



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: JENNIFER HOFFMAN, CARLETON HART ARCHITECTURE PC
From: Mark Walhood, City Planner
503-823-7806, mark.walhood@portlandoregon.gov
Re: 14-127050 DA – Miracles Central
Design Advice Request Summary Memo: May 1, 2014 Session

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 1, 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 1, 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 1, 2014.

Commissioners in attendance on May 1, 2014: Gwen Milius, Ben Kaiser, David Wark, Jane Hansen, David Keltner, Jeff Simpson

Materials Quality/Masonry

- **The lap siding on the top floor does not integrate cohesively with the remainder of the building design and materials.** A panelized material may work better, or perhaps brick.
- **There are too many materials transitions at the corners and end walls, over-emphasizing what should be a background feature in the design.** Simplify the materials and architectural form of the corners and end walls.
- There is an odd relationship between the end wall concrete and the end wall materials in general, as well as between the end wall concrete and the dark ground floor brick. Greater architectural coherency is needed between the horizontal alignments and proportions of the ground floor primary facades and the end walls, with a simpler design employing fewer materials, as well as greater design integration with the primary street facades.

Ground Floor

- **Re-evaluate the ground floor placement and building setbacks to create an active streetscape and eyes on the street while avoiding inactive dead zones and hiding places.**
- The setbacks are more successful on the 2nd Avenue side, where the wider zones of covered area provide an opportunity for people to gather, perhaps some bench seating, etc. Pulling back an entry door from the sidewalk without creating a usable at-grade zone creates a less desirable streetscape condition.
- The outdoor space created by the courtyard is very nice. Play up the visual connection from the main lobby entry clear through the building to the courtyard as you enter or pass by to make the most of this important building amenity.
- Varying heights for the ground floor windows feels unresolved. The floor-to-ceiling versus shorter windows should be reconsidered.
- The scale of the residential lobby entrance feels a little tight and uncomfortable, especially when compared to the other entries on the building. A little more space and graciousness at this entry could be helpful.

Massing/Coherency

- The deep setback areas at the outside edges of both street façades should be revised to come closer to the street and better support the pedestrian environment, eliminate blind corners and hiding spaces, and strengthen the urban edge/enclosure created by the building.
- To define the main mass of the building versus the base and the wrapping top/side forms, you might consider pulling more of the building at the 2nd/Wasco corner out to the property line, creating a stronger base to the building and more definition for the ground floor setbacks found elsewhere.
- **There needs to be a better architectural relationship between the top and middle of the building, especially when viewed from the outside street corners.** There should be material and rhythmic compatibility between these two segments of the building, whereas now there is a very weak connection between the (stronger) brick central portion of the building and the (weaker) lap-sided top floor.
- The base of the building feels pretty solid, the middle section is also fairly strong, but the top floor feels disconnected and unresolved. There should be a clear sense of the termination of the building form, with stronger and clearer design relationship between the base, middle and top of the building.
- **Window fenestration at the exterior corners feel like too small an aperture on too large a form.** Can the window patterns be regularized? Can the windows be enlarged?
- **The stair towers are being over-emphasized and should be played down a bit. The dark orange color might be part of the concern.** Could the stairs be better integrated with the white penthouse/side wrapping elements?

- The central portion of the building with the regular decks and windows feels the most resolved. Take this pattern and expand the sense of regularity and order to the rest of the building.

Pedestrian Rain Protection

- **More weather protection at the ground floor could help.** Perhaps a corner wrapping canopy? Recess the entire ground floor except at the outside edges to create a sense of covered, enclosed space?

Other/General Comments

- **The electrical vaults should go in the right-of-way.** PP&L can be worked with to develop a concrete vault lid that does not interrupt the sidewalk scoring and paving pattern. Please pursue locating the electrical vaults in the right-of-way, consistent with long-standing Design Commission support for this arrangement.
- **The loading bay should be enclosed within the building or eliminated altogether.** The dead zone created by the big loading bay recessed area along the sidewalk creates a difficult urban streetscape.
- Stormwater planters create an opportunity to daylight or expose functioning stormwater management facilities (scuppers, rills, etc.). Consider celebrating your stormwater management facilities in an explicit, visual, kinetic manner.
- The arrangement of uses on the ground floor is good, and effectively orients active uses along the street.
- Pay careful attention to your rooftop mechanical equipment and screening.

AGENCY COMMENTS:

BES has no specific comments related to this Design Advice Request. Staff is available to attend the hearing to comment about stormwater management requirements as they relate to the building design, if requested. Also see staff comments from the recent Pre-Application Conference (14-117192-EA) for information about requirements that will apply to the proposed development (S. Himes 4/17/14).

See **PBOT** response from the pre-application conference that was held for this project (EA 14-117192). (Fabio De Freitas 4/17/14)

Exhibit List

(Not attached unless indicated)

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
 - 2. Cover memo provided with revised plan set, rec’d. 4/17/14
- B. Zoning Map (**attached**)
- C. Drawings
 - 1. View from Southwest (**attached**)
 - 2. View from Southeast (**attached**)
 - 3. View from Northwest (**attached**)
 - 4. Bird’s Eye View of Courtyard (**attached**)
 - 5. Site Plan
 - 6. Second Floor Plan
 - 7. Third Floor Plan
 - 8. Fourth Floor Plan
 - 9. Fifth Floor Plan
 - 10. Sixth Floor Plan
 - 11. Roof Plan
 - 12. Elevation – South
 - 13. Elevation – West
 - 14. Elevation – East
 - 15. Elevation – North at Courtyard

16. Elevation – North
17. Section – North/South
18. Section – East/West
19. Enlarged Elevation, Section & Materials Palette
- D. Notification
 1. Posting instructions and notice as sent to applicant
 2. Applicant’s statement certifying posting
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 1. Bureau of Environmental Services
 2. Portland Transportation
- F. Public Testimony (*none received*)
- G. Other
 1. Application Form and Receipt
 2. Staff Memo to Commissioners, sent 4/22/14
 3. DAR “cheat sheet” for Commissioner Discussion, 5/1/14
 4. Staff PowerPoint Presentation, 5/1/14