

City of Portland, Bureau of Development Services
Type III Design Review
Alamo Manhattan Blocks Mixed-Use Development

Applicant:

Alamo Manhattan
3012 Fairmont street, Suite 100
Dallas, TX 75201
Contact: Wade Johns

Project team:

River Blocks Architect
WDG Architecture Dallas, PLLC
2001 Bryan Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75201
Contact: Shaney Mullen

City Blocks Architect
Hensley Lamkin Rachel, Inc. Architecture and Planning
4881 Quorum Drive, Suite 550
Dallas, TX 75254
Contact: Jeancarlo Saenz

Civil Engineer
OTAK, Inc
808 SW 3rd Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97204
Contact: Mike Peebles

Landscape Architect
Linda Tycher & Associates
11411 N. Central Expressway, Suite V
Dallas, TX 75243
Contact: Linda Tycher

Location: Block 41, 42, 44, and 45 in the South Waterfront District

Map:

Zoning: CXd with design overlay
Plan Dist: Central City Plan District version 3/1/17
Neighborhood: South Portland NA
Business District: Downtown Retail Council

ALAMO MANHATTAN BLOCKS MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT NARRATIVE:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed development consists of four new multi-story, mixed-use buildings on Block 41, 42, 44, and 45 in the South Waterfront neighborhood.

Two high-rise buildings are proposed on Block 41 and Block 44, these blocks are bounded by a Greenway along the Willamette river to the east, SW River Parkway to the west, SW Lane to the north, and SW Lowell to the south. Two mid-rise buildings are proposed on Block 42 and Block 45, these are bounded by SW River Parkway to the east, SW Bond to the west, SW Lane to the north, and SW Lowell to the south. SW Abernethy cuts across both Block 42 and Block 45.

The development will also include four levels of above grade parking for Block 41 and 44 and one level of below-grade parking and one level at grade for Block 42 and 45. Commercial retail spaces are provided along SW Bond, SW Abernethy, SW River Parkway.

The project will have a total combined of 1,200 rental apartments that include an inclusionary housing component.

PROJECT SUMMARY RIVER BLOCKS

Block 41	Program SF
Amenity	8,080 SF
Commercial	3,500 SF
Core/ Circulation	64,630 SF
Leasing/ Lobby	4,180 SF
Parking	92,950 SF
Storage	2,190 SF
Residential	298,640 SF
Utility/ Service	12,410 SF
Total Gross Square Feet	486,580 GSF
Total Outdoor Amenity	29,450 SF

Block 44	Program SF
Amenity	6,920 SF
Commercial	2,530 SF
Core/ Circulation	64,460 SF
Leasing/ Lobby	3,850 SF
Parking	96,090 SF
Storage	2,510 SF
Residential	308,050 SF
Utility/ Service	8,030 SF
Total Gross Square Feet	495,240 GSF
Total Outdoor Amenity	21,650 SF

Residential Units Mix

Block 41	
<u>Unit Type</u>	<u>No. Units</u>
Townhouse	12
One Bedroom	252
Two Bedroom	72
Penthouse	12
Total	348

Block 44	
<u>Unit Type</u>	<u>No. Units</u>
Townhouse	5
One Bedroom	275
Two Bedroom	67
Penthouse	12
Live/ Work	4
Total	363

PROJECT SUMMARY CITY BLOCKS

Block 42	Program SF
Amenity	5,369 SF
Commercial	8,495 SF
Core/ Circulation	26,356 SF
Leasing/ Lobby	3,032 SF
Parking	62,513 SF
Residential	157,671 SF
Total Gross Square Feet	263,436 SF
Total Outdoor Amenity	14,475 SF

Block 45	Program SF
Amenity	3,363 SF
Commercial	7,558 SF
Core/ Circulation	32,812 SF
Leasing/ Lobby	3,009 SF
Parking	79,585 SF
Residential	211,066 SF
Total Gross Square Feet	337,939 SF
Total Outdoor Amenity	18,722 SF

Residential Units Mix

Block 42	
<u>Unit Type</u>	<u>No. Units</u>
Studio	30
One Bedroom	176
<u>Two Bedroom</u>	<u>20</u>
Total	226

Block 45	
<u>Unit Type</u>	<u>No. Units</u>
Studio	20
One Bedroom	150
Two Bedroom	55
Three Bedroom	36
<u>Live / Work</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	263

ZONING INFO

Base zone standards: CX - Central Commercial

Plan district standards: Central city plan district, South Waterfront sub district Version 03.01.2017

