



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: April 23, 2018
To: TIMOTHY EDDY, HENNEBERY EDDY ARCHITECTS
From: Hillary Adam, Land Use Services
Hillary.adam@portlandoregon.gov / 503-823-3581
Re: 18-124279 DA – Rothko Pavilion
Design Advice Request Summary Memo April 9, 2018

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 April 9, 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. It should be understood that these comments address the project as presented on April 9, 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 for your next Design Advice Request meeting on July 9, 2018 with the Commission.

Encl:
Summary Memo

*Cc: Historic Landmarks Commission
Respondents*

This memo summarizes **Historic Landmarks Commission** design direction provided on July 9, 2018.

Commissioners in attendance on July 9, 2018: Kirk Ranzetta, Kristen Minor, Matthew Roman, Annie Mahoney, Wendy Chung, Maya Foty, Ernestina Fuenmayor

General Comments.

- The Commission requested that the City Attorney provide guidance as to what the city Council Ordinance does and does not allow with regard to construction within the SW Madison vacated street. It was suggested that all past ordinances be reviewed to clarify whether all features of the vacated street have been considered with regard to whether or not they are required and/or allowed to remain or go away. One Commissioner stated that the sculpture garden is an important feature and wanted to know if it is required to be kept as a public benefit; she noted that the current Ordinance was not clear on that fact. ***Staff will follow up with what is and is not allowed per the Ordinance history prior to the July 9th Design Advice Request.***
- The Commission noted that the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate how Adjustments and Modifications requested meet the approval criteria.
- The Commission requested that the entire length of the facades be shown in elevation in order to understand how the hierarchy of entrances will be communicated.
- One Commissioner noted that this new intervention needs to be a part of the City; it needs to be a unifying piece that gives something back to the City. This is not an infill project in a typical or atypical block, this is an infill of what used to be a right-of-way. Start from the premise that the project should be understandable as such from far above as well as from street level.
- The Commission expressed support and appreciation for the letters and comments received from the public, expressing particular gratitude for the Design Commission’s comments and interest in the proposal.
- One Commissioner noted that the Commission often looks at just the building, not the street pattern, but because this building has evolved over time, how people use the spaces need to be considered. She noted that this could be a great opportunity.

Design Expression.

- The Commission agreed that a glassy expression is the appropriate response for a new structure occupying the space between these two brick Landmarks. It was noted that the blocky brick buildings express the block structure and we want to continue to see between them. One Commissioner noted that with a glass exterior, the old exterior façades become new interior walls that can be seen from the outside.
- A couple Commissioners noted that the building seemed wedged in between the two existing buildings and doesn’t relate to the existing buildings. One Commissioner noted that the applicant was careful about where the new insertion touched the existing buildings but there is no sense that this used to be a street.
- One Commissioner noted that the Belluschi building has been added onto over the years and this new pavilion could unfortunately fall into the pattern of just being

another small, additive piece. The overall open space between the two masonry blocks must first and foremost be unified, in a bolder or more linear move.

- Another commissioner noted that the figure ground of the 1932 Belluschi building is iconic and that filling in the spaces behind the bar with loading and stair messes with that plan diagram.
- A couple Commissioners noted concerns with the glass stair tower, stating that it was not cohesively integrated with the building in that it was disconnected and projected above everything else and just adds another element to the overall design. There was concern with the stair tower's location immediately behind the 1932 Belluschi building. One Commissioner stated that she was open to a glassy stair tower because it bookends the one on the Mark building, but added that it would help if it wasn't so proud.
- One Commissioner stated that it would be nice to see an evolution of the design decisions.

Loading.

