

City of Portland, Oregon Bureau of Development Services Land Use Services

STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

CASE FILE:	LU 20-124348 HRM
	PC # 19-239662
	1010 SE Ash
REVIEW BY:	Historic Landmarks Commission
WHEN:	June 8, 2020 @ 1:30pm
REMOTE	
ACCESS:	Historic Landmarks Commission Agenda:
	https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/42441

Due to the City's Emergency Response to COVID-19, this land use hearing will be limited to remote participation via Zoom. Please refer to the instructions included with this notice to observe and participate remotely.

Bureau of Development Services Staff: Hillary Adam 503-823-3581 / Hillary.Adam@portlandoregon.gov

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant:	Megan Zack Hartshorne Plunkard Architecture 232 N Carpenter Chicago, Il 60607	(312) 226-4488 *134
Owner Representative:	Allison Reynolds Stoel Rives LLP 760 SW 9th Ave #3000 (30th Fl) Portland, OR 97205	(503) 294-9625
Consultant:	Robin Scholetzky Urbanlens Planning LLC 3439 SE Hawthorne, Suite 215 Portland, OR 97214	(971) 706-8720
Owner:	Alex Standford Troy Laundry Property Holder LLC 133 N Jefferson St 4th Flr Chicago, Il 60661	(312) 267-4185
Site Address:	1010 SE ASH ST	

Legal Description: Tax Account No.:	BLOCK 224 LOT 1&2&7&8, EAST PORTLAND R226514450, R226514450, R226514450, R226514450, R226514450, R226514450, R226514450
State ID No.:	1N1E35CD 08400, 1N1E35CD 08400, 1N1E35CD 08400, 1N1E35CD 08400, 1N1E35CD 08400, 1N1E35CD 08400, 1N1E35CD 08400
Quarter Section:	3031
Neighborhood:	Buckman, contact Richard Johnson at buckmanlandusepdx@gmail.com
Business District: District Coalition:	Central Eastside Industrial Council, contact ceic@ceic.cc. Southeast Uplift, contact Leah Fisher at 503-232-0010.
Plan District: Other Designations:	Central City - Central Eastside Within the boundary of a National Register-listed Landmark, the Troy Laundry Building
Zoning:	EXd – Central Employment with Design and Historic Resource Protection overlays
Case Type: Procedure:	HR – Historic Resource Review Type III, with a public hearing before the Historic Landmarks Commission. The decision of the Historic Landmarks Commission can be appealed to City Council.

Proposal:

The applicant requests Historic Resource Review for a proposed 6-story residential building with ground floor retail, rooftop terrace, and below-grade parking and loading accessed from SE Ash, to be constructed within the boundary of the landmark Troy Laundry building. Exterior materials include brick, limestone, and aluminum windows.

One Modification is requested:

1. 33.510.243.B - to reduce the required amount of ecoroof from 60% to approximately 50% of the roof area not otherwise occupied by terraces, mechanical, and other service areas.

Please note: The decision adopting the July 9, 2018 code (CC2035 Plan) was appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). LUBA's decision was appealed to the Oregon Court of Appeals by multiple parties. While the particular code provisions this project relies on are not at issue in the appeal, the Oregon Court of Appeals remanded CC2035 on 3-16-2020 and on that date the City reverted back to the version of PCC 33.510 that was in existence before July 9, 2018 until Council is able to readopt CC2035.

Please be aware of the following. As details of the remand and results of the Council's future action to the remand are unknown at this time, this land use review is being reviewed under two versions of PCC 33.510. The most recent version that went into effect on July 9, 2018, and the previous PCC 33.510 version that was in effect prior to July 9, 2018, which is now the 3-16-2020 Code.

Relevant Approval Criteria:

In order to be approved, this proposal must comply with the criteria of Title 33. The relevant criteria are:

• 33.846.060.G Other approval criteria

- Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines
- Special Design Guidelines for the Design Zone of the Central Eastside District of the Central City Plan
- 33.846.070 Modifications Considered During Historic Resource Review
- Oregon Statewide Planning Goals

ANALYSIS

Site and Vicinity: The subject property is located on the north half of the block bound by SE 10th, SE Ash, SE 11th, and SE Pine in the Central Eastside subdistrict of the Central City Plan District. The south half of the block is occupied by the historic Troy Laundry Building, a National Register-listed landmark, constructed in 1913. The two-story brick building was designed by Ellis Lawrence, a prominent Portland architect. On the north half of the block, is a surface parking lot and a one-story non-contributing warehouse addition to the Troy Laundry Building. The immediate area is a mix of commercial, warehouse, and residential development, with the concentrated residential areas of the Buckman neighborhood located one block east just beyond SE 12th, which marks the boundary of the Central City Plan District. Newer, larger buildings have begun to be constructed within the Central City Plan District to the north, west, and south, as well as some larger developments being developed just east of 12th. SE Sandy Boulevard runs diagonally just beyond the northwest corner of the property. Per the City's Transportation System Plan, SE Sandy Boulevard and SE 11th Avenue are Transit Access Streets, Emergency Response Routes, City Bikeways, Major City Walkways. Additionally, SE 11th is classified as a Major Truck Street and a Community Corridor.

Zoning: The Central Employment (EX) zone allows mixed-uses and is intended for areas in the center of the City that have predominantly industrial type development. The intent of the zone is to allow industrial and commercial uses which need a central location. Residential uses are allowed, but are not intended to predominate or set development standards for other uses in the area. The development standards are intended to allow new development which is similar in character to existing development.

The Historic Resource Protection overlay is comprised of Historic and Conservation Districts, as well as Historic and Conservation Landmarks and protects certain historic resources in the region and preserves significant parts of the region's heritage. The regulations implement Portland's Comprehensive Plan policies that address historic preservation. These policies recognize the role historic resources have in promoting the education and enjoyment of those living in and visiting the region. The regulations foster pride among the region's citizens in their city and its heritage. Historic preservation beautifies the city, promotes the city's economic health, and helps to preserve and enhance the value of historic properties.

The Design "d" overlay promotes the conservation and enhancement of areas of the City with special historic, architectural or cultural value. New development and exterior modifications to existing development are subject to design review. This is achieved through the creation of design districts and applying the Design Overlay Zone as part of community planning projects, development of design guidelines for each district, and by requiring design review. In addition, design review ensures that certain types of infill development will be compatible with the neighborhood and enhance the area.

