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executive summary

The purpose of this document is to help Oregon State University (OSU) and its design teams navigate the various approvals processes that are required to allow new construction on OSU’s campus, a portion of which has been identified as a National Historic District, with a particular emphasis on the Historic Resources Committee (HRC) review process. This Workbook uses OSU’s Hallie Ford Center project as an example of an application that was successful in its approvals and describes a structural framework for presentation that could be useful to other design teams.

OSU’s campus is renowned for its architectural harmony. This was a key goal of the 1909 Olmsted Brothers’ Plan and all subsequent Campus Plans. Per OSU’s Historic Preservation Plan (2010), “Olmsted had provided President William Jasper Kerr in 1909, a type-written sixty page report which described in detail the future development of the university’s campus. While the Olmsted firm did not provide any plans or drawings to accompany the report, a plan was drafted a year later in 1910 by landscape architecture professor Arthur Lee Peck. The drawing showed the creation of quadrangles and grouping of buildings. One important aspect of the plan was to develop architectural unity for the campus, which was primarily implemented by architect, John V. Bennes.” Buildings designed by Bennes between 1909 and 1925 and by A.D. Taylor between 1926 and 1944 basically implemented the Olmsted plan.

A significant portion of OSU’s campus was designated a National Historic District in 2008. As a result, all significant development within, and in some cases adjacent to the Historic District, is subject to a historic review process by the City of Corvallis. Development also remains subject to the standard regulations such as local planning and building code requirements and the requirements of OSU’s Campus Master Plan. The review criteria associated with development is distributed through a variety of documents, and the requirements can be confusing and sometimes potentially contradictory. OSU’s 2010 Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) is complementary to the Campus Master Plan and takes precedence if there is a conflict between the documents.

Understanding that the goal of all Campus Plans has been to achieve architectural harmony, the recommended approach is to identify the common characteristics of the contributing resources and to develop the new work based on this understanding of the site context.
In order to appropriately address the full range of review criteria, this Workbook proposes that designs are developed with an appropriate level of analysis of the surrounding context for each project, and that the following categories are used to organize and present the proposed design in relationship to its context:

I. Overall Design Approach
II. Site Development
III. Building Orientation
IV. Massing
V. Scale
VI. Proportion
VII. Height
VIII. Modulation
IX. Materials
X. Architectural Details
XI. Entrances
XII. Roof Form
XIII. Window and Door Openings
XIV. Accessory Development
XV. Sustainability

Each of the review criteria can be placed within one of these categories, allowing for an organizational methodology that can be used for each of the review processes.

This Workbook is thus divided into three distinct parts: a review of the background information and applicable documents, an itemization and analysis of the specific guidelines, and a suggested approach. Diagrams and flowcharts are included in the appendix to illustrate the issues.
A portion of Oregon State University’s campus was designated a National Historic District by the National Register of Historic Places on June 25, 2008.

The nomination establishes the period of significance as 1888-1957 and notes the following architectural styles as present on campus: Late 19th and 20th Century Revivals (Beaux Arts, Classical Revival, Italian Renaissance, and Spanish Colonial Revival) and Modern Movement (International Style).

A survey of the campus identified 54 contributing buildings, 4 contributing sites and 1 contributing structure, for a total of 59 contributing resources within the period of significance. The survey identified a variety of building materials: foundation of concrete and stone; walls of wood, brick, stone and stucco; roofs of asphalt, tile and wood, and “other” (terra cotta).

Benton Hall (1887-88) was the first building on campus. Others followed, including Kearney Hall (formerly Apperson Hall, 1899-1900) and Furman Hall (formerly Education Hall, 1902). These early buildings aligned with the orientation of the original town plat, with streets parallel to the Willamette River. Fairbanks Hall (1892) was the first building on campus to be oriented north-south. Per the nomination: “Campus development during the remainder of the period of significance can best be broken into three periods: the Olmsted Brothers period (1909-1925), the first A.D. Taylor period (1926-1944), and the post-war A.D. Taylor period (1945-1957, although technically Taylor’s second plan was in place until the Campus Master Plan was revised in 1964).” OSU’s 2004 Campus Master Plan introduction describes the 1964 Long-Range Physical Development Plan by Louis A. DeMonte and Albert R. Wagner in more detail.

The nomination discusses the Olmsted brothers’ Campus Plan and its recommendations for “Grouping of Buildings,” “Approaches,” “Orientation of Buildings,” “Architectural Harmony,” and “Design of Grounds and Plantings;” and it notes that the Olmsted brothers wrote that “Harmony and unity was to be achieved through architectural style, exterior materials, and the massing and orientation of buildings.”

A.D Taylor’s later Campus Plan reports built on the legacy of the Olmsted plan, while post-war campus development was influenced by the rise of the Modern Movement and included a significant amount of dormitory construction.
OSU’s Historic Resources Map, also included as Appendix G in this document.
OSU’s historic campus will continue to change and develop within, and adjacent to, the National Historic District. Such development is now subject to a specific review process both on and off campus.

The City of Corvallis is the certified local government that has the delegated authority (both State and Federal) to evaluate changes to “Designated Historic Resources” including OSU’s campus and its eligible resources (buildings, sites, and structures). The governing requirements are outlined in the City’s Land Use Development Code Chapter 2.9, Historic Preservation Provisions (October 18, 2010).

The University also has its own approvals process, as outlined in the Campus Master Plan (December 2004) and the Historic Preservation Plan (April 2010).

And finally, any development is required to meet provisions of various typical State, local and Federal Codes including local Planning and Building Codes, the ADAAG, OSU’s Best Practices for Accessibility and others. Sustainability mandates might apply to some projects, as can energy performance criteria.

The following discussion outlines the approvals background and process for each of the four key documents that influence development within the National Historic District:

3.1 The City of Corvallis’ Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan provides an over-arching policy and establishes a series of specific policies regarding historic and cultural resources, including:

- Policy 5.4.3
  The City shall maintain a local Historic Preservation Advisory Board.

- Policy 5.4.4
  The public’s safety and general welfare shall be carefully evaluated when a conflict surfaces between the renovation of an historic structure and the City’s building and fire codes.
Policy 5.4.5
Special architectural review criteria for historic structures shall be maintained in the Land Development Code.

Policy 5.4.7
The City shall continue efforts to inventory historic structures, archaeological sites, and other potential historic sites (as more structures on OSU’s campus “age in” to consideration as Historic Landmarks).

The Plan also dedicates Article 13 to development on the Oregon State University Campus and specifically establishes the relationship between the Campus Master Plan and the City’s oversight in Policy 13.2.5:

Policy 13.2.5
Development on the Oregon State University main campus shall be consistent with the 1986 Oregon State University Plan, its City-approved successor, or approved modifications to the Plan. This plan includes the Physical Development Plan Map that specifies land use at Oregon State University.

3.2 The City of Corvallis’ Land Use Development Code (LDC)

A stated goal of the LDC Chapter 2.9 is to “Adequately implement the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Preservation since they were used in the development of review criteria for Historic Preservation Permit requests.”

Chapter 2.9 establishes the application process for Historic Preservation Permits and identifies the criteria for the review process for the Historic Resources that are subject to alteration, new construction, demolition or moving. It is important to note that the LDC clearly states that a Historic Preservation Permit is required for certain Alteration or New Construction, Demolition, or Moving activities affecting Designated Historic Resources, even if no Building Permit is required by the Building Official. Also, some activities are exempt from the Historic Preservation Permit application requirements, including interior alterations that do not alter the building exterior, some routine maintenance, and various other items. Careful reading of Section 2.9.70 is recommended to confirm the need for a permit.

There are two types of Historic Preservation Permits: The Director-level Historic Preservation Permit is used for minor non-exempt work, while the HRC-level Historic Preservation Permit is used for all other work.

A Historic Preservation Permit application for a Designated Historic Resource is
submitted using forms provided by the City of Corvallis, for both types of permit. The Director may waive certain requirements. Director-level Historic Preservation Permits will be approved, conditionally approved, or denied no later than 45 days from the date the application is deemed complete. HRC-level Historic Preservation Permits will be approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the HRC following a public hearing. The decision is made no later than 75 days from the date the application is deemed complete.

Appeals are allowed, and re-application following denial or partial approval is allowed. If following a denial, the modified application is treated as a new application. A re-application following partial approval is considered in the context of the existing permit and any conditions related to that permit. Modifications to issued permits are processed as new applications.

Development must begin within two years of approval to prevent expiration of a permit.

### 3.3 OSU Campus Master Plan (2004)

The design process for all campus development must be coordinated with Facilities Services (or its designee) to ensure it is evaluated in relationship to the CMP and other campus related issues. The Campus Planning Committee (CPC) reviews all proposals for new construction, significant remodeling, and renovations that “visually alter the exterior appearance of the campus.”

The CPC includes members from OSU, the City of Corvallis, and the Corvallis community, and its membership is described in detail in the Plan. Its meetings are open to the public but aren’t considered public hearings.

Submittals to the CPC are required to include information about “the project’s intent, project scope, design, size, height, location, and materials. As appropriate, graphic materials of additional project details shall be provided.” Conceptual plans illustrate the proposed development, its anticipated future expansion, and its relationship to planned growth in the sector.

The CMP is silent regarding the timing of such a review, but the City of Corvallis’s review process for a Historic Resources Permit requires the prior approval of the CPC. The CPC will approve, deny, or modify the proposal; its recommendations can only be overturned by OSU’s President or its Vice President for Finance and Administration, through review by OSU’s University Cabinet. The Cabinet’s decision can be accepted or modified by the President or Vice President for Finance and Administration.
3.4 OSU Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) 2010 Review Process

The HPP does not replace requirements established by the CMP, but rather complements it. However, the HPP states that “should an apparent conflict or contradiction arise, the policies in the more specific HPP shall take precedence.”

Because the HPP calls for its design guidelines to be reviewed and updated regularly, it is essential that the most current information is referenced.

Several different categories of work are identified, each with its own approach. Simply stated:

- HPP Section 6.0, Historic Preservation Standards, is to be applied to additions or alterations to any historic building or structure within or partially within the OSU Historic District, and to alterations to any contributing resource within the District (including Historic Places, Sites, or Elements).

- HPP Section 7.0, New Construction, is to be applied to any new structures within or partially within the OSU Historic District that don’t touch or alter an existing contributing structure and any alterations to existing non-contributing structures.

- Certain historic and/or significant trees located outside of the OSU Historic District may be subject to HPP regulations.

The CPC is OSU’s reviewing body, while the City of Corvallis regulates development in OSU’s National Historic District.

