



City of Portland Historic Landmarks Commission

Design Advice Request

SUMMARY MEMO

Date: January 28, 2019
To: Historic Landmarks Commission
From: Hillary Adam, Land Use Services
503-823-3581 | hillary.adam@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 18-124279 DA – Rothko Pavilion
Design Advice Request Memo – January 14, 2019

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. Following, is a summary of the comments provided by the Design Commission at the 3rd Design Advice Request on January 14, 2019. 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/record/11686822>.

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 January 14, 2019. 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 3 land use review process [which includes a land use review application, public notification and a Final Decision] 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 we move forward with your Type 3 Land Use Review Application.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Historic Landmarks Commission
Respondents

Commissioners Present. Kristen Minor, Maya Foty, Annie Mahoney, Wendy Chung, Matthew Roman, Ernestina Fuenmayor. Commissioner Andrew Smith was recused.

Executive Summary.

- The Commission offered general support for the larger moves that have been made from the previous design. They noted that:
 - The design is more refined than the previous design.
 - The plazas relate better to the urban landscape.
 - The entrance feels more like a public entrance and more inviting to all, furthering universal access goals.
 - Moving the loading away from the pedestrian realm helps.
 - There is a net improvement to public space.
- There were still some concerns about the character of the pedestrian accessway between SW Park and SW 10th. Commissioners noted:
 - This connection needs to be the best it can be; it needs to be spectacular.
 - A general desire to see the connection be one floor taller in height with one Commissioner stating that the lowest portion of this element should be reduced to the minimum width possible.
 - It feels more deliberate; however, it feels underwhelming and claustrophobic; some said it still feels like a tunnel; doesn't feel inviting.
 - Width may be okay considering the constraints in which there is room to build however, section details through the Whitsell Auditorium and the pedway were requested to gain a full understanding of these constraints and to see if it is possible to introduce stairs between the west plaza and the pedway.
 - The views felt more comfortable from the west with regard to wayfinding.
- It was helpful that the applicant matched their goals to the guidelines but more information on how the design matches to the guidelines is desired.

Summary of Comments. Following is a general summary of Commission comments by issue.

Compatibility of Design.

- The Commission stated that a glass box is the most appropriate and simplest solution with regard to exterior cladding of the additions.
- The Commission requested additional information on how the glass box is taking design cues from the historic buildings; the Commission did not yet see the relationships between the new and the historic.
 - Some Commissioners noted that it felt busy with the different spacing between mullions and the projections from the glass box and different scales though this could be refined and work well. It was noted that the glass box is grabbing too much attention.
 - It was noted that the current design relates better to the Belluschi building with regard to the cornice, frieze, the modules, and the window openings, but that the relationship to the Mark Building needs more work. The proposal needs to be unified with both buildings, or at least more sympathetic to the Mark Building.
 - The proposed height and massing of the loading bay was appreciated as it related to the massing of the adjacent historic building. Concerns were noted about back-painted glazing to obscure the loading bay interior stating there should be consistency in the way the glazing is treated so that it reads the same from the exterior. In the primary glass volume, the window module spacing has a smaller scale as one moves up in levels, but this concept may not work for the loading bay. Instead, use a spacing which works with the door opening.

- Earlier concerns for the additions proximity to the west façade of the Belluschi wing have been alleviated to some degree due to the material treatment and a better understanding of the dimensional constraints.
- It was suggested that eliminating the inset railing at the terrace and allowing the glass box to extend up to serve as a railing would simplify this volume.
- It was noted that if publicly-accessible open space is being taken away for enclosed private space, there should be a grandness and a deliberateness in the design to make up for that loss.

Response to Context.

