



City of Portland  
**Bureau of Development Services**  
Land Use Services Division

1900 SW Fourth Ave., Suite 5000  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
Telephone: (503) 823-7300  
TDD: (503) 823-6868  
FAX: (503) 823-5630  
[www.bds.ci.portland.or.us](http://www.bds.ci.portland.or.us)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** August 8, 2013  
**To:** Susan Makris, GBD Architects  
**From:** Kara Fioravanti, Land Use Review  
503-823-5892  
**Re:** 13-151841 DA – Park Central (Block 15)  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo from April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting

Thank you for taking advantage of the opportunity to hold a Design Advice Request regarding your project. I hope you find it informative and valuable as you continue with your project development. Attached is a summary of the comments provided by the Design Commission at the August 1, 2013 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/webdrawer/search/rec?sm\\_class=uri\\_7547&count&rows=50](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/search/rec?sm_class=uri_7547&count&rows=50)

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 August 1, 2013. As the project design evolves, the comments, too, may evolve or may no longer be pertinent.

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

Please continue to coordinate with me if you choose to return for a second DAR, or if you choose to prepare your Type III Design Review application.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Design Commission  
Respondents

This memo summarizes Design Commission design direction provided at the August 1, 2013 Design Advice Request meeting.

### **General**

- This building will have to bridge the “new economics” of development with the existing towers in South Waterfront. The design needs to blur that line between the two typologies and bring the two languages together. That has to be done poetically and this proposal needs more work to achieve that. Express a sensibility that these are homes with “badass modern”. South Waterfront needs “badass modern”.
- The building has a long way to go. This was reiterated/”seconded”, which highlights the need to carefully consider all comments (especially those that would result in substantial shifts). There were stated expectations for significant differences next time.

### **SW Gaines Height Corridor Modification**

- The Modification could be approvable if you demonstrate the shadow impact on Gaines is (at least) no more than a project that conforms to the zoning envelope that the standard prescribes.

### **SW Lane Setback Modification**

- The ground level should conform to the standard. Support for upper floors to encroach as much as is proposed in the current plans.

### **Composition and materials**

- The object and its elevations are confusing. There is a lack of hierarchy. Turn off all the various layers. Stick with a primary material and maybe add a secondary.
- The earlier studies were more compelling. Blend your original intent with this project through more study. Though, one Commissioner noted support for the proposed general form.
- The yin-yang diagram is confusing.
- Celebrate the honesty of forms. Make the building simple and elegant.
- There are massing shifts in plan that do not clearly translate in the volume.
- Do more design with fewer materials. There needs to be fewer graphic moves at the elevations.
- Study proportions – the parapet looks very heavy and the base of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is skinny.
- You are describing wanting to add warmth in South Waterfront, but this doesn’t do it.
- The skin is confusing.
- For a cement panel system to be allowed, it should be very much a secondary building material. If used it should be framed/contained and, of course, minimal. The most recent building in South Waterfront initially started with a considerable amount of cement panel and was approved with zero cement panel. With the exception of Matisse (which is not a model for South Waterfront), there is very little cement panel in South Waterfront.
- Commercial-grade vinyl windows are acceptable when bounded by higher quality materials and punched. The idea you are presenting for the vinyl windows, trying to look like horizontal strips of storefront, will not be successful.
- Why are the horizontals broken up?
- The areas where you are using wood are incongruous and forced. The wood is odd.
- It is very early on in the design process to be relying on color for a good project. What happens if/when the budget requires more value engineering?
- Be clear with color, if you utilize color. Be systematic where color is used.

### **Corners**

- All corners need to be excellent.
- The Gaines/River Parkway corner and the Gaines/Greenway corner are different contexts with different audiences. Stated agreement with the testimony about the Gaines/Greenway corner.
- The Gaines and Greenway is a transition from development to nature. A majority commented this corner should erode. Though, majority support for an urban edge at the ground level of this corner.
- The built form at Gaines and the Greenway needs to weave in the River.
- The ground level of the building up against the Greenway urbanizes the Greenway, which is a good thing.
- One Commissioner supported the Greenway/Gaines corner as proposed.

