



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

FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Amanda Fritz, Commissioner  
Paul L. Scarlett, Director  
Phone: (503) 823-7300  
Fax: (503) 823-5630  
TTY: (503) 823-6868  
[www.portlandoregon.gov/bds](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** March 24, 2014  
**To:** William Bailey, Waterleaf Architecture  
**From:** Staci Monroe, Development Review  
**Re:** 14-102814 DA – Lloyd Center Mall Renovations  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo March 6, 2014

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 March 6, 2014 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 March 6, 2014. 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 formal approval for specific elements of your project is desired.

Please continue to coordinate with me as you prepare your formal land use application, or if you desire another Design Advice Request meeting with the Commission.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Design Commission  
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Design Commission** design direction provided on March 6, 2014.

### Overall Concept

- Given the on-going transformation of the surrounding area, consider how the branding and identity elements will fit with the mall as it transitions from a regional to a more local, neighborhood center. Similar and supporting comments provided include:
  - Scale of the facade elements and signage, existing and future access points and the need for parking structures are elements to consider.
  - Large-scale green and wood clad features centered on the NE Multnomah has more of a suburban appearance than an integrated concept.
  - It may be a regional mall but that doesn't mean it's a suburban mall. It needs an urban presence.
- While the Commission appreciates the efforts to update and spruce up the mall, a master plan, of sorts, is needed to fully understand how the proposed improvements fit in with the larger vision for the mall. Similar and supporting comments provided include:
  - A diagram showing where the energy centers are, future development on site (cinema parking lot and structured parking) and around the site (Lloyd Blocks to the southwest) would help inform where the focus should be.
  - Providing analysis of how people move around the site and access the building would be helpful in understanding the focus on these entry points.
  - The proposed entry elements appear cosmetic (putting lipstick on existing locations where you have ingress and egress to the building), but the locations do not relate to the surrounding area, parking, or to the systems around the site.
  - Entry points specifically for bikes should be explored, as well as covered areas. Given the increase in bike traffic in the area, they should also be included in the diagram of how bicyclists access the site and building.
  - The master plan could study returning NE 15<sup>th</sup> to a street. The energy that comes down NE 15<sup>th</sup> could be harnessed and brought towards the mall.
- The challenge is not necessarily finishes and branding, but how do you communicate the visual queues to people around the project site in a more global way.
- If the south side of the mall is a primary focus, the first phase should be for the *entire* south façade. The other facades could be tied in with paint and light fixtures.
- The south façade is the most transformative piece and has the ability to strengthen the connection to the park, transit, and the pedestrian realm.
- The new façade elements seem to be focused at the upper levels. Start at the pedestrian level and work your way up the building. Particularly on the south façade where you are trying to focus on the pedestrian experience.
- The identity could be an invitation that is well lit and gracious, it may not be a material or a logo. You may be inviting people to a place instead of coming to a trend.
- Given our climate, this is one place where you have to have cover for pedestrians and those utilizing the mall.
- Walkways on the north side of Marshall's seem narrow and unsafe. Explore improvements to these walkways between the surface parking lot and the building.

**Design and Materials**

- The design of the new mall entry and forecourt along the south façade was noted as a design preferred for the entire remodel. It is inviting, well, lit, safe, transparent, it has one foot in the old modernist tradition of the buildings around it, and it is timeless.
- There was some concern that wood and green walls, which each have their own issues, are a departure from the rich heritage of the 50-60’s modernism of the mall.
- The wood and green wall concept is ‘very 2011’, and therefore likely outdated within years like other similar branding improvements.
- Green and wood are a stereotype of Oregon and a bit overplayed. This site has the opportunity to brand itself in a unique way.
- Concerns with the use of wood on the exterior given the urban nature of this area. Could be used judiciously and not within the touch-zone.
- Green walls are very prone to vandalism and a require a ton of maintenance. If used, should be done so judiciously and not within reach of people.
- Sign size could be addressed by reducing the logo.

Commissioners in attendance on March 6, 2014:

Jeff Simpson  
David Wark  
Jane Hansen  
Tad Savinar  
Gwen Millius  
Ben Kaiser

**Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
  - 1. Project Summary Memo dated 1/31/14
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
  - 1. through 26.
- D. Notification
  - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
  - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
  - 2. Applicant’s statement certifying posting
- E. Service Bureau Comments
  - 1. Bureau of Environmental Services
  - 2. Bureau of Transportation
- F. Public Testimony
  - 1. Kiel Johnson, neighbor across the street, testified at hearing regarding noise associated with cleaning the parking garage during the night.
- G. Other
  - 1. Application form
  - 2. Copy of Zoning Confirmation Letter dated 6/15/2012 (12-147559 PR)
  - 3. Design Commission Summary Memo dated 2/24/14
  - 4. Copy of Staff’s PowerPoint presentation dated 3/6/2014