



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: June 8, 2016
To: Leslie Cliffe, Bora Architects
From: Benjamin Nielsen, City Planner, Land Use Services
Benjamin.nielsen@portlandoregon.gov, (503) 823-7812
Re: 16-143500 DA – Under Armour (Metro Family YMCA) Building Addition
Design Advice Request Summary Memo May 12, 2016

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 May 12, 2016 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/Record/9158292>.

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 May 12, 2016. 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 May 12, 2016.

Commissioners in attendance on May 12, 2016: David Wark (chair), Andrew Clarke, Jeff Simpson

General Comments.

- Overall, the Commissioners present thought the proposed additions were very well-designed and that the materials proposed are very good. The proposed addition is “taking the essence of the building and improving on it.”

Roof Design & Impacts to Terwilliger Blvd.

- One Commissioner stated that the third floor addition may not detract from the view to the east from the major viewpoint on Terwilliger, but instead could help improve it by adding a better-designed “sill” to it with an eco-roof.
- Regarding the proposed eco-roof, the ratio of green roof to single-ply roof is a “big deal.” Investigate if lighter weights of eco-roof are possible to completely cover the roof.
 - Another idea is to combining the eco-roof with ballast into a pattern that could help to create more of a visual amenity from the major viewpoint.
 - The expression of the eco-roof should be more artful or organic, without sacrificing your load restraints.
 - Commissioners also asked if the single-ply membrane could be painted to help mitigate it, though this would be less-preferable than using a full green roof.
- The Commission asked if there is a strategy for mitigating escaping light that could affect Terwilliger Blvd and the hill. Rather than the proposed large skylight, a roof monitor or clerestory might be less intrusive.
- The Commission stated that there should be little to no mechanical equipment on the roof.
- Commissioners had some concerns about the potential intrusiveness of the west windows on the view from the major viewpoint. They’re “pretty much in full view....” Explore if there is a way to screen the windows from the outside, possibly taking a cue from the already-approved wood garage screen. Ultimately, the windows need to have little to no impact on the hillside.
- Regarding exterior lighting, the Commissioners agreed that the least amount of lighting that gets the job done is what is approvable.

Proposed Zoning.

- The Design Commission is generally supportive of the proposed zone change to CS with limitations on height and FAR.
- The Commissioners wondered what the “endgame” of the zone change process is, relative to the building. They asked if this last of the additions. They cannot see approving any more height or FAR than what’s shown on the current building. A 45’ height limit may be acceptable for any future additions. Limitations would be “healthy for everyone,” especially since future development could replace this building.

Drawing Requests for the Design Review.

- Provide multiple, exact site sections. Ensure that the sections also show Barbur Blvd. These sections can be diagrammatic. They will help the Commission and the public understand the impact of the building.

Public Comments.

- Jim Gardner, Land Use Committee Chair of the South Portland Neighborhood Association, testified that the neighborhood is strongly opposed to the previously-proposed CX zoning, though he stated that the CS zone described at the hearing was much more reasonable. He had no strong concerns about the design itself, but the concern was about future waves of development. He also alerted the applicants that there are active improvement measures being undertaken at the major viewpoint to trim and remove trees and shrubs to open up the view; ultimately, the views from that viewpoint may not be as obscured as they are now.
- Anton Vetterlein, President, Friends of Terwilliger (FoT), via email after the hearing, submitted testimony strongly disagreeing with the Design Commission’s assessment that the proposed addition would have an insignificant impact on views from Terwilliger. The FoT are working with Portland Parks & Recreation to improve views from the major

viewpoint through cutting and trimming of trees. He stated that a full green roof is the minimum treatment that would meet Guideline C-2.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 - 1. Original Drawing Set, dated 3/31/2016
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1-33. Drawing Package, dated 4/25/2016
- 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. Bureau of Transportation
 - 2. Bureau of Environmental Services
- F. Public Testimony
 - 1. Testimony Sign-up Sheet
 - 2. Anton Vetterlein, President, Friends of Terwilliger, email with concerns about visibility of the roof, dated 5/24/2016
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff Memo to the Design Commission, dated 5/5/2016
 - 3. Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines Matrix
 - 4. Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines Maps 1 & 2
 - 5. Staff Presentation
 - 6. Applicant's Presentation