classical modillions, cornice and rusticated base.

Over the years, several important buildings from the primary period of significance have been demolished. One of these was St. Helen's Hall, an elite school for girls. It was a large brick building constructed in the Queen Anne style in 1890. This was the second site for this school. The imposing brick building with multigabled roofline and cupolas, was located on a block of land between S.W. Vista and St. Clair, and S.W. Park Place and S.W. Main Street. This parcel of land had been donated for the construction of the school by Arthur Johnson. The cornerstone for the new school building was laid in June of 1890. The building, which was designed by architect Henry Hefty, burned in 1914.

Prominent People

General Charles Beebe (1848-1922): Beebe was born in New York in 1848. He was an Oregon National Guard leader and Portland businessman. Beebe graduated from Flushing Institute at Long Island in 1865, and entered into New York business first with Beebe and Brother (1865-1879) and then with the brokerage house of Henry M. Evans (1879-1883). Beebe moved to Portland in 1884 as the west coast agent of Sutton & Company Dispatch Line of Clipper Ships. He purchased the west coast interest of the firm in 1897 and incorporated under the name Charles F. Beebe Company, specializing in shipping, commissions, maritime hardware and insurance. Beebe's other business interests included insurance sales and ventures with the Ladd family which included production of lime and gypsum. Active in civic affairs, Beebe served as both vice president and president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, president of the Commercial Club, and was a member of the Arlington and Multnomah Clubs. But of more significance is Beebe's participation in the Oregon National Guard. Beebe had served in the New York National Guard, and upon his arrival in Oregon, joined the Oregon Guard. He was promoted to the rank of colonel in 1887, and in 1895 appointed as brigadier general by Governor William P. Lord. General Beebe
headed Oregon” mobilization during the Spanish-American War, with which he was attributed the creditable showing of the Oregon units in the Philippines. In 1918 he was made Adjutant General of Oregon and served until 1919. [Oregonian, November 12, 1922, p. 8; Fred Lockley, History of the Columbia River Valley (Chicago, 1928) II pp. 540-544]

Percy Blyth (1866-1941): Blyth moved into his residence in the King’s Hill neighborhood the same year as his marriage to Mary A. Wilder in 1901. Blyth was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, and attended Loretto School and later Oxford University. Following graduation, Blyth moved to Portland and established a real estate business in 1890. [Capitol’s Who’s Who, p. 70] Percy Blyth and Robert Livingstone (also a King’s Hill resident) were the local representatives of the Scottish American Investment Company of Edinburgh. They were active in the development of the Willamette Heights, an area above the Guild’s Lake site in northwest Portland [Ticor Title Company; Oregonian, April 29, 1963, p. 17].

Isaac Lipman (1864-1927): Isaac Newton Lipman was the son of Solomon Lipman, co-founder of the oldest general merchandizing firm in the Northwest (1850-1979). Lipman & Wolfe was begun in Sacramento, California, by the elder Lipman in 1850, prospering from the influx of gold miners to the area. With his nephew Adolphe Wolfe, Lipman opened two branch stores, the first in Nevada City in 1866, and the second in Portland in 1880. Isaac Newton and his brother Will later managed the family business, located at 5th and Washington, until 1925. While under their management, Lipman & Wolfe was credited with introducing many innovations in department store design. [Sunday Oregonian, May 4, 1930, p. 1; Oregon Journal, February 10, 1979, p. 1; Oregonian, August 25, 1927, p. 6.]

Robert Livingstone (1853-1927): Scotland-born Livingstone attended Edinburgh University and operated a law practice in Edinburgh from 1874 to 1885. He apparently traveled to Portland in 1885 for the Scottish American Investment Trust Company, Limited. He was sent by the Edinburgh based company to replace William Reid in the management of their Oregon Mortgage Company. The investment company owned over seven blocks of property on the lower Willamette Heights, which would become quite profitable following the creation of the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition. Livingstone, along with his neighbor, General Beebe and others, invested in mining-related activities following the discovery of Alaskan gold fields in 1897. Livingstone’s daughter would marry Beebe’s second son. Livingstone also served as vice-president of the Y.M.C.A., and president of the Chamber of Commerce from 1904 to 1905. At the time of his death in 1927, Livingstone’s estate was valued at over $2000,000. [Who’s Who in the Northwest, 1911; E. Kimbark MacColl, The Shaping of a City, pp.53-4, 266; Oregonian, January 3, 1927, p. 20]

Charles J. Schnabel (1867-1921): Charles Schnabel was a prominent attorney, financier, leader of the German Aid Society, and unsuccessful Republican candidate for the 1918 United States Senate. Pittsburg-born Schnabel moved to Oregon in 1889 and graduated from the University of Oregon’s School of Law in 1891. From 1893 until 1896 Schnabel served as Assistant U.S. District Attorney, then formed a partnership with William W. Thayer, former Oregon governor (1878-1882) and former Chief Justice of Oregon Supreme Court (1888-1890). Following Thayer’s death, Schnabel went into partnership with his brother, Joseph Schnabel, and finally with W.P. LaRoche in 1907. Following Schnabel’s 1921 murder by a former client, his widow, Elsa, remained in the residence until her death in 1961. The house remained in the Schnabel family until 1985.

Theodore Wilcox (1856-1918): Theodore Burney Wilcox was a prominent figure in Portland banking, flour production and numerous smaller enterprises. Wilcox was born in Agawam, Massachusetts, where he attended public schools. In 1877, while employed by the Hampden National Bank in Westfield, Massachusetts, he met and was offered a job by Asahel Bush of Portland “Ladd & Tilton and Salem” Ladd & Bush Banks. Wilcox worked as a teller in Portland” Ladd & Tilton Bank until 1884, when he was appointed W.S. Ladd’s administrative assistant. Ladd also chose Wilcox as general manager of Ladd’s Albina Flour Mills (precursor to the Portland Flouring Mills). Wilcox assumed presidency of the flour mills upon Ladd’s death in 1893. [Joseph Gaston, Portland, Oregon. Its History and Builders,
As a member of the board of the Ladd & Tilton Bank, Wilcox used the bank to finance his fortunes, making the reorganized Portland Flouring Mills Company the largest flour-milling business on the Pacific Coast, and the largest single investment by the Ladd & Tilton Bank. The flour mill turned out over 10,000 barrels of flour per day. Wilcox was also president of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association (owned by the Ladd & Tilton Bank), and was active in efforts to promote Portland. Railroad magnate U.U. Hill singled out Wilcox as the primary individual responsible for Portland boosterism and commercial opportunities on the Columbia River. He was president of the Port of Portland Commission, served on the Oregon Developmental League, the Portland Commercial club, the Portland Water Board, and sat on the executive committee for the Lewis & Clark Exposition. Wilcox also actively promoted the Rose City Park residential development in northeast Portland. In 1917 he purchased 160 acres of the Peter Smith Donation Land Claim, which was subsequently developed as the Wilcox Estates. Upon his death in 1918, the Wilcox estate was estimated at over ten million dollars [Gaston, p. 417; MacColl, E. Kimbark The Shaping of a City (Portland: 1976) pp. 311, 359, 364; Portland Oregon Historic Inventory].

