



City of Portland Design Commission

Design Advice Request

SUMMARY MEMO

Date: October 27, 2021
To: Leslie Cliffe | Bora Architects
From: Staci Monroe | Design & Historic Review Team
503-865-6516 | Staci.Monroe@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 21-047286 DA – 1122 SE Ankeny Street | YBP Ankeny
Design Advice Request Commission Summary Memo – June 17, 2021

Thank you for taking advantage of the opportunity to hold a Design Advice Request regarding your project. I hope you find it informative and valuable as you continue with your project development. Following, is a summary of the comments provided by the Design Commission at the June 17, 2021 Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings. To review those recordings, please visit: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/record/11686822>.

These Design Commission comments are intended to guide you in further design exploration of your project. These comments may also inform City staff when giving guidance over the course of future related land use reviews. It should be understood that these comments address the project as presented on June 17, 2021. As the project design evolves, the comments, too, may evolve or may no longer be pertinent.

Design Advice Requests are not intended to substitute for other Code-required land use or legislative procedures. Please keep in mind that the formal Type II or Type III land use review process [which includes a land use review application, public notification and a Final Decision] must be followed once the Design Advice Request meetings are complete, if formal approval for specific elements of your project is desired.

Please continue to coordinate with me as you prepare your Type II or Type III Land Use Review Application.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Design Commission
Respondents

Commissioners Present. *Julie Livingston, Chandra Robinson, Brian McCarter, Sam Rodriguez, Don Vallaster, Zari Santner*

Executive Summary. Overall, the massing strategy with two bars of different scale is successful. Study ways to provide some differentiation between the buildings so they better respond to their immediate context, without compromising the strong diagram and composition. The transition from the sidewalk to the building on 12th needs to be enriched with layered landscaping, seating and a more inviting porch while the Ankeny frontage needs to provide weather protection. The presentation included good options for material and colors.

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

CONTEXT

- The massing strategy with two separate volumes is very successful. Supporting comments include:
 - While a significantly larger building than the houses, the masses themselves are not large.
 - The lower mass on SE 12th is a good move to respond to the lower scale of the adjacent houses.
 - One Commissioner stated the scale on 12th might be large for the context and to study setting back the top floor along SE 12th by 10' to better align with the houses. Other Commissioners said even at 4 stories, the volume on 12th is petite and doesn't need to push back on the upper floor.
- The building setback on 12th is contextually appropriate. However, more needs to be done to improve how the ground plane of the building and site engages horizontally with the adjacent properties. Supporting comments include:
 - Understand the challenges with accessibility so it could be done architecturally or graphically rather than elevating the ground floor and adding a raised porch.
 - The recessed ground floor is a start but needs more to evoke a porch feeling with finer scaled elements. Study increasing the depth as well.
 - The recessed ground floor feels more like a cave than a porch. Needs work to increase light, visibility and details.
 - Improving the landscaping on 12th will provide a stronger contextual response with layered landscaping within the building setback of the adjacent houses.
 - Within the building setback look at relocating the bike parking so they don't dominate the area, adding seating and more generous and thoughtful landscaping.
- Both masses are graphically strong. However, the two separate volumes provide a great opportunity to differentiate each volume to better respond to each street frontage and adjacent context. Supporting comments include:
 - Use same genesis (like the current design as a foundation) and then add finer-grained detail on 12th to help with context.
 - Elements to explore on 12th could include window proportions and arrangement (3 bars versus 2 bars), scale of the board and batten as it goes up the building, ground floor height (graphically), porch elements, etc.

- Exterior materials and/or colors could be used to differentiate the two volumes so it doesn't appear as one large project overwhelming the smaller houses. Could also help reduce the scale.
- One Commissioner concluded the building composition as proposed is successful in responding to the context along both frontages.
- Western bar is contextual at the termination of the industrial district. The simplicity of the punched windows also works well.
- The addition of street trees along both frontages would be contextual.
- Regarding materials:
 - Materiality doesn't have to be same as houses. Needs to be grounded in the context but not match the context.
 - Board and batten works well with the residential building type and is contemporary.
 - Metal is not appropriate on the smaller volume and probably not on the larger mass either.
 - Shingles are a good contextual response. However, one commissioner concluded the shingles are too fine scaled for the height of the building.
 - Consider cement board for the western bar.
- Regarding the color options provided:
 - A building with color is more appropriate to the context versus a black or white color palette.
 - Moss green color allows the building to recede back into the context, especially with a street tree in front of it.

PUBLIC REALM

- Weather protection over the sidewalk is needed along 12th to meet the guidelines and could be another way to differentiate from the 12th frontage. The length of the canopy needs to be studied to ensure adequate weather protection. If large enough, the ground floor recess may not be necessary.
- One Commissioner stated that street trees are more contextual than the need for canopies.
- Shifting the roof deck to the east closer to the edge of the building would help activate SE 12th.

QUALITY AND RESILIENCE

- All the material options being considered appear to be of high quality.
- The landscaping along the east side of the Ankeny bar should be planted with species that will grow and provide some privacy for the abutting properties.
- Given how small the units are and little open space there is on the site, a larger active roof area would be a great asset to the residents of the building.

MODIFICATIONS & ADJUSTMENT

- Support was expressed for a Modification to the setback landscaping along SE 12th, indicating the 50% requirement is not critical but the design and amount needs to be more intentional and thoughtful.

- Support was expressed for a Modification to the ground floor window requirement along SE Ankeny to allow flexibility on how much of the glazing is into a bike room given the Major City Bikeway designation along this frontage.
- Support was expressed for a Modification to reduce the pedestrian path from SE 12th to the western bar entry from 6' to 5' in width.
- Support was expressed for an Adjustment to not provide any loading on site given the adverse impacts a loading space would have on either of the narrow street frontages.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Plans dated 5/10/21
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. through 32
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 - 1. PBOT response dated 6/1/21
- F. Public Testimony
 - 1. Testifier List from 6/17/21 hearing
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff memo to Design Commission dated 6/14/21
 - 3. Staff presentation to Design Commission for 6/17/21 hearing