

**IN THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF
PORTLAND OREGON**

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION

BY

Erica Ceder, DLR Group FOR A

**Historic Resource Review + Modifications + Adjustment at 1120 SW 5th Avenue
LU 17-153413 HRM AD (The Portland Building)**

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

**ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON
September 13, 2017**

APPROVAL of an Historic Resource Review + Modifications and Adjustment

IN THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION
BY

Erica Ceder, DLR Group FOR A
**Historic Resource Review + Modifications + Adjustment at 1120 SW 5th Avenue
LU 17-153413 HRM AD (The Portland Building)**

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings and conclusions of the City Council in this matter are set forth below.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant:	Erica Ceder, Architect DLR Group 421 SW 6th Ave., Suite 1212 Portland, OR 97204	503-220-1338
	Kristin Wells, Applicant City Of Portland 1120 SW 5th Ave., Rm 1204 Portland, OR 97204	503-823-1181
	Multiple Tenants 1120 SW 5th Ave #1204 Portland, OR 97204-1932	
Site Address:	1120 SW 5TH AVE	
Legal Description:	BLOCK 57 LOT 1-8 SEE SUB ACCT R508653 (R667706771), PORTLAND; BLOCK 57 LOT 1-8 SEE MAIN ACCT R246103 (R667706770) DEFERRED ADDITIONAL TAX LIABILITY, PORTLAND	
Tax Account No.:	R667706770, R667706771	
State ID No.:	1S1E03BC 00200, 1S1E03BC 00200A1	
Quarter Section:	3129	
Neighborhood:	Portland Downtown, contact Rani Boyle at 503-725-9979.	
Business District:	None	

District Coalition: Neighbors West/Northwest, contact Mark Sieber at 503-823-4212.

Plan District: Central City - Downtown

Other Designations: Historic Landmark, individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places on October 25, 2011.

Zoning: CXd – Central Commercial with Design and Historic Resource Protection overlays

Case Type: HRMAD – Historic Resource Review with Modifications and Adjustment

Procedure: Type III, with a public hearing before the Historic Landmarks Commission. The decision of the Historic Landmarks Commission can be appealed to City Council.

Appellant #1: Erica Ceder, Architect 503-220-1338
DLR Group
421 SW 6th Ave., Suite 1212
Portland, OR 97204

Kristin Wells, Applicant 503-823-1181
City Of Portland
1120 SW 5th Ave., Rm 1204
Portland, OR 97204

Appellant #2: Peter Meijer, Peter Meijer Architect, LLC 503-517-0283
605 NE 21st Ave
Portland, OR 97232

II. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Original Proposal:

The applicant proposes exterior alterations and rehabilitation of the Portland Building, to include the following:

- Installation of a rainscreen system on the exterior of the building to be composed of aluminum panels at the upper levels (off-white, red, and blue penthouse) and ceramic tile at the lower (teal) levels, to be set proud of the underlying concrete structure by up to 11.5 inches at the upper levels and 7 inches at the lower levels. The new rainscreen is designed to match the patterning of the existing, though the ground level tiles are proposed at twice the current dimension (from 9.5" x 9.5" to 19" x 19") and the terracotta-colored tiles area are proposed at 15.5" x 15.5", increased from 9.5" x 9.5".
- Replacement of existing formed "column capitals" and decorative "medallion and garland" elements with new aluminum panels designed to match the existing.
- Replacement of all upper level windows and introduction of clear glazing where dark tinted glazing currently exists. Areas of mirrored glazing area will remain mirrored, though new glazing will be installed.
- Replacement of 2nd floor louvers with new windows. Replacement of ground floor storefront systems with new butt-glazed floor-to-ceiling storefront systems.

- Enclosure of two bays of floor area each at the north and south portions of the ground level loggia. The new infilled areas are proposed to be clad with the proposed teal replacement tile, windows to match adjacent windows, and storefront system to match adjacent storefront system.
- Removal of two existing rooftop mechanical units and installation of two new air-handling units on the west side of the roof and six new cooling towers on the east side of the roof. Because the new cooling towers on the east side of the roof exceed the maximum height allowance for that side of the building, the applicant is utilizing the performance standard identified in 33.510.205.C in order to exceed the height limit on the east.
- Removal of the vehicle access at the ground level of the east façade and infill of this area with new glazing and expansion of that glazing upward to the second floor. Relocation of entry and egress doors on the east façade and the application of sikh-obscuring film on the ground level east façade windows and doors.

The following **Modifications** are requested:

1. 33.130.230.C – to reduce the amount of ground floor windows on the north façade to 37% (from 50%) of the wall length and, on the east façade, to 0% (from 50%) of the wall length and to 0% (from 25%) of the wall area. *The Notice of Proposal indicated that the reduction in the length of windows was from 50% to 12.5% but this has since been clarified as 50% to 0% due to the way the standard must be calculated.*
2. 33.510.225 – to reduce the depth of the ground floor active uses (at the loggia) from the required 25' depth to approximately 16' to 20'.

The following **Adjustment** is requested:

1. 33.266.310.C – to reduce the number of required loading spaces to zero (0) by removing the existing on-site basement level loading space.

Historic Resource Review is required because the proposal is for non-exempt exterior alterations to a Historic Landmark.

Relevant Approval Criteria:

In order to be approved, this proposal must comply with the approval criteria of Title 33, Portland Zoning Code. The applicable approval criteria are:

- 33.846.060.G *Other Approval Criteria*
- *Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines*
- 33.846.070 *Modifications Considered During Historic Resource Review*
- 33.805.040 [Adjustment] *Approval Criteria*

Procedural History:

The first Historic Landmarks Commission hearing for this case was held on June 26, 2017. At that hearing, staff presented the staff report, the applicant presented their proposal, and public testimony, including a request to hold the record open, was received. A return hearing was set for July 24, 2017. The majority of the Commission present generally expressed support for the proposal but individually noted areas of concern, including: the potential for delisting from the National Register, details, change in tile size, and lack of screening around the rooftop mechanical units. The record was held open for seven days, ending at 5pm on July 3, 2017, with a response period ending at 5pm on July 10, 2017. The applicant waived their rebuttal.

During the first seven day period for new evidence (June 26, 2017- July 3, 2017), the following additional testimony was received:

1. Fred Miller, former Chief Administrative Officer for the City of Portland, on June 29, 2017 wrote in support of the proposal. See Exhibit H-8.
2. Matthew Davis, Principal at Architectural Resources Group which is a member of the project team, on June 29, 2017 wrote in support of the proposal. See Exhibit H-9.
3. Dan Everhart, Preservation Programs Manager for Restore Oregon, on June 30, 2017, noting a concern for the potential loss of National Register status. See Exhibit H-10.
4. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided additional information in response to staff and Commission comments. See Exhibit H-11.
5. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided updated drawings in response to staff and Commission comments. See Exhibit H-12.
6. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, provided a letter from Jessica Engeman, Venerable Properties, on July 3, 2017, provided a response to the commission's request for more information on the potential for delisting from the National Register. See Exhibit H-13
7. Peter Meijer, Peter Meijer Architect, PC (PMA) on July 3, 2017, wrote in opposition, providing additional testimony in the form of a published interview with Michael Graves, an alternative cost estimate for renovation by PMA, a daylighting study by PMA, an email chain from PBOT regarding denial of an Encroachment Permit, and a report entitled "Exterior Envelope Restoration Structure Improvements Assessment Phase 1" by FFA Architecture and Interiors, Inc. See Exhibit H-14.
8. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2016, provided a response to testimony about the selected rainscreen material. See Exhibit H-15.
9. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided a matrix on alternative materials (referenced in Exhibit H-11. See Exhibit H-16.
10. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, provided a letter from Jessica Engeman, Venerable Properties, on July 3, 2017 provided an updated version of Exhibit H-13. See Exhibit H-17.
11. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, provided a letter from Kristin Wells, Portland Building Reconstruction Project Manager, on July 3, 2017, noting the City's commitment to provide a covenant requiring that before the building could be demolished in the future, the owner must comply with the Demolition Review process in effect at the time. See Exhibit H-18.
12. Kate Kearney, provided a letter from Theodore H.M. Prudon, President of Docomomo US, on July 3, 2017, in opposition to the proposal and noting concerns regarding precedent. See Exhibit H-19.
13. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided an updated memo represented in Exhibit H-15. See Exhibit H-20.

During the second seven-day period for responses to new evidence received (July 3, 2017- July 10, 2017, the following responses were received:

14. Matthew Davis, Principal at Architectural Resources Group which is a member of the project team, on June 29, 2017 provided revised testimony, still in support of the proposal. See Exhibit H-21.
15. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 10, 2017, provided responses to testimony received, particularly in response to Exhibits H-14 and H-19. See Exhibit H-22.

Prior to the July 24, 2017 hearing, staff forwarded all newly received materials to the Commission and testifiers, and provided a revised staff report, dated July 17, 2017. The hearing opened with a closed record, however, during the hearing the applicant requested that the record be opened in order to answer questions posed by the Commission. The public was given the opportunity to testify, however no testimony was

provided. The Commission closed the record, held discussion, and ultimately voted to approve the proposal with conditions.

The final findings and decision of the Historic Landmarks Commission were mailed July 28, 2017.

The applicant, Erica Ceder of DLR Group, appealed the decision on August 1, 2017. Erica Ceder is designated Appellant 1.

Peter Meijer of Peter Meijer Architect, PC appealed the decision on August 11, 2017. Peter Meijer is designated Appellant 2.

Appellant 1's written statement submitted with the appeal indicated disagreement with the Historic Landmarks Commission's decision on one basis:

- 1) Condition G of the Historic Landmark Commission's decision ("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).") cannot be satisfied because relocating the proposed air handling units to the interior or reducing them by 50% is not technically feasible. The proposal as submitted with the two air handlers on the roof meets the approval criteria.

Appellant 2's written statement submitted with their appeal stated nine bases for its appeal:

- 1) Approval criteria 33.846.060.G 1-5, 7-8, and 10 are not met.
- 2) Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines A3, A6, C2, C3, C4, C5, C10, and C11 are not met.
- 3) Modification approval criteria 33.846.070 for ground floor windows are not met.
- 4) Comprehensive Plan 2035 Policies are not met.
- 5) Project goals related to interior work spaces and the exterior urban environment are not met.
- 6) Proposed encroachment was not review via standard methods and is not necessary.
- 7) Proposed overcladding design is overly expensive.
- 8) The new design does not meet the standards of historic preservation (Approval Criteria 1-5, 7-8, 10, C2, C3, C4, C5)
- 9) The Portland Building may lose its National Register eligibility.

BDS mailed a notice of a potential public hearing before City Council with the Final Findings and Decision by the Historic Landmarks Commission on July 28, 2017. The appeal hearing before City Council was scheduled for August 24, 2017 at 3 pm time certain. On August 16, 2017, BDS mailed a revised notice of a public hearing before City Council, listing Peter Meijer of Peter Meijer Architect, PC as Appellant 2.

On August 24, 2017 Council held a closed record hearing. BDS staff, Erica Ceder, and Peter Meijer made presentations and Council heard testimony from all members of the public who wished to speak. Council made a unanimous tentative decision (4-0) to grant Appellant 1's Appeal, striking Condition G of the Historic Landmarks Commission's decision and upholding the Historic Landmarks Commission's decision to approve with conditions (with the exception of Condition G) the requested Historic Resource Review (HR), Modifications (M) and an Adjustment (AD), case file #17-153413 HRM AD for the Portland Building. Council requested that City staff return with findings on September 13, 2017.

III. ANALYSIS

Site and Vicinity: The Portland Building occupies a full block bound by SW 5th Avenue to the west, SW Madison to the south, SW 4th Avenue to the east, and SW Main to the north. SW 5th Avenue serves as one of the City's major transit arteries with regular, with bus lines located on SW Main and Madison as well. Across SW 5th Avenue is the 1962 Standard Plaza building, with 1980 Congress Center to its north and the 1988 PacWest Building to its south. Across SW Main is the 1909 Multnomah County Courthouse, a Historic Landmark. Across SW Madison is the 1895 City Hall, also a Historic Landmark, with the 1970 Wells Fargo Building one block further south. The Portland Building is located at the center of a roughly 10-block microcosm of significant local architecture. Across SW 4th Avenue is Chapman Square, established in 1852 and a Local Landmark. To its north is Lownsdale Square, also established in 1852 and also a Local Landmark. South of Chapman Square and across from City Hall is Terry Shrunk Plaza, a federally owned park.

The following is taken from the National Register nomination for the Portland Building (Exhibit G-3):

The Portland Public Service Building, known universally as the Portland Building, is a boxy, fifteen-story building in the center of downtown Portland, Oregon. The building occupies a full 200 by 200-foot city block and is surrounded on all sides by the urban development of Portland, including Portland's City Hall on the next block to the south. There are two single-block city parks to the east and southeast of the Portland Building, both with a variety of leafy mature trees. The Portland Building is a surprising jolt of color within the more restrained environment of nearby buildings, with its bright-green tile base and off-white stucco exterior accented with mirrored glass, earth-toned terracotta tile, and sky-blue penthouse. The building is also notable for its regular geometry and fenestration as well as the architect's use of over-scaled and highly-stylized classical decorative features on the building's facades, including a copper statue mounted above the entry, garlands on the north and south facades, and the giant pilasters and keystone elements on the east and west facades. Taken together, the use of color and applied ornament give the building a feeling of monumental mass and dynamic dimension despite the relatively uniform face of the exterior walls. The building was completed in 1982, but the design of the building was not fully realized until the installation in 1985 of "Portlandia," a classically-garbed hammered-copper monumental statue set on a centered two-story pedestal at the main entry on Fifth Avenue. Only the interior lobby and the second floor public spaces were designed by Graves, and these spaces exhibit his characteristic use of earth-tones and stylized and exaggerated classical elements, such as the tile wainscot and trim around doors and entries. While the exterior has not been significantly changed since construction, the lobby has been altered and the other Graves-designed interior spaces at the second floor were extensively modified. The building and the statue are counted as separate contributing resources.

The following is taken from the National Register Nomination (Exhibit G-3) and is a summary of the Statement of Significance:

Constructed in 1982, the Portland Public Service Building is nationally significant under Criterion C, Architecture, as the notable work that crystallized Michael Graves's reputation as a master architect and as an early and seminal work of Post-Modern Classicism, an American style that Graves himself defined through his work. When the Portland Building project was awarded to Michael Graves in 1980 the design immediately ignited a national

conversation about Post-Modern architecture in trade magazines such as Architectural Record and Archetype, and general national publications such as People, Time, and Newsweek. The fifteen story monumental structure was ground-breaking for its rejection of “universal” Modernist principals in favor of the bold and symbolic color, well-defined volumes, and stylized- and reinterpreted-classical elements such as pilasters, garlands, and keystones to create a building that was physically and symbolically tied to place, its use, and the Western architectural tradition. Though not yet 50 years old, the building meets the requirements of Criteria Consideration G because it is exceptionally important as one of the first large-scale manifestations of a new architectural style coming on the heels of the Modern movement. The Period of Significance begins in 1982 when the Portland Public Service Building is completed and extends to 1985 when Graves’s design intent was fully realized with the installation of the Portlandia statue.