Erskine Wood (1879-1983): Erskine Wood was one of Portland's most notable figures, whose career as lawyer, poet and writer spanned over 80 years. Wood was born in Vancouver Barracks, Washington, the son of army lieutenant Charles Erskine Scott Wood. Erskine Wood’s father was himself a prominent figure in Portland history, a lawyer, author, social critic and friend of Chief Joseph and Mark Twain. The elder Wood first met the Nez Pierce chief while aide-de-camp for General Howard. Wood transcribed Chief Joseph’s famous “I will fight no more forever” surrender speech. As a child, Erskine Wood spent two consecutive summers in 1892 and 1893 living with Chief Joseph, about which he later wrote in the book, Days With Chief Joseph. Wood attended Portland Academy and graduated from Harvard University in 1901. After studying with his father's law firm, Wood graduated from the law school at the University of Oregon in 1912. He was admitted to the bar that year, and joined his father, specializing in maritime law. Wood became the senior member of the firm of Wood, Tatum, Mosser, Brooke & Holden, and continued to try cases well into his 90s. He practiced in Oregon's state courts and various Federal courts, including the United States Supreme Court. Wood had been described by a senior judge on the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals as one of the greatest admiralty lawyers in the United States. [Oregonian, July 7, 1983, D3; Fred Lockley, History of the Columbia River Valley p. 245-6; Walter Curtis, “Charles Erskine Scott Wood,” Multnomah Monthly, pp. 8-12]

Hardy C. Wortman (1859-1934): Hardy Christian Wortman, the son of Oregon pioneers, was born in Canemah, Clackamas County. Wortman's father, Jacob, was a businessman and mayor of McMinnville, and opened that city’s First National Bank. Hardy Wortman enrolled at the University of Oregon in 1876, then worked for his father in Junction City the following year. In 1883 Wortman was employed by the Portland Savings Bank, and later by the Commercial National Bank. In 1891 Hardy followed his brother John and purchased an interest in the Olds & King business, which was subsequently became Olds & King, Inc., and in 1901, Olds, Wortman & King. Over the following 20 years, Olds, Wortman & King became the largest department store on the Pacific coast. In 1925, the business was sold to California interests, and Wortman officially retired. Built in 1896, this is the primary residence associated with Hardy Wortman, and his wife Mary E. (Test) Wortman. [Oregonian, September 24, 1934, p. 10: Fred Lockley, History of the Columbia River Valley, pp. 220-223.]

Architects

The King’s Hill neighborhood has a high concentration of architect-designed buildings, including the work of the most prominent architects in Portland.

A.E. Doyle: Albert Ernest Doyle (187-1928) was born in California and moved to Portland with his family in 1882. Doyle gained experience from his father, a carpenter and building contractors, and became one of Portland’s most prominent architects under the tutelage of the eminent Portland firm of
Whidden and Lewis. Doyle worked as an apprentice with the firm until 1906. He attended architecture school at Columbia University in New York from 1902 to 1904. While in New York, Doyle worked briefly with Henry Bacon, designer of the Lincoln Memorial. After a year long trip through Europe, Doyle opened his architectural office in Portland in 1907 with partner William B. Patterson, a supervisor of construction. This partnership lasted until 1917, when Doyle resumed practice on his own. Among Doyle’s many designs in Portland are the Selling Building (1910), the Benson Hotel (1911), the Central Library (1913), the American Bank Building (1913), the Morgan Building (1913), and the Pittock Block (1914). Doyle also designed the buildings of Reed College. Several prominent Portland architects began their careers in Doyle’s office including Pietro Belluschi and John Yeon.

**Henry J. Hefty:** Henry J. Hefty was born in the Swiss canton of Glarus in 1858, the son of an architect. He attended a technical high school in Darmstadt, Germany, where he graduated in 1879. Hefty emigrated to Portland in 1881 where he started a successful architectural practice. Hefty designed several prominent buildings in Portland including the First Congregational Church, the Washington Block and St. Helen’s Hall, an elite school for girls which was located in King’s Hill until it was destroyed by fire in 1914. Hefty and his wife Agatha had three children.

**Joseph Jaccoberger:** Joseph Jaccoberger (1856-1930) was born in Alsace-Lorraine, and emigrated as a child to the United States. The Jaccobergers settled in the Midwest, where Joseph later graduated from Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska. After several years in Minneapolis, Jaccoberger settled in Portland in 1889. Jaccoberger designed many churches and institutional buildings in Portland, including St. Mary’s Cathedral, St. Clement’s School of Nursing, the chapel of All Saints Catholic Church and a building at Marylhurst College.

**Otto Kleeman:** Otto Kleeman was born in Astrow, Germany, in 1855. He graduated from the Architectural Polytechnicaum of Hljnden, with degrees in architecture and construction. He emigrated to San Francisco in 1871 and moved to Portland with his family in 1880. Kleeman worked in the firm of Clark and Upton briefly before joining Justus Krumbein’s firm in 1881. During the early 1880s, Kleeman was employed as projects manager and staff architect/engineer with the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company. Kleeman developed a reputation for his designs of Catholic churches including the monastery and school at Mt. Angel and St. Patrick’s Catholic Church in Portland (1891). Kleeman also designed the Hotel Armenius in Portland (1904).

**William C. Knighton:** William Christmas Knighton was born in 1864 in Indianapolis, Indiana. In 1893 he moved to Salem, Oregon, where he worked for several years with C.S. McNally. In 1896, Knighton moved to Los Angeles where he remained for two years, when he returned briefly to Indiana where he married Elanor Waters of Salem, Oregon. The Knightons returned to Portland in 1902. From 1913 to 1917, Knighton held the post of State Architect, the first to hold this position. He also became the first president of the Oregon State Board of Architectural Examiners in 1919, a position he held until 1924. He served as both secretary and president of the Oregon chapter of the American Institute of Architects. Knighton maintained his private practice throughout this period and in 1922 formed a partnership with Leslie Howell. Knighton designed numerous buildings in Portland in several popular styles, including the Queen Anne, Jacobethan, Arts and Crafts, Beaux-Arts, Mediterranean and Chicago style. Among Knighton’s designs are “Deepwood” in Salem, Oregon, the Trinity Place Apartments and the Governor’s Hotel in Portland.

**David C. Lewis:** David Lewis was educated in the United States and Europe, and began his professional career in Portland in 1899. He designed many of Portland’s landmark structures, including Trinity Church (of which his father was parish leader), and the Board of Trade, the Railway Exchange, and Couch & Lewis buildings. The L. Allen Lewis residence is the earliest residential design by David Lewis in the King’s Hill neighborhood, and perhaps in Portland. He also designed the 1903-04 Dole residence (#122), and redesigned the Honeyman residence (#95) in 1916. Lewis moved to California in 1917 due to ill health, where he died the following year. [Oregonian, April 5, 1918, p.7: Who’s Who in the Northwest, 1911]
MacNaughton, Raymond and Lawrence: This architectural firm was in existence from 1906-1910. Ernest B. MacNaughton (1880-1960) was born in Cambridge, Mass., and graduated from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1902. He arrived in Portland the following year and worked with architect Edgar Lazarus. In 1906 he formed a partnership with H.E. Raymond, his brother-in-law, and Ellis Fuller Lawrence, a former classmate at M.I.T. MacNaughton served as the business manager of the firm, with Raymond as engineer and Lawrence as lead designer. Ellis F. Lawrence (1879-1946) was born in Malden, Massachusetts, and later received bachelor’s and master’s degrees in architecture from M.I.T. Following his graduation in 1902, Lawrence worked in the offices of John Calvin Stevens and Steven Codman. Lawrence traveled to Portland in 1906. He formed a partnership with former classmate E.B. MacNaughton. In 1910, Lawrence opened his own firm and in 1913 formed a partnership with William G. Holford, also an M.I.T. graduate. This firm designed several hundred buildings in Oregon, including many of the buildings on the University of Oregon campus. Not only was Lawrence a significant Oregon architect, he was also active in civic affairs, the arts, and was a visionary in planning and education. In 1914 he founded the University of Oregon School of Architecture and Allied Arts. The firm of MacNaughton, Raymond and Lawrence designed several Portland residences and warehouses. They also designed the Alexandra Court Hotel (now the Alexandra Court Apartments) and the Cumberland Apartments.101

Emil Schacht: Emil Schacht (1854-1926) was born in Sommerland, Schleswig-Holstein, Germany, to a prominent, well-educated family. He graduated from the Polytechnic School of Hannover where it is likely he received the typical Beaux-Arts-influenced education of the period. In 1874, Emil Schacht left his native country for New York, where he worked as a draftsman in an unknown architectural firm for six years. In 1880, Schacht returned to Germany where he married Auguste Trier. Schacht returned to America once again and applied for citizen ship in Omaha, Nebraska, before arriving in Portland, Oregon, in 1883. Schacht opened his office in 1885 and practiced in Portland until his death in 1926. Schacht’s son Martin, an architect and engineer, practiced with his father in the firm of Emil Schacht and Son, Architects, from 1910-1915. During Schacht’s career of 41 years, he designed numerous buildings of varying types and styles in Oregon and Washington. At various times during his career, Schacht was the busiest architect in the state. Schacht was a leader in the earliest architectural association of Portland: the Portland Association of Architects for which he served as president in 1907 and 1908. He was also involved in subsequent organizations including the Portland Architectural Club, the Architectural League of the Pacific Coast and the Oregon Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, for which he was a charter member. Among his many buildings, Schacht is best known for his design of the Astoria City Hall (1904-5), the Portland Police Block (1912-13) and the S.E. 33rd and Francis Fire Station (1912).102

