



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

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 5000  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
503-823-7300  
Fax 503-823-5630  
TTY 503-823-6868  
[www.portlandonline.com/bds](http://www.portlandonline.com/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** March 12, 2014  
**To:** Portland Design Commission  
**From:** Kara Fioravanti, Senior Planner – Urban Design  
503-823-5892, [Kara.Fioravanti@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Kara.Fioravanti@portlandoregon.gov)  
**Re:** March 20, 2014 Design Review  
LU 13-233011 DZM – The Overton Apartments

Attached is a drawing set for revisions made to “The Overton” since the first Type III hearing on February 20, 2014. The Commission comments were extensive and assumed to result in significant changes to the building’s design. For these reasons, the applicant agreed to return for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Type III hearing on March 20, 2014 for an informal check-in to make sure the new design concept is responsive and on the right track toward approval before getting too invested.

After the February 20<sup>th</sup> hearing, I provided a casual email to the applicant summarizing Commission direction. That email is copied on **Page 8** of the latest submittal. **Page 9** lists the areas where the design team put their efforts. Important to note is that the design team chose to maintain the rotated tower. To address the inherent coherency problems between a rotated tower and an appropriate podium design, the design team chose to float the tower atop a stronger/larger podium that engages the street frontages. This overall direction might not have been the most preferred by the Commission, but the applicant embraced the direction provided for this specific idea.

**Page 12** summarizes the original concept. **Pages 13-15** depict 2 ideas the design team considered for a stronger podium. The design team chose to simplify the podium and moved forward with 2 plazas that are orthogonal (option 2), rather than introducing a diagonal in the podium (option 1). Option 1, a diagonal, was considered overly complicated. If the Commission can embrace the idea of a floating tower atop a larger podium, does the orthogonal option work with regard to coherency? (*\*\*Page 15 incorrectly notes NW 12<sup>th</sup> as NW 13<sup>th</sup> in “Study 1”.\*\**)

**Pages 17-43** describe the new podium design, including the simplification of all facades and the coherency among all podium facades. To note: the plazas are more intimate, stoops are introduced at NW 12<sup>th</sup>, the SE corner has a building corner, a recessed parking court is eliminated, the storefront openings and alignments are regularized, the dock is slightly higher and fully ADA accessible, and more units are introduced at Pettygrove.

**Pages 44-47** introduce a new material for the north and south corners of the tower. The design team will bring, to the hearing, a mock up and case studies of other projects utilizing this material for a discussion on this material.

Landscape is described on **Pages 50-55**. It includes general plaza designs, the podium roof, and streetscape design (including streetscape across 2 streets).

A final note, this set is intentionally conceptual. If the Commission is favorable to this direction, the project would return with a more detailed set of drawings to describe necessary information.

As you know, the review criteria are “*Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines*” and “*River District Design Guidelines*”.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.