



City of Portland Design Commission

Design Advice Request

SUMMARY MEMO

Date: June 1, 2019
To: Amanda Bryant | Mithun
From: Hannah Bryant, Design Review
503.823.5353 | Hannah.Bryant@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 18-281575 DAR – 2505 NE Pacific Street – Pepsi Blocks Phase One
Design Advice Request Commission Summary Memo – May 23, 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 23, 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 23, 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 supported the proposed design direction. The simple massing with punched openings serves as an excellent backdrop for the existing Pavilion. The design direction for the plaza and woonerf are consistent with the Planned Development approval and the Community Design Guidelines.

Commissioners Present. Sam Rodriguez, Don Vallaster, Julie Livingston, Jessica Molinar, Brian McCarter. *Commissioners absent: Zari Santner, Andrew Clarke.*

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

CONTEXT

1. **Massing & Architectural Expression.** The current straightforward architectural expression is aligned with the direction provided by the Commission through the Planned Development DARs and LU discussions. The transparency at the ground level is important.
 - a. **Building Length.** The Mews is well-located to break up the mass of Building A.
 - b. **Response to Pavilion.** Building A is successfully serving as a backdrop to the plaza and the Pavilion. Retaining the staggered window pattern and adding roll-up doors is a good adaptation of the existing building.
 - c. **Materials and detailing.** The Commission supports using different materials between the two wings of Building A, so it contributes to a diverse neighborhood avoids a campus-like feel. Building A will still need more fine-grain detail/articulation to keep from feeling too massive and to meet Guideline D7 – Blending into the Neighborhood.
 - d. **Entries.** The Commission questioned whether the two wings of Building A should have a single main entrance, or whether both wings should have their own entry lobbies.

PUBLIC REALM

1. **Mews.** The chamfer opening into the Mews is a good move. The precedent images for the Mews are active, commercial spaces with an implied ceiling. However, this Mews is lined with less active uses that do not contribute to the same fine-grained spaces. The townhouses on the west side of Building A are set back and up above the sidewalk – both dimensions are critical to successful ground floor residential.
2. **Work/Live Units.** The Commission has concerns about the success of work/live units. The design as presented could be separated and seems to support the most flexibility of uses. The Commission supported this design.
3. **Parking and Loading.** The Commission supported the location of the parking garage entrance. It supported the concept of Adjusting the on-site loading if PBOT supports a loading space in the right-of-way. It has concerns about the location of the Type B space, which detracts from the public realm.

QUALITY & PERMANENCE

1. **Exterior materials.** The Commission supported the simple material palette as discussed at this DAR. It celebrates the internalized balconies as a stronger response to guidelines than additive balconies.
2. **Coherency.** Simple massing highlights the existing Pavilion. Proposal is very coherent and strong.

MODIFICATIONS + ADJUSTMENT

1. **Transit Street Main Entrance Modification.** Approving this existing condition to facilitate the adaptive reuse of the historic Pavilion building is “the best Modification ever.”
2. **Loading Adjustment.** Supported. Less land given to loading is better.
3. **Loading Space Landscaping Modification.** Further exploration of this loading space is needed before this Modification can be discussed.
4. **Bike Rack Spacing Modification.** Supported.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
 1. Original Submittal
 2. Revised Submittal
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 1. DAR Submittal for May 23, 2019
- D. Notification
 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 1. Applicant’s statement certifying posting
 2. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 1. Portland Bureau of Transportation, May 31, 2019
- F. Public Testimony: None
- G. Other
 1. Application form
 2. Staff memo to Design Commission, dated May 14, 2019