The following is taken from the National Register Nomination (Exhibit G-3) and describes the exterior of the building:

The building is 362,422 square feet overall and is fifteen floors, about 200 feet, in height to the roof surface. Parking is below-grade and is accessed from a large central garage opening facing toward Fourth Avenue to the east. The structure is a reinforced-concrete frame, with two-way reinforced-concrete waffle slabs. Exterior walls are poured-in-place reinforced concrete. Generally, the exterior material is stucco, with the lower level and the decorative pilasters clad in tile. The composition of each facade is bilaterally symmetrical, with both halves a mirror image of each other around an imaginary vertical centerline.

The building is designed in the classical three-part division of base, shaft, and capital, with a grand centered entry on the west facade. The building’s base consists of a full-story arcade, or loggia, and two successively and proportionately shorter steps above clad in green, some would say teal or blue-green, square ceramic tile. A monumental copper sculpture of a kneeling and classically-garbed woman, called “Portlandia,” dominates the west entry facade as it sits on a two-story two-step pedestal that is set flush to the outside wall. A small square window is immediately below the statue, and a larger square fourlight window is placed at the mezzanine level directly below the first opening. The first floor arcade is punctuated with regularly spaced rectangular openings that extend along Fifth Avenue and along three-quarters of the building’s length along SW Main Street and SW Madison Street before the arcade ends. The main entry on Fifth Avenue is marked by a break in the arcade wall and vertically-oriented non-historic glass-and-metal light fixtures placed on the columns on either side of the entry and a single metal flagpole on each of the two columns to either side of the light fixtures. On the stucco panel above are capital aluminum letters that read “The Portland Building.” The entry doors are set under the overhanging pedestal, and consist of three sets of two narrow metal doors with two rows of six vertical lights. The wall is clad with a green tile wainscot, and similarly colored and decoratively scored stucco punctuated with regularly-placed vents above. The metal storefronts to either side of the entry are symmetrically stepped back twice.

Stepped back above the arcade are equally spaced square vents set into the base of the wall, while the third step exhibits small regularly spaced square windows that are not visible from the street level. Above the base, the shaft, or middle, of the building at this facade consists predominantly of off-white

stucco panels¹ with square 4' by 4' windows on a regular grid. A single scored horizontal line runs across the top and bottom of each window, with a paired set between floors. Horizontal scoring further divides the otherwise featureless wall, thus giving the viewer the impression that the wall might be constructed of large blocks of stone.

One of the most prominent architectural features are the multistory-terracotta pilasters on each of the four facades. At the east and west facades, a pair of over-scaled pilasters made of vertical ribs of earth-tone terracotta tile are topped by smooth, projecting capitals of the same color and set within an area of blue reflective glass. The glass is divided regularly into sets of three panes to either side of each pilaster in a A,B,A pattern of thin and wide lights. Rectangular panes span the space between floors, and square panes are aligned with the windows in the stucco facade. The window block is divided equally horizontally and vertically by a narrow buff-colored metal panel. Directly above this, the expressed top of the building starts at the eleventh floor and maintains the white stucco and square windows on either side of a triangular-shaped keystone created by horizontal terracotta-colored stucco matching the pilasters, alternating with bands of dark ribbon windows divided vertically by metal frames.

At the fourteenth floor, the capital, a centered inset balcony is notched out of the keystone. The balcony is enclosed by a blue-colored wall with inset square panels with a centered "X" in raised white stucco. The rail is interrupted by the two front-most rose-colored square columns of a four-column pergola. At the roof level a short parapet wall is located flush with the outside wall and decorated with the same pattern of square insets with white "X"s on a blue background set in symmetrically spaced groups of three. A final inset level of pale blue stucco, scored into geometric shapes matching the main facade with large square openings, marks the topmost floor. A centrally-located rectangular mechanical enclosure occupies the center of the roof, but is not visible from the street. A "green roof," a thin horizontal structure attached to the roof with sufficient depth to contain a planting medium, irrigation, and drought-resistant plants, is installed on the main roof and on top of the mechanical enclosure.

Moving to the building's south side, facing City Hall, the green-tile base continues around the building, stepping in at each level, and featuring similar details as that of the main facade. At the eastern third of the wall the sidewalk slopes down, and the ground-floor arcade ends. In place of the open arcade is interior office space, but the pattern of arcade openings is continued with large dark-glass windows. The off-white stucco panel wall with its grid of square windows covers the building from the fourth up to the fourteenth floor, with the exception of a large contrasting area in the center of the wall at levels four through ten. This area has four giant vertical pilasters, without capitals, made of terracotta tiles with reflective glass areas between each pilaster. In place of the keystone, the pilasters are topped by giant circular concrete escutcheons that hold a horizontal flattened concrete garland. The upper four floors are unadorned, but include the same treatment at the parapet as the main facade. Steps extend up to the arcade level at the northwest corner of the building, and at about mid-block on SW Madison Street. The north side of the

¹ As is noted on page 11 in the Applicant's Narrative (Exhibit A-1), the exterior of the building is painted concrete, not stucco. The original design was intended to be terracotta but value-engineered to be stucco and finally painted concrete.

building is identical to the south, with the exception that this side of the building has only a single level entry at midblock on SW Main Street.

Facing the park, the Portland Building's east facade is similar to its western one, but lacking the centered pedestal and statue. In its place is a centered three-story wall punctuated with a recessed garage opening with a stucco panel above. The word "Parking" is centered on the panel in aluminum capital letters. On either side of the garage entry are three narrow and vertically oriented stucco panels extending the height of the wall and divided by two equally spaced square windows. The center panel in each set contains a single recessed door instead of a window. A single horizontal line of regularly placed terracotta-colored tiles separate the garage opening and the stucco panels from a single centered square stucco panel above the garage and three square windows to either side of the panel at the mezzanine level. To either side of the garage entry, the "base" steps down one story. The line of terracotta-colored tile continues above eighteen square windows set in three rows of nine each with five centered openings below at street level. The northeast corner opening is a single recessed door.

The following is taken from the National Register Nomination (Exhibit G-3) and describes exterior alterations since the original construction:

The City of Portland has made minimal alterations to the Portland Public Service Building. The following is a summary of maintenance work and changes since the building was completed. A more complete list is provided in Appendix A.

The entrance was altered to make it more visible less than a decade after the building was completed. Also in approximately 1990, the entire green-tile base and tiled pilaster areas were re-grouted. Other exterior alterations include the addition of railings and some storefront changes in 1999-2000 at the south side of the ground floor to accommodate a daycare facility. New rooftop mechanical units were added in 2003 and a 15,000 square-foot green roof was installed on the Portland Building in 2006.

From Appendix A:

- 1. At the ground floor, all exterior light fixtures were replaced (2000). The loggia opening at the south was closed and moved one bay to the west, and a gate and fence were added for the daycare play area (2000). Playground equipment and floodlighting was added (2007). Many bike racks were replaced or added (2000 through 2010). The main gas meter for the building was moved to the loggia (2008). Several modifications were made to retail storefront configurations (2004). The loggia ceiling was dropped and repaired (2001 and 2010). Fill and vent for emergency fuel tank was moved on the west side (2002). The large roll-up door to the parking garage was replaced (2003).*
- 2. At exterior walls above the ground floor, water intrusion into the building called for re-grouting as well as some tile replacement and sealant application (2002).*
- 3. Roof areas at 2nd and 3rd floors were re-roofed (no date). On the 2nd floor roof, two emergency power generators, associated piping and conduit, and a ventilation fan and hoods were added (2008).*
- 4. Penthouse walls received radio/telecom equipment (1998). Various added pipe and cable runs were attached to the penthouse walls (1998).*
- 5. The penthouse roof and 15th floor roof eco-roof addition included new cap flashing on parapets (2006) as well as irrigation and measurement equipment (2006-07). Radio/telecom equipment was added to the penthouse roof (1998). A cooling tower was added at the 15th floor roof (2004).*

Alterations since 2011 are noted below under “Land Use History”.

Zoning: The **Central Commercial** (CX) zone is intended to provide for commercial development within Portland's most urban and intense areas. A broad range of uses is allowed to reflect Portland's role as a commercial, cultural and governmental center. Development is intended to be very intense with high building coverage, large buildings, and buildings placed close together. Development is intended to be pedestrian-oriented with a strong emphasis on a safe and attractive streetscape.

The **Design Overlay Zone** [d] promotes the conservation, enhancement, and continued vitality of areas of the City with special scenic, architectural, or cultural value. This is achieved through the creation of design districts and applying the Design Overlay Zone as part of community planning projects, development of design guidelines for each district, and by requiring design review. In addition, design review ensures that certain types of infill development will be compatible with the neighborhood and enhance the area.

The **Historic Resource Protection** overlay is comprised of Historic and Conservation Districts, as well as Historic and Conservation Landmarks and protects certain historic resources in the region and preserves significant parts of the region's heritage. The regulations implement Portland's Comprehensive Plan policies that address historic preservation. These policies recognize the role historic resources have in promoting the education and enjoyment of those living in and visiting the region. The regulations foster pride among the region's citizens in their city and its heritage. Historic preservation beautifies the city, promotes the city's economic health, and helps to preserve and enhance the value of historic properties.

The **Central City Plan District** implements the Central City Plan and other plans applicable to the Central City area. These other plans include the Downtown Plan, the River District Plan, the University District Plan, and the Central City Transportation Management Plan. The Central City plan district implements portions of these plans by adding code provisions which address special circumstances existing in the Central City area. The site is within the Downtown Subdistrict of this plan district.

Land Use History: City records indicate that prior land use reviews include the following:

- LU 80-002436 CU (ref. file: CU 060-80) – Conditional Use approval with conditions for a below-grade garage with 71 off-street parking spaces;
- LU 80-004421 DZ (ref. file: DZ 16-80) – Design Review approval for a new City building;
- LU 84-005261 (ref. file: DZ 99-84) – Design Review approval for a public parking sign;
- LU 90-004052 (ref. file: DZ 047-90) – Design review approval for storefront alterations;
- LU 92-009794 (ref. file: LUR 92-00675 DZ) – Design Review approval of replacement of entrance doors and new lighting;
- LU 99-016895 DZ (ref. file: LUR 99-00490 DZ) – Design Review approval for replacement of existing wood light fixtures at loggia, a new door and replacement of three existing doors at 2nd floor (loggia roof), new stucco soffit at loggia, new condenser unit atop loggia, and repair and replacement of windows with comparable materials and color;

- LU 00-006766 DZ (ref. file: LUR 00-00211 DZ) – Design Review approval for new fencing/railings for day care play area;
- LU 03-112603 DZ – Design Review approval for two rooftop mechanical units and replacement of 2nd floor louvers;
- LU 05-159783 DZ – Design Review approval for a new eco-roof;
- LU 12-119428 HDZ – Historic Design Review approval for replacement of stucco and deteriorated flashings at penthouse;
- LU 12-190802 HDZM – Historic Design Review approval with Modification to the ground floor windows standard to replace existing windows with ventilation louvers;
- EA 15-260540 DA – Design Advice Request with the Historic Landmarks Commission for the current proposal; and
- EA 16-266387 PC – Pre-Application Conference for the current proposal.

Summary of the Applicant's Statement:

The following italicized text describing the project is taken directly from the applicant's narrative (Exhibit A-1).

The specifics of the proposed alterations are detailed below and shown in the drawing set provided with this submittal.

Teal Colored Glazed Tile with Black Grout (Floors 1-3)

Michael Graves had noted in some of his lectures that the original intent for the building design was to use Gladding McBean glazed terracotta on the entire facade. He preferred terracotta because he could get the colors he wanted, the material worked well in the Portland climate, and it exhibited a nice sheen, even on cloudy days. He also drew inspiration from Portland's many terracotta facades. As the process evolved, it was clear that terracotta was not going work with the budget, but Graves tried to keep the terracotta in critical areas. These areas of terracotta that were eventually value engineered to a 9.5x9.5 inch ceramic tile.

To work within the new rainscreen system and to replicate the existing teal tile's glazed surface, new terracotta tiles in the same teal color will be mounted onto concealed custom aluminum frames. The terracotta tile size will be increased to approximately 19x19 inches. There are several reasons for this proportioned change in size. First, mechanically-fastening a small 9.5 x 9.5 inch tile onto a panelized system comes with a high level of difficulty that adds excessive cost and constructability challenges to the project. Therefore, it is impractical to replace in-kind—something that is discussed further under Guideline #4 – Historic Features. While larger than the original, the 19x19 inch square tile is compatible because it continues to reinforce the character-defining square patterning of the base, while matching the color and glaze of the existing ceramic tiles. Furthermore, the larger tile is supported by Michael Graves' office, as it is in keeping with Graves' intended design aesthetic that included a more monumental-scaled terracotta tile. Reviewing side-by-side elevations of the original and the proposed, the larger tile does not significantly alter the character of the base substantially while respecting the square modules.

The grout will be replaced with hard black charcoal gray colored silicone with a sanded finish that will replicate the original "black" grout, but will not be susceptible to the same efflorescence issues.

Painted Concrete (Floors 4-15)

Like the tile, the elastomeric-painted concrete that comprises the exterior envelope on floors 4-15 was the result of extensive value engineering to meet the project's meager budget. Originally planned to be terracotta, this façade area was changed to stucco and finally to painted concrete. (Incidentally, the concrete is incorrectly identified as stucco-clad concrete in the National Register nomination.)

As noted previously, the existing painted concrete has fared poorly over time due to multiple shortcomings as a facade system for a high-rise building.

In order to remedy the building's envelope deficiencies, two options were reviewed by the Portland Building Reconstruction Project design-build team. In both options, the approach to all systems other than the concrete system remained the same. The concrete system options are as follows:

Option 1 – Construct a pressure-equalized rainscreen enclosure over the existing concrete with insulation on the outside face of the existing concrete enclosure. The visual qualities of the elastomeric-painted concrete surface replicated using Kynar paint on metal panel.

Option 2 – Maintain the existing elastomeric-painted concrete shell as the primary building enclosure with insulation on the inside face of the existing concrete enclosure, using sealants and applied flashing to manage water at the exterior.

A risk and opportunity analysis is outlined in the attached "D3 No. 8 Decision-Making Document." When weighing evaluation criteria related to performance, maintenance, cost, energy performance, and historic preservation, Option 1 was overwhelmingly the better solution. The November 19, 2016 letter from Façade Forensics (included as an appendix) provides further technical reasoning why a repair approach that uses sealants and flashings is unable to solve the Portland Building's enclosure problems and provide a long term solution required of this project.

As part of the risk and opportunity analysis, the team created conceptual detail drawings that were generated for Option 2, it was found that, while this approach allowed for the retention of the historic concrete materials, it created alterations to the original design by 1) cluttering the cleanly punched window openings with flashings and 2) changing the planar relationship between the base of the building (where all agree the new tile must be part of a rainscreen system) and the tower as well as between other systems within the tower such as the upper keystone tile and ribbon windows.

The D3 document formalizes the City's decision to pursue Option 1. The project will reconstruct Graves' design for the exterior as a new rainscreen enclosure system over the entirety of the original façade. This new façade will be done in a manner that substantially replicates Graves' original design intent. While the new façade will be several inches proud of the existing façade—nominally increasing the building size—this growth will be imperceptible due to the large scale of the building. Because the entirety of the building must be over-clad, all planar relationships will be maintained. It should be noted that because the building structure is the façade, it is not possible to remove the existing materials and reconstruct a new façade in the same plane.