Land Use History: City records indicate that prior land use reviews include:

 LU 02-124188 HDZ – Historic Design review for a new fence around the parking lot;

- EA 19-142041 APPT Early Assistance Appointment for the proposed building within the boundary of the historic landmark Tory Laundry Building as well as a rooftop addition to the Troy Laundry Building;
- EA 19-239662 PC Pre-Application Conference for the proposed building within the boundary of the historic landmark Troy Laundry Building as well as a rooftop addition to the Troy Laundry Building; and
- EA 20-103960 DA Design Advice Request for the proposed building within the boundary of the historic landmark Troy Laundry Building as well as a rooftop addition to the Troy Laundry Building.

Agency Review: A "Notice of proposal in Your Neighborhood" was mailed May 19, 2020. The following Bureaus have responded with no issue or concerns:

- Water Bureau
- Fire Bureau
- Life Safety Division of BDS

The <u>Bureau of Environmental Services</u> responded, noting that the applicant has not provided information sufficient to determine that the proposed project can accommodate approvable stormwater facilities; therefore, BES did not recommend approval. Please see Exhibit E-1 for additional details.

Staff Response: BDS and BES staff have discussed the potential for additional stormwater management areas on the roof levels. A condition of approval has been added to address the lack of certainty in the proposed stormwater management proposal. The condition will require that the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with BES requirements and shall submit a follow-up Type II Historic Resource Review to demonstrate that all applicable ecoroof requirements are met and to address any potential changes.

The <u>Bureau of Transportation Engineering</u> responded with no objections. Please see Exhibit E-2 for additional details.

The <u>Site Development Section of BDS</u> responded with no objections. Please see Exhibit E-3 for additional details.

The Bureau of Parks-Forestry Division responded with the following comment: Urban Forestry does not object to approval of the proposed development subject to the following conditions: "Building materials are not selected that require an encroachment into the right-of-way which prevent the existing street trees to be preserved. This includes scaffolding requirements associated with some masonry installation." Please see Exhibit E-4 for additional details.

Staff Response: Staff notes that the Forestry Division of Parks is concerned with preservation of the street trees along SE 10th and SE 11th Avenues. The existing conditions plan (sheet C.88) shows one tree on SE 10th and three trees on SE 11th "to remain" and the tree plan (C.68) shows these trees to be preserved. The proposed site plan (C.18) and proposed first floor plan (C.28) show trees in these same locations but do not indicate that they are existing trees to remain. *In order to rectify this discrepancy, staff has added a condition that if the four trees proposed to remain must be removed, a follow-up Type II Historic Resource Review will be required for this change from the approved proposal.*

Neighborhood Review: A Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood was mailed on May 19, 2020. No written responses have been received from either the Neighborhood Association or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

ZONING CODE APPROVAL CRITERIA

(1) HISTORIC RESOURCE REVIEW (33.846)

Purpose of Historic Resource Review

Historic Resource Review ensures the conservation and enhancement of the special characteristics of historic resources.

Historic Resource Review Approval Criteria

Requests for Historic Resource Review will be approved if the review body finds the applicant has shown that all of the approval criteria have been met.

Findings: The site is a designated Historic Landmark in the Central Eastside subdistrict of the Central City Plan District. Therefore, the proposal requires Historic Resource Review approval. The relevant approval criteria are listed in 33.846.060 G. 1.-10. In addition, because the site is located within the Central Eastside subdistrict of the Central City Plan District, the relevant approval criteria are the Special Design Guidelines for the Design Zone of the Central Eastside District of the Central City Plan and Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines.

Staff has considered all guidelines and has addressed only those guidelines considered applicable to this project.

G. Other Approval Criteria

- **1. Historic character.** The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. Removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that contribute to the property's historic significance will be avoided.
- **2. Record of its time.** The historic resource will remain a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings will be avoided.
- **3. Historic changes.** Most properties change over time. Those changes that have acquired historic significance will be preserved.
- **4. Historic features.** Generally, deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where practical, in materials. Replacement of missing features must be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- **5. Historic materials.** Historic materials will be protected. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- **9. Preserve the form and integrity of historic resources.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic resource and its environment would be unimpaired.

Findings for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9: The proposed building will be located on the north half of the block within the boundary of the historic Troy Laundry Building, which is located immediately south of the proposed building. While situated within the boundary of the landmark Troy Laundry Building, the demolition of the one-story 1953 warehouse and the surface parking lot on the north half of the block will not result in a loss of historic features, materials, or character as these elements are

noncontributing to the significance of the Troy Laundry Building. The essential form and integrity of the landmark Troy Laundry Building, which is on a separate property but technically part of the "site" will remain intact as a result of this proposal with the exception that windows on the north facade will be obscured and ultimately closed as is required by Building and Fire Codes. *These criteria are met.*

6. Archaeological resources. Significant archaeological resources affected by a proposal will be protected and preserved to the extent practical. When such resources are disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Findings: No known archaeological resources are known to exist; however, some excavation will be performed in order to construct the below grade parking structure. If in the event that archaeological resources are discovered, as is required by state law, all work will be stopped and the State Archaeologist will be notified. This has been included as a condition of approval.

With the condition of approval that upon the discovery of archaeological resources, all work will be stopped and the State Archaeologist will be notified, this criterion is met.

7. Differentiate new from old. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. New work will be differentiated from the old.

Findings: The proposed building will be situated on a separate property, though within the boundary, of the historic landmark Troy Laundry Building. As noted above the proposal will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property as there are no materials on the north half of the block that are considered to be historic. The proposed building is generally designed to be compatible, though differentiated from the adjacent historic landmark; this is discussed in more depth in findings below. *This criterion is met.*

- **8. Architectural compatibility.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will be compatible with the resource's massing, size, scale, and architectural features. When retrofitting buildings or sites to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities, design solutions will not compromise the architectural integrity of the historic resource.
- **10. Hierarchy of compatibility.** Exterior alterations and additions will be designed to be compatible primarily with the original resource, secondarily with adjacent properties, and finally, if located within a Historic or Conservation District, with the rest of the district. Where practical, compatibility will be pursued on all three levels.

Findings: The proposed building, while significantly larger than the landmark Troy Laundry Building has made attempts at achieving greater compatibility with the resource through materials, detailing, and proportional relationships. The primary building materials include standard brick, limestone, and aluminum window systems. The brick is proposed to be laid in various patterns throughout the facade, similar to the various brick detailing patterns seen on the Troy Laundry Building, though the proposed patterns are not intended to match those on the Troy.

