



# City of Portland Historic Landmarks Commission

## Design Advice Request

### SUMMARY MEMO

**Date:** January 23, 2025  
**To:** Stephen Effros, PPS Office of School Modernization  
**From:** Benjamin Nielsen, Design & Historic Review Team  
503-865-6519, benjamin.nielsen@portlandoregon.gov  
**Re:** EA 24-094383 DA – *Jefferson High School Reconstruction*  
Design Advice Request Commission Summary Memo – December 2, 2024

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. Following, is a summary of the comments provided by the Historic Landmarks Commission at the December 2, 2024, 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: <https://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/record/17080033/>.

These Historic Landmarks 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 December 2, 2024. 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 land use review process [which includes a land use review application, public notification, and a Final Decision] 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 Land Use Review Application.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Design Commission  
Respondents

**Executive Summary.** The commissioners present at the DAR agreed that the overall design (aside from details discussed below) and layout of the building and site were good additions to the Piedmont Conservation District and would serve the neighborhood well. One commissioner noted that the placement of the new school building close to N Killingsworth makes the school more welcoming and accessible.

**Commissioners Present.** Hugo Hamblin-Agosto, Kimberly Moreland, Peggy Moretti, Andrew Smith

**Summary of Comments.**

- Commissioners agree that the proposed siting of the building is appropriate and generally responsive to its district context.
- Regarding the arts entry and N Killingsworth St:
  - Commissioners initially had varying opinions on whether the arts entry to the school should be at the N Killingsworth St frontage. All agreed that student safety is important.
  - Some commissioners noted that the architectural design of the northwest corner of the building (and proposed signage) suggested that an entry was also located here, and that it is confusing that the entry is so much farther south.
  - One commissioner found that there is a “golden opportunity” to create something special along Killingsworth with the arts entry. He noted that something akin to a marquee would be a great addition to the streetscape and appropriate to the use and design of the northwest corner of the building as shown at the DAR. He said the recessed space at the northwest corner works well and provides an opportunity for relief from the street and cover from the rain, and that the only other thing missing would be for the entrance to be located at that corner as well.
  - The Commission ultimately recommended that, if the arts entry does not have adjacency to Killingsworth, that there should be a stronger connection from N Killingsworth St to the entry in the form of a strong architectural design response to lead people down N Kerby Ave.
- Regarding other entries into the building:
  - Commissioners agree with the proposed placement of the main entrance and athletic entrance (though this lies outside the conservation district boundary).
  - The Commission noted that there should be a canopy and other features that denote the entry into the health clinic on the Commercial Ave side of the building.
- Regarding proposed exterior materials and design coherency:
  - The Commission expressed strong support in the overall design and materiality of the building, with one specifically noting appreciation for a design that is “timeless rather than super-trendy”. Commissioners appreciated the reinterpretation of the design of the original school in the use of shaped brick and angled metal panels. They also appreciated the proposed color palette and generally found the incorporation of darker hues to be beneficial.
  - Two commissioners asked whether a lighter cream or white trim could be incorporated to offer more of the contrast found in the historic school building. The other two commissioners thought adding a lighter color for trim was unnecessary.

- Regarding detailing of the N Killingsworth St façade:
  - Overall, the Commission thought the design was responding well to previous comments cautioning against treating the façade like it was a back or non-primary façade.
  - One commissioner noted that the further development of the landscaping along the street and the addition of lighting and/or an art project would help to further bolster the façade's importance.
- Commissioners were supportive of proposed building setbacks and had no specific concerns regarding likely Modifications to setback standards.
- Regarding the loading area:
  - One commissioner questioned the extension of the brick wall around the generator enclosure and postulated that metal screening that relates more to the fencing might slightly help to create more interest in this area, noting the extent of the brick in this area feels "a bit relentless".
- Regarding weather protection:
  - Commissioners agreed that the proposed design did not satisfactorily meet Guideline E5: Light, Wind, and Rain and that additional weather protection is needed.
  - Commissioners discussed the idea of using weather protection along N Kerby Ave to connect Killingsworth St to the main entry, suggesting that providing weather protection here would be worth losing some of the landscaping proposed in this area.
- Regarding a likely Ground Floor Windows Modification, commissioners agreed that the school use is a unique case (as opposed to a retail use, for instance) that requires less glazing so as not to distract students or have poor acoustics in the music classrooms, and they were generally supportive of the reduction from 60% glazing along N Killingsworth St to 40%. One commissioner pointed out that additional glazing could easily be provided on the north façade by moving the arts entry to the north elevation of the building.

### **Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  - 1. Draft Presentation Slides
  - 2. Final Presentation Slides
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
  - 1-48. Slide Set presented to Design Commission on 12/2/2024 (same as Exhibit A.2).
- D. Notification
  - 1. Mailing list
  - 2. Mailed notice
  - 3. Posting instructions sent to applicant
  - 4. Posting notice as sent to applicant
  - 5. Applicant's statement certifying posting
  - 6. Revised Mailing List
- E. Service Bureau Comments

1. PP&D Transportation Review

F. Public Testimony

*No public testimony was received.*

G. Other

1. Application form
2. Staff memo to Design Commission
3. Staff Presentation to Design Commission
4. Email correspondence