While great efforts are being taken to reproduce the character of Graves' design for the exterior, not every material can be replaced with a like-kind material within this rainscreen enclosure system (e.g. concrete for concrete). Some materials are not suitable for their originally-specified applications or using these materials in the rainscreen system

creates other insurmountable problems (discussed in further detail below). Even where “in-kind” replacement is not feasible, new materials will replicate existing color, forms, and visual appearance as closely as possible within the rainscreen system. It should be noted that for Graves, these were the most important aspects of the building and most of the materiality that exists today was the result of budget constraints. By replicating the original color, form and visual appearance, the rainscreen solution will preserve the building’s original design, which is of paramount importance to its character, significance, and integrity.

Concrete cannot be used in the rainscreen system because the existing building structure cannot bear the substantial additional weight that pre-cast concrete panels would add. Aluminum plate panels are the most appropriate new material in terms of weight and ability to recreate Graves’ design for the exterior, all while preventing water intrusion. Reveal sizes, scoring patterns, and alignments will be closely replicated. Metal panel in a rainscreen system allows for windows to retain their crisp punched openings—a hallmark of postmodern design. Texture added to the Kynar finish of the panels will assist in recreating the slight texture of the painted concrete. From the street-level, the material change will be hard to discern, particularly due to the fact that the concrete only extends down to the fourth floor.

Terracotta Colored Tile in Keystone (Floors 11-14 – North and South Facades)

Because the terracotta colored tile begins at the 11th floor and the details of this tile are less visible compared to the tile at the base, they will be replaced in the rainscreen system with terracotta colored aluminum tiles fastened to aluminum plate panels. The size of the replicated tiles in the keystone will increase in size to better match the new terracotta tile at the base of the building. This system will replicate the original tile patterns, color, texture, and square patterning. Kynar finishes will duplicate the existing color and sheen.

Punched Window Openings

The existing window openings have black anodized frames and dark-tinted glass. The choice for the dark glazing was made late in the design process to respond to energy saving requirements. Black glass was not part of Michael Graves’ aesthetic vision for the Portland Building and he never used black glass on any subsequent buildings in his portfolio.

In the rainscreen system, the punched windows will have black aluminum frames with insulated glazing. Sight lines, mullion arrangements, colors, and window/wall relationships will be replicated as closely as possible. Slight differences will be largely imperceptible, as these windows begin at the fourth floor. Dark-tinted glass will be replaced with vision glass to bring more light into the building and create a pleasant work environment—a change that is consistent with Graves’ intent for the building. Additionally, when 1,300 City employees were surveyed about desired improvements to the building, improved daylighting was one of the most requested items.

The mechanical louvers on the second floor (which are minimally visible from the street) will be replaced with new aluminum windows and vision glass, as the mechanical systems will be removed from this floor.

Ribbon Windows with Dark-Tinted Glazing and Spandrel Glass (in Keystone Areas – Floors 11-14)

For the same reasons stated above, all glass will be replaced with vision glass and new window frames will replicate the existing as closely as possible. Spandrel glass will be

replaced with vision glass to increase access to daylight for the building occupants. Where it remains necessary to conceal building structure, shadow boxes will be used in lieu of spandrel glazing. This will create a more uniform look for these glazing elements from the outside.

Curtainwall with Reflective Glazing (East and West Facades)

In these areas of curtainwall, reflective glass will be replaced with new reflective glass and new window frames will replicate the existing as closely as possible.

Stucco Column Capitals (10th Floor - North and South Facades)

Aluminum panels will replicate the shape and color of these projecting column capitals at the 10th story. The durable Kynar finish on the panels will assist in recreating the texture of the stucco and will not sag or telegraph the framing members like the existing stucco.

Fiber-Cement Stucco Medallions and Garlands (10th Floor - East and West Facades)

Graves' original design for the ornamental medallions and garlands was much more exuberant and three-dimensional. The flowing garlands were eliminated to achieve budget goals. However, when new mayor Frank Ivancie came into office, he expressed second thoughts about the bare medallions and asked Graves to draw up a new design. The garlands—now flattened, stylized, and constructed of fiberglass-reinforced concrete—were approved by City Council and added back to the project.

In this project, the existing ornamentation will be recreated with custom-formed aluminum medallions and garlands to closely match the existing in form and color. The existing stucco medallions and garlands are so poorly constructed that they would not survive being removed and put back on the building.

Stucco Penthouse

No work is proposed on the penthouse. The stucco was replaced in 2012 and is in good condition.

Roof

In addition to the existing mechanical penthouse, the roof currently features two cooling towers and a green roof. Much of the building's HVAC is presently located in mechanical rooms around the perimeter of the second floor. Moving all of the mechanical to the roof allows for improved programming within the building and an enhanced public experience as well as better air quality and enhanced performance of the mechanical system. The large mechanical louvers will be replaced with windows, bringing in much-needed natural light. This change will also allow for the creation of a second-floor viewing area for Portlandia, creating a greater connection between the public and this important statue. As many mechanical units as possible will be located in the penthouse. The units proposed for the roof will be organized in a clean layout and will be minimally visible from the street.

Portlandia Statue

The Portlandia statue will be preserved at its location on SW 5th Avenue.

Loggia

The loggia at the building's ground floor was originally designed for retail spaces and, as such, was always intended to be altered to accommodate changing tenants and functions. Indeed, over the years, these spaces have been altered many times with various reconfigurations of doors and glazing types. Being set back from the street, the

loggia spaces have not offered the best urban experience and retail visibility from the right-of-way.

The ground floor programming will no longer be retail uses. The first and second floors will be for public access to the City bureaus and services and the loggia must adapt to and express this increase in public use and engagement with the space. The storefronts will be removed and much of the loggia wall will be opened up with glazing, increasing natural light and transparency. The glazing system will utilize black mullions, which is consistent with the existing glazing frames on the building. The effect on the overall façade does not negatively alter the historic character, as the interior wall is deeply recessed from the tile base. Because of this, the solid, monumental character of Graves' design for the building's base is not negatively affected by the increased area of glazing.

On the south and north elevations, two bays of the open loggia will be enclosed to accommodate additional interior office space. Because the south and north loggia wings have been truncated short of the Fourth Avenue façade and have never functioned as a true loggia throughout the building's existence, this reversible alteration has minimal negative impact on design integrity.

Fourth Avenue Elevation

Graves' final design for the building featured a garage door on the Fourth Avenue elevation despite the fact that his original intent was for an axial plan where one could enter the building on Fifth Avenue and walk all the way through to the park side. The garage door on Fourth Avenue has long been considered an urban design failure and many stakeholders—including the Historic Landmarks Commission—have called for a treatment that engages with and honors the neighboring park.

Although an improved façade design with glazing that maintained the size of the existing garage opening was considered, the central opening became awkwardly scaled given the way the first floor bisects this opening. What is proposed is a larger, double-height glazed window area that looks out to the park. This allows the interior spaces on both the first and the second floors—which are programmed for public uses—to have inviting spaces that allow occupants to enjoy views of Fourth Avenue and Chapman Square and for pedestrians and users of the park to see into and experience the interior functions of the building. This larger opening is much more successful in the way it respects the overall scale and symmetry of the building, echoes the vertically-oriented patterns in the columns and glass above, and is a much stronger urban design response. Fritted glass and decorative metal screening are used proposed to create visual interest on the openings where privacy and security are a requirement of the interior programming.

Agency and Neighborhood Review:

1. Agency Review: A "Request for Response" was mailed May 12, 2017. The **Bureau of Parks-Forestry Division** responded, noting that they do not support the removal of two London Plane trees in front of Portlandia. Please see Exhibit E-1 for additional details.

Staff Response: While the applicant has proposed removal of two London Plane trees and shown this on the plans as part of this proposal, this aspect is exempt from Historic Resource Review and will be officially considered by Urban Forestry during the Permit Review.

The following Bureaus have responded with no issues or concerns:

- Bureau of Transportation Engineering

- Bureau of Environmental Services
- Fire Bureau
- Life Safety Division of BDS
- Site Development Section of BDS
- Water Bureau

2. Neighborhood Review: A Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood was mailed on June 6, 2017. One written response was received from interested parties, the Neighborhood Association, or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

1. Iain MacKenzie, DoCoMoMo Oregon Vice President, wrote on June 15, 2017, in support of renovation of the Portland Building, but noting several concerns with the proposal, including:
 - Rainscreen Cladding, if approved, should be a more compatible material and should be located closer to the concrete frame of the building;
 - Pedestal Tile should remain the same size as existing;
 - Infill at Parking Entry should not extend beyond the current opening;
 - Infill at Loggias should be able to relay where the areas of infill are located through differentiation or some other marker;
 - Rooftop Mechanical Equipment should be relocated to within the existing envelope of the building;
 - Lobbies and Interior Spaces should be preserved to the extent possible.

Following issuance of the initial staff report, dated June 16, 2017 and before the first hearing on June 26, 2017, the following testimony was received:

1. Iain Mackenzie, on June 19, 2017, provided a letter dated Mar 15, 2017 from Lisa Deline at the National Park Service (NPS) to Ian Johnson at the State Historic Preservation Office of Oregon (SHPO), indicating SHPO and NPS concurrence that the proposed rainscreen system would “destroy the historic integrity of the building and necessitate its removal from the National Register.” See Exhibit F-2.
2. Peter Meijer, then a member of the project team, on June 23, 2017, wrote in opposition to the proposal. See Exhibit F-3.
3. Anthony Veerkamp, Field Director for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, on June 23, 2017, wrote in opposition, stating that the proposal is not a preservation solution and could jeopardize the building’s National Register status. See Exhibit F-4.

Staff’s Response: Please see findings below.

Council received additional oral and written testimony at and prior to its hearing on August 24, 2017. The written testimony is referenced as Exhibit numbers I.1 – I.11 to this decision.

The record for this decision includes the BDS case file that was placed before Council.

Council response to issues raised by Appellant 1:

Appellant 1—Erica Ceder of DLR Group—appealed on one issue, which relates to Central City Fundamental Design Guideline C11, and is discussed under the findings for that applicable criterion.

Council response to issues raised by Appellant 2:

Appellant 2—Peter Meijer of Peter Meijer Architect, PC—appealed on nine matters in his original statement. Of these, five are matters outside the scope of the Historic Resource Review, Modification, and Adjustment approval criteria, and are discussed here. The other four address the Historic Resource Review, Modification, and Adjustment criteria, and are discussed under the findings for the applicable criteria. The five matters discussed here are:

- 1) **Comprehensive Plan 2035 Policies.** Appellant 2 asserted that Comprehensive Plan 2035 Policies are not met. Specifically, Appellant 2 stated that Policy 8.23 (Asset management), Policy 8.26 (Capital programming), Policy 8.27 (Cost effectiveness), Policy 4.46 (Historic and cultural resource protection), Policy 4.51 (City-owned historic resources), and Policy 4.60 (Rehabilitation and adaptive reuse) were not met by the Applicant's proposal.

The Comprehensive Plan 2035 is a long-range land use and public facility investment plan to guide future growth and the physical development of the City of Portland. The new 2035 Comprehensive Plan was adopted on June 15, 2016. Subject to state DLCD review and acknowledgement, the new plan will take effect on January 1, 2018. Because the Comprehensive Plan 2035 is not yet in effect and because neither the Comprehensive Plan 2035 policies nor any current comprehensive plan policies are land use approval criteria for the land use reviews requested by this application, these policies are not applicable.

- 2) **Project goals.** Appellant 2 asserted project goals outlined in the City's Project Charter for the Portland Building are not met with respect to interior work spaces and the exterior urban environment. Specifically, Appellant 2 found that the proposal does not improve the quality and efficiency of the workplace, that the proposal will put more people closer together within the workplace, that the urban environment is not improved due to the encroachment needed for the rainscreen system, and the intrusion of rooftop equipment.

Appellant 2 did not identify how the city project goals relate to any of the applicable Title 33 approval criteria for this application. Council finds that the project goals are internal administrative goals that are not land use approval criteria. Further, Council finds that no party has established that the project goals are relevant to the applicable approval criteria. The goals found in the Project Charter were established separately and outside of the land use review process. Because they are not approval criteria, these goals are not applicable to this application.

- 3) **Encroachment.** Appellant 2 asserted that the proposed encroachment was not reviewed via standard methods and is not necessary.

The June 12, 2017 PBOT response to the BDS land use review request noted that the project had received an approved Encroachment Permit. Encroachment Permits are reviewed through a separate PBOT permit process that is not governed by Title 33 or the city's land use permitting processes. In any event, whether or not an applicant has received an encroachment permit is not relevant to the approval criteria for this application.

- 4) **Cost.** Appellant 2 asserted that the proposed overcladding design is overly expensive and that there are less-expensive repair options that do not necessitate overcladding the building.

The cost of a project is only a matter of consideration with regard to determining the appropriate land use review procedure type. Project cost is not a land use review approval criterion.

- 5) **National Register eligibility.** Appellant noted concerns that if the proposed project moved forward, the Portland Building could lose its National Register eligibility due to the covering of historic materials.

While the Landmarks Commission discussed the potential loss of National Register eligibility, ongoing eligibility is not a land use approval criterion. Nevertheless, Council understands the concerns related to the potential loss of this designation. Evidence in the record indicates that, if the delisting process was initiated, this would occur after the project is completed. A petition for delisting would be evaluated by the State Advisory Committee for Historic Preservation. Given that any future delisting is not certain, the Landmarks Commission worked with the Applicant to create conditions that would protect the building's landmark status. These include a condition for a covenant that requires Type IV demolition review for any proposed demolition and a condition for a Type III local landmark designation to list the building as a local landmark should the National Register listing ever be lost. Council finds that, while maintaining National Register eligibility is not an approval criterion, these conditions are appropriate to ensure the recognition and protection of this historic resource.

IV. ZONING CODE APPROVAL CRITERIA AND FINDINGS

(1) HISTORIC RESOURCE REVIEW (33.846)

33.846.060 Purpose

Historic Resource Review ensures the conservation and enhancement of the special characteristics of historic resources.

33.846.060 Historic Resource Review Approval Criteria

Requests for Historic Resource Review will be approved if the review body finds that the applicant has shown that all of the approval criteria have been met.

Findings: The site is a Historic Landmark. Therefore, the proposal requires Historic Resource Review approval. Because the site is a Landmark located in the Central City Plan District, the applicable approval criteria are listed in 33.846.070 and in the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines.

Chapter 33.846, Historic Reviews

Purpose of Historic Resource Review

Historic Resource Review ensures the conservation and enhancement of the special characteristics of historic resources.

Historic Resource Review Approval Criteria

Requests for Historic Resource Review will be approved if the review body finds the applicant has shown that all of the approval criteria have been met.

Findings: The site is a designated Historic/Conservation Landmark. Therefore, the proposal requires Historic Resource Review approval. The relevant approval criteria are listed in 33.846.060.G. 1.-10. In addition, because the site is located within the Central City, the relevant approval criteria are the Central City Fundamental Design

Guidelines.

