



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

Ted Wheeler, Mayor
Rebecca Esau, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 10, 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 August 27, 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 August 27, 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 August 27, 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 August 27, 2018.

Commissioners in attendance on August 27, 2018: Kirk Ranzetta, Kristen Minor, Matthew Roman, Annie Mahoney, Maya Foty, Ernestina Fuenmayor, as well as special guest Design Commissioners Julie Livingston, and Tad Savinar.

General Comments.

- The Commissioners noted that the Portland Art Museum is the most culturally significant space within the city and demands something truly special and worthy of this institution's importance. Because of the building's cultural significance within the city, this project is an opportunity to create something bold that could draw more people to the building. As presented, Commissioners generally agreed that the project design feels tentative and transitional.
- As the City's most significant cultural institution, the face that it presents to the public, how people access the building, and how people use and interact with the spaces around the building matters greatly. Several Commissioners asked for more urban design study, specifically how the project can better illustrate how the project relates to Portland's block structure as well as how views moving towards and through the block have been taken into account.
- The Commission was appreciative of the revised proposal showing a pedestrian connection through the block but noted concerns with its design. Additional comments are below.
- The Commission suggested that a more transparent pavilion would better meet the guidelines than some of the other cladding concepts shown. Additional comments are below.
- The Commission noted that for Modifications and Adjustments that are requested, the resultant development must better meet the approval criteria. Some Commissioners noted that the building does not yet meet any of the guidelines, particularly those related to the pedestrian experience.

Loading.

- A couple Commissioners noted that several modifications are required, thus what is proposed necessitates careful scrutiny to ensure that the proposal better meets the approval criteria. PBOT's flexibility in allowing some loading activities to take place here, in some ways, makes sense, but allowing additional loading activities results in more risks to the public realm guidelines and public safety along Jefferson and 10th. While a better solution had not been identified, the current proposal does not meet guidelines A8, B1, B2, B3.
- Various Commissioners noted that the project is on the cusp of solving the programmatic needs of the Art Museum, but the interventions do not yet address the rest of the city. The whole project needs to be considered holistically and the loading dock is only one element of that. Therefore, it is unlikely that there will be a perfect solution. The overall proposal needs a lot of work in order to *better meet* the approval criteria, which is required to allow loading on Jefferson, but if a truly great design was presented for the pavilion, the plazas, and the pedestrian connection, the loading would, in turn, become more acceptable. Some of the suggestions presented by commissioners for the design team to consider include:
 - The brick wall was appreciated as an urban edge, though it was also suggested that columnar vegetation between the loading space and the sidewalk could block the views of the loading trucks from the pedestrian realm and may require removal of part of the brick wall. A balance between the "softness" of vegetation and an urban solution not obscuring views of the historic architecture is needed.
 - This project could be an opportunity to invigorate the south façade, currently the "least desirable" of all the elevations.
 - A canopy could add scale to the loading dock and help mitigate some of the blankness in the design concept.
 - Potentially, all architectural interventions that occur with this project should have a similar language, i.e. match the exterior treatment of the pavilion (despite the loading dock being a service element).

- An alternate loading design that angled the loading space could resolve some of the issues related to the design of the loading dock.
- A couple Commissioners encouraged a reduced scale and/or recess at the loading dock addition in order to meet approval criterion #9, noting that the current concept obscures the north-south bar plan and cornice line of the Original Belluschi building.
- One Commissioner asked her fellow Commissioners if there was solution where two separate loading areas could better meet the approval criteria. It was acknowledged that re-locating the loading between the buildings, as it is now, would destroy the urbanism of the overall design. One Commissioner noted that maintaining loading in its current location would compromise the pavilion design and having a pavilion that is truly an asset is where the overall proposal needs to go in order for loading on Jefferson (and its attendant Modifications and Adjustments) to meet the approval criteria. It was noted that it was difficult to envision any other option for controlled access given the site constraints. Others agreed.

Public Pedestrian Connection.

- Some Commissioners inquired as to the overall size of the proposed pavilion and asked if the footprint could be reduced to allow for more generous outdoor spaces, including the plazas and pedestrian connection. While the Commissioners understood the program desires at the ground level, it was noted that the ground level lobby seemed to be maxed out and was compromising the public pedestrian connection, which is a very important connection that feels like a squeezed dark tunnel.
- Several Commissioners agreed with the concerns noted in the public comments about the potential risks of the pedestrian connection which would be exacerbated by the current design. One Commissioner noted that even though the connection opens up to a two-story space, it is still a risky space to be in because it is covered for an extensive length and because it is so narrow.
- It was noted that approval criteria A5, C3, C4, A3, B1, B5, C6 were not met with regard to the public spaces, including the pedestrian connection and plazas. One Commissioner noted that even with the inclusion of public art, the south elevation of the connection is largely a blank wall expression; and that the width and height of the connection feels ungenerous and not like a public space. She noted that the same level of care and generosity that is being provided for the interior connections between the two buildings needs to be given to the outdoor spaces, noting that the entry sequence and the pedestrian connection feel inhospitable and ungenerous. Recognizing the multiple design challenges, she noted that the design team is doing an excellent job of exploring ideas but there is still a long way to go toward meeting the approval criteria.
- Several Commissioners challenged the design team to consider what, besides a need to cross through the block, would draw people through the pedestrian connection and encouraged the design team to design it in a way that draws people to it as a space to be seen and visited, not merely utilized. One Commissioner noted that a more integrated approach where the pedestrian connection felt like part of the building rather a passage through the building could resolve design and accessibility issues and noted that landscaping could help draw people through the space.
- Additional comments can be found under East and West Plazas and under Design Expression.

