



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 10, 2014
To: Kevin Cavanaugh, Guerilla Development
From: Kara Fioravanti, Development Review
Phone number 503-823-5892
Re: 13-227219 DA – The Dumbbell
Design Advice Request Summary Memo April 3, 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 April 3, 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

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 April 3, 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 decide on a return DAR date.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Design Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Design Commission** design direction provided at the **April 3, 2014**.

Commissioners in attendance on April 3rd: Jeff Simpson, Ben Kaiser, David Wark, David Keltner, Gwen Milius, and Tad Savinar.

Wrap

- The overwhelming majority of Commission preferred no skirt.

Landscape

- With the elimination of the skirt and the resulting large amount of ground plane area, the landscape design is critical to the success of this urban project.

The parti and Urban Design

- The stair/tower creates a dead-end space – safety concerns, bad urban design.
- The boxes (and dumbbell concept) are pure when you eliminate the central stair/elevator tower and the balcony projections at the north and south ends.

Quality: materials and details

- With the way the ground level is rendered (storefront, doors, canopies, etc.), the base is incongruous with the top. The ground level detailing and materials need to be of the highest quality – butt-glazed storefront, minimal canopies, etc.
- For this project to succeed every detail has to be 100% (material joints, corners, mechanical, windows, doors, window sections, skin wrapping into the door/window openings, railings, garage door, canopy design, etc.)
- The boxes are sophisticated; all other components must be, also. The bridges (and stair/elevator if they remain) must be equally refined.
- Canopies must be fully integrated – a suggestion included a continuation of the butt-glazed storefront system; canopies only at the entry doors could be acceptable.
- The garage door deserves an integrated and creative treatment.
- There is a random exposed concrete column at the garage.
- Get ahead of signage because it can significantly affect this architecture in a negative way.
- Real mock-ups demonstrating quality construction must be provided prior to approvals.

Skin pattern

- Regarding the actual pattern on the boxes, there was a healthy debate. One Commissioner was strongly supportive of the Florentine pattern because of its assumed commentary on the pattern's dichotomy with the district character. More Commissioners were strongly encouraging you to not present a borrowed pattern – instead, present a concept for the art. Regardless of what the proposal is, it must have meaning – tie it to something with meaning to place (not in a literal sense).
- RACC was debated as well. The Commission in general was more comfortable with keeping the purview of the skin pattern with Design Commission, rather than handing it over to RACC. Though RACC wasn't completely eliminated as an option. In general, the pattern will have more relevance if an artist was involved, but an intentional pattern can be reviewed and approved through Design Review.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Information
 1. Original drawing set
 2. Drawing set (1 of 2), reviewed for January 23, 2014 hearing
 3. Drawing set (2 of 2), reviewed for January 23, 2014 hearing
 4. Option 1 Drawings (1 of 2), reviewed for April 3, 2014 hearing
 5. Option 1 Drawings (2 of 2), reviewed for April 3, 2014 hearing
 6. Option 2 Drawings (1 of 2), reviewed for April 3, 2014 hearing
 7. Option 2 Drawings (2 of 2), reviewed for April 3, 2014 hearing
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings (see A series above)

D. Notifications

1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
2. Applicant's statement certifying posting
3. Posting notice as sent to applicant
4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice

E. Public Testimony – *none received*

F. Bureau Responses – *none received*

G. Other

1. Application form
2. Transmittal, 1-13-14
3. Staff cover memo for January 23, 2014 hearing
4. Staff 'cheat sheet' for January 23, 2014 hearing
5. Staff powerpoint for January 23, 2014 hearing
6. Staff notes from January 23, 2014 hearing
7. Summary memo from January 23, 2014 hearing
8. Staff cover memo for April 3, 2014 hearing
9. Applicant narrative for April 3, 2014 hearing
10. Staff powerpoint for April 3, 2014 hearing
11. Staff notes from April 3, 2014 hearing
12. Staff 'cheat sheet' for April 3, 2014 hearing