G. Other Approval Criteria:

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

Findings: This criterion contains two elements: (1) The proposed alterations will retain and preserve historic character and (2) The proposal will avoid removing materials or altering features and spaces that contribute to its significance. The second of these elements was raised in Appellant 2's appeal.

The Portland Building is an iconic and monumental piece of architecture, a building that is both loved and loathed. It is loved and loathed by those who study architectural history and it is disproportionately loathed by those who occupy it. Common complaints by the occupants of the building are that the building lacks natural light and suffers from water infiltration. The lack of natural light is due to both the construction of the building as solid concrete walls with relatively small windows, but also because the windows are dark in color. In addition, water infiltration has been a perpetual problem due, in part, to irregular window systems being installed in the original construction, systems which have continually been patched with sealants.

The aspect of the historic character of the property that is relevant to this proposal is described by the National Register nomination for The Portland Building, which states: "The fifteen story monumental structure was ground-breaking for its rejection of "universal" Modernist principals in favor of the bold and symbolic color, well-defined volumes, and stylized- and reinterpreted-classical elements such as pilasters, garlands, and keystones to create a building that was physically and symbolically tied to place, its use, and the Western architectural tradition." The building was listed in the National Register under Criterion C as "the notable work that crystallized Michael Graves's reputation as a master architect and as an early seminal work of Post-Modern Classicism, an American style that Graves himself defined through his work."

The primary significance of the building is its aesthetic exterior design, rather than its method of construction. This is particularly notable because throughout the original design process the method of construction of the building, as a whole as well as its elements, changed due to value engineering, however, the overall design intent remained throughout these efforts to stay on budget. Therefore, while the painted concrete walls of floors 4-15 make up the body of the building, the character of the building is found in the 4' x 4' square windows and score lines in those walls, as well as the teal pedestal base, the ground level loggia, the decorated façades including the abstracted garlands and medallions, etc.

It is well documented that a major reason for the failure of the Portland Building's envelope is due to the relatively low budget set by the City at the outset of its design and construction. Because of this, Michael Graves' true vision for the construction of the building was not able to be realized. For instance, what was originally envisioned to be a terra cotta-clad exterior was then redesigned to be stucco-clad concrete and, finally, painted structural concrete in order to reduce costs. This is particularly noteworthy because the 8" thick exterior skin of the building has not kept water from infiltrating the interior and significantly affecting the work environment for the users of the building.

The applicant's proposal is to add a rainscreen to the exterior of the building, which will be designed to match all aspects of the original design, except that the material and dimensional aspects of the building will change; the face of the new rainscreen will be set approximately 11.5" proud of the current exterior face of the wall on all sides. Per the applicant, because the building could not physically support an additional concrete (or similar) skin, the new rainscreen at levels 4-15 will be constructed of metal panels with a textured Kynar finish. In addition, the decorative garlands, medallions, and capitals will also be reconstructed out of metal for similar reasons and to better integrate with the new system. The dark square and ribbon windows have been identified as not intrinsic to the Graves' original vision and were installed in an effort to reduce energy costs. During the Design Advice process, the Historic Landmarks Commission noted that the color of the existing glass, except where the glass is reflective, was not a significant feature worthy of retention, and that the comfort of occupants is an important consideration. As such, all windows, except for the highly reflective vertical windows will be replaced with vision glazing in order to allow more natural light to enter the building. All windows will be set within the new rainscreen wall at a distance matching the current inset.

It has been documented that at the pedestal level, the existing teal ceramic tile was applied directly to the underlying concrete structure. This has resulted in water intrusion which has caused a general failure of the tile. The applicants have noted that removing the original tile and reinstalling it would be very difficult as it is likely that the tiles would break during removal, and replacement with the same tile is not feasible. The applicant has proposed to install a terra cotta tile rainscreen system set approximately 7" proud of where the face of the exterior wall is currently. Notably, the proposed tile is twice as large in area as the existing tiles – a change that is proposed to simplify constructability – and will also feature "charcoal gray colored silicone with a sanded finish that will replicate the original "black" grout, but will not be susceptible to the same efflorescence issues".

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this approval criterion was not satisfied "due to the removal of numerous historic architectural elements, including the formed 'column capitals' and decorative 'medallion and garland' elements; all upper level windows; ground floor storefront systems; and windows on the east elevation of the ground floor."

Although the proposal is a unique and unorthodox approach to the practice of rehabilitation of a historic building in that it proposes to shroud the entire building with a new skin that matches, to the greatest extent possible, the character of the original skin of the building which will remain beneath. A similar approach was used to rehabilitate the 1996 Peter Eisenman-designed EIFS-clad Aronoff Center for Design in Cincinnati, Ohio in 2010; however in that case, the new metal panel rainscreen replaced the original EIFS in its entirety. As was noted earlier, the limitations that were imposed on the Portland Building at the outset of its construction, specifically the limited budget which was established by the City and served as a primary determining factor in their decision making, are directly responsible for the challenges facing this building today. The applicant's proposal indicates that the failure of the building is intrinsically connected to the porousness of the exterior skin of the building, which would not necessarily be cured by solely addressing the interior. In their alternatives analysis, the design team noted that a strict preservation approach would over time result in the same issues the building is facing today due to an over-reliance on sealants with no clear path for water to escape.

Testimony presented by Patrick Burke, AIA and Historic Landmarks Commissioner Matthew Roman at the Historic Landmarks Commission's Type III hearing and repeated during the Council appeal hearing is relevant to this criterion. Patrick Burke—an architect with Michael Graves Architecture & Design since 1983—explained Graves' intent with the building's design and confirmed that the low-budget materials with which the building was constructed—including the painted concrete, the small ceramic tiles, and the black glass—came about through the value engineering of the project and were not part of Graves' original vision. Matthew Roman explained that Postmodern architecture was a reaction to International Modernism whereby decorative elements of the past were abstracted and reintroduced to overcome the austerity of modernism. Commissioner Roman indicated that the new materials that the iconography of Postmodernism was built out of were immaterial to the message being conveyed. He indicated that the Landmarks Commission therefore did not find the materials of the Portland Building as being its most character-defining feature. The Council agrees with this conclusion.

Council finds that through the recreation of the original skin on the new exterior skin, the historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. Council finds that the criterion's requirement to "avoid" removal of historic materials is not a blanket prohibition on removal of such materials. Rather it requires an applicant to limit removal of significant historic materials to address situations such as significant deterioration. This interpretation is supported by the context of 33.846.060.G.4 which acknowledges that significantly deteriorated historic features may need to be replaced. Because of the general failure of the building's envelope, removal of original materials, with some original materials remaining behind the new skin, is necessary to ensure that the building will be able to function in a practical and humane way. Furthermore, Council finds that the National Register nomination for the building emphasizes the importance of Graves' design—not the original materials—to the building's historic character. Therefore, the character and historic significance is preserved even when the design is recreated with new materials. Council further finds that the proposal meets the requirement that removal of historic materials be avoided by removing only significantly deteriorated materials and retaining the design features on which the historic significance is based. *This guideline is met.*

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

Findings: In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this approval criterion was not satisfied because the Portland Building's original design and material selection was a response to the constraints of the time in which it was designed and built. Appellant 2 asserts that the Portland Building serves as a record of those events and that the Applicant's proposal would result in the Portland Building becoming a completely new building.

The proposal calls for the addition of an entirely new skin wrapping the exterior of the building, with some historic building elements recreated anew. The proposed method of construction is widely employed today and has been for some time, and is particularly beneficial in wet climates like that of the Pacific Northwest. While this would seem to be a conjectural feature, the record demonstrates that Graves originally intended to clad the building with terra cotta, which, if allowed to be realized, may have helped to avoid the water infiltration issues that the building has

experienced over the past few decades. Council notes that much of the original building will remain beneath, which contributes to the retention of a physical record of the building's time, place and use. The unorthodox approach to rehabilitation of this building serves as an allegory of its time (1982) and will serve to tell the story of how the strict adherence to a lower-than-market budget at the outset resulted in increased expenditures and extreme measures in the future. To ensure that visitors to the building can easily understand the proposed change and to document the physical record of the building, Council is imposing a condition of approval that interpretive materials describing the original and proposed construction methods be developed; these materials should be installed within the loggia or within the 5th Avenue sidewalk, where the proposed treatment would be experienced by the majority of people.

Through the proposed storefront revisions, the applicant intends to locate the new storefront outboard of where it is currently located, which is in line with the existing structural columns. Staff previously suggested that the historic teal tiles should remain at the columns, which would now be interior to the building. At the June 26, 2017 hearing, the applicant suggested that perhaps the tiles could remain at the 5th Avenue entry; however, the interior columns will be modified as part of the seismic upgrade and thus the tiles could not remain as they are currently in those locations. The Council supports the proposal to retain the historic tiles at the 5th Avenue entry as shown by the applicant's drawings (Exhibits C-73-revised and C-74-revised). Council finds that retaining the teal tiles at the main entry will allow this original element of the building to carry forward as a remnant, the only potential area for original material to be retained in a location where the public can see and touch it. Retention of the tile at this location, in close proximity with the rainscreen tile of the pedestal will provide a clear connection between the building's past and its present, thus enhancing this storytelling.

Council finds that the Applicant's proposal will allow the building to serve as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Particularly in light of the findings for Historic Character above, Council finds that the overcladding of the existing, failed materials with a new skin that recreates the design preserves what is historically significant about the building. Council agrees with BDS staff and the Landmarks Commission that retaining the original tile at the 5th Avenue entry and the installation of interpretive materials will further help visitors understand the changes made to the building through the proposed work. Based on the combination of the high-quality rebuilding of the exterior facades and exterior interpretative materials, and in light of the significant benefit of remedying the failed original materials with a new exterior skin, Council finds that the proposal fulfills this approval criterion.

With the condition of approval that interpretive materials, describing the original and proposed construction methods, be installed within the loggia or (per PBOT approval) the 5th Avenue sidewalk, and that the historic teal tiles remain at the main 5th Avenue entry shall remain as shown on Exhibit C-74-revised, this criterion is met.

- 3. Historic changes.** Most properties change over time. Those changes that have acquired historic significance will be preserved.

Findings: In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this approval criterion was not satisfied. They state that the changes made during the design and construction process in the early 1980s should be respected and not reversed with the Applicant's proposed alterations.

Council finds that Appellant 2's issue has already been addressed under **Record of its Time**. This approval criterion is relevant to subsequent changes that are made after a building is placed in service, which must be evaluated for acquired significance. Council agrees with the findings of BDS staff and the Landmarks Commission that while there have been alterations to the Portland Building since its construction, none of these alterations have acquired historic significance. *Therefore, this criterion does not apply.*

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

Findings: As has been noted and is documented in the applicant's packet, severe deterioration is found at the windows and tiled portions of the façades. All windows, tile, and decorative elements will be removed. The proposed rainscreen system is designed to match the original design of the building with regard to pattern, color, texture, and sheen. The proposed material however, will change from the exposed structural concrete, ceramic tile, stucco (at capitals), and fiberglass-reinforced concrete (garlands and medallions) to metal at the upper levels and from ceramic tile to terra cotta tile at the pedestal.

Staff previously noted concerns with the dimension of the score lines in the field panels; however, this has been addressed with the revised drawings submitted in Exhibit H-12, now incorporated as Exhibit C-91-revised. In addition, the proposal also includes enlargement of the base and upper level tiles. At the June 26, 2017 hearing, some members of the Commission expressed concerns with the increased scale noting that this increase changes the character of the building and is not true to the history of the building. Because of these concerns, staff suggested a condition of approval that the pedestal and upper level tiles be replicated as proposed but at the existing dimensions in order to better match the historic condition. At the July 24th hearing, the Commission noted the revised color of the grout lines and after discussion, accepted the larger tiles, provided the color of the new teal tiles will exactly match the color of the existing tiles.

Replicating all of the original decorative building elements in the same material, rather than in materials more similar to the original or utilizing the original materials (which would be impossible in some instances) will ensure the continued integrity of the proposed rainscreen as all elements will be designed as a function of the whole system.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this approval criterion was not satisfied due to the proposed rainscreen system hiding, encapsulating, and/or removing all historic elements.

Due to the extensive deterioration of the existing building envelope and repeated past attempts to address these issues, the Council finds that a traditional restoration of the building (whereby existing materials are preserved to the greatest extent possible) is not practical. The Council agrees the evidence in the record provided by the applicant demonstrates that the severity of deterioration requires replacement rather than repair. While the applicant provided an alternative analysis which considered a traditional maintenance and repair approach to the Historic Landmarks Commission, the Commission and Council found that the evidence presented by the applicant supporting the proposed approach to be more persuasive

with regard to preservation of the resource. The approval criterion specifically allows some flexibility when materials cannot be replaced in-kind: “Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, ***where practical, in materials.***”

As outlined in the alternatives analysis provided by the Applicant, a traditional restoration would not permanently resolve the water infiltration issues that have plagued the building. Therefore, the Council finds that the proposed rainscreen system is the proper approach to ensure the building’s longevity. Additionally, while some of the building’s characteristic elements may not be as deteriorated as other elements of the building needing replacement, the Council finds that preserving some original building elements and integrating them into the new system is relatively impractical and would lead to additional maintenance issues in the future. As such, the Council finds that the proposed replacement of all major features of the building is warranted in order to rehabilitate the building as a unified whole.

With the condition of approval that the color of the new teal tiles will exactly match the color of the existing tiles and the condition that interpretive materials be installed, this criterion is met.

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

Findings: No chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials will be used. As is noted elsewhere, some historic materials will be protected beneath the proposed rainscreen system, while other historic materials will be removed. Please see findings under #4 *Historic features* for additional information.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 lists this as one of the approval criteria not met by the Applicant’s proposal; however, their appeal does not discuss why they believe it has not been satisfied. Given the specific intent of this criterion to not employ harmful chemical or physical treatments to historic materials that are to be retained and preserved, this criterion is met.

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

Findings: No significant ground disturbance is proposed. *This criterion is not applicable.*

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

Findings: In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this approval criterion was not satisfied due to the proposed rainscreen system radically modifying and hiding the historic building. Appellant 2 finds that in order to meet this criterion, the materials should be kept and rehabilitated, not removed or recreated in a new material.

Council finds that there is strong evidence to support the Applicant's statement that traditional rehabilitation of existing historic materials whereby they are repaired or replaced in-kind is not feasible for the continued longevity of the Portland Building. This was discussed in the findings under Criteria #1 *Historic character* and #4 *Historic features*. The proposed treatment will result in deteriorated and failing materials being removed or obscured and then replicated in the proposed rainscreen. The proposed treatment will be distinctly differentiated from old, primarily in their location outboard of the historic planes of the building, as well as by the materials used.

Additional changes are also proposed which will be distinctly different from the original design. These include the introduction of clear glazing to replace the dark windows. The original dark windows were introduced as a means toward energy efficiency and were not part of Graves' vision for the building. The proposed vision glazing will retain the goals of energy efficiency but will do so in a more humane way due to contemporary technology.