While the building is larger than the two-and-a-half—story Troy Laundry Building, the proposed building attempts to take some inspiration from the proportional relationships of the Troy, though not in a literal 1:1 sense. For instance, the building has a primary mass with a shorter and narrower sidecar mass set, offset with a slight recess from the primary mass. The primary mass of the proposed building has an ABABA rhythm (plus sidecar) on the west and east ends while the Troy has an ABCBA

rhythm (plus sidecar) on the west and east ends. The north facade of the proposed building follows an AABAAAAAABAA pattern, akin to the CBCCCCCCCBA pattern of the south facade of the Troy, the introduction of the Bs being the primary element used to break up the length of the 200' facade. While the Bs on the Troy are slightly projecting and feature raised parapets, those on the proposed building are slightly recessed and do not feature distinct parapets. At the February 24, 2020 Design Advice Request (DAR) the Historic Landmarks Commission expressed support for this variation in the pattern.

The Commission did express consternation about the proposed 5-story height of the sidecar, stating that the sidecar had no clear relationship with the sidecar of the Troy building which is two stories. The Commission suggested that the proposed sidecar should not be more than two stories in response to the Troy Sidecar. At the DAR staff also expressed concern about the likelihood of a solid wall or spandrel glazing at the south wall above the Troy sidecar, which would be required to meet Building and Fire Code. The applicant has suggested that the five-story sidecar for the proposed building maintains a more direct relationship with the Troy in that the two buildings together step down from north to south, noting that the sidecar steps down approximately one level from the Troy and the proposed sidecar steps down one level from the proposed primary building mass. This north-to-south step-down is more complete when the penthouse proposed on the Troy through a separate pending review (LU 20-136009 HR) is taken into account. The applicant has also revised the design of the sidecar including raising the sills of the third floor windows and introducing additional limestone detailing approximately at the same datum as the parapet detailing of the Troy sidecar in order to better tie it to the Troy sidecar. In order to mitigate for the relatively blank walls above the Troy sidecar, the applicant proposes vision glazing within the two westernmost and easternmost windows at floors four and five. Spandrel glazing would allow for continuing the window patterning on the remainder of the south walls of the sidecar.

While the Commission was not supportive of the five-story sidecar, staff finds that the slight revisions in the design make the relationship between the new building and the historic Troy Laundry building more explicit; if necessary additional slight revisions could be made to the sidecar to further strengthen these relationships in order for the Commission to be more amenable to the five-story massing. Such revisions could include: lowering the header height of the ground floor windows on the west facade of the sidecar so that the area of glazing is no taller than the doors on the Troy sidecar; raising sill heights on the windows to increase the wall to window ratio of the sidecar; and aligning the sill height of the second floor windows with the sills of the Troy sidecar. Staff notes that the Troy sidecar has a distinct character from the primary mass of the Troy, including variations in window sill and header heights, and that such a distinction in the proposed sidecar could be a more meaningful gesture than simply reducing the height. Staff has added a suggested condition of approval suggesting such changes, noting that if the applicant produced drawings in response to this condition on June 8, 2020, the condition could be deleted upon approval of the proposal.

With the condition of approval that: (1) the header height of the ground floor windows on the west facade of the sidecar be lowered so that the area of glazing is no taller than the doors on the Troy sidecar; (2) the sill heights of the sidecar windows shall be raised to increase the wall to window ratio of the sidecar; and (3) the sill height of the second floor windows on the sidecar shall align with the sill heights of the Troy sidecar, these criteria are met.

<u>Special Design Guidelines for the Design Zone of the Central Eastside District of the</u> <u>Central City Plan and Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines</u>

The Central Eastside is a unique neighborhood. The property and business owners are proud of the district's heritage and service to the community and region. Light industry, distribution/warehousing, and transportation are important components of the district's personality. To the general public, retail stores and commercial businesses provide the central focus within the district.

The underlying urban design objective for the Central Eastside is to capitalize on and emphasize its unique assets in a manner that is respectful, supportive, creative and compatible with each area as a whole. Part of the charm and character of the Central Eastside District, which should be celebrated, is its eclectic mixture of building types and uses. An additional strength, which should be built on, is the pattern of pedestrian friendly retail uses on Grand Avenue, East Burnside and Morrison Streets, as well as portions of 11th and 12th Avenues.

The Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines focus on four general categories. (A) **Portland Personality**, addresses design issues and elements that reinforce and enhance Portland's character. (B) **Pedestrian Emphasis**, addresses design issues and elements that contribute to a successful pedestrian environment. (C) **Project Design**, addresses specific building characteristics and their relationships to the public environment. (D) **Special Areas**, provides design guidelines for the four special areas of the Central City.

Central Eastside Design Goals

The following goals and objectives define the urban design vision for new development and other improvements in the Central Eastside

- Encourage the special distinction and identity of the design review areas of the Central Eastside District.
- Provide continuity between the Central Eastside and the Lloyd District.
- Provide continuity between the Central Eastside and the river, downtown, and adjacent residential neighborhoods.
- Enhance the safety, convenience, pleasure, and comfort of pedestrians.

Central City Plan Design Goals

This set of goals are those developed to guide development throughout the Central City. They apply within all of the Central City policy areas. The nine goals for design review within the Central City are as follows:

- 1. Encourage urban design excellence in the Central City;
- 2. Integrate urban design and preservation of our heritage into the development process;
- **3.** Enhance the character of the Central City's districts;
- **4.** Promote the development of diversity and areas of special character within the Central City;
- **5.** Establish an urban design relationship between the Central City's districts and the Central City as a whole;
- **6.** Provide for a pleasant, rich and diverse pedestrian experience for pedestrians;
- **7.** Provide for the humanization of the Central City through promotion of the arts;
- 8. Assist in creating a 24-hour Central City which is safe, humane and prosperous;
- **9.** Ensure that new development is at a human scale and that it relates to the scale and desired character of its setting and the Central City as a whole.

Staff has considered all guidelines and has addressed only those guidelines considered applicable to this project.

A1. Integrate the River. Orient architectural and landscape elements including, but not

limited to, lobbies, entries, balconies, terraces, and outdoor areas to the Willamette River and greenway. Develop accessways for pedestrians that provide connections to the Willamette River and greenway.