East and West Plazas.

- Several Commissioners recognized the challenges of connecting the two buildings. Several Commissioners asked to see the previous other solutions that had been explored by the design team that got them to this solution as the only one that works. Commissioners requested a better understanding of what these spaces (plazas and pedestrian connection) look like from the pedestrian's perspective from across the street and how pedestrians would approach and interact with these spaces. One Commissioner noted that that the current design concept started from the inside of the building and moved outward and that it is time to consider the space from the outside, including its position within the city, and how people would view and move through the site.
- Several Commissioners noted that the plazas need to be inviting spaces to all potential visitors that allows the Portland Art Museum to shine like the significant institution that it is, that distinguishes the new primary entrance from the historic entries, and also meet

the goals of the museum to maximize accessibility. The current concept did not accomplish this on either side and the east entry did not come across as accessible as it introduced barriers to direct entry.

- Several Commissioners suggested that the solution to accessibility should be located at the interior and believed that the revised entry designs that the design team presented at the meeting were heading in the right direction in terms of internalizing the solutions for resolving the grade changes. It was noted that everybody needs to enter through the same doors and this should drive the design for the east plaza facing the Park Blocks.
- Several Commissioners encouraged an amplification of the new primary entrance so that people know where to go to enter the building. Again, noting the stature of this institution within the city, it was noted that the invitation to enter the building should be extremely clear, graceful, respectful, and inviting to all.
- One Commissioner noted that the current plaza designs isolate and lengthen the pedestrian connection and that the revised designs for the entry were moving in the right direction. He noted that if the plazas were more integrated with the entrance to the pedestrian connection, it would help make the connection feel less long and narrow. One suggestion included relocating the museum entrance to the north end of the plaza at the edge of the pedestrian connection, which would help generate more activity within that space and thus discourage less desirable activities within that area.
- Additional comments can be found under Design Expression.

Design Expression.

- Commissioners were generally in favor of the bypass glazing skin treatment shown as it is cleaner expression; whereas the concepts that reveal the floor plates reveal the level challenges that the building is trying to resolve and feel too heavy. Others agreed, noting that the pavilion needs to remain a delicate connection and remain as light and dematerialized as possible and that being able to view art from the outside is an important part of the program. One Commissioner noted that a more sculptural building could call for a different skin treatment.
- Several Commissioners were intrigued by the idea of the pavilion taking on a different form than the glass box shown. Commissioners noted that a different form could soften the edges of the pedestrian connection and result in a dynamic sculptural piece that could create something wonderful and incredibly dynamic that makes everyone want to be there, while also resolving the circulation challenges, better signal the entry to the museum, and generally better meet the approval criteria in such a way that makes the loading on Jefferson a more supportable aspect of the overall concept.
- One Commissioner noted that the design concept needed to be more thought through and
- cited the Morgan Library addition in New York City as an excellent example of a similar situation for a modern addition to a historic building, noting that how this pavilion touches the two historic buildings is very important. One Commissioner referenced the Aspen Art Museum which is a glass box that features an outer layer of woven wood and acts as a lantern at night. He noted that the context is different but there may be elements worth exploring. One Commissioner noted that with regard to the design of the pavilion, the pedestrian connection, and the plazas, universal access could be provided through a more integrated approach and referenced the architecture of the Central University of Venezuela, where ramps are integrated into the overall design of the building and are part of the architecture.
- One Commissioner suggested there should be more information as to how the proposed pavilion fits within its neighborhood context. He noted that the Historical Society across the Park Blocks has challenges with blankness and this pavilion has the opportunity to really draw all of the attention and be the jewel that shines the brightest in the Park Blocks, which could be a great thing for the museum and for the City.

Historic Entry.

- The Commissioners agreed that the historic Belluschi entry needs to be repurposed for active uses, not closed off to public access via a cable or fence. It was suggested that the historic entry be repurposed as a place that people can go, or serve as a pedestal for art. While suggested by one Commissioner, replacement of the original doors was generally discouraged.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. Drawing Set for April 9, 2018
 - 2. Drawing Set for August 27, 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
 - 12. Holly Hansen, with concerns, received August 14, 2018
 - 13. John Spencer of the Urban Design Panel (forwarded by Kirk Ranzetta), with concerns, received August 23, 2018
 - 14. Paul Lifschey, in support, received August 26, 2018
 - 15. Nancy Catlin, in support, received August 26, 2018
 - 16. Deanna Mueller-Crispin, with concerns, received August 26, 2018
 - 17. Holly Hansen, with concerns, received August 26, 2018
 - 18. Holly Hansen, with concerns, received August 27, 2018
 - 19. Katie Urey, with concerns, received August 27, 2018
 - 20. Testifier Sheet, August 27, 2018
 - 21. Walter Weyler, in support, received at hearing August 27, 2018
 - 22. Wendy Rahm, with concerns, received at hearing August 27, 2018
 - 23. Judith Marks, with concerns, received at hearing August 27, 2018
 - 24. Peter Meijer of the AIA Historic Resources Panel, in support, received at hearing August 27, 2018
 - 25. Lincoln Tuchow of the Architectural Heritage Center, with concerns, received at hearing August 27, 2018bcxzp
- 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
 - 8. Staff Memo to Commission, dated August 15, 2018
 - 9. Hennebery Eddy Project Narrative, Dated August 16, 2018
 - 10. Staff Presentation, August 27, 2018
 - 11. Applicant Presentation, August 27, 2018
 - 12. Staff Summary, dated September 10, 2018