- Support for making a great corner at Gaines and River Parkway, but this proposal does not include a great corner. Revisit the building design at the upper floors of the corner, and revisit the ground level layout – too much service is too close to the corner.

### **River**

- Your first intuition was right to have outdoor spaces open up to the River. This proposal lost that River connection. Explore more how to orient to the River (example provided: Salk Institute.)
- Show erosion in the building at the River.
- The ground level at the East elevation is a straight line with a fence – this ground level needs a lot more work - activation, interest, landscape design, etc.
- Soften the Waterfront edge at the ground level and in the upper floors.
- The Greenway cannot continue to feel like individual backyards. Would the garage entry moving closer to the Greenway bring activity closer to the Greenway? You claim the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony is engaging and activating the Greenway, how is that happening? Build in flexibility now for the ground level units at the Greenway to be easily converted to commercial, ideally retail.
- The Greenway side has to have vitality. If the club room is next to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor outdoor courtyard, then the courtyard would be activated. The ground level units need to be able to accommodate commercial uses.

### **Ground level** *(See River above for more discussion re: Greenway ground level)*

- The south courtyard is buried with little street connection, but it is a major building move. It needs to have a more robust pedestrian level connection.
- Do better with the canopies – this project needs them. Weather protection is encouraged by the guidelines.
- Need good transitions to the Greenway.
- The first 30' of the building has to be great.
- Concern with corten at the “touch zone”.

### **Parking**

- Support for parking entry at Gaines.
- Is there a better location on Gaines? Show us your studies.
- Can you explore achieving a higher parking count?

### **Roof**

- Very big concern with roof – explore and design it.
- The roof is critical.
- There is habitat here. Work with BES and their programs to incorporate an ecoroof, which would encourage habitat. Ecoroofs are feasible for this project type given their low weight.
- If it isn't green, it has to be very consciously designed and beautiful. If using rocks, think long-term maintenance. The roof should not become a ballast roof with weeds.
- If rocks, don't end up with a busy pattern solution. It should be simple and unified.
- It is not a “garden” if people can't be up there.

## **Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  1. Original Zoning Summary from applicant, May 10-2013
  2. Original drawing submittal, April 25, 2013
  3. Original building counts, May 10-2013
  4. Applicant memo, June 3, 2013
  5. Floor plans at the Greenway, June 18, 2013
  6. Drawings for review prior to DAR and presented at DAR, June 20, 2013
  7. Original Utility Plan, April 15, 2013
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings (see Exhibit A.6)
- D. Public Notification
  1. Posting letter and notice
  2. Signed certification for posting

- E. Bureau Responses
  - none received
- F. Public Testimony
  - 1. Barker, Bjelland, Diamond, Juckeland, Luke, Rubin, Taylor
  - 2. Jubitz
  - 3. Bjelland
  - 4. Dannen, June 10, 2013
  - 5. Rubin, Barker
  - 6. Nunn, June 10, 2013
  - 7. Glick, June 9, 2013
  - 8. Crandall
  - 9. Fellman, June 10, 2013
  - 10. Creamer, June 10, 2013
  - 11. Juckeland, June 10, 2013
  - 12. Diamond, June 10, 2013
  - 13. Sewell, June 9, 2013
  - 14. Durkin, June 8, 2013
  - 15. Atwater Place Board
  - 16. Meriwether Condominium Owner's Association, July 11, 2013
  - 17. Kendrick, July 16, 2013
  - 18. Spence, July 1, 2013
  - 19. Skopil, June 20, 2013
  - 20. Gertenrick, July 16, 2013
  - 21. Crandall, July 13, 2013
  - 22. John Ross Condominium Owner's Association, July 24, 2013
  - 23. Anderson, August 1, 2013
  - 24. Creamer, August 1, 2013
  - 25. Savory, August 1, 2013
  - 26. Dannen, August 1, 2013
  - 27. Russell, August 1, 2013
  - 28. Petition – multiple names, August 1, 2013
  - 29. Dannen, August 5, 2013
- G. Other
  - 1. Original Application form
  - 2. Staff presentation, August 1, 2013
  - 3. Memo to Commission, June 11, 2013
  - 4. Staff notes from August 1<sup>st</sup> Commission meeting
  - 5. Pre-application notes 13-139771 PC, May 14, 2013