Findings: The proposed building occupies a full half-block in the Central Eastside, eleven blocks from the Willamette River. An outdoor terrace is proposed at the west end of the roof, offering views toward the river, Downtown, and the West Hills. The residential lobby entrance is located at the northwest corner, reducing residents' travel distance to the river ever so slightly. *This guideline is met.*

A2. Emphasize Portland Themes. When provided, integrate Portland-related themes with the development's overall design concept.

A2-1. Recognize Transportation Modes, Produce, and Commerce as Primary Themes of East Portland. Recognize and incorporate East Portland themes into a project design, when appropriate.

Findings for A2 and A2-1: The Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines suggest that the A2 guideline could be met by introducing imagery of Portland-related symbols such as a rose or salmon while the Central Eastside guidelines suggest that A2-1 can be met by recognizing themes such as transportation, produce, and commerce. The proposed building emphasizes and respects Portland and East Portland Themes in a less literal manner but emphasizes these values through its design. Specifically, more recognized current themes of the city include access to the outdoors, quality design, and emphasis on the pedestrian realm which serves one form of transportation. The proposed building emphasizes these themes with the proposed rooftop deck providing access to the outdoors and expansive views to the surrounding landscape, plentiful windows offering similar views, ample retail space to support local commerce and an active pedestrian realm. In addition, the building is of quality design and will make better use of the north half of this block by replacing a one-story warehouse and surface parking lot. *These guidelines are met.*

A3. Respect the Portland Block Structures. Maintain and extend the traditional 200-foot block pattern to preserve the Central City's ratio of open space to built space. Where superblock exist, locate public and/or private rights-of-way in a manner that reflects the 200-foot block pattern, and include landscaping and seating to enhance the pedestrian environment.

A7. Establish and Maintain a Sense of Urban Enclosure. Define public rights-of-way by creating and maintaining a sense of urban enclosure.

Findings for A3 and A7: The proposed building occupies a full half-block and is designed to be built to the property lines, and meets the corners of the half-block Troy Laundry Building with only a slight recess introduced to offset the sidecar from the rest of the building. The blocky development pattern maintains and reinforces the 200-foot block pattern of the city. As such the proposed building helps maintain a sense of urban enclosure. *This guideline is met.*

A4. Use Unifying Elements. Integrate unifying elements and/or develop new features that help unify and connect individual buildings and different areas.

Findings: The proposed building's primary relationship is to the Troy Laundry Building. This primacy is necessary in order to ensure compatibility with the Troy as the proposed building is located within the landmark boundary of the Troy. The two buildings occupy half-blocks oriented east-west and are defined by long rectangular blocky masses with slightly shorter sidecar buildings. Similarly, the proposed building's materials take inspiration form the Troy and. Primarily consist of brick and limestone. Additionally, the proposed window pattern is reflective of the grouped double-hung windows of the Troy, though the proposed windows are markedly modern in their design and materiality. In this way, the proposed building is unified with the adjacent historic landmark. In addition, the proposed large massing volume, use of brick, and large windows unifies the building with other contemporary buildings of similar use in the neighborhood. *This guideline is met.*

A5. Enhance, Embellish, and Identify Areas. Enhance an area by reflecting the local character within the right-of-way. Embellish an area by integrating elements in new development that build on the area's character. Identify an area's special features or qualities by integrating them into new development.

A5-2. Acknowledge the Sandy River Wagon Road (Sandy Boulevard). Acknowledge the historical significance of the Sandy River Wagon Road (Sandy Boulevard) from East Burnside to 7th Avenue with an upgrade of the public right-of-way to be more pedestrian accommodating and which is related to its historical context. New development located adjacent to this diagonal alignment also should acknowledge the historical significance in a creative way that is attractive, informative, and appropriate.

B1. Reinforce and Enhance the Pedestrian System. Maintain a convenient access route for pedestrian travel where a public right-of-way exists or has existed. Develop and define the different zones of a sidewalk: building frontage zone, street furniture zone, movement zone, and the curb. Develop pedestrian access routes to supplement the public right-of-way system through superblocks or other large blocks.

B3. Bridge Pedestrian Obstacles. Bridge across barriers and obstacles to pedestrian movement by connecting the pedestrian system with innovative, well-marked crossings and consistent sidewalk designs.

B3-1. Reduce width of Pedestrian Crossings.

- **a.** Where possible, extend sidewalk curbs at street intersections to narrow pedestrian crossings for a safer pedestrian environment.
- **b.** Maintain large service vehicle turning radii where necessary.

Findings for A5, A5-2, B1, B3, and B3-1: The sidewalks around the building will be rebuilt to current PBOT standards, thus reflecting the local character in the right-of-way. Thus, the pedestrian environment will be reinforced and enhanced, with barrier-free access. While not immediately adjacent, Sandy Boulevard is located just beyond the site and the northwest corner of the proposed building will be highly visible from Sandy Boulevard. This road is acknowledged by locating the residential entrance at this prominent corner. *These guidelines are met.*

A5-3. Plan for or Incorporate Underground Utility Service. Plan for or Incorporate Underground Utility Service to development projects.

C10. Integrate Encroachments. Size and place encroachments in the public right-ofway to visually and physically enhance the pedestrian environment. Locate permitted skybridges toward the middle of the block, and where they will be physically unobtrusive. Design skybridges to be visually level and transparent.

C8-1. Allow for Loading and Staging Areas on Sidewalks. On local service streets, adjacent businesses may use the sidewalk area for temporary loading and staging as long as pedestrian access through it is maintained.

Findings for A5-3, C10 and C8-1: Utility service is proposed below grade in the right-of-way on SE 10th, thus allowing services to be concentrated at the interior of the building or below grade, rather than at the building face. There are no other encroachments other than the below-grade utility vaults. Dedicated loading spaces are provided in the below-grade parking garage; however, this will not prohibit local

service delivery trucks from parking on the street and utilizing the sidewalks on occasion. *These guidelines are met.*

B2. Protect the Pedestrian. Protect the pedestrian environment from vehicular movement. Develop integrated identification, sign, and sidewalk-oriented night-lighting systems that offer safety, interest, and diversity to the pedestrian. Incorporate building equipment, mechanical exhaust routing systems, and/or service areas in a manner that **B4.** Provide Stopping and Viewing Places. Provide safe, comfortable places where people can stop, view, socialize and rest. Ensure that these places do not conflict with other sidewalk uses.