Whidden and Lewis: This firm was responsible for the design of more residences in the King’s Hill District than any other individual or firm. The firm introduced to Portland the Colonial Revival style in domestic architecture, American Renaissance in public buildings, and the classically detailed Commercial style in office buildings. Their designs included the Portland Public Library (1891), the Arlington Club (1891), Portland City Hall (1892) and Good Samaritan Hospital (1900). Both William M. Whidden and Ion Lewis were trained at M.I.T., where they first met. Lewis then worked in the Boston office of Peabody & Sterns, later forming a partnership with Henry P. Clark. Whidden went on to study at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris for four years. He then joined the prestigious New York firm of McKim, Mead & White. While working in New York, Whidden traveled to Portland in 1882 to supervise work on the Portland Hotel. After owner and railway magnate Henry Villard’s bankruptcy halted construction in 1883, Whidden resumed work on the east coast with new partner, William E. Chamberlin. The partnership would last until 1891. New ownership of the Portland Hotel and an invitation to resume work on the Portland Hotel prompted Whidden’s return to Oregon in 1888. In 1890 Whidden formed a partnership with his visiting friend, Ion Lewis. Lewis continued to practice for a number of years following Whidden’s retirement in 1920. During his career in Portland, Lewis would also serve as Park Commissioner, and
member of the Board of Appeals; and vice president of the Oregon Taxicab Company. [NHPA, Whidden/Kerr National Register Nomination, 1987; Who’s Who in the Northwest, 1911]

Transportation
The development and improvement of transportation routes in the 1880s and 1890s greatly influenced residential development of the King’s Hill area. Streetcars and cable cars which traveled along West Burnside, 18th and S.W. Jefferson Streets, made the area more accessible and resulted in an increase in land values. The magnificent view afforded from the hill encouraged development as well.

In 1882, the Multnomah Street Railway Company was established with E.J. Jefferey (son-in-law of Amos King) as its president. This horse-drawn streetcar line, which was carried on a 42” gauge line, began at the foot of Washington Street and extended west to its confluence with “B” Street and then continued to the junction of 23rd and Ford.103

In 1890, the line was electrified and extended to 23rd Street, where the main shops and the powerhouse were located. On August 1, 1892, the Portland Consolidated Railway Company was formed to take over operations of the Multnomah Street Railway Company.104 In 1905, a small “waiting station” was constructed for the Portland Consolidated Railway Company at the base of S.W. Vista, the site now occupied by the Benjamin Franklin Bank building (Burkhardt’s Florist shop). This station was designed by King’s Hill resident, architect Emil Schacht, and was located directly across from his own residence. In 1906, the entire city-wide system of streetcar lines (along with the interurban rail lines and the power companies) were consolidated into a single company—the Portland Railway Light & Power Company.105

Secondary Period of Significance: 1915-1942
The United States’ entry into the World War I resulted in a recession in Portland. This was primarily because Portland was a shipping rather than manufacturing center. Total foreign exports from Portland dropped 77 percent from 1915 to 1916. Grain and lumber exports to foreign markets declined drastically as well.106 The recession hit the housing market, although it did not collapse—in fact, while growth on the west side of the city slowed, it increased on the east side. From 1910 to 1920, the population of the east side of Portland increased from “58 to 71 percent of the city’s total population,” and this increase consisted predominantly in single family residences.107

A decline in residential construction in the King’s Hill neighborhood during and just following World War I is particularly evident. From 1915 to 1922, only four new buildings were constructed in the area. Construction began to rise again in 1923 and continued until 1930. This period was the second major building phase in the district, with the years 1926 and 1929 the greatest in building activity.

The stock market crash of October 1929, and the Great Depression which followed, ended the rapid construction going on in King’s Hill. From 1931 to 1942, only seven new buildings were constructed in the King’s Hill neighborhood.

Development in the King’s Hill neighborhood during the secondary period of significance followed two trends: an increase in density along the north edge of the district, where apartment buildings and flats remain characteristic of the area; and the further development of smaller lots throughout the district, particularly in the western portion along S.W. Madison Street, S.W. Ardmore Avenue, S.W. Douglas Place and along S.W. Park Place.

By 1926, the block between S.W. King Avenue and St. Clair and West Burnside and Wayne (S.W. Yamhill) was filled with multifamily buildings and a few commercial buildings along
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Burnside. The Amos King house was surrounded by encroaching development, and the Johnson’s house was in use as “House Keeping Rooms.” King’s residence (beyond the boundaries of the district) and the Johnson House were demolished by the end of the decade. In 1941, the Vista Avenue Apartments were constructed on the Johnson House site. S.W. Vista Avenue, below its junction with S.W. Park Place, was eventually filled in with apartment buildings. The Envoy, the largest historic apartment building in the district (constructed in 1929), dominates the lower slope of Cedar Hill.

Architecture

Following World War I, the architectural styles of the previous period fell out of favor as the “Historic Period” styles become popular. The Secondary Period of Significance also saw the rise of the “Early Modern” styles.

Historic Period Styles (1910-1935)

English Cottage Style: This style continued the traditions of the English Arts and Crafts Movement, with more emphasis on the “picturesque.” Characteristic elements of the English Cottage style include: medium or steeply pitched gable roof, frequently with rolled eaves or gable ends flush with the surface of the wall; prominent chimneys, frequently with compound flues; asymmetrical plan and massing; windows with multiple, small panes, dormer windows, round or arched window and door openings; brick construction, often with stucco façade; or wood frame construction with horizontal or shingle siding; picturesque ornamentation.

Examples of the English Cottage style in King’s Hill are: the Carman residence, #6, at 2350 S.W. Madison, notable for its stucco surface, massive chimney with clay pots, diamond pane leaded glass casements and garage, enclosed within the volume of the house; the Aaron Frank residence, #68, at 1125 S.W. St. Clair, notable for its multiple steeply pitched, intersecting gable roofs and stucco wall surface and round arched door with rounded hood.

Tudor and Jacobethan style: The Tudor style was influenced by English country manor houses of the 16th and early 17th centuries. The Jacobethan style, a composite of the words Elizabethan and Jacobean, had similar origins but was primarily used for larger masonry structures. Both styles were very popular in the United States following World War I. Characteristic elements of the Tudor and Jacobethan styles are: steeply pitched gable roofs, often with double gable dormers; ornamental parapets; prominent chimneys with clustered flues; rectangular form with vertical orientation; bay, oriel, dormer and multipaned windows; brick construction or wood frame construction, often in combination with stucco surfacing; Tudor arch or round arch openings; medieval inspired ornamentation including quatrefoil designs and imitation half timbering.

Examples of the Tudor and Jacobethan styles in the King’s Hill neighborhood are: the Tudor style Neate residence, #1, at 2390 S.W. Madison Street, notable for the elaborate half timbering of the front-facing steeply pitched gabled dormers, and the second story, which contrasts with the white stucco surface of the residence; and the Jacobethan style Holtz residence, #20, at 2370 S.W. Park Place, a large “major house” surfaced with brick laid in a Flemish bond, notable for the parapeted gables, projecting bay windows with stone surrounds and quoin and the elaborate stone entrance.

Colonial (1910-1935): This style is based on Colonial American building from the 17th and 18th centuries. It differs from the earlier “Colonial Revival” in that there is more emphasis on “Correct” historic detailing. Characteristic elements of the Colonial style include: low pitched hipped gable or gambrel roof; bilateral symmetry; small paneled rectangular windows, often with shutters, dormer windows, fanlights and sidelights with transoms; wood frame construction with narrow weatherboard siding; ornamentation derived from classical precedent.

