



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

Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner
Rebecca Esau, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: **February 26, 2018**

To: Brendan Sanchez, CARLETON HART ARCHITECTURE

From: Grace Jeffreys, Development Review
503-823-7840

Re: **EA 17-269490 DA – 1724 NW Hoyt**
Design Advice Request, *Revised Summary Memo, January 8, 2018 Hearing Date*

Revisions from February 16 Summary memo shown boxed.

Thank you for taking advantage of the opportunity to hold a Design Advice Request regarding your project. I hope you find it informative and valuable as you continue with your project development. Attached is a summary of the comments provided by the Historic Landmarks Commission at the **January 8, 2018** Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings. To review those recordings, please visit: http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/search/rec?sm_class=uri_7547&count&rows=50

These Historic Landmarks Commission comments are intended to guide you in further design exploration of your project. These comments may also inform City staff when giving guidance over the course of future related land use reviews. These comments address the project as presented on January 8, 2018. As the project design evolves, the comments, too, may evolve or may no longer be pertinent.

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

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

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: *Historic Landmarks Commission*
Respondents

This memo summarizes Historic Landmarks Commission design direction provided on January 8, 2018, per the applicable Approval Criteria.

Commissioners in attendance on January 8, 2018:

Kirk Ranzetta, **Carin Carlson**, Kristen Minor, Matthew Roman, Wendy Chung, Annie Mahoney, Maya Foty

I. Executive Summary. The Commission commended the applicant for the refurbishment of the Buck-Prager building, and for looking towards local precedents for material and style cues. However, the Commission were in general agreement with the Staff Memo to the Commission dated January 3, 2018, and noted concerns regarding the scale and massing of the North Building and the character and ground floor treatments of both the North and South Buildings. Not enough contextual information was provided for the Commission to fully respond to compatibility, especially with the lower-scaled streets to the north and south. To better illustrate how the proposal sits within its context, please provide accurate elevation and section drawings that show the adjacent context. These should extend beyond the site and show the scale of the north and south street conditions.

II. Alphabet Historic Addendum

1. Historic Changes. *"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."*

- The Commission commended the applicant on the refurbishment of the Buck-Prager (BP) building based on historical information.
- The Commission also commended the applicant on exposing the historic brick details of the sidewalls in the courtyards.
- For Historic Resource Review approval, more detailed information will be needed for:
 - The windows, canopies, cornices, and material construction.
 - The scope of proposed alterations to the historic fabric, including location and percentages of floors, walls and roof. It will be critical to determine whether a Type IV Demolition Review would be required.

2. Differentiate New from Old. *"New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will retain historic materials that characterize a property to the extent practicable. Replacement materials should be reasonable facsimiles of the historic materials they replace. The design of new construction will be compatible with the historic qualities of the district as identified in the Historic Context Statement."* Refer to the Historic Alphabet District: Community Design Guidelines Addendum for further detail, which can be found here:

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/index.cfm?&a=58828>.

- Connect better with the surrounding context. There is too much differentiation from the Buck-Prager, as well as from the district. Too many colors/ material changes proposed. Differentiate without so many color/material changes. Color can be used to highlight differentiation, but be wary about using too many colors.
- The overall scale and massing of the North Building is not yet "compatible with the historic qualities of the district", especially the overall height and stepped-back massing of the upper stories.
- The Buck-Prager was not historically residential, but a commercial building. This creates a challenge to relate this new residential program to a non-residential historic building. Please explore options of how to feather-in the residential "grain" to maintain compatibility.

3. 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. New development will seek to incorporate design themes characteristic of similar buildings in the Historic Alphabet District.*”