A Historic Resource Report (HRR) is required for projects that involve exterior alteration, addition and/or rehabilitation. A certified historic preservation consultant is required to complete the report, guided by Facilities Services. The report is to be included in documentation submitted to the City of Corvallis.

HPP Section 5.1.2 notes that OSU intends to develop Historic Building Conditions Assessments of its historic resources, and requires that such assessments are performed by the end of the schematic design phase. This section also establishes the format for these reports.

HPP Section 5.2 outlines analysis required during the schematic design phase for new construction within, partly within, and in some cases immediately adjacent to the historic district, or immediately adjacent to another historic resource.
1. Ensure that any required studies have been completed or are commissioned in a timely manner. Specifically, OSU HPP Section 5 requires the commissioning of an HRP for projects that involve exterior alteration, addition, and/or rehabilitation of a Historic Resource.

2. Establish the applicable period of significance for the proposed location of new construction, addition, or renovation. While the National Historic District’s Period of Significance ranges from 1888-1957 per the nomination to the National Register, each Resource within the district has its own specific date and style. See appendix for matrix of OSU properties within National Historic District.

3. Undertake the HPP-required graphic analysis of the historic resources (ideally contributing rather than non-contributing) that are within the study area. Per HPP Section 5.2:
   - Open space land pattern and existing built area surrounding the development site
   - Pedestrian, automotive, bicycle, and transit circulatory patterns
   - Analytical façade studies of adjacent buildings

4. As the design of the proposed development matures, similar graphic analysis of the design must be generated:
   - Analytical façade studies of proposed development
   - Height and massing relationships between the proposed development and its closest neighbors, such as a simple sectional drawing, to scale, at each relevant condition
When multiple contributing styles display an influence on a proposed development, use the graphic analysis to study and define the COMMON CHARACTERISTICS of those styles. Organize the analysis within the following categories:

I. Overall Design Approach
II. Site Development
III. Building Orientation
IV. Massing
V. Scale
VI. Proportion
VII. Height
VIII. Modulation
IX. Materials
X. Architectural Details
XI. Entrances
XII. Roof Form
XIII. Window and Door Openings
XIV. Accessory Development
XV. Sustainability

During design, the team is to consider the COMPATABILITY of the proposed design to the surrounding Historic Resources. From LDC 2.9.100.04 b2:

In general, the proposed Alteration or New Construction shall either:

• a) Cause the Designated Historic Resource to more closely approximate the original historic design or style, appearance, or material composition of the resource relative to the applicable Period of Significance; or

• b) Be compatible with the historic characteristics of the Designated Historic Resource and/or District, as applicable, based on a consideration of the historic design or style, appearance, or material composition of the
resource.

For additions and new construction, the team should also take into careful consideration the Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines for rehabilitation that state: “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”

7 As the design develops, the team can demonstrate the compliance of the proposed design to the various criteria through a graphic comparison of each issue.
Hallie Ford Center
an OSU example of Communicating Design
Intent in a Historic District

The Hallie Ford Center for Healthy Children and Families brings together faculty and student researchers to advance scholarship around the holistic health of children and families in Oregon and around the world. The facility houses seminar rooms, offices, and collaborative research areas for Oregon State University’s College of Health and Human Sciences. The three-story structure is sited in the historic district of campus, immediately south of Bates Hall. Careful attention has been paid to harmonizing the Hallie Ford Center with the surrounding campus buildings.

The following pages document the process of historic compliance documentation for the Hallie Ford Center. This documentation is to serve as an example of how future projects on the OSU campus can demonstrate compliance within the historic district.
The Hallie Ford Center (above & right) was designed by Thomas Hacher Architects (THA) and completed in the fall of 2011. The 21,000 sf building on the OSU campus serves as a quality example of new construction within a historic district.
I. overall design approach

This category demonstrates that the overall design is compatible with the common characteristics of OSU’s historic campus.

The purpose of this category is to:

- Introduce the site for the proposed building and its campus context and illustrate the complexity of that context;
- Introduce the proposed building design, its program and its purpose;
- Illustrate that many different styles prevail on the campus

Suggested Comments:

- Outline the presentation and introduce the design of the new building, its purpose, its program, and the institutions that it serves.
- Offer any relevant history regarding the proposed design and its site.
Photographs of Frederick Law Olmsted and John V Bennes allow to open a discussion about the history of campus development through the Olmsted Brothers’ plan and the legacy of John Bennes.

Suggested Comments:
- Discuss architectural harmony – the recommendation in the Olmsted Plan to develop architectural unity and the recognition that OSU has now gained for its success in achieving architectural harmony.

The diagram above introduces the theme of “Common Characteristics” as a methodology to find common ground among many contributing historic resources. The diagram introduces the theme of “Common Characteristics” as a methodology to find common ground among many contributing historic resources.

Suggested Comments:
- Discuss the variety of architectural styles across the campus and the need to find common characteristics that can be expressed in meaningful ways in the new design, thus achieving compatibility between old and new work.

REFERENCES:
- The National Historic District status and the OSU Historic Preservation Plan briefly outline the history of the campus development and the major players – Olmsted, Bennes, and A.D. Taylor and the need to preserve significant themes on the campus.

“A simple, restrained variety of Classic”

“Achieved best by limiting bold, large features and opting for simple, lighter details instead”

“A good quality of rough red brick for the main walls permitting some range of choice in stone or terra cotta for trim”
There are **19 contributing building styles** on this campus and most new development will be located close to more than one contributing resource, and therefore, more than one style.

This comment, with reference to the OSU Historic Resources Map, can serve to center the discussion on the OSU Campus and the complexities of working with so many different styles.

The Vicinity Plan showing contributing buildings and landscapes (right) identifies surrounding buildings that are contributing historic structures, their year of construction, and their architectural style. This image illustrates that many architectural styles prevail on campus, and clearly identifies the site for proposed development, along with proposed massing for new work.

The purpose of the Vicinity Plan is to:
- Focus discussion on specific site context, its opportunities, and challenges.
- Introduce adjacent contributing landscapes and buildings, identifying the date and style for each resource.
- Introduce proposed massing and orientation and show it in context.

Suggested Comments:
- Of the 19 contributing building styles on campus, many are directly adjacent to this site.
- Proposed massing for new work is demonstrated to be consistent with site development.
- Continue to develop theme of common characteristics and the desire to achieve architectural harmony.
II. site development

The site development documentation shows the project Site Plan with first floor plan of proposed design in relationship to immediate site context. **The purpose is to show the position of the proposed design in context, introduce circulation systems, landscape development, etc.**

Suggested Comments:
- Show connections to existing outdoor spaces and circulation systems (CMP asks for links to pedestrian open spaces; HPP asks for consistent perimeter landscaping);
- Introduce accessibility and show how site accommodates level changes.
- Option for discussion: floor area ratio, site coverage and setbacks per CMP.

REFERENCES:
- City of Corvallis LDC 2.9 Compatibility Criteria J (site development); and
- OSU HPP 6.2 Design Guidelines

**Site plan** (which includes the first floor plan) shows the position of the building in context, and introduces the circulation system, landscape, outdoor spaces, and accessibility.
The building orientation documentation shows the first floor plan of the proposed design in relationship to immediate site context. [Note: this is shown on the site plan for category III: site development]. **The purpose is to show the position of the proposed design in context, demonstrating compatibility of setbacks and plan modulation, etc.**

**Suggested Comments:**
- Explain building orientation and site development and how they relate to existing conditions. Establish which frontages are major and which are minor.
- Identify building entries (major and minor) and discuss position (CMP and HPP require main entrance located in central bay, main façade).
- Continue to refer to theme of common characteristics and the desire to achieve architectural harmony.

**REFERENCES:**
- City of Corvallis LDC 2.9 Compatibility Criteria I (building orientation)
- OSU CMP 5.2.h Design Guidelines; and
- OSU HPP 6.2 Design Guidelines

*Site plan* with a graphic overlay showing the major axis of travel around the site and the building entrances.
IV. massing

The massing diagram serves to:
- Show proportion and massing of proposed design; and
- Demonstrate symmetrical relationships to two axes; and the
- Contextual analysis shows wide variety of plan responses to site conditions and program.

Suggested Comments:
- The scale of the proposed design suggests the use of simple massing.
- Campus tradition suggests axial symmetry.
- The corner condition and dual frontage does make the site response more complex, and this is reflected in the inset corner condition, emphasizing both “main” façades.

REFERENCES:
Shows compliance:
- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility
- Criteria i) Building Orientation
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics – Simple Building Masses

Symmetrical Design:
- OSU HPP 6.3 General Design Guidelines 6.1.2

The massing diagram illustrates the simple and symmetrical massing of the surrounding historic buildings and how the proposed massing corresponds with that precedent.
Suggested Approach

V. Scale

The Pharmacy Building, Graf Hall, and Milam Building (left to right), shown adjacent to the proposed building east and south elevations, helps to illustrate that buildings on the campus use a similar approach to façade development through scale of openings and depth of the façade.

The building elevation (showing shadows) helps to illustrate how the depth of the façade and the compositional approach to scale is similar to that of existing buildings on campus.

Suggested Comments:
For this specific design, the comments would include:

- Some OSU buildings that are three or more stories in height modulate their actual scale by “gathering” two stories together via façade composition devices.

- These historic buildings also layer the masonry detailing of their walls. In addition to reducing the apparent mass of the building this device also expresses the structure of the building as the column bays are emphasized in the vertical proportion of the walls, which begin to behave as pilasters in the façade composition.

References:
Shows compliance:
- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria b) façades
- OSU HPP 6.3 General Design Guidelines 6.1.2
V. scale & VI. proportion

Kidder Hall (above) and Ballard Hall (left) display historic examples of the scale and proportion of buildings on campus. The proposed Hallie Ford Center (right) breaks the façade into similar proportioning elements.
Historic drawings of resources on OSU’s campus showing analysis of wall and window proportions. (Includes details of PROPOSED windows.) The graphics show analysis of existing structures and then compares this analysis to the proposed design, demonstrating the relationship between the two.