Good examples of the Colonial style in the King’s Hill neighborhood include: the White residence, #4, at 2368 S.W. Madison Street, notable for its symmetrical façade and orate broken pediment of the main entrance.; the Markewitz residence, #90, at 2165 S.W. Main Street, notable for its massive interior chimneys, pedimented dormers, wood quoins and the entrance portico, consisting of a sunburst design above an architrave.
**Mediterranean:** The Mediterranean style is derived from the vernacular stucco buildings along the Mediterranean. Characteristic elements include: low pitched hipped or gable roof, often surfaced with tiles; wrought iron railings, balconies and window grilles; round arched windows and door openings, casement windows, loggias and arcades; wood frame construction with smooth or textured stucco surface, and sometimes poured concrete. Good examples of the Mediterranean style in the King’s Hill neighborhood are: the Jacob Barde residence, #11, at 2400 S.W. Park Place, notable for its tiled roof, triple arched entrance portico, decorative elements of wrought iron and cast stone, and porte cochere; the San Carlos Apartments, #52, at 831 S.W. Vista Avenue, notable for the entrance, consisting of three arches which spring from twisted columns, the decorative parapet and cast stone swag and medallion ornament below the central gabled portion of the parapet.

**French Renaissance:** This style was inspired by the French chateaux of the 16th and 17th centuries. Characteristic elements include: steeply pitched gable roof, or mansard roof; conical roofs on towers; tall, prominent chimneys; asymmetry: casement windows with multiple panes; lintels and sills of stone or brick often in contrast with the color and texture of the building surface; brick or masonry cladding on a steel, concrete or wooden frame; classical ornamentation. The sole example of the French Renaissance style in the King’s Hill neighborhood is Burkhardt’s Florist Shop (1929), #54 (now Benjamin Franklin bank) located at 2280 West Burnside. The Burkhardt’s Florist Shop is notable for its irregular massing, pyramidal roof and cast stone ornament, including the carved owl. This building has a prominent position at the northwest edge of the King’s Hill District, where it serves as a gateway into the district.

**Norman Farmhouse:** This was an extremely popular style in the period following World War I. It was inspired by the picturesque vernacular cottages of 10th century France, particularly in the area of Normandy. Characteristic elements of the Norman Farmhouse style include: steeply pitched gable roof; steeply pitched gable porch roof, asymmetrical massing, generally one and one half stories; round arched and segmental arched window and door openings, windows with small panes; various building materials used in combination; Tudor arches, half timbering and towers. A good example of the Norman Farmhouse style in the King’s Hill neighborhood is Dent Mowrey residence, #17, at 1062 S.W. Douglas Place, notable for its massive exterior chimney and the engaged turret form with shingle-clad conical roof.

**Half-Modern (1915-1959):** This style, which was influenced by early modern buildings of Europe beginning in 1900 and the earlier Arts and Crafts movement, generally employed a classical system of proportioning, but was stripped of detail. Characteristic elements of the Half-Modern or Transitional style include: stepped or flat roof; classical proportion and balanced spatial composition; rectangular windows with metal or masonry frames and muntins; steel frame of concrete construction, clad with brick, stucco or marble veneer; traditional and classical forms without historical ornament. The sole example of the Half-Modern style in the King’s Hill neighborhood are the Vista Avenue Apartments, designed by Pietro Belluschi in 1941, #57, located at 800-864 S.W. Vista Avenue. These Vista Avenue Apartments, an early example of the Half-Modern style, are notable for the use of Roman brick as the wall surface, massive chimneys and the sensitive integration of the buildings into an existing landscape.

**Prominent People**

**Dent Mowrey (1888-1959):** Dent Mowrey was a noted composer and musician who toured the United States and Europe in 1920s and 1930s. Mowrey was born in India and studied in Leipzig, Germany, and Paris, but lived most of his adult life in Portland. A musical prodigy, he wrote his first composition at age 12. His later works include “Bedouin Melody,” “The Gargoyle of Notre Dame,” “Danse Americains,” “Prelude,” and “Gavotte.” Mowrey maintained a music studio in the Pacific building in Portland, and when not touring, played with the Portland Philharmonic Orchestra. He also was a composer/pianist for the Portland Symphony. [Oregonian, August 21, 1960, p. 46: Portraits, Mowrey, Dent, Oregon Historical Society files.]
Aaron Holtz (1879-1953): Aaron Holtz was associated with some of Portland’s most prominent retail stores, and was the first administrator of the Oregon State Liquor Control Commission. New York-born Holtz moved to Portland in 1900 and worked as the first advertising manager of the Meier & Frank Company. In 1909 he left Meier & Frank to become a partner in the rival Olds, Wortman & King store. Holtz directed planning and erection of the present Olds & King (now Galleria) building. In 1912 he opened his own Holtz Department Store at S.W. Fifth Avenue and Washington Street. Holtz moved to Pittsburg in 1914 to manage Boggs Boggs & Buhl, owned by the May Department Stores. The following year he was promoted to the position of merchandise manager for the parent store in Cleveland. Holtz returned to Portland in 1925 and purchased this property the same year. He had returned to serve as the first president of Lipman Wolfe & Company after its purchase by the National Department Stores Company, and retired in 1927. Holtz was also involved in the States Steamship Company. In addition to his business ventures, he was appointed by Governor Julius Meier as the first administrator of the Oregon State Liquor Control Commission following the passage of Oregon’s Knox Liquor Law. Under Holtz, the statewide system of liquor stores was established. Holtz moved to Beverly Hills, California, in 1942. [Oregonian, 4/6/1953, p. 15; Capitol’s Who’s Who 1936-1937, p. 267]

Aaron Frank (1891-1968): Frank was born in Portland, the son of Sigmund Frank, one of the founders of the Meier and Frank department stores. He was educated in Portland public schools, and earned a law degree from the University of Oregon in 1913. Frank practiced law for two years before entering the family business first as a stock clerk and later as assistant manager. He became president of the firm in 1937, a position he maintained until his retirement in 1964. In 1965, while he sat on the board of directors, Meier and Frank merged with May Company, becoming the second largest department store in sales volume in the West. Frank was also well-known as a prize winning horse breeder, and his Aaron M. Frank Farm boasted one of the largest private covered rings in the United States. His country estate was in Washington County. Aaron Frank was active in many civic clubs, and sat on many boards of directors, including the Portland branch of the Federal Reserve. [Portland Historic Resource Inventory; Lockley, Fred, History of the Columbia River Valley, (Chicago, 1928) p. 768; Oregonian, Nov. 29, 1968, p.1]

Thomas H. Banfield: Banfield is recognized for his development of the automatic coal stoker, and his service on the State Highway Commission. Banfield was born in Portland and attended public schools. According to the Portland Historic Resource Inventory, he formed a construction business with C.J. Parks and purchased the Portland Wire and Iron Works in 1923. Following their discovery of the automatic coal stoker, Banfield and Parks created the Iron Fireman Company to manufacture the device. Iron Fireman became the largest manufacturer of such products in the United States. In addition to this business enterprises, Banfield served on the dock commission from 1930 to 1947, and held the chairmanship of the State Highway Commission from 1943 to 1950. During the 1940s, Chairman Banfield pushed for the creation of a thoroughfare connecting Portland with the Columbia River Highway. Completed in 1957, the “T.H. Banfield Freeway” was lauded by a state highway engineer who had predicted in 1952 that “‘when complete, [would] be one of the finest expressways in America.’”[Oregon Journal, November 24, 1957]