B6. Develop Weather Protection. Develop integrated weather protection systems at the sidewalk-level of buildings to mitigate the effects of rain, wind, glare, shadow, reflection, and sunlight on the pedestrian environment.

B6-1. Provide Pedestrian Rain Protection. Rain protection is encouraged at the ground level of all new and rehabilitated commercial buildings located adjacent to primary pedestrian routes. In required retail opportunity areas, rain protection is strongly recommended.

Findings for B2, B4, B6, and B6-1: As is noted elsewhere, vehicle access is located on SE Ash Street and provides access to both automobile parking and loading in the below-grade garage. The garage location was selected as this is the safest location with regard to traffic, including truck traffic on Sandy and SE 11th Avenue. Pedestrians are also protected from the negative impacts of rain, sun, and glare in that canopies are provided at the ground level and the primary material is brick which absorbs light. The ground level also features approximately 3'-0" recesses between the columns which provide opportunities for pedestrians and visitors of the building to stop, rest, and socialize outside of the pedestrian path of travel. The proposed design also features sidewalk-oriented night-lighting at the columns and signage at the ground level. Mechanical equipment is located at the roof level an no ventilation is proposed at the street level or at the street-facing façades. Therefore, pedestrians will be protected from vehicles, mechanical equipment and will be provided a sense of safety with lighting. *These guidelines are met.*

B7. Integrate Barrier-Free Design. Integrate access systems for all people with the building's overall design concept.

Findings: The proposed building is designed to ensure barrier-free access to all levels, all retail spaces, and all residential amenity areas. *This guideline is met.*

A5-4. Incorporate Works of Art. Incorporate works of art into development projects. **C2.** Promote Quality and Permanence in Development. Use design principles and building materials that promote quality and permanence.

C5. Design for Coherency. Integrate the different building and design elements including, but not limited to, construction materials, roofs, entrances, as well as window, door, sign, and lighting systems, to achieve a coherent composition. in design proposals, which enhance overall district character.

Findings for A5-4, C2, and C5: The Central Eastside guideline indicates that "works of art should be included in the development of major outdoor and indoor spaces accessible to the public." As this building is built to the property lines, works of art can be accommodated at the interior. The building itself, has a higher level of detailing than is often proposed in similar contemporary buildings of this size. The various brick patterns proposed show a level of craft and artistic expression that will provide interest to the streetscape. The proposed materials – brick, limestone, and

the aluminum window system – are quality materials that will ensure the longevity of the proposed building.

The overall composition of the building is ordered and coherent, with an attention to detail in ensuring consistency in the overall rhythm, such as the extension of the garage door between the columns despite the narrower width of the garage entry behind the door. Staff notes; however, that this door is framed with a metal panel for which no details have been provided. In order to ensure the proposed metal panel will not oilcan and will be resistant to denting at this high traffic area, a condition has been added that the metal panel around the garage door shall be a minimum 16-gauge steel. The building is coherent from bottom to top with a consistent storefront base, accented with ordered lighting and canopies between the columns and wrapping the corners, the decorative warehouse expression, traditional detailing, deeply inset windows, and topped with a single volume containing mechanical equipment, stair and elevator towers.

With the condition of approval that the metal panel around the garage door shall be a minimum 16-gauge steel, these guidelines are met.

C1-1. Integrate Parking.

- **a.** Integrate parking in a manner that is attractive and complementary to the site and its surroundings.
- **b.** Design parking garage exteriors to visually respect and integrate with adjacent buildings and environment.

Findings: The parking is located below grade and accessed from SE Ash Street. The proposed garage door is glazed and extends to the edges of the columns on either side of the opening, thus ensuring a coherent composition with the rest of the ground level. *This guideline is met.*

C13. Integrate Signs. Integrate signs and their associated structural components with the building's overall design concept. Size, place, design, and light signs to not dominate the skyline. Signs should have only a minimal presence in the Portland skyline.

C1-2. Integrate Signs.

- **a.** Retain and restore existing signage which reinforces the history and themes of the district, and permit new signage which reinforces the history and themes of the East Portland Grand Avenue historic district.
- **b.** Carefully place signs, sign supports, and sign structures to integrate with the scale, color and articulation of the building design, while honoring the dimensional provisions of the sign chapter of the zoning code.
- **c.** Demonstrate how signage is one of the design elements of a new or rehabilitation project and has been coordinated by the project designer/ architect. Submit a Master Signage Program as a part of the project's application for a design review.

Findings for C13 and C1-2: The applicant has provided some signage details indicating the general locations and sizes anticipated to be installed. These include canopy-mounted free-standing letters and wall-mounted blade signs, all of which are noted to be illuminated. While staff is generally supportive of the proposed signage scheme and the proposed locations, not enough details have been provided to approve these specific signs in this review. As such, staff has added a condition of approval that the any future signage must be approved through a separate follow-up review.

With the condition of approval that any future signage must be approved through a separate follow-up review, these criteria are met.

C3-1. Design to Enhance Existing Themes in the District. Look to buildings from throughout the district for contextual precedent. Innovation and creativity are encouraged.
C3-2. Respect Adjacent Residential Neighborhoods. Respect the architectural character and development patterns of adjacent residential neighborhoods.
C4. Complement the Context of Existing Buildings. Complement the context of existing buildings by using and adding to the local design vocabulary.

Findings for C3-1, C3-2, and C4: The Central Eastside subdistrict of the Central City Plan District has long served as a largely industrial and commercial neighborhood of Central City. Over the past several years, many new mixed-use buildings have been constructed in the areas of this subdistrict. The proposed building follows that pattern of larger blocky new buildings with residential units located above ground floor retail uses. Many of these new buildings are clad with brick and the proposed building is intended to be clad with brick primarily to be compatible with the immediately adjacent historic Troy Laundry Building.