REFERENCES:
- Corvallis LDC Ch 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.b) Façades; e) Scale & Proportion
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics; Columns or Pilasters; Visibly Bearing Walls; Symmetrical Design; h.2.0 Proportion; h.3.0 Modulation; h.4.0 Vertical Bays; h. 5.0 Corners
- OSU HPP 6.0 General Design Guidelines 6.1.6
- Historic resources on the campus show a variety of approaches to façade development. Some buildings develop wide masonry bays at their corners; some have similar approaches at the central entrances. Other buildings exhibit a more uniform approach to masonry detailing.
- This analysis investigates the proportions exhibited in façades and components of those façades (specifically, windows and groups of windows) shown in nearby contributing resources.
- The proposed design shows two approaches common on the campus: the development of strong corners and a uniform approach to window / wall distribution in the body of the building. This approach emphasizes the axial symmetry of the design and the proposed central entrance bay.
- The proportion of the proposed window design is directly related to adjacent structures.
- Note the paired windows used over single larger windows – another device found on adjacent buildings.
VII. Height

The elevation of the proposed design shown alongside equal-scaled drawings from existing neighboring buildings (including sectional drawing of Cordley) with graphic analysis showing relationships / datums demonstrates compatibility of building scale in its context and shows relative heights of adjacent structures.

Suggested Comments:

- The proposed design is significantly taller than Ballard Hall but the masonry detailing and stepping back of the façade at the third floor creates strong visual relationships between the two buildings.
- Neighboring buildings are taller than the proposed design.
REFERENCES:
- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.f) height
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics – h.2.0 Proportion
- OSU HPP 6.0 General Design Guidelines 6.1.2

Cordley Hall (left) shown alongside the proposed building (center) and Ballard Hall (right) show the height of the proposed building in relation to the surroundings.
VIII. modulation horizontal

The graphics showing horizontal modulation of the proposed building adjacent to modulation of existing historic structures sets the context for discussion regarding compliance of design with modulation criteria.

Suggested Comments:

- Historic façades often incorporate banding details of contrasting materials to differentiate between floor levels or to combine multiple floors into a single apparent volume, to establish datums, to create bases and to generally “order” the façade.
Many historic buildings on OSU’s campus divide the vertical aspect of the façade into three distinct bands – base, middle and top. The base is strongly articulated and often uses different construction materials. The middle is often multiple stories that are treated as a single plane. The topmost story is sometimes clearly articulated as separate; sometimes it simply incorporates a strongly articulated cornice line. The topmost story can also be treated as part of the roof rather than the “wall.” In this instance, dormers and/or mansards are used to introduce windows to the upper floor.

• The proposed design is also clearly divided into “base, middle, and top” in a manner similar to adjacent historic resources

• The base is proposed to be of a contrasting material.

• The first and second stories of the proposed design are a simple unified plane that reads a strong “middle.”

• The third story set-back acts as a cornice and creates a strong “top.”

REFERENCES:

• Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.b) façades

• OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics – h. 3.0 Modulation; h.6.0 Base; h.7.0 Cornice

• OSU HPP 6.0 General Design Guidelines 6.1.2
VIII. modulation vertical

The graphics demonstrates context of historic resources with regard to vertical bay organization. The analysis demonstrates design relationship between proposed design and adjacent historic resources with regard to vertical bay organization.

Suggested Comments:
- Note that there are various approaches to vertical bay organization on the campus. Some buildings show simple vertical groupings of openings where window organization is repeated from one floor to the next. Others show more complex relationships, including more offset or transitional relationships moving upward through the façades.

Proposed building (middle) shown next to a photo of Gilmore Hall (below) and main entry elevation of Gilmore Hall. The bay organization analysis demonstrates the similar elevational relationships between the two buildings.
This project utilizes both approaches demonstrated in adjacent historic resources – namely paired windows stacked over larger more “primary” windows as well as simple vertical stacking window systems.

This approach helps to modulate the large masonry walls, creating a more intimate scale.

The proposed design includes offset “layers” of masonry to help modulate the large.

REFERENCES:

- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.h) pattern of window and door openings
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics –h. 2.0 Proportion, 3.0 Modulation, 4.0 Vertical Bays and 8.0 Windows
- OSU HPP 6.3 Design Guidelines for New Construction 6.3.2.1

Proposed building (right) shown next to a photo of Ballard Hall (below) and main entry elevation of Ballard Hall. The bay organization analysis demonstrates...
IX. materials

The elevation rendering of the proposed design and photographs of nearby historic resources serves to demonstrate compliance with building material standards.

Suggested Comments:
- The use of red brick as the predominant material is consistent with historic campus development.
- Proposed use of pre-cast concrete to highlight building entries is consistent with historic resources.
- Pre-cast concrete is also proposed as a base material (see earlier discussion on Horizontal Proportions) and as an accent material for window heads and cornices.

REFERENCES:
Demonstrate compliance with:
- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.c) Building Materials
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics –h. 10.0 Building Materials
- OSU HPP 6.3 Design Guidelines for New Construction 6.3.2.1
X. architectural details

The elevation rendering of the proposed design and photographs of nearby historic resources serves to demonstrate compliance with design characteristic guidelines for corners, base, and cornice.

Suggested Comments:
- Proposed use of pre-cast concrete as an accent material for the base and cornice is consistent with historic resources.
- This project has chosen NOT to highlight its corners with pre-cast material. A study of adjacent historic resources finds a variety of corner details including simple brick corners, as proposed for this design.

REFERENCES:
Demonstrate compliance with:
- SU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics – h. 5.0 Corners; h.6.0 Base and h.6.0 Cornice

Ballard, Gillmore, and Hovland Hall are examples of brick and pre-cast concrete usage around the campus.

The elevation rendering of the proposed design and photographs of nearby historic resources serves to demonstrate compliance with design characteristic guidelines for corners, base, and cornice.
XI. entrances

The site plan clearly showing the proposed entrances, as well as the primary building elevations, demonstrate compliance with the pattern of window openings and entries. The historic photographs serve to demonstrate other buildings on campus that comply by these standards.

Suggested Comments:

- The HPP and other guidelines clearly support the development of central entrances for new designs.
- The proposed design is located on a campus corner, so it has two strong public façades. Each of these includes a central entrance that is strongly articulated and detailed, consistent with historic campus development.

REFERENCES:

Demonstrate compliance with:

- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.h) Pattern of Window and Door Openings
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics –h. 9.0 Entries
- OSU HPP 6.3 Design Guidelines for New Construction 6.3.2.3

Site plan with floor plan for proposed design, clearly indicating primary entrances to the building.
A series of historic photographs of historic resources showing centrally located entrances. (Left to right, top to bottom) Ballard Hall, Gilmore Hall, Hovland Hall, and Milam Hall. Primary elevations of the proposed building, showing centrally located entrances.
XII. roof forms

The photographs of historic resources show a variety of roof forms with an emphasis on pitched roofs.

Suggested Comments:
- Campus development has historically included many different roof types. Some buildings exhibit strongly pitched roofs that are clearly evident from the ground. Others utilize pitched roofs to manage rainwater but incorporate parapets or large cornices that reduce the visual impact of the roof and imply instead a flat roof.
- Proposed design includes a pitched roof.
- Mechanical equipment is screened by pitched roof.
- Roof form is consistent with adjacent historic resources.

REFERENCES:
Demonstrate compliance with:
- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.g) Roof Shape
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics –h.11.0 Roofs
- OSU HPP 6.1 General Policies (under General Design Guidelines) 6.1.8
Note: there are inconsistencies between these various guidelines

Historic structures emphasizing the abundance of pitched roofs on the campus. (Left to right, top to bottom).
Memorial Union, Gilmore Hall, Kidder Hall, Agricultural Hall, and Kearny Hall.
XII. roof forms

Roof Plan of proposed building, shown with elevations of proposed building. Shadows on elevations help to give an understanding of the depth of the roof overhang.
XIII. window & door openings

Historic drawings of adjacent resources and details of windows (repeat of slide 15 used earlier in presentation)
Graphic analysis of window arrangements

REFERENCES:
Demonstrate compliance with:
- Corvallis LDC Chapter 2.9 Compatibility Criteria 3.h) Pattern of Window and Door Openings
- OSU HPP 6.3, Design Guidelines for New Construction 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.4
Suggested Comments:

- Organizing the windows in a manner consistent with adjacent historic resources relates the new design to its historic neighbors.
- The repeated motif of vertical bay organization is used in adjacent buildings. This design proposes to repeat the motif three times on each side of the central entrance on the long façade.
XIV. accessory development

This section continues presentation and discussion of accessory development using similar theme to previous slides. The graphic site plan locates each accessory on the site plan and illustrates the design response graphically and with photographs when applicable.

REFERENCES:
Demonstrate compliance with:
- OSU CMP Section 5.2 Design Characteristics – g) Utilities and Site Furnishings.

- Benches
- Covered Bike Parking
- Marks location of historic light posts (4)
Benches

Campus Standard and Accessible Benches are identified in OSU’s Construction Standards

Covered Bike Parking

Covered bike racks are identified in OSU’s Construction Standards

Light Pole Design

Campus “historic” light pole products are identified in OSU’s Construction Standards
appendix

Applicable Standards & Order of Precedence
Analysis of Resources within OSU’s National Historic District
Suggested Approach: HRC Application
Schedule of Design Criteria
Flow Chart: Approvals Process
Diagram: Relationship between Documents
OSU Historic Resources Map
National Historic Districts, Buildings & Structures Defined
Appendix A: Applicable Standards and Order of Precedence

A. Secretary of State of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, Guidelines for Rehabilitation

Sec. 67.7 Standards for Rehabilitation.

(a) The following Standards for Rehabilitation are the criteria used to determine if a rehabilitation project qualifies as a certified rehabilitation. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property’s significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building’s site and environment, as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. To be certified, a rehabilitation project must be determined by the Secretary to be consistent with the historic character of the structure(s) and, where applicable, the district in which it is located.

(b) The following Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility. (The application of these Standards to rehabilitation projects is to be the same as under the previous version so that a project previously acceptable would continue to be acceptable under these Standards.)

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of
structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

(8) Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(c) The quality of materials and craftsmanship used in a rehabilitation project must be commensurate with the quality of materials and craftsmanship of the historic building in question. Certain treatments, if improperly applied, or certain materials by their physical properties, may cause or accelerate physical deterioration of historic buildings. Inappropriate physical treatments include, but are not limited to: improper repointing techniques; improper exterior masonry cleaning methods; or improper introduction of insulation where damage to historic fabric would result. In almost all situations, use of these materials and treatments will result in denial of certification. Similarly, exterior additions that duplicate the form, material, and detailing of the structure to the extent that they compromise the historic character of the structure will result in denial of certification. For further information on appropriate and inappropriate rehabilitation treatments, owners are to consult the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings published by the NPS. “Preservation Briefs” and additional technical information to help property owners formulate plans for the rehabilitation, preservation, and continued use of historic properties consistent with the intent of the Secretary’s Standards for Rehabilitation are available from the SHPOs and NPS regional offices. Owners are responsible for procuring this material as part of property planning for a certified rehabilitation.

