



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: November 14, 2014
To: HOLST ARCHITECTURE *RENEE STRAND*
From: Hillary Adam, Development Review
503-823-3581
Re: 14-205172 DA – DELTA
Design Advice Request Summary Memo October 23, 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 October 23, 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 October 23, 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 October 23, 2014. Commissioners in attendance on October 23, 2014: Wark, Keltner, Savinar, Simpson, Kaiser

Scale and Massing

- The Commission noted that the building's presence and visibility from the freeways and coming up Mississippi will serve as a billboard or gateway into the Mississippi district; therefore the treatment of the southern façade(s) will be very important. While there is the potential for creating something great, there is also the potential for conflict with the smaller-scaled properties directly to the south.
- The Commission noted that a broad face, approximately 200' long, along N Revere would be more successful than splitting the building into two narrow bar buildings, as in the Bar scheme. Therefore, they were in support of a building that crossed the zoning boundary. They also noted that if you don't get an adjustment to increase FAR on the RH side, the Commission will still expect the building to break down the building massing on the Mississippi side.
- The Commission agreed that the building at the corner of Fremont and Mississippi should be shorter, and more responsive to the existing neighborhood, recognizing that the shorter you make the building on the corner of Fremont and Mississippi, the longer the resultant façade on the building to the south. It was suggested that if the building at the corner has a bigger footprint, it would push the outdoor space to the south. One of the advantages of that open space being further to the south is it gets closer to being able to link up to interior space created by the backside of the L or the J schemes, thus creating the potential for a relationship between the two.
- One commissioner noted that the massing at north and west should step down to the surrounding neighborhood, suggesting that the west and north ends could be lower with the building stepping up in the middle.
- One commissioner noted that breaking the development into three buildings wouldn't be really successful because the buildings would start to get small, so if you are going to have one complete break in the building, it should be along the 300-foot long frontage. He also noted that it's nice to have buildings that aren't trying to apologize for their size, adding that actual breaks create stronger buildings than do disingenuous recesses.
- One commissioner noted that one of the characteristics of this neighborhood is the fine-grained detailing of it and asked how you would develop a massing program that enhances that. He noted that the J-scheme creates a little less privacy and a little more noise for apartments facing each other and that might be a little less desirable for people living there. He noted that the L-scheme is attractive because it doesn't turn in on itself and it still gives people privacy but without the potential cacophony of the noise created by an enclosed courtyard.
- Another commissioner noted that the L-scheme presents challenges because you have to accommodate the alley, ramps for vehicular access, and meaningful outdoor space that's connected to the building but is separated from these other uses. He suggested that one of your priorities should be how to get the remaining outdoor space to be really active and good and to not be leftover space compromised by vehicular access.
- Another commissioner noted that the western summer sun could be really cool on a courtyard on the west side, suggesting that the rear courtyard should be developed as an amenity, rather than apartments looking down on parked cars.
- One commissioner wondered if the building height could be articulated to break down the massing, suggesting step back at upper floors along Mississippi. He also supported moves to step back the southeast corner to maintain southward views to downtown along the Mississippi corridor. He noted that consideration of height variations and overall length of building walls, with regard to context, will make or break the success of the building.

Parking Access

- One commissioner noted he would prefer to see vehicular access anywhere other than on Mississippi, noting he could not recollect any other project on Mississippi that has a garage on Mississippi, because they all have alley access. He suggested that using the alley to access the parking would be the most successful as that's what an alley is for. He also noted that he did not think that the addition of 150 units is going to overwhelm the intersection.

- Another commissioner noted that Michigan is an interesting street because the houses are higher off the street and he didn't think a garage on Michigan would significantly affect anybody in a negative way. He noted that, opposed to a bunch of cars going in and out of the alley all day, residential traffic noise might be quieter if they entered and exited off of Michigan. He also added that if the garage was accessed off of Michigan, it would free up the whole courtyard for outdoor space, it might require less excavation because of the lower elevation, and it would split the traffic both ways and relieve pressure from the Fremont intersection.
- Another commissioner supported the idea of using the alley for vehicular access, but was also interested in the idea of using Michigan. He noted that both are stronger than Revere, which would only be half a street. He noted that if access is provided via the alley, be conscious of the width and try to avoid having a 30-foot wide access, adding that it should be softened with landscaping and concluding that it might be better off of Michigan.
- Another commissioner noted that, based on the options and the nature of site constraints and the character of adjacent neighborhood, it seems like Fremont access makes the most sense, though he was interested in seeing more study and analysis.
- One commissioner noted that even though there is no design review on the RH portion of the site, it would be pretty disappointing if it contained surface parking. Another commissioner noted that surface parking should be limited or non-existent across the entire site.
- One commissioner noted that depending on how you treat Revere, it may affect how you need to treat the alley for fire trucks.