With regard to respecting adjacent residential neighborhoods, which is situated one block away beyond SE 12th, the proposed building is intended to be 75' tall, rather than the maximum 125' which could be achievable through the housing bonuses. This maximum 125' height limit achievable through bonuses is available to all of the blocks between SE 11th and SE 12th between NE Couch, three blocks to the north, and SE Taylor, seven blocks to the south. All of which are subject to Design Review, but not to Historic Resource Review. On the east side of SE 12th Avenue, between SE Ankeny and SE Stark, the CM2d zone extends the depth of one-half block, allowing heights up to 75' with bonuses. These height allowances indicate that within this area east of 12th, buildings could be constructed up to 75' with buildings west of 12th constructed up to 125'. Due to these allowances, the proposed building respects the adjacent neighborhood as it is only proposed to be a height of 75'. *These guidelines are met.*

A8. Contribute to a Vibrant Streetscape. Integrate building setbacks with adjacent sidewalks to increase the space for potential public use. Develop visual and physical connections into buildings' active interior spaces from adjacent sidewalks. Use architectural elements such as atriums, grand entries and large ground-level windows to reveal important interior spaces and activities.

C1. Enhance View Opportunities. Orient windows, entrances, balconies and other building elements to surrounding points of interest and activity. Size and place new buildings to protect existing views and view corridors. Develop building façades that create visual connections to adjacent public spaces.

C6. Develop Transitions between Buildings and Public Spaces. Develop transitions between private development and public open space. Use site design features such as movement zones, landscape elements, gathering places, and seating opportunities to develop transition areas where private development directly abuts a dedicated public open space.

C7. Design Corners that Build Active Intersections. Use design elements including, but not limited to, varying building heights, changes in façade plane, large windows, awnings, canopies, marquees, signs and pedestrian entrances to highlight building corners. Locate flexible sidewalk-level retail opportunities at building corners. Locate stairs, elevators, and other upper floor building access points toward the middle of the block.

C8. Differentiate the Sidewalk-Level of Buildings. Differentiate the sidewalk-level of the building from the middle and top by using elements including, but not limited to, different exterior materials, awnings, signs, and large windows.

C9. Develop Flexible Sidewalk-Level Spaces. Develop flexible spaces at the sidewalk-level of buildings to accommodate a variety of active uses.

Findings for A8, C1, C6, C7, C8, and C9: A substantial amount of active use areas surround the perimeter of the ground floor; the only inactive areas are the garage entrance and a few egress paths. Retail is proposed to front on the east and north facades with the residential lobby and fitness amenity located at the northwest corner and on the west facade. Locating the residential lobby at the northwest corner will ensure increased activity at the most visible corner. The retail spaces are large and could potentially be divided into smaller spaces. The ground level of the building is designed as projecting brick columns with storefront, set approximately 3'-0" back, extending from column to column with canopies situated over the majority of these recesses. This design allows for extensive views between the interior and exterior of the building as well as plentiful comfortable space for retail spillout such as cafe seating along the sidewalk but out of the path of pedestrians. The ground level is differentiated from the upper levels by these larger storefront windows, canopies and signage, light fixtures illuminating the sidewalk and building features. *These guidelines are met.*

C11. Integrate Roofs and Use Rooftops. Integrate roof function, shape, surface materials, and colors with the building's overall design concept. Size and place rooftop mechanical equipment, penthouses, other components, and related screening elements to enhance views of the Central City's skyline, as well as views from other buildings or vantage points. Develop rooftop terraces, gardens, and associated landscaped areas to be effective storm water management tools.

A5-5. Incorporate Water Features. Enhance the quality of public spaces by incorporating water features.

Findings for C11 and A5-5: The rooftop hosts many different functions including mechanical equipment, a rooftop terrace for passive recreation including a spa, ecoroof, and stormwater management. The proposed location of the rooftop amenity at the west end of the building will provide the opportunity for views of the Downtown skyline while the proposed mechanical enclosure is contained within a single coherent volume so as to minimize clutter and enhance the view of this building from other buildings and the street. *These guidelines are met.*

C12. Integrate Exterior Lighting. Integrate exterior lighting and its staging or structural components with the building's overall design concept. Use exterior lighting to highlight the building's architecture, being sensitive to its impacts on the skyline at night.

Findings: The proposal includes simple up-down lights to be mounted at the column faces along the ground level. These fixtures are subtle and will provide illumination to the sidewalk and will also highlight the architectural features of the building without negatively impacting the skyline at night. *This guideline is met.*

(2) 33.846.070 Modifications Considered During Historic Resource Review

The review body may consider modification of site-related development standards, including the sign standards of Chapters 32.32 and 32.34 of the Sign Code, as part of the historic resource review process. These modifications are done as part of historic resource review and are not required to go through the adjustment process. Adjustments to userelated development standards (such as floor area ratios, intensity of use, size of the use, number of units, or concentration of uses) are required to go through the adjustment process. Modifications that are denied through historic resource review may be requested as an adjustment through the adjustment process. The review body will approve requested modifications if it finds that the applicant has shown that the following approval criteria are met:

- A. Better meets historic resource review approval criteria. The resulting development will better meet the approval criteria for historic resource review than would a design that meets the standard being modified; and
- B. Purpose of the standard.
 - 1. The resulting development will meet the purpose of the standard being modified; or
 - 2. The preservation of the character of the historic resource is more important than meeting the purpose of the standard for which a modification has been requested.

Modification #1: Ecoroofs - 33.510.243.B - to reduce the required amount of ecoroof from 60% to approximately 50% of the roof area not otherwise occupied by terraces, mechanical, and other service areas.

Purpose Statement: Ecoroofs provide multiple complementary benefits in urban areas, including stormwater management, reduction of air temperatures, mitigation of urban heat island impacts, air quality improvement, urban green spaces, and habitat for birds, plants, and pollinators. The standards are intended to:

- Maximize the coverage of ecoroofs;
- Allow for the placement of structures and other iterms that need to be located on roofs; and
- Support the architectural variability of rooftops in the Central City.

Standard: The ecoroofs, including required firebreaks between ecoroofs areas, must cover 100% of the building roof area, except that up to 40% of the building roof area can be covered with a combination of the following:

- Mechanical equipment, housing for mechanical equipment, and required access to, or clearance from, mechanical equipment;
- Areas used for fire evacuation routes;
- Stairwell and elevator enclosures;
- Skylights;
- Solar panels;
- Wind turbines;
- Equipment, such as pipes and pre-filtering equipment, used for capturing or directing rainwater to a rainwater harvesting system; or
- Uncovered common outdoor areas. Common outdoor areas must be accessible through a shared entrance.

Findings: As is noted in the BES response, the applicant has not provided enough information to demonstrate that the proposal can meet the stormwater management demands. Therefore, BES does not support the proposed reduction of ecoroof to approximately 50% of the roof area. Additionally, BDS staff does not find that the proposed reduction of ecoroof meets the purpose statement as there appears to be additional area of roof that could be used for ecoroof rather than amenity areas, for instance. Additionally, staff has not identified any approval criteria that would be better met by the proposed reduction of ecoroof.

