



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: June 3, 2015
To: Stefanie Becker
From: Kara Fioravanti, Development Review
503.823.5892
Re: EA 15-123301 DA – Center for Health and Healing South (CHHS)
Design Advice Request Summary Memo April 23, 2015

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 April 23, 2015 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 April 23, 2015. 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 return Design Advice Request meeting with the Commission.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Design Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Design Commission** design direction provided on April 23, 2015.

Commissioners in attendance on Simpson, Wark, Kaiser, Savinar, Millius:

Overview

Generally, the Commission is surprised by a proposal including skybridges, vehicle drop-off, and 5 full levels of parking. These are all intense impacts to the public realm. And, a drop-off and above grade parking are non-urban insertions at a City park. Diminish or eliminate these elements. Acknowledge people on the street. Next time convince us that all alternatives were investigated. You need to find a balance between the City's adopted design guidelines and what OHUS wants.

Drop-off

- It should not face the park and not be the park's backdrop.
- Entry has to be at the face of a building. You aren't inviting people to the street.
- Provide numbers of CHHN drop-off vs. parking patrons vs. transit users.
- Think about real needs for queuing.
- Did you consider another street for drop-off? Whitaker would be a good street, but challenges include 1-way, existing loading, and Streetcar. Consider redesigning to help fix the problems of Whitaker and make Whitaker the new front door.

Parking and Parking Garage

- Dead facades facing the park are a big challenge. The park is THE urban garden, please respect it.
- Wrap the parking garage with active uses at the perimeter. This can happen if you have some below-grade parking and some above-grade parking.
- Can you go under Bond to share underground parking and vehicle entry with Block 29?
- Who is the parking for? Show numbers and expectations next time. Parking garage users should not use a skybridge.
- Provide us with existing and proposed parking garage plans next time.
- At least one Commissioner noted no support for this much above-grade parking.

Skybridge

- Did you consider a taller building so there is not a need for skybridges?
- How do we know OHSU won't ask for skybridges for the next 3 blocks?
- Skybridge over SW Bond has less credibility in what has been presented. 1 skybridge does not beget 2. You need to earn both.
- The skybridge needs to go beyond typical and ordinary. How is it better for people on the street and how is it better for the district? How do you make people want to be at the street? How are you better meeting public realm needs?
- This is a neighborhood and it needs activation and transparency.
- We want to avoid the hill where people never walk on the streets. Skourtes is teeming with people – that should be happening here. A skybridge must only be for people who NEED it – it cannot be for everyone (i.e. guests, healthy patrons, etc.)
- Show the skybridges in real time. Do they impact views of the River?
- Provide shadow studies.
- What is the feeling for pedestrians who are near and below the skybridges?
- Elaborate on the location of the skybridges – “circulation logic”.
- Do you need 2 levels? 1 level is much preferred.

Art

- What is your plan for public art?
- Are you required to pay a percentage of the project cost for art?

Architecture

- Have you considered more variety to the architecture? Diversify the architecture.
- Do you need to make it look and feel like a campus?

- To the general public “distinctive” has a different meaning than it does to an architect. It is OK for common threads, but these buildings need real distinction. Think distant cousins instead of siblings.
- Buildings can have variety – avoid homogeneity of South Waterfront buildings.
- CHHS is the termination of the park; the park needs something strong there.
- Don’t create a perceived line between neighborhood and OHSU “campus”. Be a part of the City.
- Show how the buildings meet the street.

Loading/Parking

- Be more aggressive with regard to sharing loading and parking functions among multiple blocks. Consolidate so there is less pressure and impact to the public realm.
- What is the greater plan for these 6 blocks?
- Unfortunate to see above grade parking and a lack of a plan for future blocks. Why not go underground with parking at Blocks 23 and 27?
- It is important to think of the mechanics of the ground levels and master plan for the other 3 blocks.
- OHSU needs to focus on shared infrastructure.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
 - 1. Original drawing set, 4-2-15
 - 2. Draft PowerPoint presentation
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings for April 23rd DAR
 - 1. see Exhibit A.2.
- D. Notification
 - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 - 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
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 - 1. PBOT, June 2, 2015
- F. Public Testimony
 - 1. none received
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Pre-application notes
 - 3. Notes from 2-5-15 meeting
 - 4. Letter, 2-9-15
 - 5. Letter, 4-17-15
 - 6. Email, 5-5-15
 - 7. Email, 5-12-15
 - 8. Agenda, 5-20-15
 - 9. Agenda, 6-5-15
 - 10. April 10, 2015 memo to Commission
 - 11. Encroachment Review Policies
 - 12. April 23rd staff presentation
 - 13. Staff notes from April 23rd