



City of Portland Historic Landmarks Commission

Design Advice Request

SUMMARY MEMO

Mailed: November 23, 2021
Date: November 19, 2021
To: Mark Schmidt | Holst Architecture
From: Arthur Graves, Design Review
503.865.6517, Arthur.Graves@portlandoregon.gov
Re: EA 21-087458 DAR – Grace Peck Apartments at 1839 NE 14th Avenue
Design Advice Request Memo for October 25, 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 Historic Landmarks Commission at the **October 25, 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:

<https://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/14670367/>

These Historic Landmarks Commission comments are intended to guide you in further design exploration of your project. These comments may also inform City staff when giving guidance over the course of future related land use reviews. It should be understood that these comments address the project as presented on **October 25, 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 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 Land Use Review Application.

Encl: Summary Memo

Cc: Historic Landmarks Commission
Respondents

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Present: Ron Bronson, Maya Foty (Vice Chair), Ernestina Fuenmayor, Kristen Minor (Chair), Matthew Roman, Andrew Smith.

Commissioners Absent: Kimberly Moreland

Executive Summary:

- The Commission generally supported the proposed removal and replacement of the existing cladding. Both proposed materials, Oko skin and thin brick, were initially supported with a majority of Commissioners supporting Oko skin over thin brick. Detailing of materials was stated as being very important.
- The Commission agreed that the removal of the balconies should be avoided.
- The Commission encouraged development of another common outdoor area as concerns about north patio in shade 100% of the time.
- The Commission was amenable to new vinyl windows to replace existing vinyl windows.
- The Commission was amenable to possible Modifications if necessary, depending on limitations of existing building/site conditions and proposal.

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

CONTEXT and QUALITY & PERMANENCE

- 1. Response to Historic District;**
- 2. Materials and skin expression;**
- 3. Balconies and windows.**

- The Historic Landmarks Commission agreed the existing stucco cladding could be removed and replaced with the materials proposed: Oko skin (cementitious material) or thin brick. Oko skin was generally considered to be a more honest/true material, and more compatible with the plaster material of the original building than the thin brick material. While some commissioners supported thin brick, the majority supported the use of Oko skin.
- Commissioners had concerns with the proposed new cladding, particularly the thin brick, removing the residential language and patterning of the building to be replaced with a generic and repetitive scheme that appears very industrial and inconsistent with the historic district.
- Commissioners had concerns with the amount and randomness of color proposed with the Oko skin option and felt less color would be more appropriate to the historic context.
- Commissioners agreed that either thin brick or Oko skin could be fit within the historic context, but that detailing would be key for success and longevity of the material.
- Commissioners had concerns with the Oko skin option's use of thin brick at the base. Specific concerns focused on the location of the differentiation of material in relation to the building's use - stating the change in material would be more appropriate on the base of the building's north volume which is community space vs the building's south volume which are residential units.
- The Commission agreed that the removal of the balconies should be avoided and, in an effort to be more equitable, additional balconies should be provided to units that are currently without balconies.
- Commissioners were accepting of replacement windows being vinyl construction due to existing windows to be replaced being vinyl.
- Commissioners were not supportive of fixed windows due to their inability to be opened by residents.

- Commissioners agreed that proposed windows should have a significant inset or “punch” and shadow lines and that building elevations should have depth and not appear to be on one plane.

PUBLIC REALM

- 4. Main Entry;**
- 5. Outdoor Patio Areas;**
- 6. Modifications.**

- The Commission agreed on the value of the entrance screen wall, which is proposed to be removed, in its helping to bring the building down to a human scale at the entrance. Because of this, Commission agreed either the wall should remain, or an architectural feature should be added to the design proposal that can help provide this transition and accomplish this effect.
- Some Commissioners stated that the removal of the existing screen wall at the entrance was positive in that it allowed greater visibility to and from the building’s main entrance. However, Commissioners also agreed that the proposed entrance should include amenities and a design solution with greater clarity and presence than the existing entrance and entry sequence.
- Commissioners agreed that the proposed location for the outdoor terrace was problematic, stating it would not be active due to being in shadow a majority of the time because of its location below grade and on the north portion of the site. Commissioners suggested locating this patio at the north-west corner of the building.
- Commissioners agreed that the proposed north patio could be a usable area in warmer months but felt that additional outdoor areas located with improved solar aspect for use during at least three seasons should also be included for residents.
- Commissioners agreed that Modifications to landscaping and outdoor areas could be approvable if necessary, depending on limitations of existing building/site conditions and proposal.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant’s Narrative & Drawings
 1. September 17, 2021 Initial Submittal
 2. October 04, 2021 Revised Drawings
 3. October 11, 2021 Revised Drawings
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 1. Cover
 2. Zoning Summary
 3. Zoning Map
 4. Site Location Plan
 5. Site Context Plan
Site Context
 6. Site Context Image reference Plan
 7. Site Context Images
 8. Site Context Image reference Plan
 9. Site Context Images
 10. Site Context Images
 11. Site Context Images
 12. Site Context Images - Existing Building
 13. Site Context Images - Existing Building
Public Realm
 14. Site Plan - Existing
 15. Site Plan - Proposed

16. Existing Plan - Ground Level
17. Proposed Plan - Ground Level
18. Existing Plan - Typical Upper Level
19. Proposed Plan - Typical Upper Level
- Quality & Permanence
- Option 1
20. Existing View
21. Proposed Option 1 View
22. Existing View
23. Proposed Option 1 View
24. Existing View
25. Proposed Option 1 View
26. Existing View
27. Proposed Option 1 View
28. Option 1 Elevations
29. Option 1 Elevations
30. Option 1 Elevations
31. Option 1 Elevations
- Option 2
32. Existing View
33. Proposed Option 2 View
34. Existing View
35. Proposed Option 2 View
36. Existing View
37. Proposed Option 2 View
38. Existing View
39. Proposed Option 2 View
40. Option 2 Elevations
41. Option 2 Elevations
42. Option 2 Elevations
43. Option 2 Elevations
44. Option 1 Overview
45. Option 2 Overview
46. Existing Main NE Entry
47. Proposed Main NE Entry
48. Existing North Terrace
49. Proposed North Terrace
- Material Overview
50. Technical Information
51. Technical Information
52. Precedent Images
53. Precedent Images
- D. Notification
 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant, includes general information on DAR process
 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
- E. Service Bureau Comments - - no comments submitted.
- F. Public Testimony
 1. October 06, 2021 email: Pauline Long
 2. October 25, 2021 DAR Testimony:
 - Pauline Long
- G. Other
 1. Application form
 2. October 18, 2021 Historic Landmark Commission Memo and Attachments
- H. Hearing October 25, 2021

1. Staff PPT Presentation