

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

MEMORANDUM

Date:	October 29, 2015
То:	Portland Design Commission
From:	Staci Monroe, City Planner 503-823-0624, staci.monroe@portlandoregon.gov

Re: November 5, 2015 Design Commission Agenda Item LU 15-156716 DZM, Oregon Square

Please find the attached plans for Oregon Square, a superblock development proposed in the Lloyd sub district of the Central City. The project was most recently before the Commission on October 1, 2015, a summary of which has been attached. The revised plans that accompany this memo (labeled as Appendix B, dated 11/5/15) only reflect the changes since the October 1^{st} hearing, as requested by the Commission. A fully updated book of the revised exhibits will be provided at the upcoming hearing for reference.

The revisions to the project have been very responsive to the comments and concerns from the last hearing. A summary of the responses and revisions from the applicant dated 10/26/15 has also been attached. There are several responses, however, that includes options, may require conditions of approval or require further consideration. Upon additional discussion and review of supplemental information to be provided at the hearing, Staff concludes the project will meet all the design guidelines and is recommending approval. The items for further discussion include:

- Bridge material (see sheet XB.16) Concrete or steel grate was not preferred and more width was desired. Revisions widen the center bridge to 12' and propose scored-concrete or wood decking, both of which are now flush with the grade of the plaza. The bridges at Phase 1 are concrete, therefore Staff recommends the scored-concrete option to complement the development to the north, which is also differentiated from the surround plaza paving (CIP concrete with exposed aggregate finish).
- 2. <u>Mobile seating</u> (see sheet XB.17) Applicant has agreed to provide mobile seating. Would a condition of approval or a friendly amendment be preferred to capture this non-permanent feature?
- 3. <u>Art</u> Staff has added a condition of approval for the plaza art piece to go through a separate Type 2 Design Review, which includes location requirements (in alignment with Pacific Street, on the ground, not within a planter) mentioned at the last hearing. Are additional parameters desired by the Commission that speak to the scale, materials or other elements of the art piece?
- 4. <u>Block 91 rooftop enclosure color</u> (see sheets XB.26-27) The black metal rooftop enclosures were noted as too dark and heavy atop the white building. White and dark grey options have been provided. Staff recommends the dark grey which is more consistent with the lighter bronze color suggested at the last hearing.
- 5. <u>Block 90</u> (see sheets XB.50-53):
 - <u>East tower facade</u> More curtain wall on the east, north and west facades was noted to better relate to the curtain wall ends of the brown interlocking form. Additional curtain wall was introduced on the north and west facades and along the upper level of the east tower elevation, however, the majority of the east façade still reads as punched windows. With more studies provided at the hearing that show how the amount of

curtain wall on the east façade can be increased in a manner that strengthens the horizontal expression, the brown form would be more cohesive and the revisions would be approvable.

- <u>West tower façade</u> At the most recent hearing the majority of the Commission indicated the window arrangement on the west façade needed another pass and should be more contained. At the 3rd DAR the Commission noted they liked the vertical texture of the staggered windows. While the applicant has studied this façade again, the option that addresses the recent concern results in a window fenestration that is very similar to other buildings on the site and the Stat Office Building. Staff agrees with the applicant's preference for the staggered windows.
- 6. <u>Block 103 entry and tower at southeast corner</u> (see sheets XB.60-63) Of the 4 options studied to address how the tower touches down, Option 3 (slot + grounded corner) is the most successful. All of the options internalize the ramping and keep the entry at grade, which was a concern with the previous design where the entry felt forced. With more details and information on how the main building entry could more emphasized, these revisions are approvable. Approaches to emphasize the main entry could include scale, height, design and/or color of the canopy, lighting and height of entry doors.

The <u>Central City Parking Review</u> (15-190239 PR) associated with the parking and loading bay locations for the project is scheduled to go before the Hearing's Officer on November 9, 2015. A condition of approval has been added to ensure the approval of this review, which includes integral components of the project, is approved prior to the issuance of any building permit.

The <u>Staff Report</u> recommending approval is forthcoming and will provided via email early next week.

The project has been evaluated against approval criteria of the Central City Fundamental and the Lloyd District Design Guidelines. Please contact me at 503.823.0624 with any questions.

Attachments: Appendix B – Post DR Design Changes dated 11/5/15 Staff summary of 10/1/15 hearing Summary of applicant's responses to 10/1/15 hearing concerns