



City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Land Use Services
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Ted Wheeler, Mayor
Rebecca Esau, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

SUMMARY MEMORANDUM – DAR #3

Date: May 16, 2018
To: Brendan Sanchez, CARLETON HART ARCHITECTURE
From: Grace Jeffreys, Development Review
503-823-7840, grace.jeffreys@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 17-269490 DA – 1724 NW Hoyt
Design Advice Request #3, Summary Memo, April 23, 2018 Hearing Date

Thank you for taking advantage of the opportunity to hold a **third** Design Advice Request regarding your project. I hope you find it informative and valuable as you continue with your project development. Attached is a summary of the comments provided by the Historic Landmarks Commission at the **April 23, 2018** Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings. To review those recordings, please visit: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/11834307/>

These Historic Landmarks Commission comments are intended to guide you in further design exploration of your project. These comments may also inform City staff when giving guidance over the course of future related land use reviews. These comments address the project as presented on April 23, 2018. As the project design evolves, the comments, too, may evolve or may no longer be pertinent.

Design Advice Requests are not intended to substitute for other Code-required land use or legislative procedures. Please keep in mind that the formal Type III land use review process [which includes a pre-application, a land use review application, public notification, a Staff Report and a public hearing] must be followed once the Design Advice Request meetings are complete, if formal approval for specific elements of your project is desired.

Please continue to coordinate with me as you prepare your formal land use application, or if you desire another Design Advice Request meeting with the Commission.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Historic Landmarks Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes Historic Landmarks Commission design direction provided on April 23, 2018, per the applicable Approval Criteria.

Commissioners in attendance on April 23, 2018:

Kirk Ranzetta, Kristen Minor, Matthew Roman, Maya Foty, Annie Mahoney, Ernestina Fuenmayor

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

- Generally:

As before, the three distinct “buildings” approach is supported, as it responds to the granular nature of the District.

The Commissions’ purview is to help keep historic buildings and neighborhoods intact. Concern was noted about setting precedence for potential development on the adjacent quarter block on Irving, and the impact that would have on the neighbors and the character of the street. One Commissioner responded that they felt the precedent of this size of building in this district was set in 1905.

- Buck Prager (BP): The refurbishment of the Buck-Prager (BP) and the internal courtyards that will highlight the brick side facades of the BP are commended. However, as the historic “centerpiece” of the development, the BP should have a stronger presence on 18th, and the new construction either side should be less prominent. Rather, make the new construction, the North Building (NB) and the South Addition (SA), good quality background buildings.
- North Building (NB): Response was varied regarding scale and massing, and change to these will be needed to gain Commission support.
- South Addition (SA): While it should read as a distinct “building”, it must have a stronger relationship to the Buck Prager, which it is an addition to.
- Loading: To support a modification and/or adjustment to development standards, applicant must demonstrate how the proposal will better meet the design guidelines.

For the NB, no concerns were noted with supporting some type of modification to landscaping and setback for loading space.

For the SA, some type of loading access is needed, however, it is unfair to modify the landscaping to nothing adjacent to a residential property. At a minimum, a setback that can accommodate vines and a fence will be needed.

II. DETAILED FEEDBACK. The Commission provided the following in-depth feedback.

- A. Buck-Prager (BP).** As noted above, as the historic “centerpiece” of the development, it must have a stronger presence. While the BP is a background building, it is important to understand the character defining aspect of it, and use these to make it pop. Emphasize important elements of the façade to make it more prominent, and consider using the color palette highlighting details such as the brackets, keystones, cornice, belt course, etc.
- B. North Building (NB)**
 - 1. Contextual Response.** As noted above, make the new construction (NB and SA) good quality background buildings.