(d) In certain limited cases, it may be necessary to dismantle and rebuild portions of a certified historic structure to stabilize and repair weakened structural members and systems. In such cases, the Secretary will consider such extreme intervention as part of a certified rehabilitation if:

(1) The necessity for dismantling is justified in supporting documentation;
(2) Significant architectural features and overall design are retained; and
(3) Adequate historic materials are retained to maintain the architectural and historic integrity of the overall structure. Section 48(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 exempts certified historic structures from meeting the physical test for retention of external walls and internal structural framework specified therein for other rehabilitated buildings. Nevertheless, owners are cautioned that the Standards for Rehabilitation require retention of distinguishing historic materials of external and internal walls as well as structural systems. In limited instances, rehabilitations involving removal of existing external walls, i.e., external walls that detract from the historic character of the structure such as in the case of a nonsignificant later addition or walls
that have lost their structural integrity due to deterioration, may be certified as meeting the Standards for Rehabilitation.

(e) Prior approval of a project by Federal, State, and local agencies and organizations does not ensure certification by the Secretary for Federal tax purposes. The Secretary’s Standards for Rehabilitation take precedence over other regulations and codes in determining whether the rehabilitation project is consistent with the historic character of the property and, where applicable, the district in which it is located.

(f) The qualities of a property and its environment which qualify it as a certified historic structure are determined taking into account all available information, including information derived from the physical and architectural attributes of the building; such determinations are not limited to information contained in National Register or related documentation.

B. City of Corvallis Comprehensive Plan
Article 5, Urban Amenities, 5.4 Historic and Cultural Resources
- This section establishes the HRC and Chapter 2.9 of the LDC

Article 13, Special Areas of Concern
- Discusses importance of OSU and a coordinated planning effort between the City of Corvallis and OSU
- Notes the City’s adoption of OSU’s Plan and requires OSU (and the City) to periodically update their plans.
- Establishes a series of policies regarding both process and development.

C. City of Corvallis Land Use Development Code (LDC)
LDC Chapter 2.9

2.9.100.04 (for Alteration or New Construction Parameters and Review Criteria for an HRC-level Historic Preservation Permit) Review Criteria

2.9.100.04.b.1. General - The Alteration or New Construction Historic Preservation Permit request shall be evaluated against the review criteria listed below.

1. Consideration shall be given to:
   a) Historic Significance and/or classification;
   b) Historic Integrity;
   c) Age;
   d) Architectural design or style;
   e) Condition of the subject Designated Historic Resource;
   f) Whether is a prime example of an architectural design or style, or type of construction; and
   g) Whether or not the Designated Historic Resource is of a rare or unusual architectural design or style, or type of construction.

2. In general, the proposed Alteration or New Construction shall either:
   a) More closely approximate the original historic design or style, appearance, or material composition
   b) Be compatible with the historic characteristics of resource and/or district

3. Compatibility Criteria for structures and site elements relative to contributing historic context:
   b) Façades - Architectural features retained or designed to complement.
c) Building Materials - Building materials shall be reflective of, and complementary to.

d) Architectural Details - Retain and repair of existing character-defining elements. Replacement to be consistent with resource's design and style.

e) Scale and Proportion - The size and proportions of the Alteration or New Construction shall be compatible, generally should be smaller. No single element visually larger than resource.

f) Height - To the extent possible, the height of the Alteration or New Construction shall not exceed that of the existing

g) Roof Shape - New roofs shall match the pitch and shape

h) Pattern of Window and Door Openings - Openings shall be compatible with the original features in form, materials, type, pattern, placement.

i) Building Orientation - Building orientation shall be compatible with existing development patterns.

j) Site Development - Maintain existing site development patterns

k) Accessory Development/Structures - Shall be visually compatible
l) Garages - Shall be compatible  
m) Chemical or Physical Treatments - Gentlest means possible.  
n) Archeological Resources - In accordance with all State requirements  
o) Differentiation - Different but complementary  

D. Oregon State University Campus Master Plan  
Section 5.2 DESIGN GUIDELINES  

h. Building Design  
List of design characteristics to be incorporated in new construction:  
- Greek, Gothic, Romanesque, Chateauesque, and Victorian  
- Eclectic adaptation of classical forms and details into modern building masses  
- human scale  
- Supports multiple functions and uses based on current and projected needs of user groups  
- Multi-story building  
- Masonry (red brick)  
- Gable (pediment) roof forms  
- Sloping roofs  
- Three-part building (base, middle, capital)  
- Defined roof edges and building base  
- Columns or pilasters (columns visibly built into the wall)  
- Visibly bearing walls  
- Well-developed major and minor entrances  
- Simple building masses  
- Symmetrical design  
- Linked to pedestrian open spaces such as plaza, quads, courtyards, and sidewalks.  

1.0 Style - Consistent with established masonry theme.  
2.0 Proportion - Proportional relationship between the parts of the structure should display composition of architectural parts.  
3.0 Modulation - Large wall areas shall be broken down visually, horizontally and vertically.  
4.0 Vertical Bays - Establish vertical bay expression using relief elements (columns, pilasters).  
5.0 Corners - Articulated end-bay expression using pilasters, quoins, building walls or rustication.  
6.0 Base - Clearly articulated base at approx. level of first floor windows or at level of first floor framing if floor level is above grade three to four feet.  
7.0 Cornice - Cornice or coping shall terminate uppermost edge of façade.  
8.0 Windows – Vertical in proportion, reminiscent of double hung scaling, set back in façade.  
9.0 Entries – Primary entry oriented to street or pedestrian access. Located in center bay of center façade.  
10.0 Building Materials - Red brick with stone, terra cotta used as accents.  
11.0 Roofs – Sloping at minimum of 4:12. Tile, concrete shingle or standing seam metal roof; no asphalt shingles.
12.0 Building Systems – Air conditioning should be provided. Passive ventilation where possible. Systems should not be visible from the exterior of the building.

13.0 Accessibility – Completely accessible.

14.0 OSU Design Criteria – Document on architectural, mechanical, electrical materials and methods.

15.0 Sustainability – Designed and constructed to incorporate sustainability considerations.

16.0 Fire Rating – Construction type permitted by code, minimum of Type V-1 hour equivalent.

General Standards

1.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) – At least 2.0, preferable 3.5 in Sector C.

2.0 Site Building Coverage – In accordance with open space requirements and max. impervious surface per sector

3.0 Setback and Building Heights – Consistent with CMP and criteria for development sector.

4.0 Transition Areas – Consistent with the OSU Design Criteria and guidelines and compatible with existing buildings and structures.

E. Oregon State University Historic Preservation Plan

Section 6.0 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE OSU HISTORIC DISTRICT

The following apply to new construction, additions, rehabilitation and alteration

6.1 General Policies

6.1.1 Will not detract from or compromise the existing character
6.1.2 The size, scale, height, massing and setback will be consistent.
6.1.3 Relate primarily to adjacent structures. Context and composition studies required.
6.1.4 Style, colors and materials will be compatible.
   6.1.4.1 The exterior material of an addition should continue the same primary building material.
   6.1.4.2 The predominant exterior building material on new buildings shall be red brick and pre-cast concrete.
6.1.5 Compatible with the setback, site design and character of the surrounding structures, and consistent with appearance of context.
6.1.6 Use similar materials and finishes, similar size, proportion, rhythm and scale.
6.1.7 Individual building elements should be integrated.
6.1.8 New roofs will be pitched.
6.1.9 Different but respect primary characteristics such as materials, mass, size, scale, and setback.
6.1.10 Different and complementary.

6.3 Design Guidelines for New Construction, Alterations or Additions to Historic
6.3.1 Expansion of Building Footprint
   6.3.1.1 Additions must be visually secondary to the original building.
   6.3.1.2 The original, primary entry, as defined in CMP Chapter 5.2h.9.0, must not be obscured, marginalized or lessened in its prominence.

6.3.2 Building Elements
   6.3.2.1 The proportion, size, rhythm and detailing of windows and doors shall be compatible.
   6.3.2.2 Entry plazas, porches, etc. shall have design and material consistent.
   6.3.2.3 Building entries shall be located in the center bay of the center façade.

6.3.3 Site Furnishings and Paving
   6.3.3.1 Site furnishings shall not detract.
   6.3.3.2 Temporary signage shall be consistent with the approved OSU Sign Plan.
   6.3.3.3 Projects will provide pedestrian pathways.

6.3.4 Windows
   6.3.4.1 CMP Chapter 5.2.h.8.0 is applicable except that exterior fenestration needs to “represent approximately 20 percent of the exterior wall area.”
   6.3.4.2 Window-to-wall area should be based on what is visually appropriate relative to context.
   6.3.4.3 Windows must be vertically aligned and grouped.
   6.3.4.4 Window materials should be complementary.

6.3.1 Lighting
   6.3.1.1 Retain existing historic fixtures.
   6.3.1.2 Reuse existing fixtures, holes, openings, ducts, conduits, etc. where possible.
   6.3.1.3 Integrate exterior lighting with existing landscape.
   6.3.1.4 Restrained direct lighting, limited to entry area.

6.3.2 Light Fixtures
   6.3.2.1 Where new fixture needed install appropriate contemporary fixture.
   6.3.2.2 Advice form architect or lighting designer when installing new fixtures in historic building.

6.3.3 Landscaping and Open Areas
   6.3.3.1 Valley Library and Memorial Union shall remain visually open
   6.3.3.2 Additions shall provide for perimeter landscaping consistent with existing.
F. Other

The OSU Facility Services Construction Standards


and its Appendices (“Technical Bulletins”) are required to be followed for all development on the OSU Campus. This document includes information regarding OS standards for building enclosures, exterior improvements, accessories and other pertinent issues. The document replaces the previously titled “Design Criteria”, and is subject to change.