Program & Ground Level Treatment

- One commissioner noted that the street level treatment on Mississippi is critical. He suggested that the development team think about how to bring activity down to the street, noting that it doesn't have to be retail, but if it is residential or live/work, think about how it interacts with the sidewalk. He added that he was suspicious of landscaping being used to solve the problem, stating that it can be used to soften the building, but it's not a substitute for activity along the street level. Another commissioner suggested that the team look at bringing residential down over the parking toward Mississippi to activate the street.
- One commissioner noted that retail should be oriented toward Mississippi and Fremont with residential patios oriented south and west and limited on the north and east. Courtyards and open spaces should be deployed to break down massing and allow for additional solar access. He also noted that retail at the southeast corner may be responsive to future conditions south of Cook.
- A couple commissioners noted that the on both the J and L schemes, the open space is a nice idea that could be really great. One commissioner noted this pattern of development on Mississippi, adding that these open spaces that serve as a finishing point for retail, and the other suggested that a pocket park could be really great.

Public Comments

- Stephen Gomez, Chair of the Boise Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Committee, provided comments on October 20, 2014. These were distributed to the commission on October 23rd. Mr. Gomez noted that the Committee had met with the applicant twice and the Committee was in favor of "Scheme D", which is now known as the J-Scheme, but with additional massing relief. He also noted that stepping the top floor of the west building along Michigan would help mitigate the height of the new building and its existing neighbors.
- Gregory T. Stevens, spoke in opposition, suggesting it would fit better in the neighborhood if it were broken up into 3 buildings with wall lengths of fewer than 200 feet. Concerned with parking exit on Mississippi due to how busy the street is, and suggested that Michigan or Cook would be better. Also noted it would be great if the Black Walnut could be saved.
- Cindy Surendorf, submitted a document (Exhibit F-3) and spoke in opposition to removal of the existing Black Walnut tree.
- Syd Most, submitted written testimony, wondering if the Walnut tree can be saved.
- Jim Winkler, Winkler Development – subject property owner, spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that he sees the potential of this building to be a visual "landmark", which would be better by crossing zone boundaries.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set (15 double-sided sheets)
 - 2. Three Scheme site plans (3 sheets)
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. Cover Sheet
 - 2. Not used
 - 3. Table of Contents
 - 4. Not used
 - 5. Overview Cover Sheet
 - 6. Project Proposal, Goals and Discussion Topics
 - 7. Aerial Map
 - 8. Property Information
 - 9. Zoning
 - 10. Not used
 - 11. Project Cover Sheet
 - 12. Not used
 - 13. Overview of Schemes
 - 14. Bar Scheme Views
 - 15. Bar Scheme Views
 - 16. Bar Scheme Plans
 - 17. Bar Scheme Plans
 - 18. L Scheme Views
 - 19. L Scheme Views
 - 20. L Scheme Plans
 - 21. L Scheme Plans
 - 22. J Scheme Views
 - 23. J Scheme Views
 - 24. J Scheme Plans
 - 25. J Scheme Plans
 - 26. Not used
 - 27. Appendix Cover Sheet
 - 28. Site Images
 - 29. Site Images
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 - 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 - 1. Bureau of Environmental Services
- F. Public Testimony
 - 1. Stephen Gomez, Chair Boise Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Committee, on October 20, 2014, provided written comments, noting the Committee's preference for "Scheme D" (now known as the J-Scheme).
 - 2. Comment Card – Gregory T. Stevens
 - 3. Comment Card and Document, submitted by Cindy Surendorf, who provided comments in opposition of removal of the Black Walnut tree.
 - 4. Comment Card and notes, submitted by Syd Most, who provided testimony asking if the Walnut tree could be saved.
 - 5. Comment Card for Jim Winkler, who spoke in favor of the proposal.
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff Memo to the Design Commission, dated October 13, 2014
 - 3. Written comments by Commissioner Jeff Simpson, read into the record