Overlay standards: d – Design zone / g – Greenway zone

Zoning Summary

Code Section	Allowed / Required	Compliance	
33.130.100 - Primary uses	Household living, Retail Sales and Services, + more	Complies	Use is apartment housing and retail
33.510.200 - FAR	Block 41 and 44 5:1 + 3.1 (bonus FAR) Block 42 and 45 6:1	Complies	Block 41 = 6.65 Block 44 = 6.06 Block 42 = 4.39 Block 45 = 4.11
33.510.205 - Height	Block 41 and 44 75' (top of bank) / 125' (standard) / 250' (bonus) Block 42 and 45 125' (standard)	Complies	Block 41 = 250'-0" Block 44 = 250'-0" Block 42 = 74'-0" Block 45 = 74'-0"
33.130.215 - Setbacks	Min. setback = 0' Max. setback = no limit	Complies	
33.130.215 – Building Coverage	No limit	Complies	
33.510.215 – Required Building Lines	Street sides - Building must extend to the street to lot line min. 75% or extend within 12' and commit space to active use	Complies	Buildings either extends to lot line or the sidewalk extends to the building face and is within 12' <i>See ground floor plans.</i>
33.510.252 A – Special Height Corridor	There are no special building height corridors per Map 510-15.	Complies	
33.510.252 A – North / South dimension above 75'	The portion of a building above 75' may be 125' in width in the north / south direction.	Complies	Block 41 and 44 <i>See plans above the 7th level.</i> Block 42 and 45 are below 75'

33.130.250 D – Street-facing facades	Main entrance visible and identifiable from the street; 15% of street-facing façade is window or entrances	Complies	Main entrances for proposed buildings are easy identifiable; more than 15% of facades are windows or entrances. <i>See Elevations and ground floor windows calculations.</i>
33.510.225 – Ground Floor Active Use	SW Bond, SW Abernethy, SW River Parkway, SW Lowell and, partial corner of SW Lowell and Greenway - 50% of wall facing a sidewalk, plaza, or public open space / 12' min. height / 25' min. depth / Uses: retail, residential Per Map 510-7	Complies	<i>See exhibits in Appendix</i>
33.510.220 - Ground Floor Windows 33.130.230.B.2 from base zone code	50% of length and 25% of ground level wall area between ground and 9ft. Requirement does not apply to the walls of residential units.	Complies	<i>See exhibits in Appendix</i>
33.510.221 – Windows Above the Ground Floor	SW Bond - 15% of the street-facing facades wall area above 9'	Complies	<i>See exhibits in Appendix</i>
33.510.116. – Retail limitations	Up to 40,000 SF allowed per retail use. Per Map 510-11	Complies	Total retail provided is less than 40,000 SF for each use proposed.
33.245 – Inclusionary Housing	The regulations of this chapter apply to buildings with 20 or more dwelling units.	Complies	<i>Calculations to be provided at time of permit.</i>
33.130.240 – Pedestrian Standards	Connect main entrance to adjacent street and internal areas	Complies	Main entrances directly connect to adjacent streets and interior building corridor. <i>See ground floor plans.</i>

33.510.252.B – Accessways	SW Lane – buildings to setback min. of 30' from centerline of accessway	Complies	<i>See site plan.</i>
33.130.225 – Landscape areas	none	Complies	
33.130.225 - Fences	< 50% obscuring, max 8'; > 50% obscuring, 3'-6" max	Complies	No fences provided
33.130.235 - Screening	Garbage and ground level mechanical equipment	Complies	Trash and ground level equipment is within building. <i>See ground floor plans.</i>
33.510.267.F.6.b – Parking Access	Parking access on other streets. New motor vehicle access to any parking structure is not allowed on the streets shown on Map 510-9.		<i>See design modifications and exhibits in appendix</i>
33.266.110 / 33.510.267 – Parking required (vehicles)	No min. parking requirement Max ratio allowed = 1.7	Complies	<i>See floor plans.</i>
33.266.130 – Table 266-4	Min. parking space = 8'-6" x 16'-0" Min. 2-way Aisle = 20'	Complies	<i>See floor plans.</i>
33.266.220 – Bicycle parking	Short-term residential = 1 per 20 units Long-term residential = 1.5 per unit Short / Long-term retail = 2 each	Complies	<i>See exhibits in Appendix</i>
33.266.220 – Figure 266-11	Bike Parking = 2'x6'	Complies	<i>See design modifications and exhibits in appendix</i>
33.266.310 - Loading	Two spaces 18'x9'x10' clear	Complies	Two spaces provided inside garages. <i>See floor plans.</i>
33.130.310 – Recycling Areas	Recycling area required for residential and retail	Complies	Recycle room provided on garage level. <i>See floor plans.</i>

DESIGN REVIEW RESPONSES

Narrative response to hearing on December 12, 2019

Future Items Requested by Commission

- Provide a diagram showing the setbacks of buildings and towers from the back of the greenway for the two developments to the north (Meriwether & Atwater)

Noted and provided.