State, Local and Federal Codes including local Planning and Building Codes, the ADAAG, OSU’s Best Practices for Accessibility and others will also apply. Sustainability mandates may apply to some projects, as may energy performance criteria. LEED and SEED requirements may influence alterations, additions and new construction on the campus.
## Appendix B

### Analysis of resources within OSU’s National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS-004</td>
<td>30th Street Mall</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Ballard Extension Hall</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Batcheller Hall</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Benton Annex</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Benton Hall</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italianate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bexell Hall</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834</td>
<td>Black Cultural Center</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Cauthorn Hall</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Cordley Hall</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Covell Hall</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>Dawes House</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dearborn Hall</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Dryden Hall</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>East Greenhouse</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Octagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Education Hall</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Romanesque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Fairbanks Annex</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Late 19th/20th American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Fairbanks Hall</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Filtering Plant</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gilbert Hall</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gilkey Hall</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Gill Coliseum</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Gilmore Hall</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Second Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gladys Valley Gymnastics Center</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italianate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gleeson Hall (Chem Engr)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graf Hall</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Heckart Lodge</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Hovland Hall</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Indoor Target Range</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Other/Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTB-346</td>
<td>Jensen Memorial Gate</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kearney (Apperson) Hall</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Romanesque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kidder Hall</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Langton Hall</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-002</td>
<td>Library Quad</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Park/Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-001</td>
<td>Lower Campus</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Park/Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>McAlexander Field House</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Exotic Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Memorial Union Bldg</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>eligible/significant</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-003</td>
<td>Memorial Union Quad</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Park/Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Merryfield Hall</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italianate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Milam Hall</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Moreland Hall</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Ocean Administration Bldg</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Physical Plant Heating Plant</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Plageman Student Health Center</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Poling Hall</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Reed Lodge</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Sackett Hall</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Modern Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shepard Hall</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Foursquare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Strand Agriculture Hall</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Vet Med Research Lab</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Veterinary Dairy Barn</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>eligible/significant</td>
<td>Other/Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Waldo Hall</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Romanesque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Weatherford Hall</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>eligible/significant</td>
<td>Mediterranean Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>West Greenhouse (W13-16)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Other/Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>West Greenhouse (W17-20)</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Other/Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>West Greenhouse (W21)</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Other/Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Wiegand Hall</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Withycombe Hall</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>eligible/contributing</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Women’s Building</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>eligible/significant</td>
<td>Neo-Classical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 contributing resources
appendix c

Suggested Approach: HRC Application

Example: Hallie Ford Center for Healthy Children and Families (2009)

This form includes the applicable Historic Preservation Permit criteria for new construction within OSU’s Historic District. Please provide responses to the highlighted areas following each criterion. If you have any questions, please call David Dodson at 541-737-8503.

The criteria can also be found on the City’s website at:
http://www.ci.corvallis.or.us/downloads/cd/PLANNING/2006%20LDC/

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Oregon State University proposes construction of a new building on their historic campus to house the Hallie Ford Center for Healthy Children and Families.

This building will serve the fastest growing college within the University, the College of Health and Human Sciences, whose mission is to find practical solutions to serious health problems confronting our state and our nation.

To further this mission, the Hallie Ford Center will promote the well-being of children and families through research, outreach and multi-disciplinary collaboration. Specifically, the center will promote a lifespan and preventive approach to child and family health, improving resiliency in children and fostering the stable family circumstances that nurture them. This multidisciplinary center will address issues such as early childhood development, parenting skills, prevention of risky behaviors, school readiness, nutrition, and exercise. The work will inform policies and programs across Oregon and beyond including programs focused on the immediate community here in Corvallis. The center will be home to faculty and students focused on these issues.

The site for the Hallie Ford Center is located within a district of the OSU campus recently nominated to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (Attachment A&B). It is adjacent to four contributing buildings, two of which were designed by John V. Bennes, who is responsible for the majority of contributing buildings on campus (Attachment C). It is also adjacent to a non-contributing building, Bates Hall, which houses a closely allied program, the Childhood Development Center. The building is located at the corner of two primary pedestrian routes, 26th Avenue and Campus Way and replaces an existing parking lot (Attachment C,D,E & F). Significant existing landscape elements include three large elm trees.
on 26th Avenue called for in the original Olmsted Brothers Masterplan which will be saved and three tulip trees along Campus Way which will be removed.

The Center will provide 18,000 square feet of space which will include research offices, director’s offices, in-formal gathering space, project rooms for focused collaboration, a seminar room for community outreach and an event space (Attachment G & H). To support and inspire the mission of the center and to attract experts, scholars and donors, the college requires the character of these spaces to be collaborative, flexible, and welcoming.

The building will be three stories tall with public outreach functions immediately accessible on the ground floor, secure collaborative meeting rooms on the second floor and open, flexible research space on the third floor (Attachment I). It is oriented with the long dimension in the east/west direction making the entrance on Campus Way primary and the entrance on 26th Avenue secondary. Because of the volume of pedestrian traffic on both streets, however, both entrances are considered significant and are fully accessible (Attachment D&F).

PROJECT APPROACH

OSU’s highest priority for this building was to have it be a compatible addition to the fabric of their newly designated historic district while simultaneously supporting a dynamic, collaborative research environment. OSU has determined the proposed design is a great success in terms of supporting the work of the Hallie Ford Center and the following document illustrates the compatibility of the design with the historic fabric of the district.

Section 2.9.100.04 – Alteration or New Construction Parameters and Review Criteria for an HRC – Level Review Criteria

(b) Review Criteria

General - The Alteration or New Construction Historic Preservation Permit request shall be evaluated against the review criteria listed below. These criteria are intended to ensure that the design or style of the Alteration or New Construction is compatible with that of the existing Designated Historic Resource, if in existence, and proposed in part to remain, and with any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources, if applicable. Consideration shall be given to:

a) Historic Significance and/or classification;

This project is before the HRC because it is within a portion of the OSU campus designated by the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 2007 as a National Historic District. From the Statement of Significance in the NRHP application, the district was nominated for three reasons. (See Attachment A)

- OSU is Oregon’s first and only land grant college.
- The campus is a well developed example of campus planning by notable
The campus has nearly 50 projects designed by a John V. Bennes, a significant regional architect.

b) Historic Integrity;

The most relevant aspect of the NRHP designation to the design of the Hallie Ford Center is the aesthetic continuity of the campus called for by the Olmsted Brother’s campus plan and achieved in large part by the work of Portland architect John Bennes.

c) Age;

At the time the district was nominated to the NRHP, the period of historically significant buildings spanned from 1888 to 1957. Because the NRHP typically requires buildings to be 50 years old to be nominated, the window of eligibility is constantly expanding. Today, buildings built on campus prior to 1959 are eligible. By the time this project is complete in 2011, buildings built prior to 1961 will be eligible. And in 2061, the Hallie Ford Center will be eligible.

d) Architectural design or style;

In approaching the project it was important to understand, that no single style defines the campus. As documented by the NRHP 19 different styles as varied as Mediterranean Revival (Weatherford Hall, Bennes, 1928) to Modern (Gilbert Hall, Bennes, 1939) contribute to the historic significance of the campus. John Bennes, the most prolific architect on campus, employed 11 different styles himself (Attachment B).

e) Condition of the subject Designated Historic Resource;

Over the last 120 years OSU has diligently applied the Olmsted Brothers’ recommendations for their University resulting in a campus worthy of listing with the NRHP.

f) Whether or not the Designated Historic Resource is a prime example or one of the few remaining examples of a once common architectural design or style, or type of construction;

From the NRHP application: “The campus is an excellent example of campus planning developed first by the Olmsted Brothers firm (1909-1925) and then by A.D Taylor (1926-1964). It retains the elements recommended throughout these plans, including the creation of quadrangles, groupings of buildings, architectural harmony and unity, and landscaping.”

Also, the work of John V. Bennes (1907-1942) is “largely the reason that the camps achieved the architectural unity recommended by the Olmsted Brothers and by A.D. Taylor.”

g) Whether or not the Designated Historic Resource is of a rare or unusual
architectural design or style, or type of construction.

The campus design and the buildings and spaces that make it are neither rare nor unusual. Rather they are significant because they are prime examples of landscape and architectural design popular at the time. See f) Prime Example of Design.

2. In general, the proposed Alteration or New Construction shall either:

a) Cause the Designated Historic Resource to more closely approximate the original historic design or style, appearance, or material composition of the resource relative to the applicable Period of Significance; or

b) Be compatible with the historic characteristics of the Designated Historic Resource and/or District, as applicable, based on a consideration of the historic design or style, appearance, or material composition of the resource.

The Hallie Ford Center has been designed to be compatible with the characteristics of the historic district considered as a whole. The most relevant characteristics are those which support the aesthetic continuity of the campus called for by the Olmsted Brother’s campus plan and largely achieved by the work of John Bennes.

By definition, historic continuity of a district is not the result of any single building or set of details. The nomination identifies 59 contributing buildings and outdoor spaces which employ no less than 19 different architectural styles. 11 of which, ranging from Italian Renaissance to Modern were employed by John Bennes himself (Attachment B). Rather, the significant continuity of the district described by the NRHP is derived from the aggregate of all contributing buildings and public spaces on campus and their common characteristics.

Rather than arbitrarily selecting one of the many styles present on campus to mimic, the design of the Hallie Ford Center is derived from timeless themes and characteristics common to the historic district as a whole. For inspiration, it returns to the Olmsted Brother’s original recommendation for buildings to be “a simple, restrained variety of Classic” with harmony achieved best by “limiting bold, large features and opting for simple, lighter details instead.”

These common characteristics are described in more detail in the following sections and have been organized to correspond directly to the review criteria of the commission.

Each section describes the range of characteristics common to buildings on campus followed by a description of how the Hallie Ford Center is compatible with these characteristics.

3. Compatibility Criteria for Structures and Site Elements - Compatibility considerations shall include the items listed in “a - n,” below, as applicable, and relative to the applicable Period of Significance. Alteration or New Construction
shall complement the architectural design or style of the primary resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain; and any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources. Notwithstanding these provisions and “a-n,” below, for Nonhistoric/Noncontributing resources in a National Register of Historic Places Historic District or resources within such Historic District that are not classified because the nomination for the Historic District is silent on the issue, Alteration or New Construction activities shall be evaluated for compatibility with the architectural design or style of any existing Historic/Contributing resource on the site or, where none exists, against the attributes of the applicable Historic District’s Period of Significance.

a) Façades - Architectural features (e.g., balconies, porches, bay windows, dormers, trim details) on main façades shall be retained, restored, or designed to complement the primary structure and any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources. Particular attention should be paid to those façades facing street rights-of-way. Architectural elements inconsistent with the Designated Historic Resource’s existing building design or style shall be avoided.

Building façades are symmetrical with center-bay entries oriented to the streets or pedestrian ways.

Entrances are highlighted by the Olmsted Brother’s recommendation for “limited and restrained” use of cast stone or terra cotta and are linked to pedestrian focused spaces.

Regardless of the number of stories, façades are organized vertically into three parts with base, middle and top being distinguished from one another.

Columns, pilasters, or other relief elements express layered structure which organizes the façades into repetitive vertical bays and reduces their perceived scale.

The façades of the Hallie Ford Center are compatible with these common characteristics.

All of the façades are composed to be completely symmetrical (Attachment J & K).

