



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: January 29, 2015

To: SRG PARTNERSHIP INC.
JON WIENER, LOUISE FOSTER

From: Jeff Mitchem, Development Review
503-823-7011

Re: 14-192493 DA – Portland State University, School of Business Administration
Design Advice Request Summary Memo for January 15, 2014 DAR Hearing

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 January 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 January 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 January 15, 2014. Commissioners in attendance on January 15, 2014: Tad Savinar, David Keltner, Ben Kaiser, David Wark.

Summary of Design Commission Comments

1. **Montgomery Green Street Response – Green + Urban**

- A. Montgomery Street is *the* most important street frontage – throw everything at it.
- B. Presently, the street is a “middle space or gap in the green sequence”. How can project resolve?
- C. When you come back, answer this key question – What is the *new* Montgomery? Consider multiple perspectives of architecture, landscape, public space activation and circulation.
- D. Establish the unique gesture for this location – formal idea, not motif.
- E. From the ground-up, how can the green street connect as layered/interactive planes? Explore the tension between the green street and activation. Can skybridge be part of solution?
- F. Formula for success: active urban + green edge = big success.

2. **Skybridges – Kill**

- A. If you touch them, bring them up to code.
- B. Currently a clash between bridges and building.
- C. Deconstruct skybridges = green bridge to street?
- D. Service building without relying on elevated infrastructure.
- E. Disconnect and do not reconnect.
- F. Skybridge torpedoes green street – over-covered/canopied.
- G. Make building independent from in every way.
- H. Help move PSU toward eliminating them in long-term.

3. **Public Space – Activate by layering**

- A. Angles make for functionally awkward space – carve out corners.
- B. Is the open space on east best for connecting to the Urban Center Plaza?
- C. One more plaza in conventional sense might not be best solution.
- D. Linear connection might be stronger solution.
- E. We seek the light, build on the shadow.

4. **Three Part Building Relationship – Simplify & Unify**

- A. Three elements parti (three languages) might be too much. Simplify.
- B. Punched and banded windows and atrium = lots of moving parts.
- C. Role of existing building – subtle backdrop.
- D. Study different solution bridging between two builds – bi-partite instead of tri-partite.

5. **Atrium Form – Clarify Role**

- A. Dirty factor - propose material/solution for cleaning and maintenance.
- B. Other shapes explored?
- C. Atrium could grab more of public space.
- D. We fear shadow / don't make it worse.

6. **City – PSU Connection – Linked Success**

- A. Analogous to outside – inside / building – block / city – campus.
- B. Opportunity to be the most engaging urban building in the city and to do something different (never seen before in Portland)
- C. No Modification for ground floor activity. Exceed code – what is the most dynamic urban experience possible?
- D. Active urban program elements – focus on them.

7. **Sustainability – Raise the Bar**

- A. Bring us something we haven't seen before.
- B. Establish new benchmark.
- C. Raise stormwater bar – exceed minimum.

8. **Materials – Permanence**

- A. Wood up high is maintenance issue in Northwest.
- B. Possible to pull off same look w/o wood?
- C. Durability important.
- D. Existing building treatment (windows) = motif.
- E. New skin, new street edge experience.

9. Pedestrian Experience – Ubiquitous

- A. Focus on Montgomery.
- B. Atrium – conduit for pedestrian.
- C. Net positive on all sides.

10. Public Art – Specify

- A. Come back with art program/overall plan/driving ideas.
- B. Explore scale – human scale aspects /opportunity for public art.
- C. Get artist involved soon.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. See Exhibit A.1
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 - 2. Applicant’s statement certifying posting
 - 3. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 - 1. None
- F. Public Testimony
 - 1. None
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff Memo to the Commission dated January 5, 2014