



# City of Portland Design Commission

## Design Advice Request

### SUMMARY MEMO

**Date:** April 2, 2019  
**To:** Cory Hawbecker | HOLST  
**From:** Hannah Bryant, Development Review  
[Hannah.Bryant@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Hannah.Bryant@portlandoregon.gov) | 503.823.5353  
**Re:** 19-115255 DA – De Paul Adult Treatment Center  
Design Advice Request Summary Memo March 21, 2019

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 March 21, 2019 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/webdrawer/search/rec?sm\\_class=uri\\_7547&count&rows=50](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/search/rec?sm_class=uri_7547&count&rows=50)

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 March 21, 2019. 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 if you want to schedule a second DAR in the future. Our schedule is full for the next few months. Please reach out as soon as possible if you would like to schedule another DAR.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Design Commission  
Respondents

**Commissioners Present.** Samuel Rodriguez, Don Vallaster, Zari Santner, Brian McCarter, Julie Livingston

**Executive Summary.** The commission appreciated the opportunity to discuss the proposal at this early design stage. Direction provided included:

- Determine extent of PBOT requirement for SE 102<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.
- Explore alternative site plans to reduce quantity of Modification requests and strengthen response to guidelines.
- Consider carefully the future context when site planning, including a youth center and activity on SE 102<sup>nd</sup>.
- Choose Modification requests carefully to provide strongest response to the Guidelines. Modifications must *better* meet the Design Guidelines *and* meet the purpose of the code standard to warrant approval.
- The current scheme does not yet meet the guidelines and will require substantial changes in order to be approvable during a Land Use hearing.

**Summary of Comments.** Following is a general summary of Commission comments by design tenet.

## CONTEXT

1. SE 102<sup>nd</sup> Development – The uncertainty regarding whether there will be a PBOT requirement to develop half of SE Cherry Blossom or if that street will remain undeveloped created uncertainty about how to discuss site entry/egress; parking locations; building siting and Modification requests.
  - a. If PBOT will require half street improvements of 102<sup>nd</sup>, then exploring that street as the entry point and designing the site to reduce the area dedicated to parking and meeting the code standards will strengthen the response to guidelines on Cherry Blossom and reduce the number of Modifications requested. If the street improvements are required, the applicant may benefit from a second DAR with a significantly revised scheme.

If development of SE 102<sup>nd</sup> is required, it should be utilized as the entry/egress. Loading spaces are more accessible if there's a driveway from 102<sup>nd</sup>. This street is more private and may be a more appropriate entry point for this privacy-oriented program.
  - b. If PBOT waives the requirement to improve 102<sup>nd</sup>, then the Commission would support entry from Cherry Blossom and will anticipate a strong response to all code standards and Guidelines on the Cherry Blossom frontage.

(Guidelines A1 – Strengthen the Relationships Between Buildings and the Street; A2 – Enhance Visual and Physical Connections; B3 – Design for Coherency; C4 – Develop Complementary Parking Areas)

2. Site Plan – The site plan feels like it is driven by the building program and parking layout, and that the open space is leftover space. A future youth center should be considered as part of the master planning, and site access and open space should facilitate this future development. One Commissioner suggested exploring a south-facing courtyard and moving parking to the north half of the site where existing topography could help to screen the parking. This would continue to require Modifications to allow Vehicle Area between the Building and the Street and may still warrant the Modification to fence opacity, but those Modifications may be more approvable than some of the major Modifications identified at this DAR. (Guidelines B3 – Design for Coherency; C4 – Develop Complementary Parking Areas; A2 – Enhance Visual and Physical Connections)

## **PUBLIC REALM**

1. Pedestrian Path – Commissioners are concerned about the location and design of the pedestrian path at the south end of the property and meeting Design Guidelines. It feels exposed between two parking areas and is currently a weak contribution to the public realm. The Commission would support a well-designed path that is narrower if that design has PBOT support. (Guideline A2 – Enhance Visual and Physical Connections)
2. Program – Revisit the program to ensure that all active uses that do not have federal privacy restrictions are located along SE Cherry Blossom. The central spine shown on the program is a strong organizational element and should carry through to drive the site design. (Guidelines A1- Strengthen Relationships Between Buildings and the Street, A2- Enhance Visual and Physical Connections)
3. Building Entrances – The building's architecture indicates an entrance facing SE Cherry Blossom, however, there is no entrance. There was not clear support for a Modification to eliminate the Transit Street Main Entrance requirement. While a secondary entrance facing the parking area is supported, eliminating the required entrance facing SE Cherry Blossom would trigger two Modifications (33.526.270 and 33.150.265), and does not better meet the guidelines. (Guidelines A1- Strengthen Relationships Between Buildings and the Street, A2 – Enhance Visual and Physical Connections)

## **MODIFICATIONS**

Commissioners acknowledged the Modifications will be necessary, but that they should be chosen carefully to prioritize an attractive, safe public realm. The applicant should focus on the strongest site planning and the best response to guidelines when determining which standards to prioritize and which Modifications to request. One recommendation is to focus Modification requests on only one frontage, and to ensure that all code standards are met on the other frontage.

1. Fence – A carefully located, well-detailed fence with robust landscaping may warrant a Modification, as long as the new sidewalk along SE Cherry Blossom is a high-quality pedestrian experience. (Guideline C1 – Provide Opportunities for Active Uses at Major Street Intersections; B1 – Convey Design Quality and Building Permanence; A2 – Enhance Visual and Physical Connections)
2. Transit Street Main Entrance + Ground Floor Windows – Two Commissioners indicated conceptual support for these Modifications. Two other Commissioners indicated that they would not support these Modifications.
3. Maximum Setback + Vehicles Between a Building and a Street – Requirements related to SE 102<sup>nd</sup> need to be determined before Commissioners are prepared to weigh possible Modifications related to that frontage.

### **Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  - 1. Original Drawing Set
  - 2. Emails from Applicant
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
  - 1. DAR #1 Submittal
- D. Notification
  - 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
  - 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
  - 1. Applicant's statement certifying posting
  - 2. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments: None
- F. Public Testimony: None
- G. Other
  - 1. Application form
  - 2. Staff memo to Design Commission, dated