Because the purpose of the standard is not met and the approval criteria are not better met, this Modification does not warrant approval.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Unless specifically required in the approval criteria listed above, this proposal does not have to meet the development standards in order to be approved during this review process. The plans submitted for a building or zoning permit must demonstrate that all development standards of Title 33 can be met, or have received an Adjustment or Modification via a land use review prior to the approval of a building or zoning permit.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed building, to be constructed within the boundary of the historic landmark Troy Laundry Building, is larger than the Troy but takes cues from the Troy and incorporates them into the design. The proposed building features high quality materials and fine detailing and will be a welcome introduction to the neighborhood. In order to address some relatively minor revisions and lack of information staff has added recommended conditions to the recommendation of approval. The purpose of the Historic Resource Review process is to ensure that additions, new construction, and exterior alterations to historic resources do not compromise their ability to convey historic significance. This proposal meets the applicable Historic Resource Review criteria and therefore warrants approval with conditions. Reduction of the ecoroof standard is not warranted, however, and therefore staff recommends denial of the requested Modification.

TENTATIVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

(May be revised upon receipt of new information at any time to the Historic Landmarks Commission decision)

Staff recommends approval of a proposed 6-story residential building with ground floor retail, rooftop terrace, and below-grade parking and loading accessed from SE Ash, to be constructed within the boundary of the landmark Troy Laundry building. Exterior materials include brick, limestone, and aluminum windows.

Staff recommends denial of the following Modification:

1. 33.510.243.B - to reduce the required amount of ecoroof from 60% to approximately 50% of the roof area not otherwise occupied by terraces, mechanical, and other service areas.

This approval is subject to the following conditions and per the drawings, as indicated in Exhibits C-1 through C-59.

- A. As part of the building permit application submittal, the following development-related conditions (B through I) must be noted on each of the 4 required site plans or included as a sheet in the numbered set of plans. The sheet on which this information appears must be labeled "ZONING COMPLIANCE PAGE Case File LU 20-124348 HR". All requirements must be graphically represented on the site plan, landscape, or other required plan and must be labeled "REQUIRED."
- B. At the time of building permit submittal, a signed Certificate of Compliance form (<u>https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/article/623658</u>) must be submitted to ensure the permit plans comply with the Design/Historic Resource Review decision and approved exhibits.
- C. No field changes allowed.

- D. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with BES requirements and shall submit a follow-up Type II Historic Resource Review to demonstrate that all applicable ecoroof requirements are met and to address any potential changes.
- E. If the four trees proposed to remain must be removed, a follow-up Type II Historic Resource Review will be required for this change from the approved proposal.
- F. Upon the discovery of archaeological resources, all work will be stopped, and the State Archaeologist will be notified.
- G. The header height of the ground floor windows on the west facade of the sidecar be lowered so that the area of glazing is no taller than the doors on the Troy sidecar. The sill heights of the sidecar windows shall be raised to increase the wall to window ratio of the sidecar. The sill height of the second floor windows on the sidecar shall align with the sill heights of the Troy sidecar.
- H. The metal panel around the garage door shall be a minimum 16-gauge steel.
- I. Any future signage must be approved through a separate follow-up review.

Procedural Information. The application for this land use review was submitted on February 28, 2020, and was determined to be complete on April 24, 2020.

Please note: The decision adopting the July 9, 2018 code (CC2035 Plan) was appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). LUBA's decision was appealed to the Oregon Court of Appeals by multiple parties. While the particular code provisions this project relies on are not at issue in the appeal, the Oregon Court of Appeals remanded CC2035 on 3-16-2020 and on that date the City reverted back to the version of PCC 33.510 that was in existence before July 9, 2018 until Council is able to readopt CC2035.

Please be aware of the following. As details of the remand and results of the Council's future action to the remand are unknown at this time, this land use review is being reviewed under two versions of PCC 33.510. The most recent version that went into effect on July 9, 2018, and the previous PCC 33.510 version that was in effect prior to July 9, 2018, which is now the 3-16-2020 Code.

ORS 227.178 states the City must issue a final decision on Land Use Review applications within 120-days of the application being deemed complete. The 120-day review period may be waived or extended at the request of the applicant. In this case, the applicant waived the 120-day review period, as stated with Exhibit A-2). Unless further extended by the applicant, **the 120 days will expire on: August 22, 2020.**

Some of the information contained in this report was provided by the applicant. As required by Section 33.800.060 of the Portland Zoning Code, the burden of proof is on the applicant to show that the approval criteria are met. The Bureau of Development Services has independently reviewed the information submitted by the applicant and has included this information only where the Bureau of Development Services has determined the information satisfactorily demonstrates compliance with the applicable approval criteria. This report is the recommendation of the Bureau of Development Services with input from other City and public agencies.

This report is not a decision. The review body for this proposal is the Historic Landmarks Commission who will make the decision on this case. This report is a recommendation to the Historic Landmarks Commission by the Bureau of Development Services. The review body may adopt, modify, or reject this recommendation. The Historic Landmarks Commission will make a decision about this proposal at the hearing or will grant a continuance.

We are seeking your comments on this proposal. To comment, you may write or testify at the remote hearing. Please refer to the file number when seeking information or submitting testimony. In your comments, you must address the approval criteria as stated in the administrative report and decision which you previously received. Please note that all correspondence and testimony received will become part of the public record.

Written comments must be received by the close of the record and should include the case file number. Any new written testimony should be emailed to Hillary Adam at Hillary.Adam@portlandoregon.gov.

Please note regarding USPS mail: If you choose to mail written testimony via USPS, due to the Covid-19 Emergency, USPS mail is only received a couple times a week, and testimony must be received before the close of the record. Therefore, please mail testimony well in advance of the hearing date.

Thank you for any information you can provide regarding this case. **Note:** If you have already written, it is not necessary to write again; your correspondence will be given to the Landmarks Commission.

If you plan to testify at the hearing, please refer to instructions included with this notice.

Appeal of the decision. The decision of the Historic Landmarks Commission may be appealed to City Council, who will hold a public hearing. If you or anyone else appeals the decision of the Historic Landmarks Commission, City Council will hold an evidentiary hearing, one in which new evidence can be submitted to them. Upon submission of their application, the applicant for this land use review chose to waive the 120-day time frame in which the City must render a decision. This additional time allows for any appeal of this proposal to be held as an evidentiary hearing.