- **Both Buildings:**
 - *Tripartite.* In the district, there is a pattern of base, body, and top. Look to design themes characteristic of similar buildings in the Historic Alphabet District.
 - *Grain.* Generally, provide a more fine-grained detail, avoid a loft-like style which feels harsh and out of context. This is not a style issue, but a grain issue. The big windows don’t help.
 - *Windows.* The larger windows at upper floors are not successful. Attic stories are typically part of plane of building, and windows same size or smaller.
 - *Ground level.* The units need to have more relationship to streets. While there is some precedent in the district for partial basement level windows, there is no precedent for egress wells on street frontages. Direct entries on street would better activate the streets.
 - *Entry Lobbies.* Would like to see larger common entries and better connection between residential and street.
 - *Setback at the Buck Prager (BP).* The Commission appreciates setting back the adjacent building on NW 18th to keep the quoins of the BP visible, but this could be accomplished with less of a setback.
- **South Building:** Additions need to “be primarily compatible with the original resource”.
 - *Generally.* There needs to be a much stronger relationship between the BP and the South Building. Since the South Building is programmatically connected to the Buck-Prager building, it will be viewed as an addition to this Contributing Resource. Take cues from the resource, such as materiality, proportions, windows, cornices, datum lines, and special detailing (such as soldier coursing over windows), to increase compatibility of new to old.
 - *Character.* The Commission is open to the addition to the Buck-Prager (the south building) to be expressed as a different building, but the details will be important. It still must be primarily compatible with the original resource; however, it does not need to be expressed as an addition. It can be a very compatible new building.
 - *Other items.* The Commission voiced concern over the setbacks on NW 18th, the fake entry/ canopy facing NW 18th, and the extremely low canopy over the entry on NW Hoyt.
- **North Building:** “New development will seek to incorporate design themes characteristic of similar buildings in the Historic Alphabet District”.
 - *Scale.* The proposed 6.5 to 7-story building is out of scale with the district, and, especially in terms of the directly adjacent small-scaled context, it is incompatible. The GL’s recognize there are larger structures in the District (3-5 stories), including apartments, however, the Commission is not aware of any at this scale, especially adjacent to small residential. Larger structures in the district are located primarily on busy streets, at the edges of the district, or fronting big open spaces, such as Park 19, which is 6-stories, and faces Couch Park, a very large, open space. The proposed 6.5-7 story height is even more out of scale with the adjacent low-scaled, narrow residential streets to the north and south, along NW Hoyt and NW Irving. These frontages are largely intact and populated with low-scaled, 2-3 story Historic Landmark structures. The proposal must show a greater

response to this adjacent residential context. Additionally, the neighboring lots are not zoned for this much height.

- *Massing.* The proposed three over three massing and the setback in plane of the upper floors is not successful, and doesn't complement the District. A more traditional, simple massing with no upper level setbacks would be more compatible.
- *Character.* Look to examples of larger apartment buildings in the district, possibly with a deep courtyard or u-shaped form to provide more relief on the residential streets.

III. **Community Design Guidelines** – In addition to the comments noted above under II. Alphabet Historic Addendum:

1. **Context** (*Community Design Guidelines P1, P2, P3, D7*)

- *Generally.* NW 18th is a busy street, while Hoyt and Irving are quiet residential streets. This proposal presents an opportunity to bridge these streets by responding to the different conditions.
- *Setbacks on NW 18th.* Along NW 18th, develop a more commercial street response and reduce setbacks. Throughout the district, apartment buildings are often built to the property lines on busy, higher priority streets. If setbacks are proposed, put them on the residential streets. Additionally, the proposed 3'-6" setback is not a successful dimension for setbacks. Make it smaller or large enough to add trees and create useable spaces.
- *NW Hoyt & Irving.* Along the residential streets, develop a more residential response. Add elements which further break down the scale and add texture, such as setbacks, balconies and finely-scaled bay windows. (*As directed in the Community Design Guidelines, NWPD, "utilize elements that distinguish the residential nature of streets from the more intensely hardscaped main streets. These can include: landscaped setbacks, courtyards; front windows placed to preserve residential privacy; and, façade articulation created by porch and other entrance treatments, bay windows, balconies, and vertically divided building volumes.*).
- *Rear Setbacks.* To support a Modification to the standards, substantial benefit will need to be demonstrated.

2. **Public realm** (*Community Design Guidelines E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, D1, D2, D3, D4, D5*)

- *Active Ground Floors.* The treatment of the street frontages must better activate the streets. There need to be more active ground floors, and the window wells create an unsafe character. Successful ground floor residential proposals use a level up and setbacks to create a level of separation between the street and residential interiors.
- *Basement wells.* While there is precedent for basement windows in the district, there is no precedent for wells along the ROW and would not be supported. Additionally, the Commission was split as to whether partially basement windows were supportable. There may be ways to make this successful, however, the Commission encouraged explorations of other ways to treat the units: look to examples of successful treatments such as walk-ups. (Look at the Campbell townhouses) and, if there are lower units, provide separate staircase down to basements.
- *Loading.* Provide more options for how the building will be serviced, and consider how the residents, especially the elderly residents, will access their building. All three streets around the site are one-way, and challenging to stop on.

