



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

FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Dan Saltzman, Commissioner
Paul L. Scarlett, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 31, 2016
To: Portland Design Commission
From: Benjamin Nielsen, Development Review, 503-823-7812
Re: EA 15-269535 DA – Bridge Housing / Riverplace Parcel 3
2nd Design Advice Request Summary Memo, April 7, 2016 hearing

Attached is a revised drawing set for the second Design Advice Request for a pair of new buildings—the eastern building a mixed-use retail and market-rate residential at 6-stories and the western building comprising affordable housing at 14 stories, both of which sit upon a level of below-grade structured parking—in the Downtown Subdistrict of the Central City Plan District.

2nd DAR Discussion Items – Following from the Commission comments given during the 1st DAR hearing on February 18, 2016, the design has been revised in some, but not all, areas discussed. Staff suggests the following issues for discussion at the April 7th DAR hearing:

1. Site Design.

- a. The design of the private street has been revised and clearly defined as an extension of SW River Drive. The revised design includes wide sidewalks with raised planters and integrated benches on both sides, and it will still provide parking access to both the retail and residential garages and the required loading space. The Commission had stated previously that the street should be something engaging and that contributes to the vitality of the project and which helps the two buildings relate to each other. Does this new design, with more windows extended south along the east side, achieve this?
- b. The landscaping concept appears more toned down and less angular and aggressive than the previous concept. The angular concept still appears in the trellis/screen at the end of the private street, and this trellis/screen concept is repeated at the south side of the east building and the southwest side of the west building, helping to integrate the landscape concept more with the buildings. The landscape along the south and western sides of the site still seems cut off from the rest of the site. Should there be an opportunity for residents to access these areas? Could the trellis/screen be pulled south towards the property line to draw the stormwater garden more into the pedestrian realm? (See Sheets 7, 9, & 25.)
- c. The south side of the site remains largely a landscaped area, and the buildings show fewer details and openings, similar to the design presented at the last hearing, though there are additional trellis/screen features added to the buildings. The applicant has identified areas for “potential gateway moments”, but it is unclear how these are addressed. Please provide additional guidance on how the building should relate to the substation and other infrastructure to the south.

2. Massing.

- a. The massing of the two buildings remains more or less unchanged. The Commission had previously stated that the massing of the west wing on the east building should be pulled back, and that the east wing on the tower building should be modified to strengthen the tower.
- b. The northeast corner of the east building has been refined at the ground level, pulling out closer to the street. Is the geometry of this corner working better than it was previously?

FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

3. Elevations, Composition, & Materials.

- a. The east building façade has been simplified and seems less busy than the previous iteration. The brick gradation pattern remains and is more clearly defined. Is this gradation working, and does the building read as a solid brick building without this patterning?
- b. The ground floor elevations on the east building have been simplified and are more rational. Additional canopies have also been added, though there appears to be opportunities for more to be added.
- c. Some additional balconies have been added on the east building, and these have been grouped into recessed columns. No balconies or Juliettes are indicated on the west building.
- d. On the west building, the prefinished composite metal panel seems like the strongest choice for the white “grid”, though GFRC panels may be acceptable depending on their fasteners, flashing, and detailing. Based on past commission comments, composite resin panels should not be used. Within the bays, both options should meet the approval criteria, depending on detailing.
- e. An “art wall” is proposed at the northwest corner of the west building. Staff has recommended to the applicants that they contact and work with RACC to select an artist and in order to meet the Public Art definition in Chapter 5.74 of the city code. (See Sheets 12 &14.)

4. Ground Floor Active Uses.

- a. Active uses along the private street are largely the same as before, and the retail parking structure occupies much of the frontage on the west building. Additional glazing has been added along the private street on the east building.
- b. Bike parking remains along SW Moody Ave with maker spaces on the floor above. Windows provide views into both spaces.

Potential Modifications & Adjustments

These potential Modifications and Adjustments remain essentially unchanged since the last Design Advice hearing on February 18, 2016, though additional ground floor windows have been added to some facades.

1. Adjustment – Parking Access Restricted Street (33.510.263.G.6.c)

Proposed: Allow parking access from SW River Parkway via a driveway extending south from the intersection of River Parkway and SW River Dr, and allow right-in, right-out parking access from SW Moody Ave.

~~2. Modification #1 – Maximum Building Setbacks (33.130.215.C.2.e.(6))~~

This modification no longer appears to be needed, as the building has been brought closer to the curved portion of the lot line.

