



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

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 23, 2017
To: Mark Schmidt, HOLST Architecture
From: Staci Monroe 503-823-0624, Development Review
Staci.monroe@portlandoregon.gov
Re: 16-291429 DA – Three Mixed-Use Buildings in Lloyd
Design Advice Request Summary Memo February 16, 2017

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 Design Commission at the February 16, 2017 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 Design 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. It should be understood that these comments address the project as presented on February 16, 2017. 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: Design Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Design Commission** design direction provided on February 16, 2017.

Commissioners in attendance on February 16, 2017:

David Wark
Julie Livingston
Andrew Clark
Don Vallaster
Tad Savinar
Sam Rodriguez

General

- The project, in its current form, was as a non-starter for a couple of Commissioners for reasons stated below.
- The project is big enough to warrant physical massing models. Provide models for the next DAR hearing.
- The Phase 1 project should be represented in the packets for next DAR hearing.

Massing + Architecture

- The 5 over 1 massing across 7-½ blocks is a significant issue.
- More variety in height and more modulation in the massing is needed.
- The building form needs more modulation in height that is a clear and deliberate response to Sullivan's Gulch and not necessarily towers to the west.
- This project is a transition between the two neighborhoods, which provides a lot of opportunity to infuse and inform the massing, design and the pedestrian realm.
- A significant break in the mass is needed, not only at the upper floor but the 1st floor as well.
- The parti is generally okay but the forms are contorted and need to be more simplified.
- The tower previously shown on the cinema site was a nice counterpoint to the 5 over 1 massing in Phase 1.
- Adhering to the 200' x 200' block structure was not critical for all Commissioners. Facades in excess of 200' would need to be appropriately mitigated.
- A huge for-sale market is not being recognized and may be the answer to the limitations associated with the rental type unit, like height.
- This phase has to be exponentially better than Phase 1 in a number of ways including breaking up the massing, varying the height, and materials.
- Laying out the elevations of opposing façades would show how the proposal is responding to existing and future conditions along the street/driveway. Better than a plan view.
- The character of the architecture is not clear.
- A lot of sameness in the architecture. The project should be thought of as 3 separate blocks and 3 separate buildings.
- This is an opportunity to create a unique character of each building, which cannot be slight variations of each other or cookie cutter.
- The building corners are more important than the middle.
- The unique two rounded corners of the property could begin to sculpt the buildings.
- Look at the shape of the corner at SE corner.
- Strong pointed corners are not welcoming.
- There needs to be focal points in the project.

Site Organization

- The sequence and configuration of ground level spaces is not clear.
- There are no obvious visible rules for pedestrians.
- The crosswalk on 16th should align with the plaza.
- Pedestrian connections through the site, and larger area, are critical.
- The pedestrian connection from the east to the mall (currently Sears building) should not conflict with any vehicle access at Sears.

Ground Floor

- The ground floor needs more attention at all three buildings.
- The best parts of Phase 1 were the two linear paths lined with a lot of activity. The south portion along eastern half 15th falls flat in terms of use. The energy of the pedestrian path on Phase 1 needs to carry up 15th across Multnomah.
- The program (plaza) and uses (back-of-house and residential) along the east side of 15th need more thought.
- Maker spaces at the southern end of 15th would be good uses at this location.
- Shifting the amenity space from the plaza to the north end of Building 1 is more appropriate than back-of-house or parking garage entry. This would also allow the lobby to be located off the plaza, which would help activate this public space.
- The programming on 16th works.
- The residential units along 16th make sense.

Colors & materials

- The Lloyd guideline that refers to light colors in the district should be a starting point. Discussions regarding color can begin when more information is provided.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
 - 2. Project Narrative
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. through 31
- 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
- F. Public Testimony - none
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff Memo to Design Commission dated 2/9/17