In addition, the ground level spaces at the loggia will be reconfigured and redesigned. Two bays at the north and at the south will be infilled to accommodate additional interior floor area floor the building. At the north, the area of infill is the existing location of a stair that leads from the sidewalk up several steps to the loggia. The infill will take the form of the adjacent window openings to the east, with the teal tile below. While most of the loggia openings are equal in width, the stair opening at the north is wider than the others. This width and pedestrian opening was repeated in the same bay at the south end, however, this bay was closed off (with the adjacent bay to the west opened for pedestrian travel) several years ago to accommodate expansion of a daycare. The proposed infill of these two bays on each façade will reintroduce some symmetry to the ground floor. Behind the loggia, the character of the ground floor walls will be updated from the current solid walls with areas of storefront to floor-to-ceiling glazing, which will make the building more inviting. The new storefront walls will be set slightly further out than the current location, which is aligned with the structural columns and jogs slightly as it wraps around the 5th Avenue façade. While these changes are distinctly different from the original, the Commission does not believe that the ground level loggia storefronts are a primary significant feature of the building that must be preserved or replicated to match the original at the expense of creating a better ground floor for pedestrians.

Lastly, the applicant proposes to remove the on-site loading spaces and below-grade parking which will allow the closure of the 4th Avenue vehicle entry. This aspect of the original construction was a late addition to the design. Graves had originally envisioned a central connection through the building from 5th Avenue to 4th Avenue, opening onto the park, however, this was revised when the City insisted that parking be provided in the basement. The vehicle entry has long been considered an affront to Chapman Square and the proposal to replace the vehicle entry with glazing will mitigate this long-standing mistake. Staff inquired about opportunities to create a true connection, via a pedestrian entry, at this location, however the applicant cited security concerns as the reason that this has not been proposed. Rather, the applicant intends to extend an elevated interior seating area to the building face and extend the glazing up to provide additional natural lighting. Graphic glazing is proposed at areas along the ground level where the glazing would otherwise provide views into basement level and back of house areas. Also of note, on the 4th Avenue façade, small red tiles that appear above the stacked windows will be removed and not replaced due to the change in tile dimension; the painted red recesses above the stacked windows will figuratively represent them.

While the most significant change will be the addition of the rainscreen in general, the more substantial changes to the constructed design will occur at the ground level where they are most perceivable by pedestrians. The majority of these changes will result in an improvement to the pedestrian level, but will be different than the original for various reasons described. The Council finds that the proposed changes reflect the design intent while being differentiated from the original construction. *This criterion is met.*

- 8. Architectural compatibility.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will be compatible with the resource's massing, size, scale, and architectural features. When retrofitting buildings or sites to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities, design solutions will not compromise the architectural integrity of the historic resource.
- 10. Hierarchy of compatibility.** Exterior alterations and additions will be designed to be compatible primarily with the original resource, secondarily with adjacent properties, and finally, if located within a Historic or Conservation District, with the rest of the district. Where practical, compatibility will be pursued on all three levels.

Findings for 8 and 10:

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that these approval criteria were not satisfied due to the Applicant's proposal looking outside of the existing design to understand and incorporate Michael Graves' design intent into the proposed alterations. Appellant 2 states that the proposal "visually recalls" rather than matches the original, which does not fulfill the compatibility requirement. Appellant 2 states that constructing the new skin outward and increasing the tile size will highly alter the exterior appearance.

Recognizing the failure of the original envelope design and the need for a serious intervention aimed at permanently eliminating the building's chronic water infiltration issues, Council finds that a rainscreen system built outboard of the existing concrete structure is a practical and appropriate approach for this particular building. Council notes that all aspects at the upper levels of the building will be replicated to match Graves' design almost exactly, though the proposal will extend the width of the building by several inches on all sides. This dimensional change will also occur at the outer face of the pedestal. Council finds that this dimension change is compatible with the original resource due to the relationship of all the parts and pieces of the Portland Building being closely maintained in this reconstruction of the façade. Council finds that the definition of compatible and the practice of compatible alterations in historic preservation does not require new work to exactly replicate or match original construction in order to be considered compatible.

Council finds that the proposed ground level alterations to Graves' original design, including the extension of the interior floor area at the loggia, the increase in glazed area at the 4th Avenue façade, and the storefront treatments are compatible in scale and proportion to the rest of the building and work within the square module established by Graves. Also of note, the applicant proposes to replace the main entry doors with new doors, which feature larger square openings based on the original design by Graves.

Council finds that in light of the extreme impracticalities of building a rainscreen system with 9"x9" tiles at the pedestal, that the larger tile size is compatible and appropriate. These larger tiles will exactly match the originals in color. They

exactly double the dimension in both height and width, maintain the same rhythm on the façade. They also continue to emphasize the square module used throughout the exterior. Lastly, testimony in the record from Michael Graves' colleague Patrick Burke confirms that the 9"x9" ceramic tiles came about through the value engineering process and Graves original intended a larger-scale module for the cladding at the pedestal.

While the exterior of the building will be essentially 100% new, the applicant has made a significant effort to accurately recreate Graves' design intent as much as possible to create compatible alterations. Where it was not possible to match the existing design, the Applicant followed Graves' design principles as further described under Criteria #4 *Historic features* and #7 *Differentiate new from old*. The proposed treatment is compatible with the existing resource and will allow the Portland Building to remain a significant representation of Post Modernism, set dynamically against the backdrop of other locally significant buildings and the adjacent parks. *This criterion is met.*

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

Findings: Because the building is constructed of exposed structural concrete, the basic form of the resource will remain; however, it will be reinforced with a complete seismic upgrade on the interior and will be obscured on the exterior by the proposed rainscreen. While unlikely, the proposed rainscreen could be removed and the original decorative features of the building could be replicated and installed in their current location. As is noted above under Criterion #1 *Historic character*, the building is failing and will continue to fail without an intervention. The alternatives analysis considered a traditional restoration approach that preserved the existing exterior as the exterior; however, this was determined to be infeasible as it could not do enough to permanently prevent water infiltration through the exterior reinforced concrete and through the window systems which heavily rely on sealants. As such, the Commission is convinced that a building of this scale and serving the purpose that it serves requires a much more practical solution that will extend the life of the building. Therefore, the proposed extreme intervention preserves the form of the building by encapsulating it, and preserves the integrity of the building by preventing further deterioration due to water infiltration, while replicating the artistic design intent of Michael Graves on the exterior. The Commission recognizes that this approach would not be preferred or appropriate for most historic resources, but notes that the reduced budget at the time of its construction have led to today's challenges which cannot be adequately corrected through a traditional approach. *This criterion is met.*

Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines

These guidelines provide the constitutional framework for all design review areas in the Central City.

The Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines and the River District Design Guidelines focus on four general categories. **(A) Portland Personality**, addresses design issues and elements that reinforce and enhance Portland's character. **(B) Pedestrian Emphasis**, addresses design issues and elements that contribute to a successful pedestrian environment. **(C) Project Design**, addresses specific building characteristics and their relationships to the public environment. **(D) Special Areas**, provides design

guidelines for the four special areas of the Central City.

Central City Plan Design Goals

This set of goals are those developed to guide development throughout the Central City. They apply within the River District as well as to the other seven Central City policy areas. The nine goals for design review within the Central City are as follows:

1. Encourage urban design excellence in the Central City;
2. Integrate urban design and preservation of our heritage into the development process;
3. Enhance the character of the Central City's districts;
4. Promote the development of diversity and areas of special character within the Central City;
5. Establish an urban design relationship between the Central City's districts and the Central City as a whole;
6. Provide for a pleasant, rich and diverse pedestrian experience for pedestrians;
7. Provide for the humanization of the Central City through promotion of the arts;
8. Assist in creating a 24-hour Central City which is safe, humane and prosperous;
9. Ensure that new development is at a human scale and that it relates to the scale and desired character of its setting and the Central City as a whole.

The Commission has considered all guidelines and has addressed only those guidelines considered applicable to this project.

A1. Integrate the River. Orient architectural and landscape elements including, but not limited to, lobbies, entries, balconies, terraces, and outdoor areas to the Willamette River and greenway. Develop accessways for pedestrians that provide connections to the Willamette River and greenway.

Findings: The subject property is an existing building and a historic Landmark and its orientation and access to outdoor areas, such as the 14th floor terraces, are already defined. However, the proposal to replace the dark-tinted windows with clear vision glazing will open up views toward the river. *This guideline is met.*

A2. Emphasize Portland Themes. When provided, integrate Portland-related themes with the development's overall design concept.

Findings: As part of the proposal (though not subject to review per Title 11), the applicant has proposed to remove two London Plane trees in front of the Portlandia statue which sits above the main entrance to the building. The Raymond Kaskey-design statue, which is made of hammered copper, is the second largest in the country after the Statue of Liberty and is a symbol of the City. Removal of these two trees would allow greater visibility to Portlandia which is a popular attraction in the City to visitors and residents alike; however the Urban Forestry section of Portland Parks and Recreation is not amenable to this, as these trees are in good condition, and has suggested targeted pruning on the these two trees, conditioning their support of the current proposal on these two trees remaining.

The Commission notes that the draft proposal for the Central City 2035 Plan indicates that views to Portlandia are to be protected by means of limiting conflicting vegetation on either side of the Portlandia statue in order to maintain air space around her. While the Central City 2035 plan is not yet adopted or in effect, and could be changed during the adoption process, this indicates that the concept of tree removal on either side of Portlandia may be able to occur in the future. Regardless, as Urban Forestry has noted, targeted pruning can also help to open up views toward Portlandia. *With either pruning or removal of the trees per Urban*

Forestry approval, this guideline is met.

A3. Respect the Portland Block Structures. Maintain and extend the traditional 200-foot block pattern to preserve the Central City's ratio of open space to built space. Where superblock exist, locate public and/or private rights-of-way in a manner that reflects the 200-foot block pattern, and include landscaping and seating to enhance the pedestrian environment.

Findings: As is noted above the proposal will add an additional 7 inches to the footprint of the building on all sides. This will result in the building encroaching 5" into the right-of-way on the north and south, and 7" into the right-of-way on the east; the building is set back from the property line by 10'-0" on the west. PBOT previously granted approval of the Encroachment Permit to allow this extension into the right-of-way.

Appellant 2's appeal states that this guideline is not met because the encroachment, will disrupt the block structure. Council finds that the expanded footprint will be relatively imperceptible. As suggested by the second sentence of the guideline, this criterion serves to prevent superblock development with no pedestrian connectivity or visual breaks via landscaping. The minor encroachments proposed by this application do not affect the traditional 200 x 200 foot block structure. While the proposal extends the building slightly beyond the standard 200' x 200' footprint, the relative ratio of open space to built space will be negligible due to the significant setback on the west. *This guideline is met.*

A4. Use Unifying Elements. Integrate unifying elements and/or develop new features that help unify and connect individual buildings and different areas.

A5. Enhance, Embellish, and Identify Areas. Enhance an area by reflecting the local character within the right-of-way. Embellish an area by integrating elements in new development that build on the area's character. Identify an area's special features or qualities by integrating them into new development.

Findings for A4 and A5: The proposal will retain, and reconstruct where necessary, existing unifying elements such as the brick sidewalk of the Bus Mall and other sidewalk furnishings. *These guidelines are met.*

A6. Reuse/Rehabilitate/Restore Buildings. Where practical, reuse, rehabilitate, and restore buildings and/or building elements.

Findings: Council finds that the proposal is for the reuse and rehabilitation of an existing Landmark building of both national and international significance. While the proposed treatment is an unorthodox approach to rehabilitation, alternatives, including demolition, were considered. In part because of the significance of the building (as well as costs), the City decided that despite the issues affecting the building and its inhabitants and the gamut of emotions inspired by the interior and exterior of the building, that demolition was not the preferred solution. Rather the City has elected to rehabilitate the building by completing a full seismic upgrade, and permanently addressing the issues of water infiltration, air quality, and access to natural light in order to extend the life of this iconic structure and ensure a quality environment for the City's employees and all who visit the building.

As is noted in the findings for #1 *Historic character* and #4 *Historic features*, the proposed treatment includes removal of failed systems such as the existing windows and tiles, and wholesale replacement with new systems. The new materials, as well as other character-defining elements, will be recreated to seamlessly integrate with

the new metal rainscreen system intended to permanently protect the interior of the building from the elements. While the original concrete structure will remain, it will become the interior skeleton of the building, with all visible elements replicated anew to match Graves' original design intent. While the City has made the decision that it is practical to rehabilitate the building, it has also determined that reuse of existing building elements is impractical. Council agrees with this assessment in part due to the quality (or lack thereof) of the methods of original construction and the systems initially installed.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that a rehabilitation of the existing skin to eliminate water infiltration would be more cost-effective and more practical than replicating it in a rainscreen system. Council finds, however, that it is not practical to initiate further repairs to the existing skin, as this does not address the root cause of the problem, requires ongoing maintenance, is not cost-effective in the long run, and would involve flashing and other visual intrusions into the building's facades. *This guideline is met.*

A7. Establish and Maintain a Sense of Urban Enclosure. Define public rights-of-way by creating and maintaining a sense of urban enclosure.

B1. Reinforce and Enhance the Pedestrian System. Maintain a convenient access route for pedestrian travel where a public right-of-way exists or has existed. Develop and define the different zones of a sidewalk: building frontage zone, street furniture zone, movement zone, and the curb. Develop pedestrian access routes to supplement the public right-of-way system through superblocks or other large blocks.

Findings for A7 and B1: For this existing building, the sense of urban enclosure is already defined by the limits of the building. As is described above, the footprint of the building will be extended by approximately 7" on all sides due to the addition of the rainscreen. The existing setback on the west will be maintained (less 7"). The existing sidewalk zones are already defined and will remain largely as they are currently (less 5"-7"). In addition, the secondary sidewalk of the loggia will also remain largely as it is, though the extents of the loggia will be reconfigured. *These guidelines are met.*

A8. Contribute to a Vibrant Streetscape. Integrate building setbacks with adjacent sidewalks to increase the space for potential public use. Develop visual and physical connections into buildings' active interior spaces from adjacent sidewalks. Use architectural elements such as atriums, grand entries and large ground-level windows to reveal important interior spaces and activities.

Findings: The Portland Building has always featured an approximately 10-foot setback from the western property line, thereby allowing for an open front porch to the city. In addition, the building's loggia wrapping the western half of the building provides for an additional covered area for pedestrians and serves as a secondary sidewalk. The loggia is open to the adjacent sidewalk, providing clear views between the loggia and sidewalk. The proposed changes to the storefront, introducing floor-to-ceiling storefront glazing will provide additional views between the interior and exterior of the building at the ground level. In addition, the conversion of the east side parking entrance to glazed area with adjacent interior active space will provide additional opportunities for engagement. *This guideline is met.*

A9. Strengthen Gateways. Develop and/or strengthen gateway locations.

Findings: The Portland Building is not located at an identified Gateway. *This*

guideline is not applicable.

B2. Protect the Pedestrian. Protect the pedestrian environment from vehicular movement. Develop integrated identification, sign, and sidewalk-oriented night-lighting systems that offer safety, interest, and diversity to the pedestrian. Incorporate building equipment, mechanical exhaust routing systems, and/or service areas in a manner that does not detract from the pedestrian environment.

