



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: May 28, 2014
To: YBA ARCHITECTS PC *ALEX YALE*
From: Hillary Adam, Development Review
Re: 14-112390 DA – Q21
2nd Design Advice Request Summary Memo May 15, 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 May 15, 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 May 15, 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 May 15, 2014.

Commissioners in attendance on April 3, 2014: Guinevere Millius, David Wark, David Keltner, Tad Savinar, Ben Keiser, & Jane Hansen.

Warehouse Retention

- There was consensus among the Commissioners that preserving the building in place does not outweigh the needs of the City with regard to development of the overall pedestrian plan or with the need for the applicant to design exceptional urban spaces, noting that retention of the building is working against these priorities.
- Many of the Commissioners commented that they appreciate the family story behind the desire to preserve the building but recommended alternative ways of honoring that history by preserving some sense of the building, without literally preserving the building in place. Some ideas that were brainstormed included: portals along Pettygrove leading to the townhouses, remnants at the interior of the building on the Quimby side, literally telling the story with words on a few panels, interpreting the history/building through art, tasking an artist to recycle some of the panels into something, and/or cutting up the concrete and using it as pavers. One commissioner posited whether the story to tell was about the concrete, the family, or the people who worked there. One Commissioner suggested you could create an ode to the building without being slavish to it.
- A couple of Commissioners recommended that you explore not keeping the warehouse, as a basic premise and exercise, noting that you can always go back to it. It was acknowledged that the proposal is dynamic within the constraints given but is not creating the best possible urban spaces and that retention of the warehouse is really a hindrance to the possibilities on this site. It was suggested that the proposal could be much better if you did something in the spirit of the warehouse and honor it without literally saving the warehouse, noting that as proposed, from every angle (Pettygrove, 21st, and Quimby), it's having difficulties getting anyone's support. Several Commissioners noted that you were thinking creatively about how to work with the complexities of your charge to work with the existing building, specifically noting that your design sensibilities and skills were impressive and that you are good problem solvers; they expressed a desire to see you return with a design that is less literal in its attempt to preserve the building.
- The question of whether or not to retain the building along 21st was applied to the whole block. One Commissioner noted that the Pettygrove façade was still the entire original 260-foot long warehouse and even though the façade pushes and pulls behind it, the proposed cuts are small breaks in a very long elevation. It was suggested that if you keep the warehouse, the Pettygrove elevation needs to have significant breaks in it, not just little breaks in the wall and a 20-foot slice; it needs to have massing breaks and deep breaks. It needs to be more in scale with a typical 200-foot block.
- One commissioner noted that the reason why the accessways are in the master plan is to break up the block sizes so you're going to have to get creative with how to break that up on both sides (Quimby and Pettygrove).
- One Commissioner cautioned that the tilt-up slabs may not be securely attached to the footings as he has found in his own work with them. He also noted that while a portion of the building may be lost along 21st, it will translate to cost savings with regard to engineering.

NW 21st Avenue

- Again, all Commissioners commented that they can't justify denying PBOT the 3-foot of right-of-way along 21st. The Commission acknowledged that there are parts of 21st to the south that have areas of narrower sidewalks but these are located at smaller parcels with less singular investment, while the blocks to the north will be developed at the standard width of 15 feet and this building should do the same considering the level of investment and the City's vision for this area.
- All commissioners agreed that NW 21st is not designed to handle a curbless street. The Commissioners noted that Quimby to the east will be the festival street, and that 21st would never be closed down in the way Quimby will, expressing serious doubts that we would want people freely crossing 21st or spilling into the street given that it is the secondary N/S arterial for the neighborhood, it has a bus line and a future streetcar line.
- A few Commissioners acknowledged the desire to do something different (saving the building) with regard to the character of future construction which will mostly utilize all

new materials, but noted that your first priority is to create great urban edges (particularly across from the plaza on 21st), then consider what else you are going to bring to the design; everything else is secondary to creating great urban edges.