Julius Meier (1874-1937): Meier was one of Portland’s leading businessmen, and governor of Oregon from 1931 to 1935. Born in Portland, Meier attended public schools and graduated with a law degree from the University of Oregon in 1895. Although admitted to the bar, he entered his father’s 29-year-old Meier & Frank department store business in 1896. While under Meier’s directorship, the present terra cotta, fourteen story building on 6th Street was completed. A contemporary described it as “Portland’s own store...the largest and finest department store in the Pacific Northwest.” [Lockley, History of the Columbia River Valley, pp.709-710] Meier would eventually become president of the company. Meier’s other activities included the promotion of and presidency for the Columbia River Highway Association during the road’s creation. During World War II he was Northwest regional director of the Council of National Defense. [Who’s Who for Oregon p. 381] But it was Meier’s role as governor which is most significant. Meier was elected in 1931 following the sudden death
of his friend, Republican gubernatorial candidate George W. Joseph. Originally intending to run as the New Republican nominee, Meier withdrew and was then nominated as an independent. His victory in 1930 carried the largest voting margin (nearly 80,000) in a gubernatorial election in Oregon history. He was also Oregon’s first independent governor. Among his many reform initiatives passed into law include the creation of a hydro-electric commission with state-wide jurisdiction; the creation of a department of home rule public utilities in favor of a public service commission; non-partisan election of judges; and the repeal of the market road millage tax. Following his death, the Oregonian observed under the Meier governorship, “no prior legislature...ever put upon the statute books so many laws of such far reaching scope.” [July 14, 1937, p. 1 and 4]

Architects

**Pietro Belluschi:** Pietro Belluschi was born in Italy in 1899, the son of an engineer. He attended schools in Rome, Bologna and Milan. In 1916 he volunteered in the Italian army and served for three years in the mountain artillery. Following the war, he enrolled in the University at Rome and graduated with a doctorate in architectural engineering in 1922. The following year he came to the United States on an exchange scholarship with Cornell University. After he was hired by the engineering firm of Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company in Kellogg, Idaho. In 1925, Belluschi moved to Portland, Oregon, where he worked as a draftsman in the office of A.E. Doyle. He was named a partner in the A.E. Doyle & Associate firm in 1933, concurrent with his efforts on the Half Modern style Portland Art Museum (1932, 1938), for which he received national recognition. The museum and the 1937 Finely’s Mortuary earned Belluschi honors from the A.I.A. in 1940. He is also well known for his design of the Equitable Building (1948), an early curtain wall structure. Belluschi was the predominant force in the architecture of the Northwest from 1930 to 1950. He is credited with the creation of the Northwest Regional style (along with John Yeon) and the modern New Formalism style.

**Cash and Wolf:** George Wolff (1898-1977) was born on July 4 in Portland, and gained early architectural experience working in the office of Portland architect Morris Whitehouse. Wolff later graduated from the University of Oregon in architecture. During the Depression, Wolff chartered sewer lines for the Federal Works Projects Administration, and at some point formed a partnership with Earle Cash. In the 1940s Wolff worked with builder Henry Kaiser, and designed several federal projects, including worker housing at the Bonneville Dam, some shipyards, and the World War II city of Vanport. He also designed projects in Hawaii and Australia. Later in his career, Wolff was a senior partner in the firm of Wolff, Zimmer, Gunsul and Frasca, a firm which is still practicing in Portland. Less is known about Earle G. Cash (1894-1956), who worked with the firm of H.L. Camp & Company in the early 1900s. Cash had his own firm by 1915 before joining Wolff. He moved to California with his wife, Harriet, in 1953.

**A.E. Doyle:** A.E. Doyle continued to design buildings in the King’s Hill District through the Secondary Period of Significance.

**Johnson, Wallwork and Johnson:** Folger Johnson was born in Georgia in 1862 and graduated with a B.S. from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a Bachelor of Architecture from Columbia University in New York. Johnson studied in Europe before settling in Portland in 1911. He formed a partnership with Jamieson Parker and later with Carl Wallwork in 1925. After Parker’s death in 1940, Johnson was named State Director of the Federal Housing Administration. Carl Wallwork (1879-1940) was born in Kansas and studied architecture in Boston. He worked in offices in Kansas City, Colorado and Seattle before moving to Portland. Hollis Johnson was born in Idaho in 1894 and graduated from the University of Oregon in 1921. He was associated with the Wallwork Johnson firm from 1930-1931. He worked in the offices of Lawrence and Holford and Sutton and Whitney before opening his own firm in 1932.115

**Carl Linde:** Carl Linde (1864-1945) was born in Germany and settled with his parents in Wisconsin in 1870. Following his graduation from Milwaukee’s German-English Academy in 1877, Linde was apprenticed as an architect, and worked in several architectural offices in Milwaukee and Chicago before arriving in
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Portland in 1906. From 1906 to 192, Linde worked in the offices of several notable Portland architects including Edgar Lazarus, Whidden and Lewis, D.C. Lewis, A.E. Doyle and Whitehouse and Fouilhoux. Linde maintained his own practice from 1921 to 1940 with offices in Portland and Seattle.

**Jamieson Parker:** Jamieson Parker (1895-1939), a native of Portland, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1916. Following his graduation, he returned to Portland to begin what was to be a successful architectural career. He married Margaret Alden Biddle of Portland in 1923. During his career, he designed several significant buildings in Portland: the Georgian style First Unitarian Church (1924); the Romanesque style St. Mark’s Episcopal Church (1925) and the Arts and Crafts style Waldeman Spliid house (1922). Parker was active in many organizations including the Portland Arts Commission and the Oregon Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, for which he served as president in 1928-29 and in 1934. Parker was director of the Oregon and Washington Historic American Buildings Survey in 1933-34, and a member of the State Planning Board from 1934-1940. From 1935 until his death, Parker served as state director of the Federal Housing Administration. During World War II, Parker was a second lieutenant in the coast artillery.116

**Whitehouse and Fouilhoux:** Morris H. Whitehouse, a Portland native, was born in 1878 to Benjamin Gardner and Clara Houmons Whitehouse, Oregon pioneers of 1859. He graduated from the Bishop Scott Academy in 1896 and attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Following a leave of absence, he graduated in 1906. Whitehouse was the first M.I.T. graduate to receive the Guy Lowell Fellowship. Whitehouse spent the following year studying at the American Academy in Rome. After his return to Portland, he formed a partnership with J. Andre Fouilhoux in 1908, which lasted until 1918. In later years, Whitehouse was in partnership with A. Glenn Stanton and Walter Church, and designed many significant buildings in Portland and in the state of Oregon, including: the United States Courthouse, the Multnomah Athletic Club, the Waverly Country Club, Multnomah Golf Club, Oswego Country Club and Eastmoreland Country Club. He also designed the Sixth Church of Christ Scientist, the United States Federal building, the Oregon State library and the Oregon State Capitol.117

J. Andre Fouilhoux (1879-1945) was born in Paris and attended the Lycee Janson de Sailly before receiving a degree from the Sorbonne. He also graduated as a civil and mechanical engineer from the Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures. He came to the United States in 1904 and moved to Oregon in 1907. In 1918, Fouilhoux joined the United States Army during World War I. Following his discharge, he established a firm in New York with Raymond M. Hood, which lasted from 1920 to 1934. From 1935 to 1941, Fouilhoux was in partnership with W.K. Harrison. He was president of the New York Building Congress and the American Relief for France, vice-president of the French Hospital and treasurer of the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design. Fouilhoux designed the Chicago Tribune Building in Chicago and in New York, the McGraw-Hill Building, the Daily News building, the Rockefeller City Apartments, and the Tryon and Perisphere at the New York World’s Fair.118

**Transportation**

Transportation in the city of Portland went through tremendous changes following World War I, particularly as a result of the introduction of the automobile in the decade prior, and the development of Inter-urban rail lines which allowed easy transportation to and from the suburbs of Portland. In December of 1926, the old Ford Street streetcar bridge, which spanned the changing at Jefferson Street, was replaced with the Vista Avenue viaduct—commonly referred to as the Vista Avenue Bridge. The bridge provided a link for the automobile from the upper Burnside area to the Portland Heights, across the canyon from King’s Hill neighborhood.119 The streetcar system remained an important form of transportation. Although it reached its peak in ridership in 1919, this system remained important until the years just following World War II, when the automobile became affordable for all.120 The Council Crest Streetcar, which ran up Vista Avenue, over the bridge to the Heights, made its last trip in 1950.121
Modern Period: 1943-1990

Following World War II, increasing land values in the King's Hill District resulted in changes in occupancy and also in the intrusion of tall apartment buildings of steel frame and reinforced concrete construction. Many residences were converted from single to multifamily occupancy and office space. In spite of these changes, the remaining historic buildings in the district have been well-maintained and the retention of historic street trees has maintained a visual link throughout the district. Although there have been intrusions, the district is remarkably intact considering its close proximity to the urban center of Portland.
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APPENDIX B

