

# **Type III Land Use Review**

# **MEMORANDUM**

Date: February 25, 2021

To: Design Commission

From: Grace Jeffreys, Design / Historic Review Team

503-865-6521 | Grace.Jeffreys@PortlandOregon.Gov

Re: LU 20-210547 DZM AD – 3000 SE Powell

Type III Design Review - March 4, 2021

Attached is a drawing set for the Type III Design Review return hearing scheduled on **March 4, 2021**. Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

#### I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Type III Design Review for a proposed new four-story multi-family dwelling structure of approximately 137,200 square feet. The building program consists of 206 affordable housing units and 28 surface parking spaces. Ground floor uses include lofted housing units, building lobby, property management offices, and residential and community amenity spaces. The project also proposes a new multi-use path connecting SE 30th Ave. through the site to SE 31st Ave and revisions to the right-of-way at SE 30th off SE Powell. The following additional reviews are also requested:

#### One (1) Modification:

• Modification #1: Setbacks 33.130.215.C.1. To allow an increase in the maximum setback standard from SE 30th from 74'-6" to 63'-5".

### Two (2) Adjustments:

- Adjustment #1: Maximum Building Height in the CE Zone 33.130.210. To allow an increase in building height in the part of the building that spans the CE zone at the south from 45' to 60'.
- Adjustment #2: Parking Lot Landscaping 33.266.130.G. To not provide all of the required 5' of L2 landscaping at the south parking adjacent to the new Multi-Use Path Right-of Way.

A third adjustment was listed in the previous staff report, which was to Loading Standards, 33.266.310, to not provide the required Standard A loading space on site. The design has since been revised to accommodate two Type B loading spaces in the surface parking area to the south of the structure, so the loading requirements of 33.266.310 are now met.

## II. DEVELOPMENT TEAM BIO

Architect Mark Schmidt | Holst Architecture
Owner Patrick Rhea | Home Forward

Project Valuation \$ 40 million

#### III. DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL CRITERIA - See attached matrix.

- Community Design Guidelines (Design Review)
- 33.805.040, Approval criteria (Adjustment Reviews)
- 33.825.040, Modifications Considered During Design Review (Modification Review)

# **IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

This is a return hearing, and the Staff Report now recommends approval, with the suggestion of two additional conditions of approval:

- The typical steel canopy should be a minimum of 5'-0" deep (Exhibit C.18, detail 3).
- A minimum of 10 of the trees along the west property line shall be native evergreens (Exhibit C.29).

### **VI. PROCEDURAL NOTES**

- DARs: The subject proposal was heard before at three (3) voluntary Design Advice Requests (DAR) meetings. The most recent DAR dated June 11, 2020 was done via written responses due to the COVID quarantine (Commissioners providing responses all). See the attached summary of Commission comments.
- Application: The application was deemed complete on November 16, 2020.
- **First Hearing**: The first Land Use hearing was held with the Portland Design Commission on January 7, 2021. The Staff Report at that time found that the proposal met the approval criteria; however, because BES and PBOT had not yet indicated their support, the proposal did not yet warrant approval.

At that hearing, the Commission asked the applicant to further consider the following items. For convenience, the applicant's response is also provided in *italics* below (Exhibits H.10 sheets APP.39-44, and H.11 pages 17 and 18):

**Context:** The architectural treatment appears too complex. Commission recommends further study of the following:

- <u>Materiality</u>: Concerns with detailing, coherency, and fenestration depth.
- <u>Material Transitions</u>: Simplify complex transitions between materials in order to enhance and compliment the overall language.

In general, the overall exterior has been simplified in order to reinforce the design concept. It was clear from the commission's comments that the conceptual expression needs to be represented not just at a large scale, but also progress through and be supported at the detailed level.

As referenced in appendix pages 39-43, the building articulation has been studied and redesigned in order to reinforce the metamorphic strata concept.

Continuity of material has become paramount by creating less interruptions, and more refined details.

- Curved brick conditions at ground floor window headers and sills: These may take away from the very strong idea of strata and may not be necessary.
- Curved brick at canopies: Overly complicated. Canopies where curved soffits occur seem odd, especially at entrances.

- NW corner: Brick transition from north to west facades needs further detailing to avoid potential leak points. Commission recommended looking at changing brick across front to all "strata" brick.
- Canopies: Commission had concerns with locations, expression, and detailing.

Curved brick headers and sills at ground floor unit windows have been simplified to incorporate minimal reveals of stack bond brick, allowing the strata bond to overlap more overtly.

Clarification has been given to canopy locations where direct weather exposure is involved.

Other locations which have weather protection is provided by horizontal soffits have been simplified by removing redundant canopies, thus allowing the user to experience a greater detail of the material expression.

 Fiber cement siding: Differences in siding profiles seem too random. Location of transitions should more clearly strengthen the strong strata concept started with the brick.

Upper story fiber cement profile patterns have been simplified to coordinate directly to the metamorphic strata banding.

### **Public Realm:**

 30th ROW: Create a more flexible space. Explore paving options such as concrete to make it appear like a place for people, not just vehicles.

Locations that occur within the ROW such as 30th Ave and MUP terminus, are being reviewed under a separate standard PBOT improvement process and therefore have been excluded from this proposal.

MUP: Ends still seem underwhelming. Consider signage.

Regarding the MUP on private property, the MUP will be celebrated by a specialty material finish to give the user a sense of place and create moments of interaction and playfulness.

- Smoking area: Show where smokers will congregate on plans.

Special attention has been given to the on- site smoking shelter to create a weather protected, and materially connected space. Please reference C.53 for details.

 Trees along MUP: All tulip trees are shown. Consider adding evergreens here to provide some added native evergreen and screening year around.

No response was provided to the comment about the trees along the MUP to the west.

Attachments: Drawing Set February 15, 2021

**Guidelines Matrix**