



**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:** June 5, 2014  
**To:** HEIDI OIEN, MITHUN  
**From:** Kara Fioravanti , Development Review  
Senior Planner  
**Re:** 14-134106 DA – Pearl Block 136  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo May 15, 2014  
\*\*UPDATED to include full “F” exhibit list\*\*

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](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 May 15, 2014: David Keltner, David Wark, Tad Savinar, Ben Kaiser, Jeff Simpson, Jane Hansen

### **Opening Remarks**

- The height request is a big issue and we need consensus on how to address the approval criteria.
- Is the massing right? How should this project best distribute the achieved 7:1 FAR?
- Thanks for the hand drawings.
- Maximizing density is supported.

### **Residential Height Bonus**

- The idea to step down to the NW 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Historic District makes good sense.
- How does this project better meet Design Guidelines and how is the project consistent with the purpose statement of Central City height? We need convincing.
- We need more shadow studies to understand existing height effects, 120' height effects, 150' height effects.
- Will the tower be a sore thumb?
- Diagram heights of other buildings.
- Think about how the ground plane of the buildings and the courtyard give back to the public.

### **General Design**

- The metaphor of “Heartling” and “Seedling” is really coming together – stay on this path.
- The parti and massing are strong.
- All things are in the right place.

### **Tower Design**

- The decks interrupt the vertical “seedlings”. There is too much attention on the decks (look a little too much like staples/zippers).
- Support for verticality in the design expression.
- Study the design to achieve a graceful relationship between the solids and voids. Is there too much solid?
- The crenellations at the top are awkward – do they go against the seedling metaphor?

### **Brick building Design**

- Unanimous support.
- It is a welcome contextual addition to NW 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Brick is preferred, but the Commission could be open to consideration of GFRC.
- The cut-outs in the solid brick form are great.
- Great concept for the ground level retail to be a pass-thru from the dock to the courtyard. Make sure the ramp, the path through and the courtyard are accessible to all. No stairs at the ramp.

### **Courtyard**

- Open rooms for people at the street edge are nice.
- On return visits, we will look carefully at the rooms, their programming, the sequencing between rooms, and the programming of those in-between spaces.
- The flatter the courtyard the better. In some respects the courtyard is one way to mitigate for height – as such, the courtyard should be very public have clear sightlines and provide fully accessible design.
- If the courtyard is contributing to the mitigation for added height, then how is this courtyard more special than others? What public benefit can this courtyard offer back?
- Integrate the 2 building designs into the courtyard design– the angles in the courtyard are awkward. Other recent projects have incorporated similar design moves as your proposal, including the angles. Be different.
- It should include RACC art.

**Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  - 1. Original drawing set
  - 2. Drawing set provided to Commission in advance of 5-15-14
  - 3. Drawing set, received June 4<sup>th</sup>
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings – *see A Exhibits*
- D. Notification
  - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant, 4-11-14
  - 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
  - 5. Posting instructions sent to applicant, 5-19-14
  - 6. Second Posting notice as sent to applicant
  - 7. Applicant's statement certifying posting
- E. Service Bureau Comments  
*none received*
- F. Public Testimony
  - 1. Stiffler, 5-9-14
  - 2. Quinn, 5-9-14
  - 3. Anderson, 5-9-14
  - 4. Winn, 5-11-14
  - 5. Jaecksch, 5-12-14
  - 6. Francis, 5-12-14
  - 7. Drake, 5-13-14
  - 8. McKinnis, 5-14-14
  - 9. Backstrand, 5-14-12
  - 10. Remen-Willis, 5-14-14
  - 11. Moiel, 5-15-14
  - 12. Kirby, 5-14-14
  - 13. Wymore, 5-15-14
  - 14. Backstrand, 6-3-14
  - 15. Anderson, 6-5-14
  - 16. Francis, 6-2-14
  - 17. Schwartz, 6-4-14
  - 18. Yeiter, 6-4-14
  - 19. Merrick, 5-20-14
  - 20. Luan, 6-4-14
  - 21. Nute, 6-5-14
  - 22. Hoang, 5-15-14
  - 23. Cartwright, 5-15-14
  - 24. Sutherland, 5-28-14
  - 25. Leming, 5-27-14
  - 26. Kirby, 5-27-14
  - 27. Backstrand, 5-21-14
  - 28. Virey, 5-19-14
  - 29. Merrick, 5-19-14
- G. Other
  - 1. Application form
  - 2. Memo to Design Commission, 5-5-14
  - 3. Staff presentation to Commission, 5-15-14
  - 4. Discussion topics for 5-15-14
  - 5. Staff notes from 5-15-14
  - 6. Staff notes from 5-15-14
  - 7. Staff summary memo from 5-15-14, dated 6-4-14
  - 8. Memo to Design Commission, 5-28-14