



# City of Portland Design Commission

## Design Advice Request

### DISCUSSION MEMO: DAR #2

**Date:** June 20, 2019  
**To:** Portland Design Commission  
**From:** Arthur Graves, Design Review  
503.823.7803 | [Arthur.Graves@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Arthur.Graves@portlandoregon.gov)  
**Re:** EA 18-280884 DA – OHSU Expansion  
Design Advice Request Memo – June 27, 2019

Attached is a drawing set for the Design Advice Request meeting scheduled on June 27, 2019. Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

#### I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

This is the second DAR for the new 14-story building (that includes 3 skybridges) located on the OHSU Campus, immediately west of the new Elks Children's Eye Clinic.

The feedback provided by the Design Commission from the first DAR, on May 02, 2019, focused primarily on: massing; integrating the building into the site; pedestrian connections; the pedestrian realm; and proposed façade articulation. Revisions have been made and are discussed in detail below.

#### CONTEXT

1. DAR #1 Commission comments include:

- a. Concern that the south facing wall was too imposing, and massive, and should be set back to detract from the entry sequence and pedestrian realm.

DAR #2 Response: The mass of the south elevation is still significant, although the revised design has eroded the elevation back, from the 4<sup>th</sup> level down, to provide for greater light, landscaping and visibility into the building's main entry.

- b. Concern that Option #5 was not as well integrated into the site as other Options (#3 and #4).

DAR #2 Response: Due to site constraints discussed at DAR #1 the massing remains largely unchanged. The increased erosion of the south elevation allows for additional landscaping and plaza area along the south and east elevations.

- c. Concern that the proposal consider future light rail connections.

DAR #2 Response: Revised drawings do not address future light rail connections.

- d. Concerns that the porte-cochere was too cavernous, compressed and unwelcoming.

DAR #2 Response: The porte-cochere continues to be significantly set back and deep. However, this area and depth has partially been reduced (at the south east corner) and previously mentioned eroding of the building mass provides additional landscaping and visibility into the area.

- e. Concerns that views from Kohler Pavilion were superseding issues and concerns that are unresolved with this building.

DAR #2 Response: Views from Kohler Pavilion continue to be expressed in drawings as meeting Guidelines.

- f. Agreement that Upper Campus Drive (UCD) be service oriented.

DAR #2 Response: Revised drawings maintain the same UCD program as shown in DAR #1.

- g. Concerns with overall design as it relates to views from Terwilliger Boulevard.

DAR #2 Response: As viewed from Terwilliger Boulevard the building massing had largely remained the same. Proposed material changes may better integrate the building into the site.

**Design Commission should focus on the following issues:** While massing has changed slightly on the south elevation it has remained mostly unchanged; integration of the building to the site; addressing future light rail connections; sense of entry regarding the building mass and porte-cochere; response to porte-cochere size and depth; massing and views regarding Kohler Pavilion and Terwilliger Blvd; proposed skybridge design and location.

## PUBLIC REALM

1. DAR #1 Commission comments include:

- a. Agreement that Lower Campus Drive (LCD) provides the majority of public interaction and use to the site.

DAR #2 Response: Revised drawings provide additional pedestrian connections, landscaping and vehicle organization along LCD.

- b. Concern with the ground floor entry and pedestrian connections.

DAR #2 Response: The massing of the building has been set back and pedestrian and vehicle areas have been reorganized to provide additional pedestrian connections and reduced depth in the drop-off zone. However, the porte-cochere continues to be very recessed while providing mostly accommodations for vehicles. The majority of the south elevation continues to be devoted to vehicle movement with pedestrian connections remaining unresolved.

- c. Concern with setting the building back to allow for additional human scale elements along LCD.

DAR #2 Response: Revised drawings step the building back providing improved transition to the pedestrian realm while also allowing additional landscaping for improved human scale features.

- d. Support for the landscape concept with concern that the pedestrian experience is diminished by the building's mass. Concern that the landscape concept better integrate with the building.

DAR #2 Response: The eroded mass along the south elevation provides additional defined pedestrian area and landscaping from the previous design. The landscape concept better integrates into the building main entry sequence.

**Design Commission should focus on the following issues:** Pedestrian comfort with revised massing shifts; pedestrian connections; proposed landscaping; pedestrian and vehicle circulation into the site.

## QUALITY & PERMANENCE

1. DAR #1 Commission comments include:

- a. Concern with internal programming resulting in blank walls and diminished views, in particular to the east and south.

DAR #2 Response: The programming of the building has remained largely the same. Revised drawings state that maximum glazing is oriented to east facing views.

- b. Concern with the parking façade area treatments being blank and unresolved.

DAR #2 Response: The parking façade has been stepped back with exterior treatment being an “extruded louver blade with a wood grain veneer finish”.

- c. Concern with the façade materials appearing specific to each elevation and “pasted on”, with poor transitions from one elevation to another.

DAR #2 Response: The façade articulations have been simplified and more uniformly integrated. The previously mentioned “extruded louver blade with a wood grain veneer finish” also wraps around the building from the south elevation parking levels to the east elevation of the building.

**Design Commission should focus on the following issues:** Proposed blank walls and diminished views; treatment of the parking facades and wood veneer, current façade articulations.

## II. DEVELOPMENT TEAM BIO

Architect	Carl Tully   NBBJ
Owner's Representative	Ed Trotter   OHSU
Project Valuation	\$230,000,000

## III. FUTURE APPROVAL CRITERIA:

- The [Marquam Hill Design Guidelines](#), and the [Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines](#) (because the project will be visible from Terwilliger Boulevard).

Staff advises you consider the following among your discussion items on June 27, 2019:

## IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

To date, staff has received two public comments. Both comments are concerning with the proposed additional on-site parking which is not within the purview of this design review. A Marquam Hill Parking Review will be required.

## ATTACHMENTS

Drawings | Public Comments | Future Approval Criteria Matrix