- All Commissioners stated concerns with the proposed loading location and stated a desire to see alternatives.
- Two Commissioners noted concerns with the amount of paved site area along Jefferson needed for all the vehicle maneuvering, and at the corner, adding that the lack of landscaping is also a concern.
- One Commissioner noted that he was concerned with the potential that trucks would hit and damage the existing building.
- One Commissioner stated that she would like to see if there is an option from Main Street. One Commissioner stated that she would be open to a loading bay punched through the north wall of the Mark building along SW Main Street; another Commissioner stated that it would be better to not punch a hole in the historic wall. A couple Commissioners noted that Main has lower traffic volume and is sometimes closed to traffic.
- One Commissioner noted that the area proposed for landscaping is especially attractive today.
- If loading is ultimately accepted on Jefferson, a couple Commissioners stated that they were open to the use of travertine as an exterior cladding material for a new addition, as proposed, for the loading bay, provided that it was detailed in a different way than the existing building.

Public Access.

- The Commission generally stated that there needs to be a linear open-air connection through the pavilion, connecting SW Park and SW 10th at the ground level. Only one Commissioner stated that she was open to an enclosed structure *if necessary*, but preferred open access all the way through. The Commission also noted that this would alleviate a lot of the public's concerns with the proposal.
- The Commission noted that the courtyard area could be covered with connections between the buildings above but allowing open access at the ground level. The commission noted that in order to gain approval the proposal has to meet the guidelines, including A3 *Respect the Portland Block Structure*.

- One Commissioner noted that the courtyard is a special moment for pedestrians who walk through here and that if doors were introduced, blocking access, pedestrians probably would not walk through here; therefore, the connection between SW Park and SW 10th needs to be generous and feel like it's part of the city so that pedestrians feel welcome.
- One Commissioner noted that this new structure should resolve issues related to the vacated street before the connections between the Landmarks are addressed. She noted concern that the access goes through the building and was not convinced that the building couldn't work without open access at the ground level.
- One Commissioner stated that at the very least there should be an open-air portal between the buildings in order to maintain clear and free access between SW Park and SW 10th. Other Commissioners noted that it is not clear that this building is intended to be publicly accessible at the ground level; the proposal needs to be able to clearly communicate that this space is publicly accessible.
- One Commissioner noted that the current design does not equitably support the accessibility tenet of the project goals as the stair and elevator would need to be integrated and away from the 1932 building. She also stated that the original entry should be maintained as a primary entry.
- Another Commissioner stated that if accessibility is important that needs to be made clearer. She noted that the current design disrupts access; the entries should not be offset, access through the site needs to be clear and easily readable.
- One Commissioner noted that the pavilion structure was rather large and did not need to be this large based on the extent of uses shown in the drawings. She noted that the drawings show a lot of areas as "open to below" and all that is really needed is a connection between the two buildings. She noted that it defies logic that the building would be kept open to the public.
- One Commissioner stated that the "Community Commons" should be outdoors.

Major Remodel.

- The Commission expressed support for a Modification to ground floor windows in order to preserve the historic facades of the buildings but noted that the burden where a new element is increasing the nonconformity.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. Drawing Set for April 9, 2018
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 2. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 3. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments

1. PBOT Pre-Application Conference Response

F. Public Testimony

1. Wendy Rahm, in opposition, received April 3, 2018
2. Mary Vogel, in opposition, received April 4, 2018
3. Elizabeth Hawthorne, in opposition, received April 5, 2018
4. Portland Design Commission, with concerns, received April 9, 2018
5. Katie Urey, Oregon Walks, in opposition, received April 9, 2018
6. Geoffrey Wren, in opposition, received April 9, 2018
7. Testifier Sheet, April 9, 2018
8. Tom Nielsen, in opposition, received at hearing April 9, 2018
9. Katie Urey, in opposition, received at hearing April 9, 2018
10. Robert Wright, in opposition, received at hearing April 9, 2018
11. Judith Marks, in opposition, received at hearing April 9, 2018

G. Other

1. Application form
2. Staff Memo to Commission, dated March 28, 2018
3. Staff Presentation, April 9, 2018
4. Applicant Presentation, April 9, 2018
5. 2017 Ordinance #188721
6. 1968 Ordinance #127882
7. Staff Summary, dated April 23, 2018