3. **Quality & Permanence** (*Community Design Guidelines D6, D8*)

- *Brick.* Supported the use of brick. Scale of building and location on busy street and character of street, brick is appropriate material.
- *Windows.* Reduce the number of window types, and make them more consistent. High-quality windows are imperative for successful infill in an Historic District. The Commission would need more

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 1. Original drawing set
 2. CHA minutes from NWDA meeting, 11/10/18
 3. Response to staff queries, 12/15/17
 4. Drawings for first DA, dated 12/29/17
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 1. "C" Exhibits, C.1-36, for 1st DAR, dated 12/29/17
- D. Notification
 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments – none received
- F. Public Testimony –
 1. Jessica Richmond, 12/12/17, questions about the PC held on 12/12/17.
 2. Vicki Skryha, 12/12/17, questions about PC doc's, and provided reference links.
 3. Steve Pinger 12/13/17, questions about status of proposal.
 4. Jessica Richmond, 12/13/17, clarifying representation.
 5. Jessica Richmond, 12/18/17, request for PC documents.
 6. Jessica Richmond, 12/27/17, questions regarding noticing and DAR process.
 7. Vicki Skryha, 12/28/17, questions regarding noticing and DAR process.
 8. Jessica Richmond, 1/2/18, concerns with scale and design.
 9. Vicki Skryha, 1/4/18, questions about applicable criteria.
 10. Vicki Skryha, 1/6/18, questions about map app.
 11. Roger Vrilakas, 1/5/18, concerns with scale and size of proposal.
 12. Douglas Coffey, 1/5/18, concerns with character and size, as well as lack of loading and parking.
 13. Annette Jolin, received 1/7/18, dated 1/3/18, Concerns with scale, compatibility, and lack of parking.
 14. Jessica Richmond, received 1/8/18, dated 1/7/18, concerns with scale, height and compatibility of both buildings.
 15. JoZell Johnson, received 1/7/18, dated 1/7/18, concerns with scale, height and compatibility of both buildings.
 16. Allen Buller, 1/8/18, support of preserving the BP. Concerns with design and scale.
 17. Page Stockwell, 1/8/18, Concerns with the height, scale and compatibility.
 18. Eric & Tanya Austin, 1/8/18, concerns with size, scale and massing.
 19. Steve and Laurie Caldwell, 1/8/18, concerns with size and bulk.
 20. Caroline Sheldon, 1/8/18, concerns with height, scale, and character, as well as lack of setbacks and parking.
 21. NWDA, received 1/5/18, dated 1/4/18, support for massing strategy, but concerns with compatibility and height of north building.

22. Vicki Skryha, 1/7/18, Support of preserving the Buck-Prager. Concerns with scale and compatibility of both buildings, lack of setbacks and articulation, basement interface, lack of loading, and bench area on 18th.
23. Richard U'Ren and Annette Jolin, 1/8/18, concern with size, scale and design of proposal.
24. Dragana Milosevic, 1/8/18, concerns with size of proposal and impact on historic integrity of neighborhood, structural integrity of her home, and increase traffic and parking problems.
25. Jill Warren, 1/8/18, handed at hearing, concerns with size, bulk and character, and effect on historic integrity of district. Also concerned with possible pile driving and effect on the structural integrity of her property, and lack of parking.
26. Tony Schwartz, 1/8/18, concerns with size and compatibility.

G. Other

1. Application form
2. Pre-Application Conference Summary notes, held 12/12/17
3. CC Findings, LU 14-210073 DM
4. Staff memo for 1st DAR, 1/3/18
5. Staff presentation, 1/8/18
6. Applicant presentation, 1/8/18
7. Testifiers, 1/8/18

H. After First Hearing

1. Jessica Richman, 1/8/18, historic photo of BP (Ballow & Wright) building.
2. Pamela Lloyd, 1/8/18, concerns with lack of setbacks, parking and loading, as well as mass and character.
3. Kathleen Carter, 1/15/18, concerns with height, scale massing and character.
4. Posting notice #2
5. Posting notice #2, signed confirmation
6. Jessica Richman, 2/1/18, typo in posting notice.
7. Revised Posting notice #2
8. Revised proposal, for 2/26/18
9. Alphabet Context Statement excerpt
10. Final dwgs for 2nd DAR, 2/13/18
11. Agenda for meeting 2/13/18
12. Staff notes from meeting, 2/13/18