Entrances are centered on the façades fronting the two public ways and are highlighted by simple and restrained use of cast stone. Variations in window width at the second floor modify the center bay and further reinforce the entries (Attachment D & M).

To clearly distinguish base, middle and top, the exterior walls of the Hallie Ford Center are made of two layers of overlapping masonry. The heavier piers and lintels of the bottom and middle floors are forward of the lighter piers and lintels of the middle and top floors. These two layers overlap to differentiate base, middle and top, modulating the scale of the wall, and creating relief for window openings (Attachment D & N).
All of the façades are organized into equal vertical bays expressed by the layered masonry structure of the building (Attachment O). These bays and the elements which make them are repeated to form a cohesive whole.

In the spirit of the Olmsted Brother’s original 1909 recommendations, “limiting bold, large features and opting for simple, lighter details instead”, cast stone is used sparingly to highlight building elements (Attachment D).

b) Building Materials - Building materials shall be reflective of, and complementary to, those found on the existing primary Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, and any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources. Siding materials of vertical board, plywood, cement stucco, aluminum, exposed concrete block, and vinyl shall be avoided, unless documented as being consistent with the original design or style, or structure of the Designated Historic Resource.

The Olmsted Brother’s recommendations for the campus in 1909 called for the buildings to be made of “a good quality of rough red brick for the main walls permitting some range of choice in stone or terra cotta for trim.” The campus has remained true to this recommendation over time. Red brick is the predominant building material. Stone is used sparingly to highlight copings, entries, bases, window sills and lintels.

The structural material of The Hallie Ford Center is traditional. Load bearing exterior masonry walls, clad in red brick, enclose a heavy timber structure.

All of the exterior walls are made of wire cut red brick with accents of cast stone (Attachment D). The red brick will be carefully blended to match red brick used on adjacent buildings. Accents will all be cast stone to match the buff color of cast stone on adjacent buildings.

c) Architectural Details - Retention and repair of existing character-defining elements of a structure (e.g., molding or trim, brackets, columns, cladding, ornamentation, and other finishing details) and their design or style, materials, and dimensions, shall be considered by the property owner prior to replacement. Replacements for existing architectural elements or proposed new architectural elements shall be consistent with the resource’s design or style. If any previously existing architectural elements are restored, such features shall be consistent with the documented building design or style. Conjectural architectural details shall not be applied.

Buildings sit on a clearly articulated and substantial base. The top edge of building façades terminate at a coping or cornice. This coping or cornice is articulated through a shadow line or material change. In older buildings with overhangs this cornice, or soffit, was wood. Layered masonry structure creates depth at window openings which varies from 4” to 12”. Sills and lintels are either brick or cast stone. Windows of contributing buildings are made of either wood or steel and glazed with clear glass. They are configured to be either casement, double hung,
awning or fixed depending on the era in which they were constructed.

The base of the Hallie Ford Center is emphasized by a 36” tall band of cast stone which extends around the perimeter of the building (Attachment D,J,K & N). This band steps down to 24” at ground level window sills.

A deep overhanging cornice formed by the edge of the roof caps the top of all façades. This cornice has a metal edge to match the roof and is wood underneath (Attachment N).

Window sills and lintels are masonry or cast stone depending on location and are set back into the façade 12 inches at the base, a combination of 12 and 4 inches at the second floor, and 4 inches at the attic level (Attachment N).

The windows in the Hallie Ford Center will have clear insulated glazing. Depending on final cost considerations, the window frames will either be thermally efficient aluminum in an awning configuration or will be aluminum clad wood in a double hung configuration.

d) Scale and Proportion - The size and proportions of the Alteration or New Construction shall be compatible with existing structures on the site, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, and with any surrounding comparable structures. New additions or new construction shall generally be smaller than the impacted Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain. In rare instances where an addition or new construction is proposed to be larger than the original Designated Historic Resource, it shall be designed such that no single element is visually larger than the original Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, or any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources.

The scale of multi-story buildings on campus is reduced through expression of a belt coursing at floor lines. Individual parts are repeated and are proportionally related to one another to form a cohesive whole. The scale of large masonry walls is visibly broken down both vertically and horizontally through offsets, shadow lines, and belt courses.

The Hallie Ford Center has been designed to modulate between dramatically different sizes of surrounding buildings (Attachments P,Q,R & S). It does this by creating a two story expression within a three story façade. By minimizing the extent of masonry at the attic level, the lower two floors are reinforced as a unit relating to shorter surrounding buildings while the overall three story mass and sloped roof relate to taller surrounding buildings. To further reinforce the bottom two floors and reduce the overall scale of the building, a continuous cast stone belt coursing marks the top of the wall.

In terms of proportion, the façades of the Hallie Ford Center are organized into repetitive bays which have strong proportional relationships between their components. These bays are formed by brick piers and lintels which create shadow lines and modulate the façade horizontally. In each bay, identically sized
windows are repeated and aligned between the second and third floors and have the same proportional ratio of width to height as the openings at the ground floor (Attachment N & O).

Where walls occur, at the service elements of the end bays, these bays are set back from the main mass of the building to minimize the length of any segment of uninterrupted brick wall (Attachment J & K). Modulation vertically is achieved through a belt course at the top of the middle floor and shadow lines of deep window openings.

e) Height - To the extent possible, the height of the Alteration or New Construction shall not exceed that of the existing primary Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, and any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources. However, second story additions are allowed, provided they are consistent with the height standards of the underlying District Designation and other Code Chapters, and provided they are consistent with the other review criteria contained herein.

Buildings contributing to the historic designation of the campus vary in height from 30 feet to 75 feet and two stories to six.

The Hallie Ford Center is three stories tall, 45 feet to the top of the façades, 50’-4” to the midpoint of the sloped roof (point of measurement for zoning compliance) and 56’-8” to the top of the sloped roof (Attachment I,P,O,R & S).

f) Roof Shape - New roofs shall match the pitch and shape of the original Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, or any existing surrounding compatible Designated Historic Resources.

Roofs are either flat or sloped. When sloped, they are typically hip roofs with a minimum 4:12 slope covered in clay tile, concrete shingles, or metal. Mechanical equipment on the roof is not visible from the ground. Roof drains are typically external and applied to the building face.

The roof of the Hallie Ford Center will be sloped at a 5:12 ratio and will be metal. All of the mechanical equipment will be contained in the attic and will be invisible from the street below. A skylight which serves the interior space is sunken down into a mechanical ‘well’ in the center of the roof and will also be invisible from below. Gutters and downspouts are located on the outside of the building at each corner (Attachment T).

g) Pattern of Window and Door Openings - To the extent possible window and door openings shall be compatible with the original features of the existing Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, in form (size, proportion, detailing), materials, type, pattern, and placement of openings.

At the time many of the buildings in the historic district were constructed daylight was the primary means of illumination. As such, windows vary in dimension
according to the depth and height of the space they serve. For example, windows serving individual dorm rooms are quite small in comparison to windows serving large reading rooms. Individual windows are typically vertical in proportion. Where masonry openings are horizontal in proportion, vertical windows are ganged together side by side to accommodate them. Windows of different sizes within the same building often share the same ratio of height to width.

Window patterns are repeated across façades in a rhythm which corresponds to the structural bay of the building. In some instances they vary in the center bay to highlight the entrance or in the end bays to highlight the building corner. The pattern of windows on the primary façades of buildings often varies slightly from the pattern on the secondary façades.

Door openings are centered in the center bay of buildings and typically recessed further back than windows to protect them from the weather. They are typically surrounded by cast stone detailing.

The doors and windows in the Hallie Ford Center have been carefully composed to not only fit within the natural variation in size, proportion, and patterns that exists on campus (Attachment V), but also to create a pattern of openings related directly to the needs of the spaces served (Attachment U); tall, gracious openings on the public ground floor, smaller openings into the more focused project rooms and offices on the second floor, and wider openings into the open collaborative space of the top floor. The window pattern developed for this building also creates a bridge between a broad variation in scale of adjacent contributing buildings as described in section d) above.

Typical of most buildings on campus, the window patterns on the north and south are similar and are composed of repetitive, vertical bays which express the width of the structural grid. The east and west do the same but vary from the north and south slightly to express the depth of the structural grid. The east and west are then further differentiated by the primary entrances. The door openings in these entrances are centered in the center bay of the primary façades, are recessed three feet, and are surrounded by restrained use of cast stone (Attachment M).

All of the window units in the façade of the Hallie Ford Center share a similar ratio of their height to width (Attachment N), but vary in size between floors corresponding to the spaces they serve. The height and width of the units at the ground level are larger to express the higher floor to floor height and public nature of the space they serve. The windows at the second floor are smaller to correspond to the lower ceilings and smaller spaces they serve. The windows of the second floor are then repeated at the third floor and ganged with an intermediate window to fill the broader masonry opening sized to serve the large open office.

h) Building Orientation - Building orientation shall be compatible with existing development patterns on the Designated Historic Resource site, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, and any existing surrounding comparable Designated Historic Resources. In general, Alteration or New Construction
shall be sited so that the impact to primary façade(s) of the Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, is minimized.

In 1909 the Olmsted Brothers recommended buildings be organized around public open spaces with a uniform set back from the street and that unless buildings could be located back to back with their fronts facing the public areas, they should be designed with double fronts. This original recommendation characterizes general building orientation on campus as it is today.

The Hallie Ford Center is consistent with this pattern of development. The building is at the corner of two major pedestrian ways, 26th Avenue and Campus Way. As such there are two entrances, each centered on the façades which face these public ways. The space behind the Hallie Ford Center, to the north, is fenced off to serve as a secure play area for children attending the daycare facility in adjacent Bates Hall and is semi-public. Therefore only secondary exits and entrances serving the Hallie Ford Center open onto this space (Attachment F).

The Hallie Ford Center adheres to a uniform setback defined by the adjacent buildings. The south face aligns with Cordley Hall to the west, and the east face is set slightly back from the face of Bates Hall to the north. The slight variation from Bates protects the roots of three historically significant Elms.

i) Site Development - To the extent practicable, given other applicable development standards, such as standards in this Code for building coverage, setbacks, landscaping, sidewalk and street tree locations, the Alteration or New Construction shall maintain existing site development patterns, if in existence and proposed in part to remain.