- a. Height/scale/ massing.** Commission response was varied as to whether the height/scale/massing was compatible with the adjacent context of the BP and the historic houses on NW Irving. Change is needed to these to gain support of the Commission.
- One Commissioner remained supportive of the height and massing. It isn't out of scale with the district, and there is a building one block away of a similar height. This type of juxtaposition is common in the neighborhood. However, the relationship to the individual scale of the neighborhood houses is worth further Commission discussion. It was noted that this scale juxtaposition was not what the PHLC was referring to in the recent State of the City, which was referring to proposals in historic districts that were twice as tall as the average buildings in the district.
 - Two Commissioners were also supportive of the height, but felt more needs to be done to lessen the impact of the massing on Irving. The notch doesn't go far enough, and more views up and through to the sky are needed to break up the massing. Consider a deeper notch, and/or some localized setback on the top floor. It was noted that this has been, and is, a district in transition, and juxtaposition of scale is in keeping with this and is appropriate here.
 - Three Commissioners noted that the proposal needs further breaking down. While the height itself is not a problem, the proposed scale and massing is overwhelmingly in relation to the context, especially the BP and the landmark buildings across NW Irving.
The design must respond to the neighborhood in addition to the overall historic district. In this location, the massing of the NB does not yet do enough to meet the criteria of *CDG D7 Blending into the Neighborhood*. "Reduce the impact of new development on established neighborhoods by incorporating elements of nearby, quality buildings such as building details, massing, proportions, and materials".
 - One way to reduce the impact of the massing of the proposal, especially along Irving, would be to break down the massing by removing a floor.
 - Another approach would be to reduce the floor to floor heights.
 - Also consider making the building visually look less tall by treating the top story as an upper story and make it recede using a lighter color with less brick, which could also relate to the base.
- b. Character.** A quieter, simpler design would allow the adjacent historic fabric to better shine, and would be more complementary with the BP, a simple building with clean windows and clear simplicity.
- It was noted that the character of the design of the North Building (NB) does have a stronger relationship to the BP than the South Addition (SA) has.
 - One Commissioner noted the break-down of scale and elements in the design adds a more human scale, but, the overt historic references are not needed or appropriate.
 - One Commissioner noted there were too many ins and outs and material changes.

2. Public Realm

- a. Entry space on 18th.** The Commission supports the entry on 18th. However, at least half of the Commission thought the entry sequence itself needed further attention:

- One Commissioner thought the basement windows worked well. If any of the units were to go away, they would want them to come from the top elevation rather than from the basement.
- Two Commissioners noted they would like to see the egress wells go away. (MR) One Commissioner noted the benches helped mitigate for the egress wells.
- Three Commissioners thought that the main entry seating area needs further attention and the pedestrian experience needs to be better addressed. The area appears an afterthought to deal with the window wells, as opposed to a deliberate effort to make a nice entrance. The benches don't do enough to create a comfortable place to wait. Consider carefully how the area will be used and how the landscaping supports this. *(CDG D2 – Main entrances, D3- Landscape features, E5 – Pedestrian experience, etc.)*
- One Commissioner added that the 2 lower level units will be hard to live in because they are so exposed, so blinds will be up making them dark units. Supports moving those units up.
- It was also noted that the sconces set off the entries well.

C. South Addition (SA)

1. **Contextual Response.** As noted above, make the new construction (NB and SA) good quality background buildings. Also, as noted above, while the design should read as a distinct “building”, it must have a stronger relationship to the Buck Prager, which it is an addition to.
 - a. **Height/scale/ massing.** Most of the Commission felt the proposed massing and height responded to the immediate context.
 - One Commissioner, however, commented that taking a floor off would make it more compatible.
 - b. **Character.** The Commission supported treating the SA as a distinct building; however, compatibility must also be shown.
 - Differentiation is important, however, there are many ways of being different without being different in every single way. The proportions and the scale should be similar.
 - It should relate to the adjacent context in a simpler, quieter way to allow the BP to be more emphasized.
 - Increase the ratio of window openings to masonry so the building will look more like the residential building it is.
 - Three Commissioners thought that a stronger relationship is needed to the BP. In addition to color, use horizontal (rather than vertical) orientation, datums, proportions, and detailing such as cornices, window sizes and spacings to provide better compatibility with the BP.
 - One Commissioner liked the ambiguity of the use of the building, the art deco expression and the multi-paned windows, however, would like to see something clearly taken from the BP.

D. Quality & Permanence (Both NB and SA)**1. Materials.**

- a. Brick and stucco are suitable cladding materials.
- b. Cutsheets and details will be important for the LU review to illustrate quality of materials as well as details at changes in materials.
- c. Three Commissioners supported a historic expression approach. A traditional design vocabulary is supportable if it is quality construction, however, be careful to not be too faux, which would diminish the value of the quality historic fabric nearby. It will be important for people to understand the difference between new and old, but the difference doesn't need to be jarring. Leaning towards traditional design but are open to quality modern design too.
- d. Three Commissioners felt the current design is too strongly historical and want a more contemporary expression. There are too many elements, while the BP is quite simple. It doesn't need to be "modern", but, the current design is too literal. There needs to be a middle ground.
- e. Don't mimic historic wood detailing with new materials such as metal louvers and panels, as this diminishes the value of the surrounding historic fabric.

