



City of Portland Design Commission

Design Advice Request

SUMMARY MEMO

Date: May 20, 2019
To: Carl Tully, nbbj
From: Arthur Graves, Design Review
503.823.7803 | Arthur.Graves@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 18-280884 DAR – OHSU | OHSU Hospital Expansion
Design Advice Request Commission Summary Memo – May 02, 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 May 02, 2019 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/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 May 04, 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 III 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 you prepare your Type III Land Use Review Application.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Design Commission
Respondents

Executive Summary. The Commission appreciated the opportunity to discuss the proposal at this early design stage and was generally supportive of the project concept and scale, but had strong concerns with the preferred massing. Additionally, the Commission had primary concerns with how the following: massing-orientation, main entrance and public realm. The Commission also asked for additional study and information to be provided on the proposed parking.

Commissioners Present on May 02, 2019. Commissioners Present: Julie Livingston, Jessica Molinar, Brain McCarter, Sam Rodriguez, Don Vallaster. Commissioners absent: Andrew Clarke, Zari Santner

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

CONTEXT

1. The Commission requested further study and development of the massing and sculpting of the proposal. The Commission noted that the massing and orientation of the building should better serve and integrate with Lower Campus Drive (LCD), adjacent buildings (such as Elks Children's Eye Clinic (ECEC) and Casey Eye), and the surrounding landscape. With this, Commissioners generally preferred Options #3 and #4. In addition:
 - a. Several Commissioners noted that the south wall (facing LCD) was too imposing and should be setback to not detract from the entry sequence and pedestrian realm.
 - b. Commission stated concern for the selected site layout choice (Option 5), and that rejected options (Options 3 and 4) integrated into the site more effectively.
 - c. One Commissioner noted that the design should consider the future light rail station connection.
 - d. Commissioners felt that the porte-cochere appears too compressed, dark, and deep.
 - e. Commissioners felt that views from Kohler Pavilion should not supersede issues and concerns that are unresolved with this building.
 - f. Commissioners agreed that Upper Campus Drive (UCD) was service oriented.
 - g. Commissioners reiterated importance of the building design and views from Terwilliger Boulevard.

PUBLIC REALM

1. Commissioners agreed that the public realm was not well served by the current building's design adjacent to LCD. In particular, the previously mentioned south wall and cavernous porte-cochere, as well as the vehicle access (and curb cuts) need resolution. In addition,
 - a. Commissioners agreed that LCD provided significant public interaction and use (as opposed to UCD).
 - b. Commissioners stated that the ground floor requires additional resolution in regard to entry and pedestrian connections.
 - c. Commissioners stated that the integration of additional setbacks adjacent to LCD would allow for human scale elements such as street trees to improve the public realm.
 - d. Commissioners strongly supported the landscape concept, however, felt that the pedestrian experience overall was being negatively impacted by the mass of the building.

- e. Commissioners suggested that the landscape design better integrate with the building and the building's mass (i.e. stepping down).

QUALITY & PERMANENCE

1. **Exterior materials.** Commissioners supported the material choices feeling they were appropriate and sophisticated, but Commissioners agreed that the overall application could be simplified for a more coherent and cohesive building design. Commissioners felt that resolving the massing would help to resolve concerns with materials. In addition:
 - a. Commissioners noted the impacts of the internal programming on the exterior of the building, resulting in blank walls and diminished views, in particular to the east and south.
 - b. Commissioners felt the west façade treatment and articulation was successful.
 - c. Commissioners stated that the parking façade area treatment was blank and unresolved.
 - d. One Commissioner articulated that the materials appeared “pasted on” and were not transitioning around the building in a coherent manner.
 - e. One Commissioner appreciated the team's successful effort to get 3-dimensionality out of solid panels.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittal
 1. Original Drawings/DAR Submittal Package: 12.20.18
 2. Revised Drawings/DAR Submittal Package, received 4.11.19
 3. Revised Drawings/DAR Submittal Package, received 4.25.19
 4. Final Drawings/DAR Submittal Package, received 5.01.19
 5. Applicant Presentation to the Commission, 5.02.19
- B. Zoning Map (attached)
- C. Drawings
 - 1-101. See Exhibit A-4 (Exhibits C-1, C-5 & C-22 attached)
- 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 emailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 1. Bureau of Transportation
 2. Bureau of Environmental Services
- F. Public Comments
 1. Ed Fischer, President of Homestead Neighborhood Association: 2.26.19, concerns with parking
 2. Anton Vetterlein, Friends of Terwilliger: 5.02.19, concerns with parking
 3. Comment sign-in sheet from 5.02.19
 4. Jackie Phillips: 5.02.19, concerns with parking
 5. Anton Vetterlein, Friends of Terwilliger: 5.02.19, concerns with parking
- G. Other
 1. Application Form

2. Email Correspondence
3. Staff Memo to the Design Commission
4. Staff Presentation to the Design Commission, 5.02.19