- Future drawing sets - Include a map/key for sheets with enlarged details so the location of the detail on the large site can be understood.

Noted and provided.

Block 41

- Commission supported concerns identified in the Staff Report. Refer to this document for when making project revisions.

Noted.

- Plaza next to garage is not supported. Needs to be located adjacent to active interior spaces and away from vehicle access points to avoid pedestrian & car conflicts. Commission encouraged studying other plaza concepts like combining the plaza spaces of the eastern buildings, since neither are working well on their own, and putting the plaza at outer edge on Abernathy and/or Lowell.

Plaza moved to lane street (north side of building) next to active lobby uses. Extra width provided at retail space sidewalks at Abernathy to strengthen that plaza area as well.

- Corner & ground floor treatment on APP05 is the most successful & meets the guidelines in terms of ground floor height, amount & design of storefront, canopy depth & height. These qualities should be referenced when making revisions along River pkwy to the non-residential spaces.

Corner & ground floor treatment extended to NW corner residential entrance as well.

- Appears to be no grade separation between residential units and accessways. They need to be elevated with a layered landscape setback. If not elevated a significant landscape buffer is needed.

Finish floor elevations revised to provide between 1'-3' of grade separation between residential units and accessways.

- Ground floor residential units along the greenway appear to be sinking into grade. If accurate image, not supported.

The renderings were done in error and did not show grades accurately. The residential units along the greenway have between 3'-5.5' of vertical separation.

- There needs to be a richness and layering of landscaping to provide privacy to units with patios along the greenway.

Bike trail moved away from building and building moved away further from bike trail.
Walks between units and bike trail removed.

- Awnings should wrap the non-residential spaces along River pkwy at the north & south ends.

Canopies added to design.

- Maker space is too small and will not be successful, especially without other commercial spaces.

Maker space removed.

- Orient active uses towards river and greenway to acknowledge the public amenity of the greenway.

After wrapping the garage with either units or corridor, there is not enough room left over to provide additional uses.

- Needs to have a hierarchy of building entrances.

Revised location of main building entrance away from driveway and created a clearer hierarchy with plaza, recessed entrance, and canopy.

- Weakest part of podium is along the greenway:

Continued language of lane and Abernethy to greenway side.

- Raised brick frames do not meet guidelines (lack coherency and scale).

- No raised brick frames on building.

- More stepping of the façade is needed.

- Additional stepping added.

- The tower needs to be more setback from the podium (minimum of 3' to 4' discussed) to strengthen the podium and better distinguish the façade of the tower.

Minimum 3'-6" now provided. At residential entrance we now show a ~17' step.

- No support for garage entry where tower reaches the ground. Tower base signifies a major building entry like to a lobby with a taller ground floor. Relocated parking entry should be recessed and not emphasized.

Noted and moved.

- Tower needs to be simplified:

- A similar language among the facades would be a way to achieve this.

- Further refinement and unification of building language on all four sides.

- Decreasing the solid cladding and increasing the glazing on the tower would complement the context.

- Added glazing to the west and north sides.

- Extension of the brick frame on the east façade of the tower at the step adds to the mass and looks heavy.
 - No brick frame at this location but metal frame removed to lighten the load.
- Top of the building is still complicated with a couple of forms married together. Not emphasizing the qualities of a slab tower, but almost there.
 - The detailing for the top of the building has been greatly simplified. Language now consistent across entire length of crown. Found other areas of inconsistent design language and corrected those areas.
- If a bus stop is needed a preference near Lane was expressed.
 - They plan to place a bus stop on the west side of block 42 (not near block 41).

Block 44

- Plaza is not successful as proposed:
 - Consider the depth (shallower might be better)
 - Made the plaza 8' shallower.
 - Needs active edges, including entries from live/work units.
 - Live/work now fully activate south half of plaza.
 - Rethink plaza landscaping at south end along Live/work.
 - Plaza redesigned.
 - Could be more than tables and chairs. Could be treated more for families.
 - Plaza redesigned and fountain added.
 - How east wall is treated is critical.
 - East wall will be greenwall. Canopy design ties in with language on portion of wall to create entrance to garage.
 - Consider combining with plaza to north or shift to Lowell.
 - Plaza is important to create hierarchy, emphasis primary building entrance, and separate vehicles from plaza.
- Greenway edge:
 - Footprint needs to erode more at the NW corner.
 - Footprint was eroded by 9' at the corner at the base and then further erodes at I4.
 - Too harsh & needs to be soften with great outdoor spaces.