E. Potential Modifications/Adjustments**1. Loading.**

- a. For the NB, no concerns were noted with supporting some type of modification to landscaping and setback for loading space.
- b. For the SA, some type of loading access is needed, however, it is unfair to modify the landscaping to nothing adjacent to a residential property. At a minimum, a setback that can accommodate vines and a fence will be needed.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
 - 2. CHA minutes from NWDA meeting, 11/10/18
 - 3. Response to staff queries, 12/15/17
 - 4. Drawings for first DA, dated 12/29/17
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. "C" Exhibits, C.1-27, for DAR #3, dated 4/23/18 (attach pages 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9)
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments – none received
- F. Public Testimony –
 - 1. Jessica Richman, 12/12/17, questions about the PC held on 12/12/17.
 - 2. Vicki Skryha, 12/12/17, questions about PC doc's, and provided reference links.

3. Steve Pinger 12/13/17, questions about status of proposal.
 4. Jessica Richman, 12/13/17, clarifying representation.
 5. Jessica Richman, 12/18/17, request for PC documents.
 6. Jessica Richman, 12/27/17, questions regarding noticing and DAR process.
 7. Vicki Skryha, 12/28/17, questions regarding noticing and DAR process.
 8. Jessica Richman, 1/2/18, concerns with scale and design.
 9. Vicki Skryha, 1/4/18, questions about applicable criteria.
 10. Vicki Skryha, 1/6/18, questions about map app.
 11. Roger Vrillakas, 1/5/18, concerns with scale and size of proposal.
 12. Douglas Coffey, 1/5/18, concerns with character and size, as well as lack of loading and parking.
 13. Annette Jolin, received 1/7/18, dated 1/3/18, Concerns with scale, compatibility, and lack of parking.
 14. Jessica Richman, received 1/8/18, dated 1/7/18, concerns with scale, height and compatibility of both buildings.
 15. JoZell Johnson, received 1/7/18, dated 1/7/18, concerns with scale, height and compatibility of both buildings.
 16. Allen Buller, 1/8/18, support of preserving the BP. Concerns with design and scale.
 17. Page Stockwell, 1/8/18, Concerns with the height, scale and compatibility.
 18. Eric & Tanya Austin, 1/8/18, concerns with size, scale and massing.
 19. Steve and Laurie Caldwell, 1/8/18, concerns with size and bulk.
 20. Caroline Sheldon, 1/8/18, concerns with height, scale, and character, as well as lack of setbacks and parking.
 21. NWDA, received 1/5/18, dated 1/4/18, support for massing strategy, but concerns with compatibility and height of north building.
 22. Vicki Skryha, 1/7/18, Support of preserving the Buck-Prager. Concerns with scale and compatibility of both buildings, lack of setbacks and articulation, basement interface, lack of loading, and bench area on 18th.
 23. Richard U' Ren and Annette Jolin, 1/8/18, concern with size, scale and design of proposal.
 24. Dragana Milosevic, 1/8/18, concerns with size of proposal and impact on historic integrity of neighborhood, structural integrity of her home, and increase traffic and parking problems.
 25. Jill Warren, 1/8/18, handed at hearing, concerns with size, bulk and character, and effect on historic integrity of district. Also concerned with possible pile driving and effect on the structural integrity of her property, and lack of parking.
 26. Tony Schwartz, 1/8/18, concerns with size and compatibility.
- G. Other
1. Application form
 2. Pre-Application Conference Summary notes, held 12/12/17
 3. CC Findings, LU 14-210073 DM
 4. Staff memo for 1st DAR, 1/3/18
 5. Staff presentation, 1/8/18
 6. Applicant presentation, 1/8/18
 7. Testifiers, 1/8/18
- H. Landmark Commission Exhibits
(Received before second hearing)
1. Letter, Jessica Richman, 1/8/18, historic photo of BP (Ballow & Wright) building.
 2. Letter, Pamela Lloyd, 1/8/18, concerns with lack of setbacks, parking and loading, as well as mass and character.
 3. Letter, Kathleen Carter, 1/15/18, concerns with height, scale massing and character.
 4. Posting notice #2
 5. Posting notice #2, signed confirmation