Portland Zoning Code Section 33.846.140.C

Excerpts from the Portland Zoning Code, Chapter 33.846.140,* Historic Reviews

Historic character. The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. Removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that contribute to the property’s historic significance will be avoided;

Record of its time. The historic resource will remain a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings will be avoided;

Historic changes. Most properties change over time, those changes that have acquired historic significance will be preserved;

Historic features. Generally, deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where practical, in materials. Replacement of missing features must be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence;

Historic materials. Historic materials will be protected. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials will not be used;

Archaeological resources. Significant archaeological resources affected by a proposal will be protected and preserved to the extent practical. When such resources are disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken;

Differentiate new from old. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. New work will be differentiated from the old;

Architectural compatibility. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will be compatible with the resource’s massing, size, scale and architectural features. When retro-fitting buildings or sites to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities, design solutions will not compromise the architectural integrity of the historic resource;

Preserve the form and integrity of historic resources. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic resource and its environment would be unimpaired; and

Hierarchy of compatibility. Exterior alterations and additions will be designed to be compatible primarily with the original resource, secondarily with adjacent properties, and finally, if located within a Historic or Conservation district, with the rest of the district. Where practical, compatibility will be pursued on all three levels.

*The Portland Zoning Code is accessible online at www.planning.ci.portland.or.us/
Steps at the north end of the Vista Avenue Bridge mark the southern boundary of the King's Hill Historic District.
APPENDIX C

Maps of the King’s Hill Historic District
APPENDIX D

Adopting Ordinance #176083

Ordinance No. 176083
Adopt design guidelines for the King's Hill Historic District. (Ordinance)

The City of Portland Ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

General Findings

1. Chapter 197 of the Oregon Revised Statutes requires cities and counties to review their comprehensive plans and land use regulations periodically and make changes necessary to keep plans and regulations up-to-date and in compliance with Statewide Planning Goals and State law.

2. Senate Bill 588 (SB 588), adopted by the Oregon legislature in 1995, requires local governments to protect any property listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a property of statewide significance. Portland complies with these rules by automatically designating such properties as City of Portland historic landmarks and districts. This automatic designation provision is included in the City's Zoning Code, Section 33.445.110. Protection of historic landmarks includes design review for exterior alterations and new construction.

3. The City Council adopted the King's Hill Historic District on January 2, 1991, by Ordinance No. 163755. The King's Hill Historic District was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in February 1991.

4. Approval criteria for historic design review in National Register Historic Districts are based on the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. If special design guidelines do not exist at the local level, Portland has incorporated the content of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards into the Zoning Code, Subsection 33.846.140.C. The ten criteria listed in Subsection 33.846.140.C. are the designated approval criteria for historic design review in Portland's historic districts for which special district design guidelines have not yet been created.

5. The U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties are generalized for all properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places and are applied throughout the United States of America. The standards focus on the alteration of landmark structures. As a result, the provisions of Subsection 33.846.140.C. are of limited value for new construction in historic districts.

6. Portland has adopted guidelines of design applicability for several historic districts. These include: East Portland/Grand Avenue, 13th Avenue, Skidmore Fountain/Old Town, Yamhill, and Ladd's Addition.

7. The Goose Hollow Foothills League (GHFL) and concerned residents and neighbors of the King's Hill Historic District perceive the approval criteria contained in 33.846.140.C. as unreasonably vague. From December 2000 to June 2001 they worked with the Bureau of Planning to develop guidelines that are specific to the King's Hill Historic District and that are designed to maintain and preserve qualities that make the district a unique historic neighborhood.

8. The King's Hill Historic District Guidelines are intended to clarify and simplify design review by identifying the applicable design guidelines based on project type; providing guidance through the inclusion of images and explanatory captions of successful projects that meet guidelines; and providing explanatory language in the background statements of the guidelines. The King's Hill Historic District Guidelines will incorporate and supersede the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties included in Zoning Code Subsection 33.846.140.C.

9. On July 24, 2001, notice of proposed action was mailed to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) in compliance with Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 660. A copy of this notice was mailed to Metro in compliance with the requirements of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

10. The Proposed Draft: King's Hill Historic District Guidelines was reviewed by the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission at a public hearing on September 10, 2001. On this date, the Landmarks Commission unanimously recommended approval of the King's Hill Historic District Guidelines by City Council.

11. It is in the public interest and critical to the successful administration of design review in the King's Hill Historic District to adopt the recommended King's Hill Historic District Guidelines.

Statewide Planning Goals Findings

A statewide program for land use planning in the State of Oregon has been maintained since 1973. The program is based on a set of 19 statewide planning goals that have been adopted as administrative rules (Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 660, Division 15). Because of the limited scope of this proposal, only some of the state goals apply. The following lists the goals that are relevant to the proposal.

12. Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement: This goal insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. This proposal has provided numerous opportunities for public involvement. In compliance with Goal 1. Portland Comprehensive Plan findings on Goal 9 (Citizen Involvement) and its related policies and objectives also support this goal. This proposal supports this goal in the following ways:

a. The King's Hill Design Guidelines project was initiated due to community interest in preserving the historic character of the area.

b. The King's Hill Design Guidelines document was developed by the City of Portland Bureau of Planning in cooperation with other bureaus and agencies with participation from residents and other interested citizens.

c. Bureau of Planning staff attended regular meetings of the Goose Hollow Foothills League (GHFL) Board of Directors and Planning Committee to provide information and gather input on the project. These meetings occurred over the course of several months, from November 2000 to August 2001.
d) In December 2000, the Bureau of Planning sponsored the first of four public workshops on the King's Hill Design Guidelines project. Bureau staff provided information and an opportunity for citizen comment. Notice was mailed to property owners; neighborhood and business associations; and interested persons. The Northwest Examiner, a local newspaper, also publicized the event.

e) In January 2001, the Bureau of Planning sponsored its second public workshop to gather input on the project. Notice was mailed to property owners; neighborhood and business associations; and interested persons. The Northwest Examiner also publicized the event.

f) In March 2001, the Bureau of Planning sponsored a third public workshop. Notice was mailed to property owners; neighborhood and business associations; and interested persons. The Northwest Examiner also publicized the event. The project's Preliminary Draft of the King's Hill Historic District Guidelines was produced for review and discussion at this workshop.

g) In June 2001, the Bureau of Planning sponsored the fourth and final public workshop. A notice about the event was mailed to property owners; neighborhood and business associations; and interested persons. A questionnaire was also distributed to solicit responses about priorities for discussion at the workshop. The Northwest Examiner, a local newspaper, publicized the event. The project's Working Draft of the King's Hill Historic District Guidelines was produced for review and refinement at this workshop. The draft guidelines were also made available to the public on the Bureau of Planning's website.

h) On August 9, 2001, a notice of a public meeting before the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission was mailed to property owners; neighborhood and business associations; and interested persons.

i) On August 16, 2001, the project's Proposed Draft of the King's Hill Design Guidelines document was released. It was made available at the Bureau of Planning office, at the office of Neighbors West-NorthWest, and at a regular meeting of the Goose Hollow Foothills League Board of Directors.

j) On October 30, 2001, the Recommended Draft of the King's Hill Historic District Guidelines was released. It was made available at the Bureau of Planning office and at the office of neighbors West-NorthWest.

13. **Goal 2 - Land Use Planning**: This goal requires the development of a process and policy framework which acts as a basis for all land use decisions and assures that decisions are based on an understanding of the facts relevant to the decision. The Portland Comprehensive Plan is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 2. The King's Hill design guidelines will provide improved guidance for the siting and design of land uses to meet the public policy objectives of the Portland Comprehensive Plan and comply with the statewide goal. The introduction of applicability charts for historic design review will help streamline the process for both applicants and design review staff and help implement the goals and policies of the Portland Comprehensive Plan.

14. **Goal 5 - Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources**: This goal includes a provision for the protection of historic resources in the State of Oregon. Planning guidelines dictate the preservation of resources of national, statewide, regional, or local historic significance for future generations. Adopting special guidelines for the King's Hill Historic District is consistent with Goal 5 because the design guidelines will ensure that new development in the historic district is compatible with the existing historic character of the area, thus assuring a higher degree of protection for the district's historic resources.