Findings: The applicant proposes to remove the below-grade parking and onsite loading spaces which will reduce the potential for pedestrian and vehicle conflicts at the 4th Avenue sidewalk. By closing this existing opening, pedestrians will also be protected from the other back-of-house service areas which are exposed by this opening. All mechanical equipment located at the interior of the second floor will be replaced with new equipment located on the roof, away from the pedestrian level and away from areas where the public would come into contact/proximity at the publicly-accessible interior second level of the building. Lighting will be provided in the form of recessed can lighting in the loggia, indirect lighting mounted to the interior of the loggia columns, and recessed linear lighting at the entry. All other security lighting around the building will be provided by the city's light standards in the right-of-way. *This guideline is met.*

B3. Bridge Pedestrian Obstacles. Bridge across barriers and obstacles to pedestrian movement by connecting the pedestrian system with innovative, well-marked crossings and consistent sidewalk designs.

Findings: The existing sidewalk corners at 5th Avenue have been upgraded to meet ADA standards. The sidewalk corners at 4th Avenue will be upgraded during construction. Also as part of the construction, the existing curbcut at the vehicle entry will be closed. Existing crossings will be maintained. *This guideline is met.*

B4. Provide Stopping and Viewing Places. Provide safe, comfortable places where people can stop, view, socialize and rest. Ensure that these places do not conflict with other sidewalk uses.

Findings: As is noted above, the existing loggia will be maintained, though the extents of the loggia will be reconfigured to accommodate additional interior floor area and enclose two bays on the north and two bays on the south. Also noted above is that the transparency of the ground level beyond the loggia will be increased through the installation of floor-to-ceiling storefront systems. The closure of the eastern opening on the north where the dual stair is located, will close an original though rarely used access point, thereby reducing areas of the loggia with limited visibility and questionable safety. The increased lighting will also ensure that the loggia will be an illuminated and relatively safe space during nighttime hours. Simple bench seating is also proposed within the loggia where no seating currently exists. *This guideline is met.*

B5. Make Plazas, Parks and Open Space Successful. Orient building elements such as main entries, lobbies, windows, and balconies to face public parks, plazas, and open spaces. Where provided, integrate water features and/or public art to enhance the public open space. Develop locally oriented pocket parks that incorporate amenities for nearby patrons. *This guideline is met.*

Findings: The Portland Building is located across 4th Avenue from a public park and historically has had a vehicle entry facing this public open space. Ideally, the entry would have been oriented to face the park rather than 5th Avenue, but this did

not occur. As is noted above, Graves did not originally design the building to have a vehicle entry at this location, but rather this was a late requirement of his client, the City. Prior to this requirement the building was envisioned to have an interior through connection to the park. Staff inquired to whether this could be introduced as part of the rehabilitation, but the applicant has cited security concerns for not redesigning this opening as a second entry.

Rather, the vehicle entry is designed to feature a large glazed window that extends up the building beyond the extent of the existing opening. At the interior the existing public seating area at the east side of the ground floor, which currently looks into the vehicle entry, will be extended to the edge of the building and will be slightly elevated above the sidewalk. Another seating area on the floor above will be opened up to overlook this area and receive natural lighting as well. Windows on this façade, specifically at the recessed vertical columns on either side of the existing garage opening, will be redesigned to provide additional employee/service entries and will be glazed with an artistic pattern reflecting the trees in the park across the street. The spaces to be obscured are primarily back-of-house areas. This pattern will also continue below the elevated seating area where the windows would otherwise look into the basement.

B6. Develop Weather Protection. Develop integrated weather protection systems at the sidewalk-level of buildings to mitigate the effects of rain, wind, glare, shadow, reflection, and sunlight on the pedestrian environment.

Findings: The existing loggia provides a secondary sidewalk along the western half of the building. Additional weather protection would be an inappropriate addition to this historic building. *This guideline is met.*

B7. Integrate Barrier-Free Design. Integrate access systems for all people with the building's overall design concept.

Findings: As part of the rehabilitation, the applicant proposes to address accessibility deficiencies in that all new points of entry will provide barrier free access. In addition, the applicant proposes to close the north dual stair at the center of the block and infill this area with enclosed floor area. While these stairs have provided access for some to the elevated loggia on the north, this opening in the wall has long been inequitable in its provision of access. The stairs at the northwest and southwest corners will remain as will the at-grade access points on the west and south. *This guideline is met.*

C1. Enhance View Opportunities. Orient windows, entrances, balconies and other building elements to surrounding points of interest and activity. Size and place new buildings to protect existing views and view corridors. Develop building façades that create visual connections to adjacent public spaces.

Findings: Because the subject property is a building made of structural concrete, with all openings built into the structure, the location, size, and number of the windows will remain as they are today. However, the proposed replacement of the dark-tinted glazing with clear vision glazing will provide enhanced views of the surrounding landscape for the building's occupants. As is noted above, the conversion of the vehicle entry to a double-height glazed window will improve the visual connection between the building's ground level and second level interior spaces to the park across 4th Avenue. *This guideline is met.*

C2. Promote Quality and Permanence in Development. Use design principles and

building materials that promote quality and permanence.

Findings: While age can take a toll on any building, the Portland Building's failures are a result of the inadequate original construction methods, brought about by a limited budget which did not allow the original vision to be executed. The Council believes that had the building been constructed with a terra cotta skin as Michael Graves originally intended, the water infiltration issues that this building has experienced would not have been so persistent and would not require such extreme measures to resolve.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this guideline is not satisfied because the design for the rainscreen system fails to promote quality and permanence in development.

Council finds that the proposed rainscreen system is a quality system, particularly for wet climates such as that in the Pacific Northwest and is commonly used today. Council also finds convincing evidence that the proposed system will permanently resolve the water infiltration and other environmental quality issues that negatively affect the building and the work environments within. The metal proposed at the upper level rainscreen is 3mm thick, painted and articulated to match the existing concrete to the greatest extent possible. The terra cotta tile at the pedestal is of higher quality than the existing ceramic tile. The new window systems at the upper levels will be integrated with the rainscreen system and will provide a higher quality defense against the elements than the current windows. Council finds that the proposed materials are high-quality and durable and will create a lasting façade solution for the building. *This guideline is met.*

C3. Respect Architectural Integrity. Respect the original character of an existing building when modifying its exterior. Develop vertical and horizontal additions that are compatible with the existing building, to enhance the overall proposal's architectural integrity.

Findings: In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this guideline is not met because the Applicant's proposal fails to "integrate the existing material usage." Council recognizes the proposal is for a more significant modification of the exterior than is typically seen on historic buildings. As has been described elsewhere, Council finds the evidence demonstrates that the proposed intervention is warranted and necessary in order to permanently arrest the water infiltration issues and other environmental quality issues that negatively affect the interior of this building. Adherence to a strict preservation ethic in this case, the Council finds, would not solve the problems of this building and would merely result in additional rounds of substantial repair and maintenance in the future. While a new over-cladding of the existing skin, which in this case is also the structure, is relatively unprecedented, the Aronoff Center for Design in Cincinnati provides a similar example of a building notable for its dynamic and colorful exterior being re-clad with a new material. There are other precedents as well of significant buildings being entirely re-clad in entirely new materials, including Lever House in New York City, the Standard Oil Building in Chicago, and the BMA Tower in Kansas City.

Within the framework of the rainscreen proposal, the applicant has strived to replicate Graves' design to the greatest extent possible through patterning, depth of window punches, color, and sheen. Some liberties have been taken with the ground floor storefronts and the conversion of the vehicle entry to glazing; however, the Commission believes that these modifications are compatible with the original character of the overall design. While the new cladding material will result in the

removal or obscuring of original exterior material, the type of materials and method of construction of the original materials is substantially less historically significant than the overall design of the building which is articulated in color and symbolism; these major design moves will be replicated in the new design, thereby preserving the integrity of the design intent through new materials. Additional findings regarding the architectural integrity of the building are found above in #1 Historic character and #4 Historic features. *This guideline is met.*

C4. Complement the Context of Existing Buildings. Complement the context of existing buildings by using and adding to the local design vocabulary.

Findings: By undertaking this significant rehabilitation of the Portland Building, the City will be able to ensure that Michael Graves' design intent will be carried into the future, supported by modern technology. The Portland Building, whether one loves it or hates it, marks a significant moment in architectural history and adds a refreshing splash of color amidst the backdrop of its neighbors, many of which are also significant buildings in their own right, as was noted above. The Portland Building's presence in the city and amidst its neighbors is a spot of contrast, making for a complementary yet dynamic cityscape, which will be maintained through this proposal. In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that this guideline is not met for the same reasons that C3 is not met due to the Applicant's proposal failing to "integrate the existing material usage." Council finds that it is not necessary to integrate existing building materials to fulfill this particular guideline. *This guideline is met.*

C5. Design for Coherency. Integrate the different building and design elements including, but not limited to, construction materials, roofs, entrances, as well as window, door, sign, and lighting systems, to achieve a coherent composition.

Findings: In their appeal, Appellant 2 lists this guideline as one of the approval criteria not met; however, they do not discuss how the Applicant's proposal fails to meet it.

Council finds that Graves' design was based on primacy of geometries, specifically the square, and sought to recall classical elements of architecture through abstraction. The proposal was revolutionary at the time and helped define the Post Modern architectural movement. Therefore, the design is inherently coherent and the rehabilitation proposal seeks to maintain this coherency. The proposed changes to the building, such as the conversion of the vehicle entry to an enlarged window overlooking the park, the revisions to the ground level storefronts, and the introduction of improved lighting, are compatible alterations in that they improve the pedestrian experience of the building while allowing the major design elements of the building to remain primary. Additional aesthetic changes are also proposed, including the removal of the small red tiles along the 4th Avenue pedestal façade and the introduction of terra cotta-colored (red) metal soffit panels at the pedestal where the soffit panels are currently the same color as the pedestal (teal). This color change from teal to red occurs in some form on all four façades and is intended to return the building to the original color scheme as seen on Exhibit C-44.

The existing conditions of the building are a product of the significantly spare budget set by the City for the construction, resulting in a building that was ultimately not properly designed for this climate, and patched and repaired multiple times with sealants and water-resistant coatings. The proposed rainscreen will reconstruct the existing outer skin of the building so that it is one integrated system of interlocking parts which will allow water to escape before it can infiltrate the

interior of the building, thus permanently resolving the water issues that have plagued the building from the beginning. *This guideline is met.*

C6. Develop Transitions between Buildings and Public Spaces. Develop transitions between private development and public open space. Use site design features such as movement zones, landscape element, gathering places, and seating opportunities to develop transition areas where private development directly abuts a dedicated public open space.

Findings: The existing publicly-accessible loggia serves as this transition space for the building. As is noted above additional lighting and seating will be introduced to better activate and enliven the space. *This guideline is met.*

C7. Design Corners that Build Active Intersections. Use design elements including, but not limited to, varying building heights, changes in façade plane, large windows, awnings, canopies, marquees, signs and pedestrian entrances to highlight building corners. Locate flexible sidewalk-level retail opportunities at building corners. Locate stairs, elevators, and other upper floor building access points toward the middle of the block.

Findings: The existing building is designed to step back at the corners above the first and second floors, and these massing moves will be retained in the proposed design. The northwest and southwest corners will also remain open to the public through the retention of the historic loggia. Entry points to the building are located midblock and will also remain. *This guideline is met.*

C8. Differentiate the Sidewalk-Level of Buildings. Differentiate the sidewalk-level of the building from the middle and top by using elements including, but not limited to, different exterior materials, awnings, signs, and large windows.

Findings: The building has a highly differentiated base articulated with teal ceramic tile; this will be rebuilt with a new terra cotta tile rainscreen colored to match the existing. While the applicant proposes to replace the existing storefronts with new floor-to-ceiling glazing and the vehicle entry with an expanded glazed curtain wall, no additional ground level embellishments are proposed in order to maintain the original design intent to the greatest extent possible. *This guideline is met.*

C9. Develop Flexible Sidewalk-Level Spaces. Develop flexible spaces at the sidewalk-level of buildings to accommodate a variety of active uses.

Findings: The proposal includes expansion of the interior floor area to encompass two bays at the north and south, as well as to create a more uniform ground level with a simplified footprint for the storefront. The storefront façades will still be stepped, however the stepping will now only occur at the main entry. While the existing retail spaces will be relocated offsite, the ground floor program as currently designed allows for flexibility of these spaces, as determined by the future needs of the City. The floor-to-ceiling storefront glazing will further enable this flexibility as the hierarchy is now focused squarely on the main entry. *This guideline is met.*

C10. Integrate Encroachments. Size and place encroachments in the public right-of-way to visually and physically enhance the pedestrian environment. Locate permitted skybridges toward the middle of the block, and where they will be physically unobtrusive. Design skybridges to be visually level and transparent.

Findings: The proposed rainscreen system will encroach into the right-of-way 5" on the north and south where the sidewalk is 12'-0" wide and 7" on the east where the sidewalk is 15'-0" wide. On the west, the additional 7" inches will not encroach into the right-of-way due to the existing 10'-0" setback.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that the Applicant's proposal does not meet this guideline because it does not visually and physically enhance the pedestrian environment "more or better than a new installation using matching glazed ceramic material."

Council finds that while the proposed encroachment will slightly reduce the width of the sidewalk, the overall experience of the pedestrian at these locations will be improved due to the improvement in the quality of the material. Council found convincing evidence in the record that the existing ceramic tile systems are failing due to the method by which they were originally installed and that the quality of the material and their installation method detracts from pedestrian experience. The new replacement tiles will be of a higher quality material in that they will be terra cotta and they will be installed in a higher quality manner. *This guideline is met.*

C11. Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops. Integrate roof function, shape, surface materials, and colors with the building's overall design concept. 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. Develop rooftop terraces, gardens, and associated landscaped areas to be effective stormwater management tools.

Findings: This guideline was the subject of Appellant 1's appeal and was also raised in Appellant 2's appeal.

The Applicant's proposal includes the addition of two new air handling units on the west side of the roof and six new cooling towers on the east side of the roof. The existing building and proposed units on the east side of the roof exceed the height limit; however, the proposal meets the performance standard for sites adjacent to designated open spaces outlined in 33.510.210.C *Performance standard for sites adjacent to designated open spaces*. The relocation of mechanical equipment to the roof has allowed the opportunity to open up the second floor to more public use, as well as introduce windows where louver vents currently exist.

Staff had significant concerns about the scale of the proposed rooftop units, particularly those on the west and suggested that the units be located within the interior of the building. Staff expressed concerns that at the current scale, the proposed units may be highly visible from the right-of-way only one block away, particularly views from the south. In addition, the proposed units would obscure the views from the west of the rooftop penthouse, designed as a "temple", as it would be viewed from higher elevations.

In the initial staff report, Staff suggested a condition of approval to address their concerns. Some members of the Historic Landmarks Commission shared concerns with the size of the proposed rooftop units on the west and suggested that perhaps they could be screened to mask their purpose. The applicant provided a response that a screen would have to be located 4'-0" outboard of the location of the mechanical equipment, thus making the mass more visible from the street. The applicant's proposal has not changed since the June 26, 2017 hearing and therefore, staff retained the originally proposed condition while adding the option to screen the units. At the July 24th hearing, the Historic Landmarks Commission

considered the potential to screen the units noting that such a solution would make this element more visible from the street, ultimately returning to the previously proposed condition.