6. Letter, Jessica Richman, 2/1/18, typo in Posting notice.
 7. Revised Posting notice #2
 8. Revised draft proposal, for 2/26/18
 9. Alphabet Context Statement, excerpt
 10. Staff Commission Memo for 2nd DAR, 2/20/18
 11. Agenda for meeting 2/13/18
 12. Staff notes from meeting, 2/13/18
 13. Staff email to Jessica Richmond regarding whether a building is attached, 2/13/18
 14. Staff Summary Memo from first DAR, 2/16/18
 15. Letter, Doug Klotz, 2/22/18, Support for proposal.
 16. Letter, Iain Mackenzie, 2/22/18, Support for proposal.
 17. Letter, Steve Bozzone, 2/22/18, Support for proposal.
 18. Letter, Jill Warren, dated 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 19. Letter, Stephen Judkins, 2/23/18, Support for proposal.
 20. Letter, Tim Davis, 2/23/18, Support for proposal.
 21. Letter, Vicki Skryha, dated 2/22/18, Concerns with proposal.
 22. Letter, Kessler, 2/26/18, Wendy Chung Conflict of interest.
 23. Letter, Allen Buller, 2/25/18, Concerns with proposal.
 24. Letter, Jessica Richman, dated 2/24/18, Concerns with proposal.
 25. Letter, Ken Johnson, 2/25/18, Support for proposal.
 26. Letter, Richard U'Ren and Annette Jolin, 2/25/18, Concerns with proposal.
 27. Letter, Steve and Laurie Caldwell, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 28. Letter, Erich and Tanya Austin, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 29. Letter, Laura Marney, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 30. Letter, Carolyn Sheldon, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 31. Letter, Dragan and Dragana Milosevic, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 32. Letter, Dennis Harper, 2/25/18, Concerns with proposal.
 33. Letter, Tanya Kapka, M.D., 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 34. Letter, Rob Fullmer, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 35. Letter, Charlie Tso, 2/26/18, support for proposal,
 36. Letter, JoZell Johnson, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 37. List of letters shared with the HLC at the hearing, 2/26/18
- (Received at second hearing)**
38. Letter, Daniel Anderson, 2/26/18, Concerns with proposal.
 39. Letter, Karen Kirsch, Concerns with proposal.
 40. NW District Plan
 41. List of Public testimony, 2/26/18
- (Received after second hearing)**
42. Revised Staff Summary Memo from first DAR, 2/16/18
 43. Letter, Steve Pinger, NWDA, received 2/27/18, support and concerns
 44. CHA notes from second DAR, 2/26/18
 45. Letter, Daniel Anderson & Joy Strand, 3/7/18, Concerns.
 46. Wendy Chung, PHLC email chain, 3/9/18, response to staff draft summary
 47. Wendy Chung, PHLC email chain, 3/9/18, PHLC letter from 2014
- (Received before third hearing)**
48. Staff Summary Memo from second DAR, 3/16/18
 49. Email chain regarding third DAR, 3/22/18
 50. Email chain regarding standards not met, 3/26/18
 51. DAR 3 posting documents, 3/27/18
 52. DAR 3 posting certification, 3/29/18

53. Letter, Steve Connolly, 2/22/18, Concerns with proposal.
54. Drawing set for 3rd DAR, 4/9/18
55. CHA Email Listing Modifications, 4/10/18
56. Letter, Iain Mackenzie, 4/10/18, Support for proposal.
57. Revised plan, 4/10/18
58. Letter, Gerson Robboy, dated 4/11/18, Support for proposal.
59. Letter, Ms. Michael James, dated 4/13/18, Concerns with proposal.
60. Letter, Allen Buller, dated 4/15/18, Concerns with proposal.
61. Letter, Brad Hochhalter, dated 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
62. Letter, Carolyn Sheldon, 4/16/18/18, Concerns with proposal.
63. Letter, Dragana Milosevic, 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
64. Letter, Erich and Tanya Austin, 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
65. Letter, Jill Warren, dated 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
66. Letter, Laura Marney, 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
67. Letter, Steve and Laurie Caldwell, 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
68. Letter, Vicki Skryha, dated 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
69. Letter, Tanya Kapka, M.D., 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
70. Letter, Richard U'Ren, dated 4/15/18, Concerns with proposal.
71. Letter, Jessica Richman, dated 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
72. Letter, JoZell Johnson, dated 4/16/18, Concerns with proposal.
73. Letter, Steve Pinger, NWDA, received 4/16/18, concerns w/ AHD 3, CDG P1 and D7.
74. Letter, Tanya March 4/17/18, Concerns with proposal.
75. Letter, Jim Heuer 4/18/18, Concerns with proposal.
76. Staff Commission Memo for 3rd DAR, 3/19/18
77. Letter, Daniel Anderson & Joy Strand, rec'd 4/20/18, Concerns with proposal.
78. Letter, Tracy Prince 4/20/18, Concerns with proposal.
79. Letter, Daniel Anderson & Joy Strand, 4/23/18, Concerns with proposal.
80. Letter, Jill Warren, 4/23/18, Concerns with proposal.
81. Letter, Doug Klotz, 4/23/18, Support for proposal.
82. Letter, Wendy Rahm, 4/23/18, Concerns with proposal.
83. Staff presentation, 4/23/18
84. List of Public testimony, 4/23/18
85. Hearings clerk summary notes, 4/23/18