Who can appeal: You may appeal the decision only if you write a letter which is received before the close of the record for the hearing, if you testify at the hearing, or if you are the property owner/applicant. Appeals must be filed within 14 days of the decision. An appeal fee of \$5,000.00 will be charged (one-half of the BDS LUS application fee for this case).

Additional information on how to file and the deadline for filing an appeal will be included with the decision. Neighborhood associations recognized by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement may qualify for a waiver of the appeal fee provided that the association has standing to appeal. The appeal must contain the signature of the Chair person or other person_authorized by the association, confirming the vote to appeal was done in accordance with the organization's bylaws.

Neighborhood associations, who wish to qualify for a fee waiver, must complete the Type III Appeal Fee Waiver Request for Organizations Form and submit it prior to the appeal deadline. The Type III Appeal Fee Waiver Request for Organizations Form contains instructions on how to apply for a fee waiver, including the required vote to appeal.

Recording the final decision.

If this Land Use Review is approved the final decision will be recorded with the Multnomah County Recorder.

• *Unless appealed,* the final decision will be recorded by the Bureau of Development Services the day after the appeal period ends.

The applicant, builder, or a representative does not need to record the final decision with the Multnomah County Recorder.

For further information on your recording documents please call the Bureau of Development Services Land Use Services Division at 503-823-0625.

Expiration of this approval. An approval expires three years from the date the final decision is rendered unless a building permit has been issued, or the approved activity has begun.

Where a site has received approval for multiple developments, and a building permit is not issued for all of the approved development within three years of the date of the final decision, a new land use review will be required before a permit will be issued for the remaining development, subject to the Zoning Code in effect at that time.

Zone Change and Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment approvals do not expire.

Applying for your permits. A building permit, occupancy permit, or development permit must be obtained before carrying out this project. At the time they apply for a permit, permittees must demonstrate compliance with:

- All conditions imposed here.
- All applicable development standards, unless specifically exempted as part of this land use review.
- All requirements of the building code.
- All provisions of the Municipal Code of the City of Portland, and all other applicable ordinances, provisions and regulations of the city.

The Bureau of Development Services is committed to providing equal access to information and hearings. Please notify us no less than five business days prior to the event if you need special accommodations. Call 503-823-7300 (TTY 503-823-6868).

Hillary Adam May 29, 2020

EXHIBITS – NOT ATTACHED UNLESS INDICATED

- A. Applicant's Statement
 - 1. Original Submittal
 - 2. 120-Day Waiver
 - 3. Completeness Response, received April 24, 2020
 - 4. Packet for June 8, 2020 Hearing
- B. Zoning Map (attached)
- C. Plan & Drawings
 - 1. Lower Level 2 (C.26)
 - 2. Lower Level 1 (C.27)
 - 3. Level 1 (C.28) (attached)
 - 4. Level 2-5 (C.29)

- 5. Level 6 (C.30)
- 6. Roof Plan (C.31)
- 7. East Elevation (C.32) (attached)
- 8. North Elevation (C.33) (attached)
- 9. West Elevation (C.34) (attached)
- 10. South Elevation (C.35) (attached)
- 11. Building Section (C.36)
- 12. Building Section (C.37)
- 13. Building Section (C.38)
- 14. Perspective (C.39)
- 15. Details Storefront and Column Base (C.40)
- 16. Product Info Storefront (C.41)
- 17. Details Driveway Location (C.42)
- 18. Details Garage Speed Ramp (C.43)
- 19. Details Garage Door (C.44)
- 20. Product Info Garage Door (C.45)
- 21. Details Residential Windows (C.46)
- 22. Details Residential Windows (C.47)
- 23. Details Typical Detail & Residential Window Product Info (C.48)
- 24. Product Info Glazing (C.49)
- 25. Details Glazing Percentage Calculations (C.50)
- 26. Details Signage (C.52)
- 27. Details Signage (C.53)
- 28. Details Signage (C.54)
- 29. Details Signage (C.55)
- 30. Details Blade Signage (C.56)
- 31. Details Canopy (C.57)
- 32. Façade Materials East Elevation (C.58)
- 33. Façade Materials North Elevation (C.59)
- 34. Façade Materials West Elevation (C.60)
- 35. Façade Materials South Elevation (C.61)
- 36. Details Brick Coursing Key (C.62)
- 37. Elevation Store Front Area (C.63)
- 38. Perspective Store Front Activity (C.64)
- 39. Plan Tree Plan (C.68)
- 40. Ground Level Plan Landscape (C.69)
- 41. 2nd & 6th Floor Plan Landscape (C.70)
- 42. Roof Plan Landscape (C.71)
- 43. Plant Palette Landscape (C.72)
- 44. Materials Palette Landscape (C.73)
- 45. Details Glass Guardrail (C.74)
- 46. Details Roof Systems (C.75)
- 47. Details Street Trees (C.76)
- 48. Details Plant Schedule (C.77)
- 49. Product Info Mechanical (C.80)
- 50. MEP Mechanical Screening (C.81)
- 51. Product Info Exterior Light Fixture (C.82)
- 52. Plan Site Lighting (C.83)
- 53. Site Plan Civil (C.86)
- 54. Utilities Plan (C.87)
- 55. Existing Conditions Plan (C.88)
- 56. Grading Plan (C.89)
- 57. Diagram Bike Parking & Product Info (C.92)
- 58. Diagram (FAR Calculations (C.93)
- 59. Diagram Building Height (C.95)

- D. Notification information:
 - 1. Request for response
 - 2. Posting letter sent to applicant
 - 3. Notice to be posted
 - 4. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 5. Mailed notice
 6. Mailing list
- E. Agency Responses:
 - 1. Bureau of Environmental Services
 - 2. Bureau of Transportation Engineering and Development Review
 - 3. Site Development Review Section of BDS
 - 4. Bureau of Parks, Forestry Division
 - 5. Fire Bureau
 - 6. Life Safety Division of BDS
- F. Letters: none
- G. Other
 - 1. Original LUR Application
 - 2. Incomplete Letter, dated March 20, 2020

Η.









A D V E V T U R O U S

NORTH ELEVATION 1/32" = 1'









SOUTH ELEVATION





WEST ELEVATION