The Olmsted Brothers and A.D. Taylor were in agreement on many aspects of the campus masterplan, but differed with respect to planting approach. The Olmsted Brothers recommended restraint in planting so buildings and grounds would not be “smothered by trees and tall shrubbery” while A.D. Taylor recommended screening portions of buildings with plantings to enhance vistas and to soften their hard lines. He also was responsible for proposing the planting of a single species of tree, American Elms, along walks and roads and specimen trees in front of buildings. In general, the campus today respects the Olmsted’s restraint in the preservation of simple landscaping in the public quadrangles, but embraces Taylor’s recommendation for more prolific planting around buildings and along the streets.

There are other site characteristics which are common but not explicitly called for in any historic master plans. Historic buildings are typically set on a base requiring a stair for approach up to the entry. More recent buildings provide flatter approaches to accommodate accessibility. The approach to entrances often incorporates a place to pause or sit.

The site design of the Hallie Ford Center has been developed to be compatible with current and historic planting characteristics of the campus while also incorporating contemporary requirements for handicapped accessibility and
service.

The building’s three story massing and placement on the site protect the roots of the historically significant Elms on 26th and allow alignment of the faces of the building with Bates Hall and Cordley Hall as mentioned in the previous section. While this placement facilitates alignment with adjacent buildings and preserves the Elms, it requires removal of three Tulip trees on the south edge of the site (Attachment E).

These trees will be replaced with smaller, lower canopy specimen trees that don’t require as much space as the Tulip trees for their roots and will make the primary façade on Campus Way more visible. There is not enough space on the south side, given the alignment with Cordley to safely plant more of the American Elms.

Lower shrubs and ground cover are planted all around the perimeter of the building to soften the building’s transition to the landscape.

With regard to accessibility, the Hallie Ford Center has handicapped accessible sidewalks leading to all entrances and exits. These sidewalks have shallow enough slopes that handrails are not required on any of the accessible routes.

A grade change of approximately 20 inches leads form the sidewalk up to the primary entrance on Campus Way. This is accommodated both by an accessible sidewalk as well as a wide, gracious stair. The stair has four shallow risers, each 3.5 inches tall with a broad 42 inch sloped tread between them. The depth of the treads eliminates the need for a handrail. The stair widens out in a welcoming gesture as it approaches the sidewalk to ease the change in direction from sidewalk to stair.

Outdoor public sitting areas are provided at the southeast corner between the main entries and on the north side adjacent to the conference room.

j) Accessory Development/Structures - Accessory development as defined in Chapter 4.3 - Accessory Development Regulations and items such as exterior lighting, walls, fences, awnings, and landscaping that are associated with an Alteration or New Construction Historic Preservation Permit application, shall be visually compatible with the architectural design or style of the existing Designated Historic Resource, if in existence and proposed in part to remain, and any comparable Designated Historic Resources within the District, as applicable.

A service structure to the west of the Hallie Ford Center is required to conceal garbage collection, a transformer and an emergency generator from view (Attachment W). This structure has been kept as low as possible (9 feet) while still providing screening. It is clad in brick to match the main building and is, itself, screened by low trees and shrubs. Service gates are located to face toward the building so they are less visible from any pedestrian way. A service drive provides requisite access to the generator and garbage. The end of the structure provides shelter for university standard bike parking.
Site lighting is provided by 12-foot tall historic pole mounted fixtures consistent with the university standards. These are located symmetrically about the main entrances.

k) Garages - Garages, including doors, shall be compatible with the Designated Historic Resource site’s primary structure (if in existence and proposed in part to remain) based on factors that include design or style, roof pitch and shape, architectural details, location and orientation, and building materials. In a National Register of Historic Places Historic District, the design or style of Alteration or New Construction involving an existing or new garage, visible from public rights-of-way or private street rights-of-way, shall also be compatible with the design or style of other garages in the applicable Historic District (those garages that were constructed during that Historic District’s Period of Significance).

Response: This criterion not applicable; the Hallie Ford Center does not include a garage.

l) Chemical or Physical Treatments - Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

Response: This criterion not applicable.

m) Archeological Resources - Activities associated with archeological resources shall be carried out in accordance with all State requirements pertaining to the finding of cultural materials, including ORS 358.905 (which pertains to the finding of cultural materials), ORS 390.235 (which describes steps for State permits on sites where cultural materials are found), and OAR 736.051.0080 and OAR 736.051.0090 (which describe requirements for cultural materials found on public verses private land, respectively).

Response: This criterion not applicable.

n) Differentiation - An Alteration or New Construction shall be differentiated from the portions of the site’s existing Designated Historic Resource(s) inside the applicable Period of Significance. However, it also shall be compatible with said Designated Historic Resource’s Historically Significant materials, design or style elements, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing to protect the Historic Integrity of the Designated Historic Resource and its environment. Therefore, the differentiation may be subtle and may be accomplished between the Historically Significant portions and the new construction with variations in wall or roof alignment, offsets, roof pitch, or roof height. Alternatively, differentiation may be accomplished by a visual change in surface, such as a molding strip or other element that acts as an interface between the Historically Significant and the new portions.

The OSU campus has been developed with exceptional stewardship resulting in a Historic District that was worthy of NRHP designation in 2008. As stated in the nomination, this is due in large part to the architectural harmony of the campus.
This harmony is achieved through a strong adherence to common characteristics and themes.

However, these common characteristics are not fixed. With every new building the definition of architectural harmony is both perpetuated and expanded. The campus is a living, growing entity which has evolved over time. It’s common characteristics are derived from 59 unique, contributing buildings built over the course of 70 years. All of them designed in the spirit and style of their time to serve the program at hand while simultaneously embodying the common characteristics of the campus and redefining them. And through this implicit, natural process of differentiation, the character of this historic campus is reinforced and enriched.

Amidst contributing buildings built over the course of 70 years in varied architectural styles, the Hallie Ford Center returns to the Olmsted Brothers original vision for buildings to be simple and restrained. In so doing it seeks to express not a singular style or collection of copied elements, but rather an authentic, timeless contribution to the common fabric of this historically significant campus.

Furthermore, by providing for the program it serves and through it’s construction which is a reflection of our time, it is naturally differentiated and so contributes to the evolution and enrichment of this forward looking University.
# Appendix D: Schedule of Design Criteria

## I. Overall Design

### Approach
- **New freestanding buildings and additions to existing**: Different but complementary to historic context’s materials, design or style elements, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing to protect the historic integrity of historic context. Achieved by variations in wall or roof alignment, offsets, roof pitch, or roof height or a visual change in surface.

### OSU Campus Master Plan
- **Recommended**
- **Adaptation of classical forms and details**

### OSU HPP
- **Recommended**
- **Design Characteristics (may be incorporated but not mandated)**
- **Not allowed**
- **General Policies**
- **Guidelines for New Const., Alteration, Additions**

1. **New Construction**: Different but complementary. Will not detract from existing character of the district. Will relate most closely to adjacent contributing structures. Balanced design to ensure one element does not detract from character of district.

2. **Addition or Alteration to Contributing Structure**: Development on existing structures should be differentiated from historic structures, respecting primary characteristics like mass, materials, size, scale, and setback.

3. **Addition or Alteration to Non-contributing Structure**: Development on existing non-contributing structures should respect structure’s materials, features, size, scale, proportion and massing. Original structure should remain primary structure. New construction should complement both the primary building and its historic context and be recognizable as contemporary.

### Comments
- **Recommended**
- **Not allowed**
- **Recommended Design Characteristics**
- **General Policies**
- **Guidelines for New Const., Alteration, Additions**

---

## II. Site Development

- **City of Corvallis LDC chapter 2.9**
- **Recommended**
- **Not allowed**
- **Recommended**
- **Design Characteristics (may be incorporated but not mandated)**
- **Not allowed**
- **General Policies**
- **Guidelines for New Const., Alteration, Additions**

- **Maintain existing site development of building coverage, setbacks, landscaping, sidewalks and streets.**
- **Entry location reinforced and pedestrian amenities like a plaza incorporated.**
- **Linked to pedestrian open spaces: plaza, quad, courtyards, sidewalks.**
- **Plazas, porches, material compatible and consistent with adjacent contributing resources.**

### City of Corvallis LDC chapter 2.9

- **Recommended**
- **Not allowed**
- **Recommended**
- **Design Characteristics (may be incorporated but not mandated)**
- **Not allowed**
- **General Policies**
- **Guidelines for New Const., Alteration, Additions**

- **New Construction and Additions/Alterations**: HPP 5.2 Schematic Design to include studies of open space land pattern and existing built area, circulatory patterns, façade studies of adjacent buildings, height and massing relationships to adjacent context.

- **Additional/Alterations**: HPP 5.1 Historic Resources Report required for addition, alterations, rehabilitations. Must be done by a certified historic preservation consultant. HPP 5.1.2 Historic Building Conditions Assessment will be performed prior to or during Schematic Design.

### Comments
- **Recommended**
- **Not allowed**
- **Recommended Design Characteristics**
- **General Policies**
- **Guidelines for New Const., Alteration, Additions**

---

### City of Corvallis LDC chapter 2.9

- **Recommended**
- **Not allowed**
- **Recommended**
- **Design Characteristics (may be incorporated but not mandated)**
- **Not allowed**
- **General Policies**
- **Guidelines for New Const., Alteration, Additions**

- **New Construction and Additions/Alterations**: HPP 5.2 Schematic Design to include studies of open space land pattern and existing built area, circulatory patterns, façade studies of adjacent buildings, height and massing relationships to adjacent context.