- We eliminated the harsher design languages used and brought the design language used on the Abernethy onto the greenway side. Balconies were added to activate the greenway. Paving removed and planting added.
 - Not enough transition between public and private spaces.
 - Landscape area added to create a greater barrier between building and the bike path. The residential units along the greenway have on average about 2.5'-3.5' of vertical separation.
- Maker spaces need to be more inviting to the public both visually and physically (add doors). Wrapping them along a portion of Lowell would support was recommended.
 - Doors and garage doors (alternating) now shown. Increased number of maker spaces.
- Study the canopy height as it appears to high with solid panel or louver above. Should be more pedestrian scaled with glazing above.
 - Canopies are now at around 11' above finished grade with glazing above.
- Two story Live/Work units needs to be glazed above canopy not louver/solid panel to express the interior volume and appropriate scale of a potential commercial ground floor.
 - Glazing provided above canopy.
- Tower is way too complicated:
 - Too many moves in the composition.
 - Total redesign of skin of canopy. Reduced moves in composition.
 - Look into rotating the tower to embrace the river similar to how the Marriot Hotel on Naito is designed.
 - Reviewed but not feasible if we want to keep parking wrapped with units.
 - Tower feels heavy from a material perspective.
 - Significant redesign on totality of tower skin.
 - No support for lighting illuminating the tower's top.
 - Lighting removed.
- Podium:
 - Expression at NW corner is heavy and needs to go. Let podium be a podium.
 - Made significant revision in design. Decks and columns relocated and lighter metal panel now used.
 - Floating brick on concrete columns at south end is not supported.
 - No longer brick at this end of the building and columns are now hidden within building skin.
 - Heaviness of the podium along the greenway are of concern.

- Heavy elements removed and lighter elements from Abernethy elevation continued on greenway including balconies, etc.
- White forms along greenway are too formal and façade needs more undulation. Work on coherency with other podium facades.
 - Forms removed.
- Podium on south side needs work.
 - Total redesign of south podium.
- Split Commission on success of gable. If it stays work needs to be done extremely well. Look at how it recedes from podium as it would be stronger if it projected. Ground floor of gable portion also needs work.
 - Gable removed.
- Buildings 41 & 44 are too similar.

Entire building skin rethought with this in mind and both buildings have more significant differences.

Greenway

- Commission supported the concerns identified in the Staff Report. Refer to this document for when making project revisions.

Will refer to staff report for responses.
- Written testimony from Urban Greenspaces should be referred for future revisions as the Commission supported the concerns it identified.

All of urban greenspaces suggestions have been implemented.
- Greenway design reads as a backyard to the eastern blocks. Should reads Portland’s front yard inviting the public and be pedestrian friendly.

Greenway design welcomes the public with three tree lined corridors, multiple plazas and viewing areas, well- lit curvilinear pedestrian & bike trails, water feature, artifacts referencing maritime history, etc.
- Greenway belongs to the public & should not include elements for private use. The building footprint needs to be adjusted to allow the private elements to occur outside the setback.

All private walkways have been removed from the greenway. Buildings 41 & 44 have been moved back from greenway setback line.
- Private pathways are not supported within the greenway setback. Reducing and limiting to building egress could be considered, but would need to be studied to show that it is minimal and demonstrates that it meets the greenway guidelines.

All private pathways have been removed from greenway. Only 2 emergency exits from building 41 & 44, as discussed at DRB meeting, are shown and these exits connect to bike trail & pedestrian walkway.

- Proposal needs layered lush landscaping between the public (greenway) and private spaces (patio, pathway).

Bike trail has been moved east allowing a heavily layered and lush landscape zone of varying from 25'-36' from buildings to the bike trail.

- Amount & location of lawn as proposed is a non-starter. Need to minimize lawn to small areas. Lawn was discouraged within and east of subarea 2.

Lawn area has been eliminated for resubmission. A separate exhibit has been prepared at request of parks & recreation dept. That shows two small lawn areas for DRB review. It should be noted that if that plan was accepted, all landscape requirements would still be met. These small lawn areas are in subarea 3 only.

