

DeCoursey, Jillian

From: Joan Frederiksen <loliyo@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2018 2:28 PM
To: Ballew, Cassie
Cc: Heron, Tim; jcarrpdx@gmail.com
Subject: LU 17- 144195 DZ

Dear Design Commissioners:

Thank you for your continued work on this proposal. Please accept these additional comments based on the revised materials submitted.

- The new schemes continue to show the northern turn around area. A building designed to have a 20-foot tall roll up door and turn around area for large trucks adjacent to residential development does not meet the required compatibility per 33.284.050.A. This element should be integrated into the building or relocated away from the residential area. This is in addition to the uncertainty as to the long term enforcement of the operational hours and “no idling” restrictions.
- A better option than what Leon Capital proposed is to have the building variation in plan B (the setback and western redesign that faces the residential houses) with the materials variation of design A (western façade treatment). If you combined the two elements the building would come closer to meeting the criteria.
- Regarding materials and facades, while the use of a high quality material like brick is appreciated it is not sufficient to masque the deficiencies in the building design, massing and length of facades. Perhaps more important is to use this material harmoniously with more variation in the building form, stronger visual breaks, more glazing and variation of other high quality materials.
- In both design schemes shown, exterior - first floor level - lighting fixtures are not shown. This is critical feature necessary for long term security of the facility and neighboring properties and to meet approval criteria for safety.
- With the simulated perspectives/view of the corner and facades, it shows more care needs to be taken with design details. For example the window/glazing should be set back from the main facade plane at least 6 inches to make it an more formidable element, particularly since it is just in the corner and along Powell. Or the ground level glazing could be recessed more like 3-4 feet to make it stand out more and break the plane.
- Scheme B takes a step in the right direction in moving the commercial setback closer to the property line while increasing the setback to the northwestern residential line. They should consider using the remaining 6 feet so that there is a zero setback - though there may be fire code issues that are limiting their desire to take that further step. This would also eliminate a future open strip between building and adjacent future development.
- With the updated drawings showing different perspectives and adding information to the overall picture not previously shown in this way, I ask that the sidewalk/right of way frontage along SE 62nd Avenue be provided with planter strips instead of tree wells for at least the area north of the driveway. This will help with the transition into the residential area. Although not directly a part of the building, by extension it could be considered part of the landscaping plan and serve to better meet 33.284.050.D.

While the applicant indicates a desire to be responsive regarding the open metal fencing for the perimeter of the site, Scheme A and B floor plans continue to show wood fencing. Please provide a condition of approval requiring high quality open metal fencing - at least 6 feet high -along the perimeter of the site so that it is clear into the future and for neighboring properties.

Thank you for your consideration of these points and all the other community testimony you have received.

Sincerely,
Joan Frederiksen