- **Additional/Alterations**: HPP 5.1 Historic Resources Report required for addition, alterations, rehabilitations. Must be done by a certified historic preservation consultant. HPP 5.1.2 Historic Building Conditions Assessment will be performed prior to or during Schematic Design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Corvallis</th>
<th>OSU Campus Master Plan</th>
<th>OSU HPP</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Siting/Building Orientation</strong></td>
<td>New work will avoid impacting the façade of an historic resource that is visible from public areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adds must be visually secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Massing</strong></td>
<td>FAR of 2.0–3.5 in Sector C</td>
<td>Simple, symmetrical</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Scale</strong></td>
<td>A single element bigger than historic context is to be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Proportion</strong></td>
<td>Proportional relationship between parts of the structure. Show proportional relationship of height to width.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. Height</strong></td>
<td>Shall not exceed existing context. Second story additions allowed as long as consistent with height standards and other design criteria.</td>
<td>Per CMP 3.36.50 Development Standards. Table 3.36-4</td>
<td>Multi-story Compatible or shall be visually minimized if taller than adjacent structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII. Modulation</strong></td>
<td>Vertical Modulation of large wall areas using offsets, shadow lines, belt courses. Vertical bay expression. Horizontal Modulation using recesses or extensions (entrances, floor area, etc.) with offsets as little as 12 inches are acceptable.</td>
<td>Vertical Modulation: Columns, pilasters. Horizontal Modulation: Three-part base, middle, capital. Defined roof edge and building base.</td>
<td>Vertical Modulation: Windows vertically aligned and grouped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IX. Building Materials</strong></td>
<td>Vertical board, plywood, cement stucco, aluminum, concrete block, vinyl; unless documented as being consistent with context.</td>
<td>Stone and terra cotta as accent material to highlight openings, corners, lintels, bases, copings, cornices.</td>
<td>Masonry (red brick) Wood siding, synthetic stucco. Compatible, red brick and pre-cast concrete. Stone, terra cotta or another material as an accent consistent with adjacent contributing resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X. Architectural Details</strong></td>
<td>Avoid anything inconsistent with historic fabric or conjectural if added to existing.</td>
<td>Comers pilasters, quoins, building walls, rustication, are articulated and bay expression. Base clearly articulated substantial base, starting at window level or first floor level if 3 to 4 feet above finish grade. Cornice or copings shall terminate at the uppermost edge of building facade. Parapet line with shadow lines and/or material change.</td>
<td>Eclectic adaptation of classical forms (design characteristics that may be incorporated Greek, Gothic, Romanesque, Victorian Chateauesque). Validly bearing walls. Similar and compatible to adjacent contributing resources. 1% art pieces are exempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Entrances一 Primary entry oriented to a street or pedestrian access way. In the center bay of the center façade. Opening highlighted with masonry, stone, terra cotta etc. inviting entry elements like arch, architrave, porch. Wall-developed major and minor entries. Entry in center bay. Original primary entry must not be obscured or lessened in its prominence. Located center bay of center façade. If not practical then can be based on entry designs of other compatible contributing resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Roof Form一 Match pitch and shape of historic context. Visible roof area will meet or exceed 4:12, covered in tile, concrete shingles, or standing seam anodized. Hide roof mounted equipment. Gable (pediment), sloped roofs. Three-tab asphalt shingles. Pitched roof with elements of surrounding contributing resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Window/door Openings一 Compatible with historic context in form (size, proportion, detailing), materials, type, pattern, and placement. Vertical in proportion, reminiscent of double-hung scaling, set back in façade. Grouped to create vertical proportions. Vertically recessed at basement or attic levels. Masonry stone sill and lintel. Exterior fenestration approx 20% of the exterior wall area. Glazing shall not have reflective qualities. Window framing members should not be highly colored. Compatible in size and proportion. Approx 20% of wall area, visually appropriate window to wall area. Material complementary. See also Modulation. Proportion, size, rhythm, detailing shall be compatible with adjacent buildings and character of the district per chapter 5 of the CMP. Windows vertically grouped and aligned consistent with surrounding contributing resources. Materials should be reflective of and complementary to surrounding contributing window materials. Must be consistent with SEED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Accessory Development一 Exterior lighting, walls, fences, awnings, landscaping shall be visually compatible with architectural design or style of designated resource or context. Signage, site furnishings shall comply with OSU standards and be consistent with CMP and other established regulations. Light from exterior fixtures should be cast downward. Bicycle parking - 50% shall not be covered. Site furnishings like bicycle racks, transit shelters, signage, trash receptacles shall not detract from character of the district. Walkways will be similar in width and material as existing walkways. Retain existing historic light fixtures. Reuse existing fixtures, holes, ducts, conduits, etc. Direct lighting of a building shall be restrained. New landscaping shall be consistent with existing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Sustainability一 Solar or hydronic panels allowed parallel to the roof surface, not protruding more than 12 inches above the roof surface and the roof surface does not directly front a street. Installation should be reversible. Green roof (vegetated roofs) allowed as a benchmark trial. Exterior mounted or applied solar screening is not allowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flow Chart: Approvals Process

**MINOR WORK**
- Work on a historic resource or in historic district or adj. to historic district

**OSU CMP HPP REVIEW**
- Facilities Staff Initial Meeting

**MAJOR WORK**
- New Construction
- Schematic Design Studies per OSU HPP Section 5.2
- Addition or Alteration to a Contributing Resource
- Historic Resource Report and Historic Conditions Assessment Required per OSU HPP Section 5.1

**CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE**
- Schematic design process (other groups may be involved - user groups, etc.)

**FACILITIES STAFF REVIEW**
- Approval

**DIRECTOR LEVEL HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT**
- Approval
- One month overall

**SUBMIT TO CITY FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT**
- Approval
- 3 months not including appeals

**HRC LEVEL HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT**
- Approval
- 12 days to appeal
- Appeal up to 7 weeks
  - Public Notice, Staff Report to City Council, up to 3 council meetings

**NOTES:**
- If mostly interior work with little exterior modifications, could possibly get building permit around the same time.
- HRC meets every month on the 2nd Tuesday. 20 days prior to that, public notice is required.
Flow Chart: Relationship Between Documents

City of Corvallis Comprehensive Plan
Historic Preservation Policies

OSU CMP (1986)
or city approved successor plan
CMP 5.0 Design Guidelines

City of Corvallis
Land Use Development Code (LDC)

OSU HISTORIC PRESERVATION
PLAN (HPP)
created by the OSU Historic Preservation Task Force (HPTF) members City HPAB, Facilities Services, SHPO, etc.

Minor Construction
OSU Facilities

Major Construction
purview of Campus Planning Committee

CPC review considers CMP, City of Corvallis Comprehensive Plan, zoning regulations, etc.
CPC includes HPP when considering a project (CMP 3-7)

before work undertaken consult
HPP OSU CMP City of Corvallis structural permit applications for historic structures within a historic district may require review by the Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB)

project adjacent to College Hill West Historic District advisory review by City of Corvallis HPAB
National Historic Districts, Buildings and Structures Defined

From the National Park Service website:
http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_4.htm#district

The National Register of Historic Places includes significant properties, classified as buildings, sites, districts, structures, or objects. It is not used to list intangible values, except in so far as they are associated with or reflected by historic properties. The National Register does not list cultural events, or skilled or talented individuals, as is done in some countries. Rather, the National Register is oriented to recognizing physically concrete properties that are relatively fixed in location. For purposes of National Register nominations, small groups of properties are listed under a single category, using the primary resource. For example, a city hall and fountain would be categorized by the city hall (building), a farmhouse with two outbuildings would be categorized by the farmhouse (building), and a city park with a gazebo would be categorized by the park (site). Properties with large acreage or a number of resources are usually considered districts. Common sense and reason should dictate the selection of categories.

BUILDING
A building, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. “Building” may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and jail or a house and barn.

Buildings eligible for the National Register must include all of their basic structural elements. Parts of buildings, such as interiors, facades, or wings, are not eligible independent of the rest of the existing building. The whole building must be considered, and its significant features must be identified.

If a building has lost any of its basic structural elements, it is usually considered a “ruin” and is categorized as a site.

Examples of buildings include:
- administration building
- carriage house
- church
- city or town hall
- courthouse
- detached kitchen, barn, and privy
- dormitory
- fort
- garage
- hotel
- house
- library
- mill building
- office building
- post office
- school
- shed
- social hall
- stable
- store
- theater
- train station

STRUCTURE
The term “structure” is used to distinguish from buildings those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter. Structures nominated to the National Register must include all of the extant
basic structural elements. Parts of structures can not be considered eligible if the whole structure remains. For example, a truss bridge is composed of the metal or wooden truss, the abutments, and supporting piers, all of which, if extant, must be included when considering the property for eligibility. If a structure has lost its historic configuration or pattern of organization through deterioration or demolition, it is usually considered a “ruin” and is categorized as a site.

Examples of structures include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Carousel</th>
<th>Irrigation System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apiary</td>
<td>Corncrib</td>
<td>Kiln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandstand</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Railroad Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats and Ships</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Silo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>Trolley Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairn</td>
<td>Grain Elevator</td>
<td>Tunnel Windmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRICT
A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Concentration, Linkage, & Continuity of Features
A district derives its importance from being a unified entity, even though it is often composed of a wide variety of resources. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can convey a visual sense of the overall historic environment or be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties. For example, a district can reflect one principal activity, such as a mill or a ranch, or it can encompass several interrelated activities, such as an area that includes industrial, residential, or commercial buildings, sites, structures, or objects. A district can also be a grouping of archeological sites related primarily by their common components; these types of districts often will not visually represent a specific historic environment.

Significance
A district must be significant, as well as being an identifiable entity. It must be important for historical, architectural, archeological, engineering, or cultural values. Therefore, districts that are significant will usually meet the last portion of Criterion C plus Criterion A, Criterion B, other portions of Criterion C, or Criterion D.

Types of Features
A district can comprise both features that lack individual distinction and individually distinctive features that serve as focal points. It may even be considered eligible if all of the components lack individual distinction, provided that the grouping achieves significance as a whole within its historic context. In either case, the majority of the components that add to the district’s historic character, even if they are individually undistinguished, must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole.
A district can contain buildings, structures, sites, objects, or open spaces that do not contribute to the significance of the district. The number of noncontributing properties a district can contain yet still convey its sense of time and place and historical development depends on how these properties affect the district’s integrity. In archeological districts, the primary factor to be considered is the effect of any disturbances on the information potential of the district as a whole.

**Geographical Boundaries**

A district must be a definable geographic area that can be distinguished from surrounding properties by changes such as density, scale, type, age, style of sites, buildings, structures, and objects, or by documented differences in patterns of historic development or associations. It is seldom defined, however, by the limits of current parcels of ownership, management, or planning boundaries. The boundaries must be based upon a shared relationship among the properties constituting the district.

**Discontiguous Districts**

A district is usually a single geographic area of contiguous historic properties; however, a district can also be composed of two or more definable significant areas separated by nonsignificant areas. A discontiguous district is most appropriate where:

- Elements are spatially discrete;
- Space between the elements is not related to the significance of the district; and
- Visual continuity is not a factor in the significance.

In addition, a canal can be treated as a discontiguous district when the system consists of man-made sections of canal interspersed with sections of river navigation. For scattered archeological properties, a discontiguous district is appropriate when the deposits are related to each other through cultural affiliation, period of use, or site type.

It is not appropriate to use the discontiguous district format to include an isolated resource or small group of resources which were once connected to the district, but have since been separated either through demolition or new construction. For example, do not use the discontiguous district format to nominate individual buildings of a downtown commercial district that have become isolated through demolition.

Examples of districts include:

- business districts
- irrigation systems
- canal systems
- residential areas
- groups of habitation sites
- rural villages
- college campuses
- transportation networks
- estates and farms with large rural historic districts
- acreage/numerous properties
- industrial complexes