

# THE PORTLAND BUILDING RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

#### TYPE III DECISION APPEAL HEARING LU 17-153413 HRMAD

AUGUST 24, 2017









#### INTRODUCTION



#### **EXISTING PHOTO**



#### EXTERIOR RENDERING - PROPOSED

/CITY OF PORTLAND / HOWARD S. WRIGHT / DLR Group /THE PORTLAND BUILDING RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

G) The proposed air handling units shall either be located at the interior of the building, or be significantly (at least 50%) reduced in scale (and not increased in number).

"...Staff has significant concerns about the scale of the proposed rooftop units, particularly those on the west and has suggested that the units be located within the interior of the building."



#### **APPROVAL CONDITION**

- Air handlers are the pieces of equipment that circulate air as part of the HVAC system
- Best source for quality outside air needed to supply these units is the roof level
- Drawing air from lower elevations would reduce air quality and require a significant amount of exterior louvers
- Drawing air from the roof to basement would require structural changes, decrease usable floor area and decrease the efficiency of the units
- Reducing the equipment size by 50% would result in insufficient air distribution to create a comfortable environment and would not meet current codes



## FEASIBILITY ISSUES

#### **C11 - Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops**

- Integrate roof function, shape, surface materials, and colors with the building's overall design concept.
- The roof is primarily occupied by the mechanical penthouse and the proposal maintains this existing function
- Equipment is rectilinear and symmetrically placed in response to the building's overall design concept
- The air handling units are covered with a housing that provides a clean, uncluttered appearance



#### APPROVAL CRITERIA

### C11 - Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops

- Size and place rooftop mechanical equipment, penthouses, other components, and related screening elements to enhance views of the Central City's skyline, as well as views from other buildings or vantage points.
- Size: The rooftop mechanical equipment has been sized to provide a healthy and comfortable environment for building occupants and to meet the current codes and policies
- Placement: The mechanical units are organized, symmetrical and located as far away from the roof edges as possible
- Views: Sightline diagrams show that the proposed equipment is not visible from typical vantage points



#### APPROVAL CRITERIA

#### C11 - Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops



• Views: Sightline diagrams show that the proposed

#### **PROPOSED DESIGN VIEW ANGLES - WEST ELEVATION**

/CITY OF PORTLAND / HOWARD S. WRIGHT / DLR Group /THE PORTLAND BUILDING RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT





#### C11 - Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops



• Views: Sightline diagrams show that the proposed

### **PROPOSED DESIGN VIEW ANGLES - SOUTH ELEVATION**

/CITY OF PORTLAND / HOWARD S. WRIGHT / DLR Group /THE PORTLAND BUILDING RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

CITY COUNCIL APPEAL HEARING/ AUGUST 24, 2017

# equipment is not visible from typical vantage points

#### **C11 - Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops**

- Develop rooftop terraces, gardens, and associated landscaped areas to be effective storm water management tools.
- The proposal has been designed to allow the maximum amount of the existing eco-roof to remain in place and function as one of the building's primary storm water management tools



#### APPROVAL CRITERIA



# THE PORTLAND BUILDING RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

#### TYPE III DECISION APPEAL HEARING LU 17-153413 HRMAD

AUGUST 24, 2017









EXISTING MECHANICAL PENTHOUSE

EXISTING COOLING TOWERS

FOURTEENTH LEVEL ROOF BELOW

SECOND LEVEL ROOF BELOW





#### **PROPOSED ROOF - AXON**





/CITY OF PORTLAND / HOWARD S. WRIGHT / DLR Group /THE PORTLAND BUILDING RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

### **EXTERIOR CLADDING MOCK-UP**







#### Memo

Date August 1, 2017 Subject | Portland Building Reconstruction # LU 17-153413 HRMAD Type III Decision Appeal

#### **Appeal Request:**

The Historic Landmarks Commission approved the Portland Building Reconstruction Project (LU 17-153413 HRMAD) with conditions designated 'A' through 'I'. The applicant is able to meet all of the conditions as stated with the exception of condition 'G' which reads:

"G. The proposed air handling units shall either be located at the interior of the building, or be significantly (at least 50%) reduced in scale (and not increased in number)"

The applicant is appealing condition 'G' and asks that it be removed from the approval decision.

As described to the Landmarks Commission in our June 26th hearing, there is no viable technical solution that meets the condition stated without creating significant negative impacts to the project. The project team has done extensive studies regarding type and location of mechanical equipment that will deliver optimum performance and air quality while minimizing visual impact. The design shown in the proposal reflects this.

Locating the air handling equipment in the interior of the building per the condition is not feasible. These units need to draw fresh air into the building and the best source for high quality outside air is at the roof level. Drawing air from lower elevations would result in reduced air quality for the building occupants and would require large louvers to be placed somewhere within the historic facade. The addition of these louvers would disrupt the historic design and potentially reduce valuable existing window area. Drawing air from the roof to air handlers located in the basement would require significant structural changes in order to accommodate new vertical shafts, would significantly reduce the usable square footage in the building, and would result in a significant drop in the efficiency and life span of the air handling equipment. This scenario would also add significant cost to the project.

Reducing the size of the equipment by 50% is also not technically feasible. The Portland Building is a 15 story building that is intended to house over 1,700 employees. Reducing the equipment size would result in insufficient air distribution for the building occupants and would not meet code.

As stated in our initial hearing, considerable work has been done to ensure a solution that balances minimizing visual impact with the needs of the building occupants and the City's sustainability goals.

#### Approval Criteria:

The approval criteria referenced as the basis of the approval condition added by the Landmarks Commission is from the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines, item C11 Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops. Responses to the individual sections of that guideline are addressed as follows:

- Integrate roof function, shape, surface materials, and colors with the building's overall design concept.
  - existing penthouse structure.
- vantage points.
  - supported by the C11 guideline.
  - possible to minimize visibility from the sidewalk level.
  - from the existing mechanical penthouse.
- management tools.
  - management tools.

Per the analysis above, the applicant believes that the proposed mechanical equipment meets the intent of the C11 guideline and requests that Condition 'G' be removed from the approval.

• While the staff report notes the roof was designed as a "temple", it is acknowledged that this design vision was never realized. The roof is, and has always been, primarily occupied by the mechanical penthouse. The proposal maintains this existing function. Equipment is rectilinear and symmetrically placed in response to the building's overall design concept. The air handling units are covered with a housing that provides a clean, uncluttered appearance and are proposed to be a color that is complimentary to the

#### Size and place rooftop mechanical equipment, penthouses, other components, and related screening elements to enhance views of the Central City's skyline, as well as views from other buildings or

o Size: The rooftop mechanical equipment has been sized to provide code required levels of air supply to the building. As such, it is designed to provide a healthy and comfortable environment for building occupants and to meet the City's sustainability policies. A condition to reduce equipment in scale by 50% is arbitrary and is not

• *Placement:* As shown in our submitted roof diagrams, the mechanical units are organized and symmetrical. Equipment is located as far away from the roof edges as

• Views: The applicant provided diagrams showing sightlines from significant vantage points including views from the adjacent sidewalks and across adjacent Chapman Square park. These diagrams show that the proposed equipment is not visible from any of these vantage points. While staff and the commission expressed concerns about the appearance of the proposed air handlers "as viewed from higher elevations," we believe that the clean and uncluttered appearance of the proposed units will not detract visually

#### Develop rooftop terraces, gardens, and associated landscaped areas to be effective storm water

 The proposal has been designed to allow the maximum amount of the existing eco-roof to remain in place and function as one of the building's primary storm water