- The Commission agreed that vertical landscaping between the pedway and the plazas could be reduced for greater visibility and making the pedway more inviting by widening the entries to the pedway. Trees may be appropriate but the use of a planter between the pedway and the rest of the plaza should be reduced to allow as much cross-path travel as possible given the grades. Specifically, the outermost tree at each plaza may be working against the desired open character of these spaces.
- The SE corner of the Mark Building and the SE corner of the pedway need to be more open and generous so there is greater connection between the plaza and these spaces.
- Some concerns noted about the landscaping design – it lacks a sense of progression. The existing Cyprresses have that; could that be retained? It was noted that the path of travel along the Mark Building is too rigid and that the Cyprresses help to soften this experience. It was suggested that landscaping should not be used as a visual screen but to help soften the hardscape.
- One Commissioner asked if there is a way to acknowledge the more southerly connection across SW 10th; for instance, whether or not it could be jogged.
- The pavilion entry needs a very strong gesture; needs to be grander. It was noted that the proposed entry won't be very visible from the SE corner of the site and there needs to be clarity in the hierarchy of entrances as there are two historic entries and now one primary entrance that all users coming from the east are supposed to use. The commission was comfortable with the retention of the Belluschi entrance for use as an occasional entrance.
- The window opening into the Mark Building gallery is greatly appreciated as are the internal changes to the Mark Building to make this a more formal gallery space.
- The Commission suggested that the space within the pedway and under the bridge should be used to give this space back to the public through art as a way to make it feel more inviting.

Loading and the Public Realm (PBOT issues).

- It was agreed that separating the loading from the pedestrian zones is a positive change, but it was also noted that the resultant solution relocates the negative impacts of the loading to a busy street corner. The Commission acknowledged that the proposed loading area is the best spot on this constrained site but that it presents challenges as well and these should be mitigated.
- The Commission supported extending the special paving into the ROW. They noted:
 - Madison was formerly a street which was vacated for public use, so it makes sense for the entire area within the vacated Madison ROW to have a different pavement that leads pedestrians through the site. The Commission did not believe that the same argument could be made for a hotel or other business that desired alternate paving at the entry only where there was no evidence of a street having been vacated.

Site Organization.

- There were some concerns about the character of the east plaza, including:
 - There needs to be a balance between the pedway and the entries.

- The likelihood of it being cast in darkness by the shade of the Eliot Tower; Some concerns about privatization of the publicly accessible areas was noted.
- The Commission appreciated the greater openness of the west plaza but asked if it could be better connected to the pedway and sidewalk, for instance by removing the proposed planters and allowing unimpeded access.
- Commissioners debated about whether or not stairs were needed at the east plaza and eventually noted a level of comfort with regard to the balance of stairs and ramp at this location, particularly after the applicant's explanation of rise and run constraints on the site.
- If possible, a connection between the passage and the plazas should be established via a stair connection or some sort of physical and visual connection to "expand" the realm of the passage into and with the plaza areas.

Major Remodel Issues.

- The Commission noted support for the ground floor windows and ground floor active use Modifications provided the overall solution "sings" and noted that preservation of the historic resources was not a sufficient reason to support these Modifications but that the B.1 approval criteria also had to be met.

Additional Details.

- The Commission requested additional information on:
 - The design of the loading bay door; The Commission suggested it should be consistent with the overall pattern of the addition in which it is located and be of high quality.
 - Curtain wall detailing.
 - Site sections, showing constraints around the Whitsell Auditorium.
 - Information on datums and historic references showing patterns within the existing landmarks and their connection to the proposal. It was noted that the elevations do not show these connections – these should be made apparent.
 - Base (foundation) materials. It was noted that it does not have to be travertine but there should be some relationship.
 - Information on the detailing of the pedway soffit, specifically materials and design details, as well as any lighting proposed.
 - The Commission agreed with public comments that the handrails and other details should be thoughtfully designed rather than off the shelf products. This applies to other elements of the overall design as well. The user experience should be considered when designing these elements.

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
 - 3. Drawing Set for January 14, 2019
- 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
 - 5. Posting notice for January 14, 2019

6. Applicant's statement certifying posting

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, 2018
26. Judith Thompson, in opposition, on August 31, 2018
27. Robert Wright, with suggestions, on October 18, 2018
28. Wendy Rahm, with suggestions for improvement, on January 8, 2019
29. Tad Savinar, with suggestions for improvement, on January 10, 2019
30. B. Story Swett, in opposition, on January 12, 2019
31. Katie Urey, in opposition, on January 12, 2019
32. Diane Lowensohn, in opposition, on January 12, 2019
33. Testifier Sheet, January 14, 2019

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
13. Staff Memo to Commission, dated January 4, 2019
14. Staff Presentation, January 14, 2019
15. Applicant Presentation, January 14, 2019
16. Staff Summary, dated January 29, 2019