- Plaza space at Lowell reads as a private, but it should convey that it is public.

- Materials, shape, and connection to the greenway need to be redesigned.
- Connection to the greenway trail needs to be emphasized as a public pedestrian connection.
- Treatment could be similar to the interface of Abernethy at the greenway.

Plan has been changed to provide a direct connection of SW Lowell to the trail. This connection is accomplished in the same fashion as SW Abernethy & SW Lane using two different color contrasting pavers

- Remove trees at terminus of Lowell so not to block view of the river to be consistent with the terminus of east-west accessways at the greenway.

Trees have been removed at terminus of SW Lowell.

- Shape of the overlook should be studied to see if a more fluid shape would be more coherent given the more sinuous design of the bike & pedestrian paths and landscaping elements in the greenway.

The overlook at SW Abernethy to the river has been removed – it was not required and was in the floodway.

- Concrete pier could be a connection to the history of the past to meet guideline A5-1. Study if it can be retained and repurposed (also supported by Parks).

After significant study, the client and its consultants has determined that it is not feasible for the pier to be modified for use in this manner. An additional sitting area at the north end of the greenway on the river side of the trail has been added to bring users closer to the water. This sitting area is not in the floodway

Block 42

- Massing is monolithic. More depth and articulation needed. The simplicity of the form would benefit from more planar offset. Increasing the depth of the recessed facades would go a long way and they have a lot of potential.

Massing has been revised to have a consistent idea on the articulation of the building. The roof line has been accentuated to make a clear differentiation between the brick massed and the recessed offsets. The depth of all recessed facades has been revised to a consistent 4ft also. Balconies have also been added to help break the façade plane on all brick masses.

- Balconies not as successful as shown and more needed to add animation. Explore adding them to the recessed façades once the depth is increased.

We removed the corner balcony and created a strategy for balcony locations on the brick masses. This keeps a cohesive idea that is carried away on all parts of the building.

- Awnings are too high and windows needed above the canopy.

All awning conditions are now revised to have a more pedestrian scale. When there is enough height, windows are provided above the awning as requested.

- Corner expression is not working. Needs to be a bigger gesture. Could happen at ground level with taller canopy and more glazing or balconies set within a glassy corner are options to explore.

Corners are now revised to be solid with large glass inserts, which is similar to the original presented version that commissioners liked.

- Plaza not supported as proposed. Open to the sky would work with active uses lining it or it should go away.

Plaza is now removed, and active uses have been located facing the sidewalk.

- Units on Lane need way more layered landscaping to provide a comfortable transition from private to public space.

Landscape on Lane is revised to provide transitions layers from the public walkway to the private patios. A combination of concrete paths, bridges and planters provide the required separation requested for the residential patios.

- No support for a lone residential unit by itself along River Pkwy.

The use of residential units along SW River Parkway has been revised to be as minimal as possible. The only residential use provided is the unit on the corner that turns into Lane.

- Too many materials. Eliminating the Equitone recommended to be more consistent with the industrial aesthetic.

Equitone panel is removed as requested.

- Building might benefit from a greater contrast color on the forms. The neutral color palette may be contributing to the flatness of the facade.

Materials presented on the meeting show the contrast that is requested. Renderings are now revised to reflect this.

- Much more thought needs to be put into wayfinding on the building. There is no hierarchy of entries.

Main entry of the building is now revised to have the requested hierarchy.

- The vents in the masonry needs to be re-thought. Louvers and venting need to be minimized, consolidated and integrated.

Vent strategy has been revised to be integrated with the window system. This result on a minimal intrusion of the vents with other elements on the façade.

- Some differentiation between this building and the block to the south is needed.

The proposed material palette and adopted massing strategies should provide the requested differentiation between the north and the south blocks.

- Generator electrical room facades need to be better resolved.

Services for this building are now minimized on the street by moving them as much as possible to the inside of the building.

Block 45 north building

- Same massing comment as on Block 42. Deeper planar changes needed.

The massing of this building has been revised to be more consisted with the original design, the proposed i

- More articulation of fenestrations.

Details have been provided to show the articulation at all fenestrations.

- Vertical windows that extend to the ground along Bond is odd. Commercial and live/work could be differentiated by sill height.

Window and wall ratio on the ground level is now revised to give a better proportion to the glass provided. Street character for Live/Work units are now revised to be different from retail but still compatible with the overall design.

- There needs to be clearer structural and geometric relationship. More of the structure needs to come down to the ground which will add texture and a more appropriate scale at the building's base.

The ground floor window strategy is now revised to meet the comment above. See also answer for comment above.

