



**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](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** June 8, 2016  
**To:** Schuyler Smith, Polyphon Architecture & Design, LLC  
**From:** Benjamin Nielsen, City Planner, Land Use Services  
[Benjamin.nielsen@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Benjamin.nielsen@portlandoregon.gov), (503) 823-7812  
**Re:** 16-109581 DA – 7<sup>th</sup> & Burnside  
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/9158265/>.

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 Commission thought that the revised proposal was “light years better” as a starting point and execution of an idea. Very simple. Excellent.
- Materials and composition appear to be well-executed.
- The Commissioners were appreciative that you took their previous comments to heart.

### **Ground Floor & Parking.**

- PBOT will probably require a speed door for the garage. If it is a speed door, it should be solid metal and perforated metal—i.e., solid at headlight and pedestrian eye level, and it may be perforated above and below.
- The garage door does not need to be as tall as proposed; it should only extend up to the transom level. Glass or another appropriate, cohesive material should be placed above it.
- One Commissioner stated that he liked the location of the entry to the retail space on the 7<sup>th</sup> Ave façade at the northwest corner of the building, and that it was better than having another recess—or more stopping points—in the ground floor along E Burnside. Other Commissioners thought that a second access point could be provided in the recess space already proposed along E Burnside.
- There was some discussion about providing art at the ground floor near the garage, though no clear resolution on whether it should be provided.
- At the southwest corner, the gas meters should be located in the garage (or elsewhere within the building), rather than at the street face on the southwest corner of the building. The regulator may be located there, but everything else should be interior. Consolidate the doors and jambs into one disruption of that solid block—make a more simplified plane.

### **Massing & Elevations.**

- The Commission appreciates the way the arcade projections step back to allow the cornice and arcade of the adjacent building to remain visible.
- The Commission had questions about whether additional metal spandrel panels would be required in your façade to meet the energy code, and they stressed that however that gets worked out, the concept needs to remain clear and strong. It would be wonderful to have as much glass as you have shown at the DA hearing, though. This should be resolved by the design review hearing.
- The “strata” concept is very clear, except for the exposed stair corridor at the south façade. One commissioner stated that “it really knifes right through your concept.” Quality control on the large area of concrete could also be very difficult. The Commission was skeptical that it could be included in a complementary way—the form and material are just too disruptive. Ideally, it should be pulled back into the building; otherwise, the terraces should engage it more to help make it more cohesive.
- As you advance in the design, ensure that your energy code analysis allows the amount of glazing you are proposing. Ensure that any additional metal spandrel panels added to the facades don’t dilute the concept. The Commissioners were concerned that this could be a difficult challenge, and it needs to be resolved for your Type III hearing.

### **Materials.**

- The Commissioners appreciated the light colored brick (specifically, the white blend). The light brick is very appropriate for the linear concept that you’re trying to achieve. They stated that it has lightness like marble—almost crystalline. With the large arcade cantilevers, especially, the lighter color makes it feel lighter in weight. It also stands as a counterpoint to other recent, darker development in the area.
- The soffits in the arcade projections are too dark.
- The plants need to be appropriate for the exposure they will be receiving—the demands on them and their performance will differ tremendously from north to south. It will be difficult to achieve with a single variety, so be sure to take some time to study that. Grasses are probably a good starting place, since they’re the most diverse group of plants. Be sure to understand the limitations of your plants—they may help inform other decisions with your façade.

- There was discussion about your proposed materials, including zinc panels. One Commissioner thought that zinc would be a good choice, especially for the soffit, since it would be much lighter than was indicated on your drawings. It's also much closer to the color of the windows and mullions, which would also be good.
- The reality of your material palette is betrayed by your drawings—make sure your drawings are more accurate in your design review submittals. It will help you make your case.

### **Roof**

- Be sure to identify what the ideas are for the lower roofs along the south and east sides of the buildings; whether they will be ecoroofs or planted in some way, etc? Imago and future buildings will be looking over that space.

### **Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  1. Original Drawing Set
  2. Original Narrative
  3. Revised Drawing Set, received 2/29/2016
  4. Revised Drawing Set, dated 3/24/2016
  5. Revised Draft Drawings, submitted 4/13/2016
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
  - 1-32. Revised Drawing Set, dated 5/12/2016
- D. Notification
  1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
  2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
  3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
  4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
  1. Bureau of Environmental Services
  2. Portland Bureau of Transportation
- F. Public Testimony
 

No public testimony was received before or at the hearing on 3/24/2016.  
No public testimony was received before or at the hearing on 5/12/2016.
- G. Other
  1. Application form
  2. Staff Memo to the Design Commission, dated 3/17/2016
  3. Design Guidelines Matrix for 3/24/2016 hearing
  4. Staff Presentation to the Design Commission on 3/24/2016
  5. Applicant's Presentation to the Design Commission on 3/24/2016
  6. Summary Memo dated April 1, 2016
  7. Draft Design Guidelines Matrix for Revised Draft Drawings
  8. Email from Commissioner Julie Livingston
  9. Staff Memo to the Design Commission, dated 5/5/2016
  10. Design Guidelines Matrix for 5/12/2016 hearing
  11. Staff Presentation to the Design Commission on 5/12/2016
  12. Applicant's Presentation to the Design Commission on 5/12/2016