15. **Goal 9 - Economy of the State**: This goal calls for diversification and improvement of the economy of the state. If the city is to achieve the goals of the Region 2040 plan for new jobs and residents, we must assure that new development increases, rather than decreases, the quality and attractiveness of Portland for investment. This proposal supports Goal 9 because the King's Hill Design Guidelines will promote high quality development in an area of Portland outside of the Central City.

16. **Goal 10 - Housing**: This goal calls for providing the housing needs of citizens of Oregon. The proposal supports this goal because the design guidelines are applicable to an established neighborhood where new housing is allowed at higher densities. The design guidelines address a variety of housing types, including rowhouses and apartment buildings, which provide a wider range of housing choices for citizens.

17. **Goal 12 - Transportation**: This goal calls for a safe, convenient and economic transportation system. The design guidelines support this goal by promoting pedestrian-friendly development. This will promote alternatives to automobile use and reduce vehicle miles traveled. The findings on Portland Comprehensive Plan Goal 6 (Transportation) also support this goal.

18. **Goal 13 - Energy Conservation**: This goal calls for a land use pattern that maximizes the conservation of energy. The design guidelines support this goal by encouraging the rehabilitation and restoration of existing buildings, thus promoting a reduction in the consumption of natural resources.

**Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Findings**

The following summarizes the proposal in terms of the relevant policies of the Functional Plan.

19. **Title 1 - Requirements for Housing and Employment Accommodation**: This title requires that each jurisdiction contribute its fair share to increasing the development capacity of land within the Urban Growth Boundary. This requirement is to be generally implemented through city-wide analysis based on calculated capacities from land use designations. The proposal is not inconsistent with this title because the guidelines and applicability charts highlight the effectiveness and desirability of maintaining, rehabilitating, and restoring resources in the historic district. The guidelines also encourage quality infill and redevelopment and provide an increased level of guidance to designers and developers of projects in the historic district.
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20. **Title 6 - Regional Accessibility:** This title recommends street design and connectivity standards that better serve pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel and that support the 2040 Growth Concept. The proposal is not inconsistent with this title because it is generally supportive of pedestrian-friendly development, which will promote alternatives to vehicle use and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

21. **Title 7 - Affordable Housing:** This title recommends that local jurisdictions implement tools to facilitate development of affordable housing. The proposal is not inconsistent with this title because design review is a discretionary process that encourages flexibility and innovation. The design guidelines may facilitate affordable housing by addressing a variety of housing types, including rowhouses and apartment buildings, which provide a wider range of housing choices for citizens.

**Portland Comprehensive Plan Goals Findings**

Chapter 197 of the Oregon Revised Statutes requires all cities and counties to develop a comprehensive plan for land use and development, in accordance with the requirements of the State Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). The City’s Comprehensive Plan was adopted by Portland City Council on October 16, 1980 and was acknowledged as being in conformance with the statewide planning goals by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) on May 1, 1981. On May 26, 1995, the LCDC completed its review of the City’s final local periodic review order and periodic review work program.

The following summarizes the proposal in terms of the relevant goals and policies.

22. **Goal 1 - Metropolitan Coordination:** This goal says the Comprehensive Plan must be coordinated with federal and state law and support regional goals, objectives and plans to promote an regional planning framework. This proposal is consistent with this goal because it has been developed to work within the framework of state and federal historic preservation policy and regulations.

23. **Goal 2 - Urban Development:** This goal calls for maintaining Portland’s role as the major regional employment and population center by increasing opportunities for housing and jobs while retaining the character of established residential neighborhoods and business centers. In general, the proposal supports this goal by encouraging quality infill and redevelopment that would have a positive effect on livability and would increase the attractiveness of Portland for investment.

**Policy 2.9 - Residential Neighborhoods:** This policy calls for a range of housing types to accommodate increased population growth while improving and protecting the City’s residential neighborhoods. The proposal supports this policy by supporting the development of housing types that improve and build on the positive characteristics of the historic district.

**Policy 2.15 - Living Closer to Work:** This policy calls for locating greater residential densities near major employment centers. Portland’s Central City is a major employment center that is close to the King’s Hill Historic District. Guidelines in the proposal emphasize design compatibility and context sensitivity. In addition, the emphasis on the pedestrian environment supports City efforts to make living closer to work an attractive option. This design approach advances the concept that sensitive design can effectively promote developments that accommodate higher densities.

24. **Goal 3 - Neighborhoods:** This policy calls for preserving and reinforcing the stability and diversity of the City’s neighborhoods while allowing for increased density that insures residential quality. In general, the proposal is in compliance with this goal. The design guidelines are specific to the district and clearly promote the retention of its unique identity as a historic district within the City of Portland.

**Policy 3.2 - Social Conditions:** This policy calls for providing and coordinating programs that promote neighborhood interest, concern and security and minimize the social impact of land use decisions. Guideline language promoting: façade articulation, directionality, lighting at the sidewalk level, and visual connections from and into buildings that create interest provide a level of security that improves the social conditions in the City.

**Policy 3.4 - Historic Preservation:** This policy calls for preserving and retaining historic structures and areas throughout the city. The proposal is supportive of this policy. The guidelines clarify issues of compatibility within the historic context of the district. The guidelines strongly encourage the rehabilitation and restoration of historic resources.

25. **Goal 4 - Housing:** This goal encourages diversity in the type, density and location of housing within the city in order to provide an adequate supply of safe and sanitary housing affordable to people of different means. In general, the proposal is supportive of this goal. Design review is a discretionary process that encourages flexibility and innovation.

**Policy 4.1 - Housing Availability:** This policy calls for the availability of an adequate supply of housing to meet the needs, preferences, and financial capabilities of Portland’s households now and in the future. **Objective E** calls for housing design that supports the conservation, enhancement, and continued vitality of areas of the city with special scenic, historic, architectural or cultural value. The proposal is supportive of this policy by meeting this objective. Guideline language emphasizes area character, architectural integrity, the context of existing buildings, and view opportunities, among other subjects.

**Policy 4.5 - Housing Conservation:** This policy calls for the restoration, rehabilitation, and conservation of existing sound housing as a method of maintaining housing as a physical asset that contributes to an area’s desired character. **Objective B** encourages the adaptive reuse of existing buildings for residential use. The proposal is supportive of this policy by meeting this objective. Guidelines highlight the effectiveness and desirability of the maintaining, rehabilitating, and restoring resources in the historic district.
Policy 4.6 - Housing Quality: This policy calls for the development of housing that exceeds minimum construction standards. All development within the historic district requires design review. The design review process encourages housing developers to go beyond the minimum standards set by the Uniform Building Code. Therefore, the proposal supports this policy.

26. Goal 5 - Economic Development: This goal strives to foster a strong and diverse economy that provides a full range of employment and economic choices for individuals and families in all parts of the city. In general, the proposal supports this goal. The guidelines and applicability charts streamline the design review process and support a development environment that protects existing investments and encourages new development that maintains the City as the major regional employment, population and cultural center.

Policy 5.1 - Urban Development and Revitalization: This policy encourages investment in the development, redevelopment, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of urban land and buildings for employment and housing opportunities. The proposal is generally supportive of this policy. This policy includes Objective E, which reads: "Define and develop Portland's cultural, historic, recreational, educational and environmental assets as important marketing and image-building tools of the city's business districts and neighborhoods." The King's Hill Historic District Guidelines document includes substantive background information about the district, its architecture and early residents. Therefore, the document could serve as an image-building tool for the neighborhood, which would help realize Objective E.

27. Goal 6 - Transportation: This goal provides for and protects the public interest and investment in the public right-of-way and transportation system by encouraging the development of a balanced, affordable and efficient transportation system consistent with the Arterial Streets Classifications and Policies. The proposal generally supports this goal in the Pedestrian Emphasis section of the design guidelines, which include provisions for pedestrian enjoyment of the built environment from the public right-of-way and provision of barrier-free design in development projects.