- Less solid wall is needed in the light colored (recessed) facades spaces, while more is needed in the darker brick.

Wall to window ratios have been revised as requested.

- Transition to residential units on River Pkwy does not work. Need more setback and layered landscaping if they stay.

Units on SW River Parkway are now removed and replaced with amenity spaces.

- Balcony edge at northeast corner needs work.
- The vertical brick would result in a hard detail at window return. Reconsider coursing if it stays.

Vertical brick detail is now removed.

- Quality of Nichiha not confirmed as 3 Commissioners with experience with the material not present. Staff to forward their conclusions separately.

Samples of Nichiha will be provided at the time of the hearing to confirmed that the use of this material is acceptable.

- Stucco at top of upper floors is odd and not coherent.

Stucco top is now removed at corners and replace with metal panel that blends with the window material.

- Storefront to ground is not working. Low stemwall needed storefront

Concrete steamwalls are provide at the base of storefronts as need it for grading conditions.

- Awnings should be lower with glass line above it.

All awning conditions are now revised to have a more pedestrian scale. When there is enough height, windows are provided above the awning as requested.

- Plaza could be successful if more active use (fitness ok but not dog wash). Could become shallower. Support for reorienting to the south to open up to the paseo and allow more solar access.

Uses around plaza have been revised to be more active (retail). Design of the plaza has been revised to allow for congregation and seating opportunities. The location of the plaza is kept at Abernethy so that it can support a more active pedestrian feel on Abernethy rather than the paseo.

- More prominent canopy over entry is needed.

Main building entrance is revised to be more prominent.

- Solar shades on north side don't service a purpose and in general stick out.

Solar shades are now removed.

Block 45 south building

- 22' width of paseo is too tight:

Paseo width is not revised to 30' at the narrowest point.

- Re-orienting the plaza from the north building to open up to the paseo would help provide the space, light, and air needed to make this more successful.
 - Since we increase the size of the paseo, we feel that the building benefits more by keeping the plaza on SW Abernethy as it will draw more active uses where we need them.
- Explore ways to incorporate design elements to support families with kids.
 - See answer to comment below.
- This is only building without its own private open space on site so the paseo needs to do the heavy lifting.
 - The paseo functions like three public malls that allow pedestrians to flow through the site on a series of unique experiences. The two malls at the ends have enhanced landscape, paving, and festival lighting to provide a more welcome feeling for people that cut through the paseo. The middle courtyard is the main body of the paseo, as it provides a water feature, patios, planting, decorative pavements, etc., which all contribute to bring life and energy to the space. Since families are expected on the building on the south of the paseo, permanent picnic tables are located to provide gathering opportunities also.
- Ground floor height needs to be increased or articulated in a way that expresses a taller condition.

Height of ground floor is now revised to 12ft at the minimum and it grounds to up to 14ft on the lower side of the building.

- More differentiation of ground floor with upper façade is needed. Could be achieved with taller windows or height.

Since we are providing a taller floor at the ground level, taller windows with combination of transoms are used to create the differentiation requested. Also, the use of recessed patios is introduced on this level to help with the character of the ground floor and the public realm.

- Commission split on the gable. It should be studied and a strong case is needed of why it should stay:

Gable end is now removed.

- Detailing of roof to wall metal would have to be precise.
- Rake at gable end is odd.

- More transition is needed at ground floor units along Lowell (more depth and layered landscaping).

A layer of landscape is now introduced along SW Lowell and also the finish floor of the units is raised from the sidewalk level to provide more separation. At the recess patio conditions, raised planters are provided to buffer the residential use to the public sidewalk also.

- Bedrooms on Bond & River Pkwy are not supported. Need vertical and /or horizontal separation of residential units from the sidewalk and landscaping.

For these two sides, large sections of layered landscape are proposed as a buffer to the sidewalk. The unit on the corner of Bond and Lowell is now removed and replaces with an amenity space, which helps mitigate the concern of bedrooms on Bond. For Lowell, besides having landscape in front of the building, the finish floor of those units is about 2ft raised from the sidewalk, providing a greater separation as requested.

- Canopies area needed along the street frontages.

Canopies for pedestrian weather protection are provided where possible. Due to the landscape layering we are doing on this building, id more canopies are added, these will shadow the landscape more than the sidewalk.