In their appeal, Appellant 1 stated that this guideline can be met without the Landmarks Commission's condition to reduce the proposed air handling units either by locating them at the interior of the building, or be significantly (at least 50%) reduced in scale and not increased in number. During the appeal hearing, Appellant 1 stated that there is no viable technical solution that meets the Commission's condition without creating significant negative impacts to the project. Furthermore, Appellant 1 noted that 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.

Appellant 1 explained that 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.

Appellant 1 also testified that reducing the size of the equipment by 50% is also not technically feasible. The Portland Building is a 15-story building. Reducing the equipment size would result in insufficient air distribution for the building occupants and would not meet code. Appellant 1 assured Council that considerable work had been done to ensure a solution that balances minimizing visual impact with the needs of the building occupants and the City's sustainability goals.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 stated that C11 had not been met by the proposal and that while the Landmarks Commission's condition "G" helped address the visual intrusion of the rooftop mechanical, the condition was too vague and therefore could not be relied upon to address C11 properly.

In reviewing the evidence, Council makes the following findings with respect to these three aspects of the C11 guideline:

- ***Integrate roof function, shape, surface materials, and colors with the building's overall design concept.***
 - While the original staff report noted that 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 existing penthouse structure.

- ***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 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 not necessary to satisfy the C11 guideline.
 - *Placement:* As shown in the Applicant's submitted roof diagrams, the mechanical units are organized and symmetrical. Equipment is located as far away from the roof edges as possible to minimize visibility from the sidewalk level.
 - *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 Landmarks Commission expressed concerns about the appearance of the proposed air handlers "as viewed from higher elevations," Council finds that the clean and uncluttered appearance of the proposed units will not detract visually from the existing mechanical penthouse.
- ***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.

Based on these findings, it is Council's determination that this guideline can be met without imposing Condition G of the Landmarks Commission's decision.

This guideline is met.

C12. Integrate Exterior Lighting. Integrate exterior lighting and its staging or structural components with the building's overall design concept. Use exterior lighting to highlight the building's architecture, being sensitive to its impacts on the skyline at night.

Findings: New lighting is proposed within the loggia area, including recessed downlighting, indirect lighting, and recessed linear lighting at the entry. The downlighting is a square, rather than round, can which is compatible with Graves' prevailing concept of the "square". The indirect lighting is mounted to the interior loggia columns and will help to wash the loggia with light; however, the fixture is rather indiscreet and staff suggested an alternative fixture be presented at the first hearing. The applicant has provided four lighting options for an alternative fixture; the Commission believed that the option 73c is the most compatible and has included a condition approving this option. The recessed linear lighting is indiscreet and will provide lighting without drawing inordinate attention to the fixture. In addition, spot lighting will be placed near the base of the flagpoles as well as Portlandia to highlight these elements.

With the condition that the interior loggia column fixtures match 73c, this guideline is met.

C13. Integrate Signs. Integrate signs and their associated structural components with the building's overall design concept. Size, place, design, and light signs to not dominate the skyline. Signs should have only a minimal presence in the Portland skyline.

Findings: No new signage beyond what currently exists is proposed. If the currently existing signage is proposed to be replaced with new signage, then an additional review would be required. However, if the existing signage is reinstalled, no additional review is needed. *This guideline is met.*

D1.Park Blocks. Orient building entrances, lobbies, balconies, terraces, windows, and active use areas to the Park Blocks. In the South Park Blocks, strengthen the area's emphasis on history, education, and the arts by integrating special building elements, such as water features or public art. In the Midtown Park Blocks, strengthen the connection between the North and South Park Blocks by using a related system of right-of-way elements, materials, and patterns. In the North Park Blocks, strengthen the area's role as a binding element between New China/Japantown and the Pearl District.

Findings: Despite its location across from Chapman Square, the subject property is not located within the Park Blocks Area. *This guideline is not applicable.*

D2.South Waterfront Area. Develop a pedestrian circulation system that includes good connections to adjacent parts of the city and facilitates movement within and through the area. Size and place development to create a diverse mixture of active areas. Graduate building heights from the western boundary down to the waterfront. Strengthen connections to North Macadam by utilizing a related system of right-of-way elements, materials, and patterns.

Findings: The subject property is not located within the South Waterfront Area. *This guideline is not applicable.*

D3.Broadway Unique Sign District. Provide opportunities for the development of large, vertically oriented, bright, and flamboyant signs that add to the unique character of this Broadway environment. Size and place signs and their structural support systems so that significant architectural or historical features of the building are not concealed or disfigured. Ensure that all signs receive proper maintenance.

Findings: The subject property is not located within the Broadway Unique Sign District. *This guideline is not applicable.*

D4.New China/Japantown Unique Sign District. Provide opportunities for the development of suitably ornate signs, using motifs, symbols, bright colors, and celebrative forms that add to the atmosphere and character of New China/Japantown. Size and place signs and their structural support systems so that significant architectural or historical features of the building are not concealed or disfigured. Ensure that all signs receive proper maintenance.

Findings: The subject property is not located within the New China/Japantown Unique Sign District. *This guideline is not applicable.*

(2) MODIFICATION REQUESTS (33.846)

33.445.050 Modifications that Enhance Historic Resources and 33.846.070 Modifications Considered During Historic Resource Review

The review body may grant modifications to site-related development standards, including the sign standards of Chapters 32.32 and 32.34 of the Sign Code, as part of the Historic Resource Review process. However, modification to a parking and loading regulation within the Central City plan district may not be considered through the Historic Resource Review process. Modifications made as part of Historic Resource Review are not required to go through a separate adjustment process. To obtain approval of a modification to site-related development standards, the applicant must show that the proposal meets the approval criteria. Modifications to all other standards are subject to the adjustment process. Modifications that are denied through Historic Resource Review may be requested through the adjustment process.

The approval criteria for modifications considered during Historic Resource Review are:

- A. Better meets Historic Resource Review approval criteria.** The resulting development will better meet the approval criteria for Historic Resource Review than would a design that meets the standard being modified; and
- B. Purpose of the standard.**
 - 1. The resulting development will meet the purpose of the standard being modified; or
 - 2. The preservation of the character of the historic resource is more important than meeting the purpose of the standard for which a modification has been requested.

The following Modifications are requested:

- 1. **33.130.230.C** – to reduce the amount of ground floor windows on the north façade to 37% (from 50%) of the wall length and, on the east façade, to 0% (from 50%) of the wall length and to 0% (from 25%) of the wall area.

Findings: The purpose of the standard states:

“In the C zones, blank walls on the ground level of buildings are limited in order to:

- Provide a pleasant, rich, and diverse pedestrian experience by connecting activities occurring within a structure to adjacent sidewalk areas, or allowing public art at the ground level;
- Encourage continuity of retail and service uses;
- Encourage surveillance opportunities by restricting fortress-like facades at street level; and
- Avoid a monotonous pedestrian environment.

Because the proposal constitutes a Major Remodel, the Ground Floor Windows standard must be met. With regard to existing buildings that do not already meet this standard, this means that new windows would have to be cut into the building to meet this standard or a Modification must be requested. The values proposed for the ground floor windows are essentially the values that they are currently.

In their appeal, Appellant 2 states that the purpose of this standard is not satisfied “because the removal of the few windows on the east elevation blocks visual connections between activities in the building and on the sidewalk, it discourages the continuity of retail and service uses on SW Fourth Ave., it eliminates the natural ground level surveillance commonly known as eyes on the street, and it creates a monotonous pedestrian environment.”

Council concurs with the findings of the Historic Landmarks Commission that because increasing the size of the windows to meet this standard on the north and east facades would destroy the essential vision of Graves’ design, the preservation of the character of the historic resource is more important than meeting the purpose of the standard. Council also agrees with the Commission that several criteria and guidelines are better met by the proposal to retain the existing size and proportion of the existing window openings on the north and east, including:

- #1 Historic character
- #9 Preserve the form and integrity of the historic resource
- C3 Respect Architectural Integrity
- C5 Design for Coherency

With respect to the concerns raised by Appellant 2, Council finds that the proposed alterations to the SW Fourth Ave façade enhance the pedestrian environment with increased glazing, allowing for more visual connections between activities in the building and on the sidewalk, and improved “eyes on the street” by infilling the garage and allowing building occupants to look out to Fourth Avenue and the park. While there is no primary entrance on Fourth proposed (also an existing condition), Council finds the infilling of the garage entrance to be an improvement towards continuity along Fourth Avenue. To clarify, the existing ground floor windows either look into inactive spaces such as the parking garage, back-of-house areas, and stairs or are located more than 4’ above the adjacent sidewalk and therefore none of the existing windows can be counted toward the standard. The proposal does not seek to increase this nonconformity, as the proposed ground floor windows will also front on inactive areas and/or be located more than 4’ above grade. Thus, the Modification to reduce the total length and area of ground floor windows to 0% would apply even if no changes were proposed to this façade. While some of these inactive windows will receive an artistic film to mask the inactivity behind, ultimately the interior/exterior connections on the east façade will be improved by conversion of the garage opening to active floor area even if it is elevated above sidewalk level.

This Modification warrants approval.

2. **33.510.225** – to reduce the depth of the ground floor active uses (at the loggia) from the required 25’ depth to approximately 16’ to 20’.

Findings: The purpose of the standard is stated as follows: “The ground floor active use standards are intended to reinforce the continuity of pedestrian-active ground-level building uses. The standards are also to help maintain a healthy urban district through the interrelationship of ground-floor building occupancy and street level accessible public uses and activities. Active uses include but are not limited to: lobbies, retail, residential, commercial, and office.”

The Code is not clear as to how this standard should apply in a situation such as the existing which includes a loggia between the exterior face of the building and the interior space of the building; however, the standards reference the street-facing

façade, which would be the outside face of the teal pedestal base. This standard requires that the active space be at least 25' deep, as measured from the street-facing façade. While it is not clear that the active space is required to be interior space, the examples provided are typically interior spaces. Also, as is indicated above, active uses include lobbies and the loggia may be considered an extension of the lobby. From the front of the street-facing wall to the back of the nearest interior space substantially exceeds 25'; however, the storefront wall divides this space into the loggia space, which is less than 25' feet (in the existing and proposed condition), and the much deeper and more flexible interior space. In order to meet this standard would require either relocating the storefront wall to behind the existing interior structural columns or shifting the storefront wall to the exterior structural columns, thereby increasing the depth of the loggia or eliminating the loggia. It is not clear that increasing the depth of the loggia would meet this standard as the space is required to be flexible space and an open-air publicly accessible loggia can essentially serve only a single purpose. Eliminating the loggia is not desirable with regard to maintaining the character of the building. Therefore, staff supports the reduction of the 25' depth requirement by considering the loggia and the interior spaces behind as two elements of a whole that allow this space to serve its existing purpose while meeting the purpose of the standard. In addition, the Commission believes that several criteria and guidelines are better met by the proposal to retain the existing size and proportion of the existing window openings on the north and east, including:

- #1 Historic character
- #9 Preserve the form and integrity of the historic resource
- C3 Respect Architectural Integrity

This Modification warrants approval.

(3) ADJUSTMENT REQUESTS (33.805)

33.805.010 Purpose

The regulations of the zoning code are designed to implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. These regulations apply city-wide, but because of the city's diversity, some sites are difficult to develop in compliance with the regulations. The adjustment review process provides a mechanism by which the regulations in the zoning code may be modified if the proposed development continues to meet the intended purpose of those regulations. Adjustments may also be used when strict application of the zoning code's regulations would preclude all use of a site. Adjustment reviews provide flexibility for unusual situations and allow for alternative ways to meet the purposes of the code, while allowing the zoning code to continue to provide certainty and rapid processing for land use applications.

33.805.040 Approval Criteria

The approval criteria for signs are stated in Title 32. All other adjustment requests will be approved if the review body finds that the applicant has shown that either approval criteria A. through F. or approval criteria G. through I., below, have been met.

The following Adjustments are requested:

1. **33.266.310.C** – to reduce the number of required loading spaces to zero (0) by removing the existing on-site basement level loading space.

- A. Granting the adjustment will equally or better meet the purpose of the regulation to be modified; and

Findings: The purpose of the regulation states: “A minimum number of loading spaces are required to ensure adequate areas for loading for larger uses and developments. These regulations ensure that the appearance of loading areas will be consistent with that of parking areas. The regulations ensure that access to and from loading facilities will not have a negative effect on the traffic safety or other transportation functions of the abutting right-of-way.”

As is documented in the applicant’s Narrative, the existing on-site loading spaces are not conducive to the needs of the building due to the way that they were constructed, being that they are too short for the typical sized truck and are slanted which makes loading freight potentially unsafe. As such, primarily for safety reasons, the building receives its deliveries from trucks unloading from the right-of-way, which allows loading trucks to not be unloaded at an incline. The current proposal would formalize this arrangement and would help reduce potential conflicts between loading activities and other operations within this back of house area which is proposed to be converted to more active uses. *This approval criterion is met.*

- B. If in a residential zone, the proposal will not significantly detract from the livability or appearance of the residential area, or if in a C, E, or I zone, the proposal will be consistent with the desired character of the area; and

Findings: The site is located in the Central Commercial zone where the intent is to provide for intense development with a broad range of uses including commercial, cultural, and government uses that are pedestrian oriented with an emphasis on a safe and attractive streetscape. The proposed removal of the existing on-site loading spaces will allow for the vehicle opening to be closed and this area to be converted to more active uses with windows looking out to 4th Avenue. This will allow for the reduction of potential vehicle and pedestrian conflicts and will ensure greater safety along SW 4th Avenue. *This approval criterion is met.*

- C. If more than one adjustment is being requested, the cumulative effect of the adjustments results in a project which is still consistent with the overall purpose of the zone; and

Findings: Only one Adjustment was requested, therefore, there will not be a cumulative effects of Adjustments beyond this request. *Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.*

- D. City-designated scenic resources and historic resources are preserved; and

Findings: The proposed removal of the on-site loading spaces will result in an improvement to this existing historic resource. In addition, staff notes that the overall proposal is for the rehabilitation of the existing historic resource. *This criterion is met.*

- E. Any impacts resulting from the adjustment are mitigated to the extent practical; and

Findings: No impacts have been identified. Staff notes that the proposed removal of on-site loading spaces will result in the loading activities of the building functioning much as they do today. *This criterion is met.*

- F. If in an environmental zone, the proposal has a few significant detrimental environmental impacts on the resource and resource values as is practicable;

Findings: This site is not within an environmental zone. *This criterion does not apply.*

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Unless specifically required in the approval criteria listed above, this proposal does not have to meet the development standards in order to be approved during this review process. The plans submitted for a building or zoning permit must demonstrate that all development standards of Title 33 can be met, or have received an Adjustment or Modification via a land use review prior to the approval of a building or zoning permit.

OTHER TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

None.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Council believes the City's original decision in the early 1980s to deliver this building at a reduced budget has directly lead to the issues plaguing this building today, as well as for the past 35 years. Because of the quality of the original construction, Council does not believe that traditional methods of preservation or restoration would adequately solve the chronic water infiltration and environmental quality issues affecting this building. The Portland Building was listed in the National Register of Historic Places primarily for its unique and groundbreaking design, articulated with color, symbolism, and decoration. These aspects of the design will be created almost exactly in the proposed overcladding and the intent of Graves' design will carry his design forward into the future, now with a more water and air-resistant system. While the proposal will permanently alter the original materials of the design, and some liberties have been taken in the proposed design, the integrity of the overall design intent will remain. The purpose of the Historic Resource Review process is to ensure that additions, new construction, and exterior alterations to historic resources do not compromise their ability to convey historic significance. This proposal meets the applicable Historic Resource Review criteria and Modification and Adjustment criteria and therefore warrants approval.