Policy 6.10 - Barrier-Free Design: This policy calls for the provision of transportation facilities accessible to all people and states that all improvements to the transportation system (traffic, transit, bicycle and pedestrian) in the public right-of-way shall comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990. The proposal is supportive of this policy in promoting design concepts that emphasize accessibility for all people.

28. Goal 8 - Environment: This goal provides for maintaining and improving the quality of Portland's air, water, and land resources, as well as protecting neighborhoods and business centers from noise pollution. In general, the proposal supports this goal and its policies. A variety of design guidelines promote resource conservation.

29. Goal 9 - Citizen Involvement: This goal calls for improving methods for citizen involvement in the on-going land use decision-making process and providing opportunities for citizen participation in the implementation, review and amendment of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The proposal has been supportive of this goal as indicated in the findings for Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement. The process provided notice and opportunities for citizens and business and neighborhood associations to participate, review, and comment on the identified issues and guideline proposals in meetings.

30. Goal 10 - Plan Review and Administration: This goal states that Portland's Comprehensive Plan will undergo periodic review to ensure that it remains an up-to-date and workable framework for land use development. The proposal does not affect this goal because it proposes no changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 10.13, Design Review: This policy calls for the preparation of design review standards for existing and proposed areas subject to design review. The proposal complies with this policy because the adopted design guidelines will function as the approval criteria for all projects within the King's Hill Historic District.

31. Goal 12 - Urban Design: This goal calls for promoting Portland as a livable city, attractive in its setting and dynamic in its urban character by preserving its history and building a substantial legacy of quality private developments and public improvements for future generations. The recommended King's Hill Historic District Guidelines are generally supportive of this goal because they will function as the approval criteria for all projects within the King's Hill Historic District, one of the City's oldest and most architecturally significant residential neighborhoods. The design review and historic design review process promotes quality development and protects the integrity of historic resources. The guidelines could also strengthen the urban character of the surrounding area by providing a model for quality development projects.

Policy 12.1 - Portland's Character: This policy calls for enhancing and extending Portland's attractive identity and extending the use of city themes that establish a basis of a shared identity reinforcing the individual's sense of participation in a larger community. The proposal complies with this policy because they will function as the approval criteria for all projects within the King's Hill Historic District, one of the City's oldest and most architecturally significant residential neighborhoods. The design review and historic design review process promote quality development and protect the integrity of historic resources.

Policy 12.2 - Enhancing Variety: This policy calls for promoting the development of areas of special identity and urban character. The proposal complies with this policy because it will function as the approval criteria for all projects within the King's Hill Historic District, one of the City's oldest and most architecturally significant residential neighborhoods. The design review and historic design review process promote quality development and protect the integrity of historic resources in the district, a unique area of the City. The development of applicability charts that streamline the design review process will help maintain the district's unique identity.

Policy 12.3 - Historic Preservation: This policy calls for enhancing the City's identity through the protection of Portland's significant historic resources. The proposal complies with this policy because it will function as the approval criteria for all projects within the King's Hill Historic District. The historic design review process promotes quality development and protects the integrity of historic resources in historic districts. The guidelines will ensure that new development in the district is compatible with the existing historic character of the area and that modifications to structures in the district do not adversely affect their historic qualities.
Policy 12.4 - Provide for Pedestrians: This policy calls for the provision of a pleasant and safe environment for pedestrians. The proposal generally complies with this policy because it promotes an attractive pedestrian environment. Each guideline in the Pedestrian Emphasis section of the document focuses on the design of the urban environment for pedestrians. The guidelines promote integrated design programs that enrich the human apprehension of the urban environment.

Policy 12.7 - Design Quality: This policy calls for enhancing Portland's appearance and character through development of public and private projects that are models of innovation and leadership in the design of the built environment. The proposal complies with this goal because it will function as the approval criteria for all projects within the King's Hill Historic District. The design review and historic design review process promote quality development and protect the integrity of historic resources. The specific district design guideline promotes the development of a unique identity for King's Hill Historic District, one of the City's oldest and most architecturally significant residential neighborhoods. The proposal's applicability charts will streamline the design review process and promote the exploration of design solutions that meet the intent of the guideline statements.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:

a) Adopt Exhibit A, the Recommended Draft of the King's Hill Historic District Guidelines, dated October 2001;

b) Adopt the commentary in Exhibit A as legislative intent and as further findings;

c) The King's Hill Historic District Guidelines and Applicability Chart will be used by the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission and other City review bodies as mandatory approval criteria for proposals subject to historic design review within the King's Hill Historic District.

Passed by the Council

Mayor Vera Katz
Lisa Mickle
October 30, 2001

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By
## APPENDIX E  Street Tree List

Street trees play an intricate role in the historic character of the streetscape in the King’s Hill Historic District. This list of trees is provided as a guide to maintain and enhance that character. City Code requires a permit to plant trees on the public right of way. The exact species of trees to be planted shall be determined by the Urban Forestry Division. Tree species selection will be based on the planting site conditions and a consultation with the adjacent property owner and/or developer. For technical assistance for the maintenance of existing street trees and the planting of new street trees, contact the Urban Forestry Division in the Bureau of Parks and Recreation at (503) 823-4489.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLIEST SURVIVING TREES PLANTED IN KING’S HILL INCLUDE:*</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT SPECIES</th>
<th>REASON SPECIES MAY BE DISCOURAGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This column lists some possible replacement species, based on historic landscaping characteristics and lists of street trees available from Urban Forestry.</td>
<td>Species are recommended by Urban Forestry based on size of the planting strip. Most planting strips in King’s Hill are 4’ - 5 1/2’.</td>
<td>This column provides some reasons the trees listed in the left column may not be advisable to plant in the King’s Hill Historic District. In all cases, it is advisable to consult with Urban Forestry to determine the most appropriate replacement tree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weeping cherry
- Recommended for 4’ - 5 1/2’ planting strips:
  - Columnar Sargent Cherry
  - Kwanzan Cherry
  - Royal Burgandy Cherry
- Litter with fruiting; invasive root system

### Sycamore
- Recommended for 4’ or larger planting strips:
  - Spaethii Maple
  - Pyramidal Sycamore Maple
- Invasive root system

### Sequoia
- No suggested replacement
- Too tall for streetscape; impairs visibility

### Horsechestnut
- Recommended for 8 1/2’ and larger planting strips:
  - Red Horsechestnut
- Litter with fruiting

### Elm
- Recommended for 5’ and larger planting strips:
  - Elm that are resistant to Dutch Elm Disease including:
    - Accolade Elm
    - Homestead Elm
    - Pioneer Elm
    - Dynasty Elm
    - Prospector Elm
- Disease-prone

### Hawthorne
- Recommended for 4’ - 5 1/2’ planting strips:
  - Lavelle Hawthorne
- ---

* The list of trees in King’s Hill was derived from the King’s Hill Historic District National Register context statement. See Appendix A for more information.
**MORE RECENTLY PLANTED TREES IN KING’S HILL INCLUDE.*\(^*\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Type</th>
<th>Replacement Species</th>
<th>Reason Species May Be Discouraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big leaf maple</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' - 5 1/2' planting strips:</strong> State Street Maple, Pacific Sunset Maple, Paperbark Maple, Queen Elizabeth Maple</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' - 5 1/2' planting strips:</strong> Chancellor Linden, Greenspire Linden, Recommended for 6' - 8' planting strips: Glenleven Linden, Crimean Linden</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locust</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 6' - 8' planting strips:</strong> Shademaster Honeylocust, Skyline Honeylocust</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetgum</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' or larger planting strips:</strong> Moraine Sweetgum, Palo Alto Sweetgum, Worplesdon Sweetgum</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' - 5 1/2' planting strips:</strong> Jacquemontii Birch, Rocky Mount Splendor Birch</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering Plum</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' - 5 1/2' planting strips:</strong> Newport Plum</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' - 5 1/2' planting strips:</strong> Kobus magnolia, Edith Bogue Magnolia</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam</td>
<td><strong>Recommended for 4' - 5 1/2' planting strips:</strong> Pyramidal European Hornbeam</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The list of trees in King’s Hill was derived from the King’s Hill Historic District National Register context statement. See Appendix A for more information.