- One Commissioner noted that the 21st façade as proposed, has the perception of being closed down with a narrow sidewalk and an aggressive building façade coming down to the street, especially when compared with the relative openness of the future public plaza across 21st. He challenged the designer to ask “What is the greatest sidewalk environment for retail activity across the street from a public space in NW Portland?” Design that. Design it to support retailers and make that space and then ask “Now, what can we do? What can we preserve?” He noted that the activity zone, which is really the draw for people across the street, is being strangled by the footprint of the existing building. He suggested that you think “public”, think “open space”, think “retail” first, and then the building, rather than the building first, and then what see what you have left over, as an approach to problem solving. He also suggested that it may not be one size fits all along this long façade, noting that 21st is full of nooks and crannies that offer diversity, asking what will be the attractor that prompts people to cross the street and visit these spaces.
- One Commissioner, responding to the idea of arcade, noted that there is a difference between an arcade and a storefront in terms of permeability, perception, and safety, noting that slimmer panels would be better; however, it was clear that an arcade located within the right-of-way would not be supported.

Quimby

- Most Commissioners noted that, better than the flat-wall option, the angled-wall option helps turn the energy coming from the accessways toward the future plaza and park to the east. The flat-wall option was regarded as a missed opportunity for enhancing this connection.
- Referring to the Conway Master Plan’s purpose for imposing the accessways, one Commissioner noted that the western end of Quimby façade needed a bit more study as it is the termination point for the accessways which will be several blocks long. He asked, “From a site planning standpoint, what are you encountering besides just the building? What’s the building? What’s the landscape? What’s happening there to really receive that end and then turn you to the east?” Another Commissioner commented that it would be really cool to continue the accessway through the building.
- All of the Commissioners noted that the proposal along the Quimby street frontage could be really successful if it was permeable, with direct engagement with the retail, and was all at grade like a grand sidewalk with an alley of trees to walk through. A couple Commissioners noted that keeping it at-grade makes it a dynamic open space, but once it’s raised, you have an obstruction which also raises concerns with regard to accessibility.
- There was much discussion on the proposed size of the plaza and whether the depth was appropriate with several Commissioners expressing concern that it might feel corporate or collegiate, particularly with the columns coming down as though to mark the space. They suggested that the plaza’s ability to feel like a public space rather than a private space would largely depend on materials, and details, landscaping, and the right mix of tenants. Again, one Commissioner suggested exploring the idea of what the design would be if you started with a blank slate (no existing building), suggesting maybe the plaza would no longer be proposed at the current depth.
- While the Commission agreed that the nearby accessways and future plaza across 21st warranted a larger open space at this corner, most Commissioners expressed concern that the proposed plaza was too large and would not support intimate public/private realm engagement. One Commissioner stated that the depth of the plaza and the height of the adjacent walls created a proportional space and that there needs to be enough room to allow for tables and chairs as well as free and comfortable movement of pedestrians, particularly at the entrance areas. Another Commissioner liked the proposed plaza size.
- It was suggested that, for the Type III land use hearing, the applicant provide precedent images of plazas of similar scale to show the diversity of design and convince the Commission that this scale was appropriate.

Retail Use Limitation

- The Commission was hesitant to confirm support for an adjustment to the retail use limitation, acknowledging that it would set a precedent and a better understanding of how

significant a precedent that would be necessary before they could formally support the idea.

- One Commissioner noted that the Conway Master Plan was designed so that the New Seasons would be the one exception for a large retailer.

For reference: Staff notes that a good portion of the Northwest Plan District that is subject to this Code provision is already developed, though redevelopment is certainly a possibility. However, an even greater proportion of the Northwest Plan District, also subject to the Conway Master Plan, is largely undeveloped and will be subject to this Code provision. See pages 2 and 22 for more information:

<http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?c=28197&a=53416>

Adjacent Single Dwelling

- The Commission posed questions on the treatment of the 15-foot wide egress path along the western edge but did not provide suggestions on how to treat it.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 1. Applicant Narrative
 2. Original drawing set
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
(April 3, 2014 DAR drawing packet)
 1. Site Plan
 2. Project Description
 3. Vicinity Aerial
 4. Context Aerials
 5. Site Photos
 6. Conway Master Plan Edge context
 7. Program Diagram
 8. Conway Build-Out context
 9. Movement Diagram
 10. Street-level context
 11. Background Images
 12. Ground Level Plan
 13. Level 02 Plan
 14. Level 03 Plan
 15. Levels 04 and 05 Plan
 16. Levels 06 and 07 Plan
 17. Perspective: Looking at NE Corner
 18. Solids and Voids Diagram
 19. Section Cut: Looking at NE Corner
 20. Perspective: Looking WSW
 21. Tectonics and Massing Description
 22. East and West Elevations
 23. Perspective: Looking at the North boardwalk
 24. South and North Elevations
 25. Perspective: Looking at East façade
 26. Architectural Description
 27. Perspective: Looking at the SE Corner
 28. Solar Studies
 29. Proposed Materials
 30. Proposed Materials
(May 15, 2014 DAR drawing packet)
 31. Cover Sheet
 32. Site Context
 33. DAR 1 Recap – Conway Maximum Height
 34. DAR 1 Recap – Ground Floor Retail
 35. DAR 1 Recap – Frontage Improvement Pedestrian Experience
 36. DAR 1 Recap – Perspective
 37. DAR 1 Recap – NW 21st Perspective

38. DAR 1 Recap – Night View
 39. DAR 1 Comments
 40. DAR 2 – Option 1 Site Plan
 41. DAR 2 – Option 2 Site Plan
 42. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Plan
 43. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Section
 44. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Elevation
 45. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Figure Ground Elevation
 46. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Perspective
 47. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Quimby Perspective (East)
 48. Quimby St. – Option 1 “Angled Edge” Quimby Perspective (West)
 49. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Plan
 50. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Section
 51. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Elevation
 52. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Figure Ground Elevation
 53. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Perspective
 54. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Perspective (East)
 55. Quimby St. – Option 2 “Property Edge Max-Out” Perspective (West)
 56. Precedent Images
 57. Precedent Images
 58. Option 1 – 21st St. “Curbless Street” Plan and Precedent
 59. Option 1 – 21st St. “Curbless Street” Section
 60. Option 1 – 21st St. “Curbless Street” Elevation
 61. Option 1 – 21st St. “Curbless Street” Figure Ground Elevation
 62. Option 1 – 21st St. “Curbless Street” Perspectives
 63. Option 1 – 21st St. “Curbless Street” Perspective
 64. 21st St. – Option 2 “6ft Arcade” Plan
 65. 21st St. – Option 2 “6ft Arcade” Section
 66. 21st St. – Option 2 “6ft Arcade” Elevation
 67. 21st St. – Option 2 “6ft Arcade” Figure Ground Elevation
 68. 21st St. – Option 2 “6ft Arcade” Perspectives
 69. 21st St. – Option 2 “6ft Arcade” Perspectives
 70. Façade Figure Ground Precedents for Townhomes
 71. Façade Figure Ground Precedents for Townhomes
 72. Intumescent Paint information
 73. Intumescent Paint Precedent
 74. Tilt-up Panel to PT Connection diagrams
- D. Notification
1. Posting instructions sent to applicant for March 20, 2014 hearing
 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant for March 20, 2014 hearing
 3. Posting instructions sent to applicant for April 3, 2014 hearing
 4. Posting notice as sent to applicant for April 3, 2014 hearing
 5. Applicant’s statement certifying posting for April 3, 2014 hearing
 6. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
 7. Posting instructions sent to applicant for May 15, 2014 hearing
 8. Posting notice as sent to applicant for May 15, 2014 hearing
 9. Applicant’s statement certifying posting for May 15, 2014 hearing
- E. Service Bureau Comments
1. Bureau of Transportation Comments from EA-13-223748-PC
 2. Bureau of Environmental Services Comments from EA-13-223748-PC
- F. Public Testimony
1. Paul Gustavson, 2154 NW Quimby, on April 3, 2014, stated that he has concerns about the development, though is not opposed to development. Mr. Gustavson stated that he was not opposed to the proposed use and that he preferred maintenance of the existing setback to preserve his access to light and air along the west property line adjacent to his house. (No written comments – see G-5 for summary.)
- G. Other
1. Application form
 2. Staff Memo to Design Commission, dated March 18, 2014
 3. Staff Presentation for April 3, 2014 DAR
 4. Applicant Presentation for April 3, 2014 DAR
 5. April 3, 2014 DAR Summary, dated April 14, 2014

6. Staff Memo for Design Commission, dated May 5, 2014
7. Staff Presentation for May 15, 2014 DAR
8. Applicant Presentation for May 15, 2014
9. May 15, 2014 DAR Summary, dated May 28, 2014