



**City of Portland, Oregon**  
**Bureau of Development Services**  
**Land Use Services**  
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Ted Wheeler, Mayor  
Rebecca Esau, Director  
Phone: (503) 823-7300  
Fax: (503) 823-5630  
TTY: (503) 823-6868  
[www.portlandoregon.gov/bds](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** October 16, 2019  
**To:** Boyce Postma | Hacker  
**From:** Staci Monroe, Development Review  
503-823-0624  
**Re:** 19-220010 DA – Live Nation at Zidell Yards  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo October 3, 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. Attached is a summary of the comments provided by the Design Commission at the October 3, 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: <https://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/13216696/>

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 October 3, 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 pre-application, a land use review application, public notification, a Staff Report and a public hearing] 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 formal land use application.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Design Commission  
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Design Commission** design direction provided on October 3, 2019.

Commissioners in attendance on October 3, 2019: Julie Livingston, Don Vallaster, Chandra Robinson, Jessica Molinar, Brian McCarter, Zari Santner

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Context - The proposal needs to do more to relate to the neighborhood on a year-round basis.

Public Realm - The project needs to include a permanent active, urban public space that addresses the river and is accessible to everyone year-round. The quality and treatment of the plaza and edges need to be elevated.

Quality - The large site elements (stage and seating) need to be designed cohesively and be more interesting. More durable materials and year-round landscaping is needed.

### **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

#### Context

- Conceptually, a strong idea that is responding well to the context of Portland. However, struggling with how the project meets guideline A5 (Enhance, Embellish & Identify Areas) primarily due to concerns with public realm issues.
- Concerns with how the project is meeting A5 (Enhance, Embellish & Identify Areas) & C4 (Complement the Context of Existing Buildings). While it blends in with the development on the immediate site (ship dismantling building), it does not complement the more urban, modern development in the district.
- The proposal is totally contained within the lease area and doesn't relate to the larger site (turns its back on Moody, no greenway trail connection). More work needs to be done to be consistent with rest of the site and larger neighborhood.
- The project and its design must work on a year-round basis and it does not appear it has been done very effectively at this point.
- One Commissioner found the materials interesting and contextually appropriate as well as the transitional nature of the proposal suitable for the context it is in.
- One Commissioner found it meeting the Context guidelines.

#### Public Realm

- The public plaza and brewery must provide a great urban public space that addresses the river and is accessible to everyone year-round. The venue could then extend the fencing around all or portions of the plaza and the brewery during events. Study the placement and orientation of the building (towards the river).
- The temporary nature of the project is where it fails. Year-round activation and permanent elements are critical to its success.
- This project provides a great opportunity to incorporate local art.
- While the project is doing well at providing unifying design elements (hops, containers, patterning, lighting), and the radiating layered plaza design is interesting, it is monotonous and the quality and desirability of the public space in winter is very questionable. The transition from the private to public space is also not working.
- If seasonal hops are used there needs to be some layering and more substantial structure.
- The design elements and spaces need to have a winter character as well as summer character.
- The proposal is not meeting the majority of the public realm guidelines including sense of urban enclosure, vibrant streetscape, and reinforcing and enhancing pedestrian ways (given the distance from the street and no greenway trail).

- The project is off to a good start (connecting to Tilikum Bridge, high quality fencing) but has a long way to go.
- There is a conflict with having ultimate flexibility of the public plaza and the quality of the public realm. Once you take away the event elements the plaza is dead space with turf and asphalt.
- The use of solely seasonal landscaping, lack of weather protection, poor quality of ground surface materials, particularly in winter, and proposed signage size and location are all of concern.
- The flatness of the site contributes to its overly large scale even with the extensive way it has been broken up. Changes in grade, permanent water features, art, and trees, are elements that could help define a more permanent and interesting public space.
- Some differentiation in the plantings and hierarchy in the plaza design is needed.
- The lack of trees and canopies is problematic.
- It is very unfortunate that there is not a greenway trail. Adding even an asphalt trail that leads people down from the Tilikum would provide a real public benefit.
- Aggressively programming the space is critical. Start to think about the brewery as the anchor and the relationship with the plaza (weather protection, lighting, etc.) rather than as an edge.
- A larger composite plan with all the details is needed to understand how the event components like the pedestrian and vehicular circulation around the perimeter and drop off-zone functions meet the guidelines.

Quality

- The large elements (stage and seating) need to be designed cohesively and be more interesting.
- The stage is an object in the landscape but is not performing as one yet. It needs to be a much more evocative form.
- Some landscape structure in the ground is needed. Some container planters are okay but not for all.
- The quality of the landscape treatment and edges need to be elevated.
- The quality of materials proposed are not yet meeting the guidelines.
- The movable planter boxes and temporary nature of the landscaping are both of concern.
- The materials of plaza should have its own character that communicates quality and permanence that stands alone without the venue.

General

- The modifications to deviate from the development standards will need to “better meet the guidelines” as required by the approval criteria.

**Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
  1. Original drawing set dated 8/30/19
  2. Applicant memo dated 9/9/19 with project narrative & modifications
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
  1. through 42
- 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
- E. Service Bureau Comments
  1. PBOT dated 9/20/19

2. Trimet dated 10/2/19

F. Public Testimony

1. George Crandall, 10/3, stating opposition due to concerns with growth, noise and global warming.

2. Steve Casey, 10/3/19, stating opposition due to immediate and long-term impacts.

3. 10/3/19 testifier sign-up sheet

G. Other

1. Application form

2. Staff Memo to Design Commission dated 9/26/19

3. Copy of Staff Presentation from 10/3/19 meeting

4. EA 19-161470 PC BDS Staff summary