



# City of Portland Design Commission

## Design Advice Request

### DISCUSSION MEMO

**Date:** September 27, 2018  
**To:** Portland Design Commission  
**From:** Jill DeCoursey, Design Review  
(503) 823-7314 | [Jill.DeCoursey@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Jill.DeCoursey@portlandoregon.gov)  
Bureau of Development Services | Portland, Oregon  
**Re:** EA 18-210300 DA – Hotel/Residential Development  
Design Advice Request Memo – October 4, 2018

Attached is a drawing set for the Design Advice Request meeting schedule on October 4, 2018. Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

#### I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The concept proposal is for a 250', 23-story building including 11 stories for a new Hyatt Place brand hotel with ground floor public uses and 12 stories for a new residential apartment community (approximately 120 residential units total). The proposed site is a quarter block on the southeast corner of NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW Flanders.

#### II. DEVELOPMENT TEAM BIO

<b>Architect</b>	Li Alligood   Otak, Inc.
<b>Developer</b>	James Wong   Vibrant Cities
<b>Project Valuation</b>	> \$ 2,300,000

#### III. RECOMMENDED DAR DISCUSSION TOPICS

Staff advise you consider the following among your discussion items on October 4, 2018:

##### CONTEXT

1. **Policy.** The following summarizes key policy context as it applies to the subject site.
  - a. **Plan – 2035 Comprehensive Plan.** The concept proposal reflects the new the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements along NW Flanders (from NW 1<sup>st</sup> Ave to NW 24<sup>th</sup> Ave) are planned as part of a PBOT long range Capital Improvement Project.
  - b. **Standards – EXd, Central Employment Zone/Central City Plan District, Pearl Subdistrict.** Though early in the design process, the proposal appears generally compliant with zoning code standards (allowed use, maximum setbacks, parking,

loading, landscaping, windows, etc.) and would likely not require Adjustments or Modifications.

- c. **Streets – TSP Designation.** Both NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW Flanders are City Walkways, Local Service Transit Streets, and Local Service Traffic Streets. NW Flanders is a Major City Bikeway, while NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a City Bikeway.
2. **Natural.** A large silver maple tree is currently located on the northwest corner of the site. This tree is proposed to be removed as part of the concept proposal. The site appears relatively flat.
  3. **Built:** Given the height of the concept proposal, the massing and articulation of the design will be critical in integrating the proposal with the surrounding urban fabric. The project's location adjacent to the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Historic District and the 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue streetcar alignment should factor into the project's design. Please consider the following discussion topics related to massing and the built context of the site.
    - a. The concept proposal includes some articulation at the top of the tower. Additional design consideration should be given to this prominent portion of the building. The north elevation currently lacks massing articulation.
    - b. Balconies are included in the concept proposal on residential floors. The inclusion of balconies is supported. As currently proposed, the balconies appear as tacked on elements, rather than an integrated part of the façade. Integrating the balconies into the massing of the building, would strengthen the proposal.
    - c. Some articulation and glazing are provided on the proposed east facing end wall. Clarification is needed on how glazing will work abutting a property line. The treatment of this end wall will be critical in the project's design approval.
    - d. The future approval criteria for the proposal require that projects integrate the river, and link the community to the river (A1, A1-1). Is there an opportunity at the conceptual, massing level for this proposal to respond to this guideline?

## **PUBLIC REALM**

1. **Site organization:** Generally, the concept proposal is a good starting point for the design of an active and pedestrian-friendly public realm. The generous use of canopies and large percentage of ground level glazing strengthens the proposal. Consider the following topics related to ground floor organization:
  - a. Inactive uses, including stair towers, offices, and mechanical shafts should be moved away from exterior walls.
  - b. In the current proposal there is no exterior entrance to the Café/Restaurant. Clarification is needed on the intended programming of this space. Designing the restaurant as a publicly accessible amenity would increase activation of the public realm. Consider adjusting the ground floor program to allow the restaurant to fill a larger portion of the building exterior.
  - c. The future approval criteria require the incorporation of water features and works of art (A5-3, A5-4). Consideration should be given to how the project can meet these guidelines.
2. **Circulation System.**
  - a. Per 33.266.310, two Type A loading spaces are required for this proposal. As currently proposed, these loading spaces take up a significant portion of the north

ground level façade. Any means to consolidate back of house spaces and limit inactive areas along the sidewalk should be considered.

- b. The concept proposal includes bike parking on a Mezzanine level. It is unclear how building users access this facility.

#### **QUALITY & PERMANENCE**

1. **Exterior materials.** The general proposal for a masonry and glass-heavy façade is appropriate in this location and site context. Consideration should be given to the proportion of glazing to masonry and the nature and quality of the masonry material selected.

#### **IV. FUTURE APPROVAL CRITERIA: *Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines, River District Design Guidelines***

#### **V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

To date, staff has received three public comments (two written, one by phone). The comments include concern with the lack of on-site parking provided, potential traffic congestion, and potential shading of nearby apartments. One commenter supports the height of the development. One commenter opposes the removal of the tree.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Drawings  
Public Comments  
Future Approval Criteria Matrix