



**City of Portland, Oregon**  
**Bureau of Development Services**  
**Land Use Services**

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 5000  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
503-823-7300  
Fax 503-823-5630  
TTY 503-823-6868  
[www.portlandonline.com/bds](http://www.portlandonline.com/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** September 21, 2015  
**To:** Landmarks Commission  
**From:** Benjamin Nielsen, Land Use Review, 503-823-7812  
**Re:** EA 14-234834 DA – Restoration Hardware  
Design Advice Request, September 28, 2015 hearing

### Project Summary

Please find the attached *revised* drawing set for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Design Advice Request for a new retail building for Restoration Hardware in the Alphabet Historic District and Northwest Plan District at the intersection of NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and NW Glisan Street. The 1<sup>st</sup> Design Advice hearing occurred on April 13, 2015, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Design Advice hearing occurred on June 8, 2015. Memos summarizing the Commission's feedback from both hearings are attached.

As at the previous hearings, the project proposes the demolition of two existing one-story, noncontributing buildings and a parking lot and the redevelopment of a 150' x 100' parcel, zoned CS, at the southeast corner of the intersection with a new three-story building plus penthouse. The revised design retains the courtyard facing NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and two stepped-down, two-story building wings with roof decks and canopies on either side of the courtyard, as presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> hearing. An alternative design is also included, which presents a full, two-story mass along NW 23<sup>rd</sup> in place of the courtyard. In both scenarios, the main mass of the building is still three stories tall with a large roof deck. The roof will also include a partially-enclosed canopy and four trellis structures, and it will be entirely used as exterior display area. Stair and elevator projections above the roof line the south and east sides of the building.

The primary proposal presents two options for the courtyard enclosure. One has stucco walls terminated by ornamental piers on either side of the courtyard, between which a metal gate extends when the store is closed. Another option replaces the stucco walls with steel fencing that matches the design of the gates. Except for the courtyard, the building is proposed to sit at the existing street lot line along NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and along much of NW Glisan Street, though a narrow landscape strip will separate it from the sidewalk along much of NW Glisan. Vehicle parking (19 spaces) and long-term bike parking (4 spaces) as well as one 10' x 35' loading space are proposed below grade and will be accessed via a driveway from NW Glisan Street. To the east of the driveway ramp and next to the adjacent RH-zoned property, a stormwater planter landscaped to the L4 High Wall standard is proposed, though a new Modification is requested to the L4 standard to allow the required 6' tall wall to be located along the property line rather than behind the required vegetative elements. The awnings, which were metal in previous designs, have been reduced in number and entirely replaced by glass awnings. Flat glazed canopies remain at the ground level.

The alternative proposal proposes a full two-story building mass along NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and retains most of the original metal awnings. The two fabric roof covers at the third floor roof decks are replaced by a centrally-located trellis. The remainder of the building remains the same.

## **Areas for discussion on September 28, 2015**

- NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Elevation & Massing
  - Some commissioners had difficulty with the courtyard concept at the last hearing, and a majority stated that the piers/wing walls at either side of the courtyard should be removed. Gates were called a “non-starter.” Is this still the prevailing direction on the courtyard concept?
  - Is the alternative massing, with a full building wall along NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue preferable?
  
- Exterior Materials & Detailing.
  - Does the building still read as “branded” architecture?
  - At the last hearing, commissioners stated that the proposal had too many applied elements, such as sunshades, canopies, railings (at parapets and at Juliettes), lights, and roof covers that made the proposal look too busy. The commission requested that the number of elements be reduced to make “an elegant package.” Has this proposal come closer to achieving this?
  - All of the metal sunshades/awnings have been replaced with glass awnings, and the total number has been reduced. The alternative proposal retains the metal awnings shown at previous reviews. Please provide further direction on these elements.
  - Window detailing has been revised to include thicker vertical mullions on the windows, adding a sense of verticality to the building and helping to break up the large window bays. Please provide comments on this revised detailing.
  - Are there any further comments on the stucco material?
  
- Exterior Display Areas.
  - The exterior display areas appear to have changed little since the last hearing. There were some questions about the extent of the display area and its visibility from the street. Whether on the roof or at grade, exterior display area will require an Adjustment to be allowed in the CS zone.
  
- Parking & Loading.
  - Please provide comments on the revised design and detailing of the parking and loading area.
  - Is the new proposed modification to the L4 High Wall landscape standard supportable—i.e., does the commission support the placement of the 6’ tall wall along the property line rather than behind 5’ of landscaping?
  
- Transformers, Vaults, Bike Parking.
  - The revised proposal has added a new transformer vault at the northeast corner of the property, with doors located fully within the property line.
  - The short-term bike parking is still not shown on the site plan. Per Section 33.266.220.A.2.b, short-term bike parking (of which 9 spaces appear to be required) is required to be located on the site itself, on an accessible route, and within 50 feet of the main entrance. Is there an ideal location in which the commission would like to see the short-term bike parking placed?

## **Approval Criteria**

The design review criteria are the Historic Alphabet District: Community Design Guidelines Addendum and the Community Design Guidelines. The Modifications approval criteria are listed in *Section 33.846.070* of the zoning code. The Adjustment approval criteria are listed in *Section 33.805.040*.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Attachments: 1<sup>st</sup> DAR Summary dated 05/08/2015  
2<sup>nd</sup> DAR Summary dated 06/15/2015