Landscape Architecture

February 7, 2020

**ALAMO MANHATTAN BLOCKS
CHANGES MADE SINCE
1ST DRB MEETING**

1. All lawn areas eliminated from Greenway.
2. All private walks to private patios eliminated from Greenway. One emergency exit from Block 44 and one exit from Block 41 indicated with bridges across swale to connect to pedestrian path.
3. SW Abernethy river adjacent overlook in Floodway eliminated. A landward plaza with water feature and custom seating provided at Abernethy terminus.
4. More direct pedestrian mall connection provided at SW Lowell to path.
5. Found objects, art opportunities, and furnishings indicating maritime history provided.
6. Mall terminus at SW Abernethy and SW Lane at SW River Parkway integrates commercial into pedestrian way.
7. Pedestrian paseo at Block 45 between SW Bond and SW River Parkway has been widened.
8. Additional planting has been added around perimeter of Block 45, including Bar Building.
9. An enlarged mall Greenway plan has been added indicating coordination of materials to adjacent developments and a photograph vision board for materials selections provided.
10. Roof terraces for Blocks 41 and 44 have eliminated eco-roofs and provide decorative gravel bands, viewing terraces and lawn areas.
11. Roof terraces for Blocks 42 and 45 have been modified and Architect has provided an exhibit for decorative rock in lieu of eco-roof on upper floor.
12. Two (2) enlarged sections added – one for typical townhome steps/ bridges/ storm water planters and second section from river patios showing grade separation and planting between buildings and bike path have been added.
13. Four (4) drawings showing Greenway sections from buildings to river have been modified or added to show relocation of 2 trails in relation to top of bank. Both trails have been moved to comply with 10' from top of bank minimum and no further than 75' from top of bank.
14. Photographs of plant material to be used added to River Blocks and City Blocks planting plans.
15. Greenway Development Plan indicates that subarea 2 is largely east of pedestrian trail providing more uninterrupted riparian planting. Ordinance compliance on planting tabulations chart indicates that planting provided exceeds ordinance. Photos of Greenway planting species has been provided.

CHANGES MADE SINCE 1ST DRB MEETING

FEBRUARY 07, 2020

ALAMO MANHATTAN BLOCKS

PORTLAND, OREGON

Page 2

16. An overlook plaza at the north end of Greenway has been added – it is out of floodway.
17. Per Parks Dept. request, an exhibit showing a small amount of grass has been added.
18. A plan indicating two (2) bonus areas adjacent to Blocks 41 and 44 has been added.

DESIGN MODIFICATIONS

33.825.040 Modifications That Will Better Meet Design Review Requirements

MODIFICATION 1

TANDEM PARKING

(33.266.130.F.1.a)

All parking areas, except stacked parking areas, must be designed so that a vehicle may enter or exit without having to move another vehicle.

PROPOSAL

We propose to use selected parking bays in the private garages for these blocks as tandem stalls, in that the front stall does not have access to the drive aisle without moving the vehicle behind it adjacent to the aisle. See Parking Plans.

APPROVAL CRITERIA

- A. Granting the adjustment will equally or better meet the purpose of the regulation to be modified*

Tandem stalls support the applicable guidelines in that they allow for greater vehicle density to be parked in smaller amount of developed footprint while also relieving pressure from surface/street, or above grade structured parking that might otherwise be necessary.

- B. The proposal will be consistent with purpose of the standard for which a modification is requested*

The design of Tandem stalls coincides with sustainable development, particularly for projects within dense urban cores because it is efficient and sensible use of space and land. Additionally, it should be considered that these Tandem stalls are for use on a private residential project and each pair of stalls is only intended and practical to be leased “in tandem” to the same unit tenants. Consequently, the tenants of that unit and the tandem stalls are effectively each other’s full-time attendants and the use of the stalls is not impacted in a substantial manner. The number of Tandem stalls will be significantly less than the 2-bedroom and 1-bedroom unit count and so the buildings easily support “in tandem” use.

MODIFICATION 2

BICYCLE PARKING STANDARDS

(33.266.220.c.3.b.)

...3. Bicycle racks. The Portland Bureau of Transportation maintains a handbook of racks and siting guidelines that meet the standards of this paragraph. Required bicycle parking may be provided in floor, wall, or ceiling racks. Where required bicycle parking is provided in racks, the racks must meet the following standards:

- a. The bicycle frame and one wheel can be locked to the rack with a high security, U-shaped shackle lock if both wheels are left on the bicycle;
- b. A space 2 feet by 6 feet must be provided for each required bicycle parking space, so that a bicycle six feet long can be securely held with its frame supported so that the bicycle cannot be pushed or fall in a manner that will damage the wheels or components. See Figure 266-11; and
- c. The rack must be securely anchored.