VI. DECISION

It is the decision of Council to uphold the appeal of Appellant 1 (Erica Ceder), deny the appeal of Appellant 2 (Peter Meijer) and approve Historic Resource Review for exterior alterations and rehabilitation of the Portland Building, a Landmark located in the Downtown subdistrict of the Central City Plan District, to include the following:

- Installation of a rainscreen system on the exterior of the building to be composed of aluminum panels at the upper levels (off-white, red, and blue penthouse) and ceramic tile at the lower (teal) levels, to be set proud of the underlying concrete structure by up to 11.5 inches at the upper levels and 7 inches at the lower levels. The new rainscreen is designed to match the patterning of the existing, though the ground level tiles are proposed at twice the current dimension (from 9.5" x 9.5" to 19" x 19") and the terracotta-colored tiles area are proposed at 15.5" x 15.5", increased from 9.5" x 9.5".
- Replacement of existing formed "column capitals" and decorative "medallion and garland" elements with new aluminum panels designed to match the existing.

- Replacement of all upper level windows and introduction of clear glazing where dark tinted glazing currently exists. Areas of mirrored glazing area will remain mirrored, though new glazing will be installed.
- Replacement of 2nd floor louvers with new windows. Replacement of ground floor storefront systems with new butt-glazed floor-to-ceiling storefront systems.
- Enclosure of two bays of floor area each at the north and south portions of the ground level loggia. The new infilled areas are proposed to be clad with the proposed teal replacement tile, windows to match adjacent windows, and storefront system to match adjacent storefront system.
- Removal of two existing rooftop mechanical units and installation of two new air-handling units on the west side of the roof and six new cooling towers on the east side of the roof. Because the new cooling towers on the east side of the roof exceed the maximum height allowance for that side of the building, the applicant is utilizing the performance standard identified in 33.510.205.C in order to exceed the height limit on the east.
- Removal of the vehicle access at the ground level of the east façade and infill of this area with new glazing and expansion of that glazing upward to the second floor. Relocation of entry and egress doors on the east façade and the application of sigh-obscuring film on the ground level east façade windows and doors.

Approval of the following Modifications:

1. 33.130.230.C – to reduce the amount of ground floor windows on the north façade to 37% (from 50%) of the wall length and, on the east façade, to 0% (from 50%) of the wall length and to 0% (from 25%) of the wall area. *The Notice of Proposal indicated that the reduction in the length of windows was from 50% to 12.5% but this has since been clarified as 50% to 0% due to the way the standard must be calculated.*
2. 33.510.225 – to reduce the depth of the ground floor active uses (at the loggia) from the required 25' depth to approximately 16' to 20'.

Approval of the following Adjustment:

1. 33.266.310.C – to reduce the number of required loading spaces to zero (0) by removing the existing on-site basement level loading space.

Approvals per Exhibits C-1 through C-137, signed, stamped, and dated July 24, 2017, subject to the following conditions:

- A. As part of the building permit application submittal, the following development-related conditions (B through H) must be noted on each of the 4 required site plans or included as a sheet in the numbered set of plans. The sheet on which this information appears must be labeled "ZONING COMPLIANCE PAGE - Case File LU 17-153413 HRM AD". All requirements must be graphically represented on the site plan, landscape, or other required plan and must be labeled "REQUIRED."
- B. At the time of building permit submittal, a signed Certificate of Compliance form (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/article/623658>) must be submitted to ensure the permit plans comply with the Historic Resource Review decision and approved exhibits.
- C. No field changes allowed.
- D. The color of the new teal tiles shall match the color of the existing tiles.

- E. Interpretive materials, describing the original and proposed construction methods, shall be installed within the loggia or (per PBOT approval) the 5th Avenue sidewalk.
- F. The historic teal tiles at the main 5th Avenue entry shall remain as shown in Exhibit C-74-revised.
- 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).~~ (Removed per Appellant #1 Appeal)
- H. The interior loggia column fixtures shall match 73c (of Exhibit H-12) with non-ribbed shrouds at the bottom and sides.
- I. As afforded by Exhibit H-18, a covenant shall be placed on the Portland Building in accordance with PZC 33.700.060. The covenant shall require that before the owner may demolish the building, regardless of status on the National Register of Historic Places, the owner must comply with the Demolition Review in effect at the time. At such time that the National Register status of the building is removed, the City of Portland will pursue local landmark status for the building.

Appellant #1 prevailed and it was determined that their original proposal with modified conditions of approval met the approval criteria.

VII. APPEAL INFORMATION

Appeals to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA)

This is the City's final decision on this matter. It may be appealed to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), within 21 days of the date of the decision, as specified in the Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.830. Among other things, ORS 197.830 requires that a petitioner at LUBA must have submitted written testimony during the comment period or this land use review. You may call LUBA at 1 (503) 373-1265 for further information on filing an appeal.

EXHIBITS NOT ATTACHED UNLESS INDICATED

- A. Applicant's Statement
 - 1. Narrative
 - 2. Original Drawing Set
 - 3. Pre-Application Conference Summary
 - 4. Completeness Response, received May 5, 2017
 - 5. Revised GFW Modification information, received May 25, 2017
 - 6. Revised Narrative, received June 5, 2017
 - 7. Narrative Appendix, received June 5, 2017
 - 8. Revised Drawing Set, received June 5, 2017
- B. Zoning Map (attached)
- C. Plan & Drawings
 - 1. Cover Sheet
 - 2. Table of Contents
 - 3. Project Team
 - 4. Project Background
 - 5. Letter of Support
 - 6. Letter of Support cont.
 - 7. Letter of Support cont.
 - 8. Summary of Previous Hearings

9. Summary of Previous Hearings
10. Blank
11. Site and Context cover sheet
12. Vicinity Map/Zoning Info
13. Vicinity Photos
14. Civil Site and Tree Plan
15. Site Utility Feasibility Plan
16. Proposed Tree Removal
17. Proposed Loading Adjustment
18. Blank
19. Existing conditions cover sheet
20. Existing Elevation Materials – West
21. Existing Elevation Materials – South
22. Existing elevation Materials – East
23. Existing Elevation Materials – North
24. Existing Conditions Summary
25. History of Studies and Repairs
26. Existing Building Conditions
27. Existing Building Conditions
28. Existing Building conditions
29. Existing Building conditions
30. Existing Building Conditions
31. Building and Project History cover sheet
32. Portland Building as Post Modernist Icon
33. Portland Building as Post Modernist Icon cont.
34. Blank
35. Post Modern Architecture
36. Precedent Studies
37. Precedent Studies cont.
38. Project Overview
39. Design Proposal cover sheet
40. Proposed Envelope Solution
41. Rainscreen Curtainwall Assembly
42. Overall Building Perspective – Existing
43. Overall Building Perspective – Proposed
44. Existing Exterior Photo
45. Proposed Exterior Rendering
46. Proposed Elevation Materials – West
47. Proposed Elevation Materials – South
48. Proposed Elevation Materials – East
49. Proposed Elevation Materials – North
50. Existing Basement Level
51. Basement Concept Floor Plan
52. Existing First Level/Site Plan
53. First Level Concept Plan/Proposed Site Plan
54. Second and Third Level Concept Floor Plans
55. Typical floor and 15th Level Concept Floor Plans
56. Proposed Building Section – East/West
57. Proposed Building Section – North/South
58. Existing Roof Aerial View
59. Proposed Roof – Axon
- 59a.Existing Roof Aerial View – Second Level Roof
- 59b.Proposed Roof Axon – Second Level Roof
60. Proposed Design View Angles – West Elevation
61. Proposed Design View Angles – East Elevation

62. Proposed Design View Angles – South Elevation
63. Proposed Design View Angles – North Elevation
64. Building Height Performance Standard
65. Building Height Performance Standard
66. Ground Floor Window Standard
67. Ground Floor Window Standard
68. Ground Floor Window Standard
69. Ground Floor Window Standard
70. Madison Street Pedestrian Level – Existing
71. Madison Street Pedestrian Level – Proposed
72. 5th Avenue Loggia – Existing
73. 5th Avenue Loggia – Proposed – revised (73c)
74. Proposed Loggia Elevations - revised
75. Proposed Loggia – Details
76. 4th Avenue Loading Area – Existing
77. 4th Avenue Loading Area – Proposed
78. 4th Avenue Enlarged Floor Plan – Basement
79. 4th Avenue Enlarged Floor Plan – First Floor
80. 4th Avenue – enlarged Elevation
81. 4th Avenue – Wall Sections
82. Graphic Glass Inspiration – Park Context
83. Graphic Glass – Frit & Applied Graphics
84. 4th Avenue – Graphic Glass
85. 4th Avenue – Graphic Glass
86. Exterior Night Rendering – Proposed
87. Details & Cutsheets cover sheet
88. Proposed Façade Details
89. Façade Details
90. Proposed Façade Details
91. Façade Details - revised
92. Proposed Façade Details
93. Façade Details
94. Proposed Façade Details
95. Façade Details
96. Proposed Façade Details
97. Façade Details
98. Proposed Façade Details
99. Façade Details
100. Proposed Façade Details
101. Façade Details
102. Proposed Façade Details
103. Façade Details
104. Proposed Façade Details
105. Façade Details
106. Proposed Façade Details
107. Façade Details
108. Proposed Façade Details
109. Façade Details
110. Main Entry Doors
111. Main Entry Door Details - revised
112. Proposed Materials and Colors - revised
113. Proposed Terracotta Cladding System
114. Proposed Exterior Lighting
115. Proposed Loggia Site Furnishings
116. Proposed Loggia Glazing System

117. Proposed Loggia Glazing System
118. Proposed Service Entrance Door
119. Proposed Service Entrance door
120. Proposed Rooftop Air Handling Units
121. Proposed Rooftop Air Handling Units
122. Proposed Rooftop Chillers
123. Proposed Rooftop Chillers
124. Proposed Rooftop Fan Units
125. Proposed Rooftop Fan Units
126. Proposed Third Floor Roof Generator
127. Proposed Metal Louvers
128. Blank
129. Historic Approval Criteria and Enclosure Report cover sheet
130. Blank
131. Historic Approval Criteria Response
132. Historic Approval Criteria Response cont.
133. Historic Approval Criteria Response cont.
134. Historic Approval Criteria Response cont.
135. Enclosure Report
136. Enclosure Report cont.
137. Enclosure Report cont.
138. Loggia Lighting: Option C – Ergo Lightscan (73c)
- D. Notification information:
 1. Request for response
 2. Posting letter sent to applicant
 3. Notice to be posted
 4. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 5. Mailed notice
 6. Mailing list
- E. Agency Responses:
 1. Urban Forestry Division of Portland Parks & Recreation
 2. Bureau of Transportation Engineering and Development Review
 3. Bureau of Environmental Services
 4. Fire Bureau
 5. Life Safety Division of BDS
- F. Letters
 1. Iain MacKenzie, DoCoMoMo Oregon Vice President, wrote on June 15, 2017, in support of renovation of the Portland Building, but noting several concerns.
 2. Iain Mackenzie Iain Mackenzie, on June 19, 2017, provided a letter dated Mar 15, 2017 from Lisa Deline at the National Park Service (NPS) to Ian Johnson at the State Historic Preservation Office of Oregon (SHPO), indicating SHPO and NPS concurrence that the proposed rainscreen system would "destroy the historic integrity of the building and necessitate its removal from the National Register."
 3. Peter Meijer, then a member of the project team, on June 23, 2017, wrote in opposition to the proposal.
 4. Anthony Veerkamp, Field Director for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, on June 23, 2017, wrote in opposition, stating that the proposal is not a preservation solution and could jeopardize the building's National Register status.
- G. Other
 1. Original LUR Application
 2. Incomplete Letter, dated May 5, 2017
 3. National Register nomination
- H. Hearing
 1. Staff Report
 2. DAR Summary #1, dated February 1, 2016

3. DAR Summary #2, dated December 28, 2016
4. Staff Presentation, dated June 26, 2017
5. Applicant Presentation, dated June 26, 2017
6. Applicant Supplemental Presentation Materials
7. Testifier Sign-In Sheet for June 26, 2017
8. Fred Miller Fred Miller, former Chief Administrative Officer for the City of Portland, on June 29, 2017 wrote in support of the proposal.
9. Matthew Davis, Principal at Architectural Resources Group which is a member of the project team, on June 29, 2017 wrote in support of the proposal.
10. Dan Everhart, Preservation Programs Manager for Restore Oregon, on June 30, 2017, noting a concern for the potential loss of National Register status.
11. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided additional information in response to staff and Commission comments.
12. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided updated drawings in response to staff and Commission comments.
13. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, provided a letter from Jessica Engeman, Venerable Properties, on July 3, 2017, provided a response to the commission's request for more information on the potential for delisting from the National Register.
14. Peter Meijer, Peter Meijer Architect, PC (PMA) on July 3, 2017, wrote in opposition, providing additional testimony in the form of a published interview with Michael Graves, an alternative cost estimate for renovation by PMA, a daylighting study by PMA, an email chain from PBOT regarding denial of an Encroachment Permit, and a report entitled "Exterior Envelope Restoration Structure Improvements Assessment Phase 1" by FFA Architecture and Interiors, Inc.
15. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2016, provided a response to testimony about the selected rainscreen material.
16. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided a matrix on alternative materials (referenced in Exhibit H-11).
17. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, provided a letter from Jessica Engeman, Venerable Properties, on July 3, 2017 provided an updated version of Exhibit H-13.
18. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, provided a letter from Kristin Wells, Portland Building Reconstruction Project Manager, on July 3, 2017, noting the City's commitment to provide a covenant requiring that before the building could be demolished in the future, the owner must comply with the Demolition Review process in effect at the time.
19. Kate Kearney, provided a letter from Theodore H.M. Prudon, President of Docomomo US, on July 3, 2017, in opposition to the proposal and noting concerns regarding precedent.
20. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 3, 2017, provided an updated memo represented in Exhibit H-15.
21. Matthew Davis, Principal at Architectural Resources Group which is a member of the project team, on June 29, 2017 provided revised testimony, still in support of the proposal.
22. Erica Ceder, DLR Group, on July 10, 2017, provided responses to testimony received, particularly in response to Exhibits H-14 and H-19.
23. Revised Staff Report, dated July 17, 2017
24. Staff Presentation, dated July 24, 2017

I. Appeal

1. Final Findings and Decision and Notice of Appeal
2. First Mailed Notice
3. NOA Mailing list
4. Appellant #1 Appeal Submittal
5. Appellant #2 Appeal Submittal
6. Revised Notice of Appeal

7. NOA Mailing list
8. Restore Oregon letter, received August 24, 2017
9. Staff Presentation, dated August 24, 2017
10. Appellant #1 Presentation, dated August 24, 2017
11. Appellant #2 Presentation, dated August 24, 2017