3. Modification #2 – Ground Floor Windows Standard (33.130.230.B)

Proposed: On the western building: allow 38% of the ground floor length on the east elevation (facing the private street). On the eastern building: allow 33% of the ground floor length on the east elevation (facing SW Moody Ave); additional windows are provided at the bike parking area along this same façade. The length of ground floor windows on the west elevation (facing the private street) has been increased to 51%. The standard appears to be met on the other elevations. Window areas have not yet been calculated but may require modification as well.

4. Modification #3 – Transit Street Main Entrance (33.130.242)

Proposed: Allow the doors in the second retail space from the west in the eastern building to face a sidewalk extension at a 90-degree angle from the transit street.

5. Modification #4 – Required Building Lines (33.510.215)

Proposed: Allow portions of the western building to be set back more than 12 feet at the northwest and northeast corners. The standard now appears to be met on the eastern building.

Project Summary – The proposal, on an 87,637 square foot lot bounded by SW Harbor Drive, the Harbor Viaduct, and a new recreational pathway to the west, SW River Parkway to the north, SW Moody Avenue to the east, and an electrical substation to the south, includes the following:

- **Zoning.** CXdg – Central Commercial with Design and Greenway, River General overlays.
- **Height.** Measureable elevations were not provided with this drawing set; however, from the previous DAR: Western building = 146'-6". Eastern building = 69'-6". Maximum height allowed before bonuses = 150'. Height bonuses allow for up to an additional 45'.
- **FAR.** No revised square footage numbers are provided; however, from the previous DAR: The base maximum FAR for this site = 4:1. With residential FAR bonuses, additional FAR of 3:1 is earned for a total of 7:1 FAR maximum. The proposal includes approximately 356,005 square feet of above-grade development with an additional 65,120 square feet of structured parking below. A portion of this structured parking, as yet undefined, is included in the total FAR, yielding a total proposed FAR of between 4.1:1 and 4.9:1.
- **Site Design.** As at the first hearing, a private street extends south between the two buildings, and the design is more street-like than before. This new street is aligned with the offset centerline of SW River Dr to the north. This street still provides access to both the retail parking garage and the residential garage below, and a redesigned trellis structure still serves as a termination and screen at its southern end. A terraced garden at the northwestern corner of the site slopes up to the second story of the western building and connects to the rooftop courtyard on the west side of that building. A large stormwater planter is shown in the southwest corner.
- **Ground Floor.** Ground floor programming remains largely the same, though the design of the ground floor facades has changed. A lobby and community-serving rooms face SW River Pkwy in the western building. Structured parking for the retail spaces sits behind these spaces. Four retail spaces, stepping down with the site, face River Pkwy in the eastern building. A residential lobby at the structured parking level anchors the corner of River Pkwy and Moody Ave. A bike parking room and garage entrance line the rest of SW Moody.
- **Upper Floors.** The upper floors and their massing remain largely unchanged. Residential and amenity uses, along with rooftop terraces and landscaping, occupy the second story of both buildings. The upper floors are all residential units.
- **Structured Parking.** There are two separate structured parking lots: one at grade in the western building to service the retail uses, and one larger garage below grade spanning the site to serve the residences. Entries to both remain on the private street, and another entry to the lower residential garage is provided off of SW Moody Ave.
- **Loading.** One Standard A loading space is required and is provided in the east building off of the courtyard/driveway through the middle of the site. Additional loading space(s) may be required by PBOT to serve a grocery tenant.
- **Materials.** The eastern building utilizes brick as its main material in a similar, though more defined, gradient pattern, as shown at the last hearing. The western building will incorporate options for either a metal panel, GFRC panel, or composite resin panel for the white frame and options for either colored standing seam or corrugated metal panels in the bays. See Sheet 34.

Approval Criteria

The Design Review approval criteria are the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines. The Modifications approval criteria are listed in Section 33.825.040 of the zoning code. The Adjustment approval criteria are listed in Section 33.805.040 of the zoning code. The Greenway Review approval criteria are the Willamette Greenway Design Guidelines, Appendix C.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Attachments: Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines
(<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/34250>)

Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines Matrix

Willamette Greenway Design Guidelines, Appendix C
(<http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/59067>)

Willamette Greenway Design Guidelines Matrix

Design Advice Request Summary Memo for February 18, 2016 Hearing