PROPOSAL

For the long-term parking provided in the garage, we are proposing to use a vertical rack system with staggered rack heights (Dero ultra space saver vertical racks). This rack model is listed under the City of Portland Bike Parking Guide as pre-approved model that provide 2 points of contact with the bike wheel and frame, allow use of a U-lock through the rack, the wheel, and the frame, and may be used by bikes with mounted fenders without damaging fenders. The proposal includes the recommended 60" access aisles width, with the racks anchored to the structural slab of the garage. The City of Portland Bicycle rack handbook indicates that these racks must be used with a 24" per bike spacing, but the manufacturer suggests that 18" spacing is adequate. We request a modification to allow the vertical storage racks to be staggered on the wall at an 18" OC spacing, as per manufacturer's recommendation.

For the long-term parking provided in the units, we are proposing a wall rack system that is excluded from the 2 points of contact with the bike wheel and frame and the use of a U-lock through the rack, the wheel, and the frame. This type of long-term bike storage is already in a secured private space so security for the rack is no longer necessary.

APPROVAL CRITERIA

- A. *Granting the adjustment will equally or better meet the purpose of the regulation to be modified*

The proposed solution meets the intent of providing sufficient space, access and security. This spacing has been approved elsewhere by the City of Portland, and even at 18" there is adequate room for access to locks. These racks are proposed to be used for long-term storage in a central controlled-access bike storage room intended for use by residents and tenants. Because these racks will be used by residents and tenants, it can be assumed that they will have some familiarity with the rack systems and therefore the more generous 24" spacing required by the City of Portland guidelines is not required, and the manufacturer recommended 18" spacing is sufficient. We intend to maintain the 24" x 72" required footprint for short term bike parking available to the public.

B. The proposal will be consistent with purpose of the standard for which a modification is requested

The proposed design for the bicycle parking is consistent with intent of the zoning code desire to provide safe and accessible bicycle parking for its long-term bike riders. The primary design strategy is to create long term bicycle parking rooms that are easily accessible, usable and safe for our tenants and occupants. The rooms have been located in a variety of locations for convenient access from the garage and from units at floors above and are located in locked rooms to keep the tenants and their equipment safe. The rack system proposed is easy to use and will help keep tenants' bicycles organized and safe.

The proposal meets the intent of the zoning code.

ADJUSTMENT 1

PARKING ACCESS

(33.510.267.F.6.b.)

...b. Parking access on other streets. New motor vehicle access to any parking area or structure is not allowed on the streets shown on Map 510-9.

Map 510-9 shows that access on SW River Parkway is only granted under adjustments procedures.

PROPOSAL

For this development, we propose to locate along SW River Parkway all the parking access points for the 4 blocks. Due to the constraints on other streets surrounding the proposed buildings, SW River Parkway is the only street that provides adequate parking access.

On Block 41 and Block 44, SW River parkway is the only street that provides frontage for those building, all other streets are pedestrian access only or designs with active uses that will not work with parking access.

It's a similar case for Block 42 and Block 45, SW Lane is a pedestrian accessway, SW Abernethy is the main active street, SW Lowell is all residential, leaving SW River Parkway as the only possible option for the parking access.

APPROVAL CRITERIA

- A. Granting the adjustment will equally or better meet the purpose of the regulation to be modified.*

Moving the parking access to SW River Parkway on this case will equal the purpose of the regulation since these buildings sit on dense urban environment. Parking access on busy streets is common on this type of neighborhoods and by locating the access points away from the middle streets in the four blocks, the pedestrian links through the blocks is preserved better.

A study on turning lanes and access to gates on the parking access was provided to BPOT where it shows that impact to pedestrian and vehicular traffic is minimal on SW Parkway.

- B. If in a residential, CI1, or IR zone, the proposal will not significantly detract from the livability or appearance of the residential area, or if in an OS, C, E, I, or CI2 zone, the proposal will be consistent with the classifications of the adjacent streets and the desired character of the area.*

Criteria does not apply.

- C. If more than one adjustment is being requested, the cumulative effect of the adjustments results in a project which is still consistent with the overall purpose of the zone.*

Only one adjustment is being requested.

BLOCK 41, 42, 44, and 45 MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

D. City-designated scenic resources and historic resources are preserved.

Criteria does not apply.

E. Any impacts resulting from the adjustment are mitigated to the extent practical; and

See response on criteria A.

F. If in an environmental zone, the proposal has a few significant detrimental environmental impacts on the resource and resource values as is practicable;

Criteria does not apply.