



City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Land Use Services

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 5000
Portland, Oregon 97201
503-823-7300
Fax 503-823-5630
TTY 503-823-6868
www.portlandonline.com/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 28, 2010
Date Mailed: February 3, 2010
To: Alex Haecker, Meyer, Scherer, Rockcastle Ltd
From: Kara Fioravanti, Development Review
Phone number 503-823-5892
Re: 09-170059 DA – Fields Park Bridge and Centennial Mills
Summary Memo from the 2nd DAR, held on January 21, 2010

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 January 21, 2010 Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings. For a small fee we can provide you with copies of those recordings; to request copies, please call 503-823-7814.

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 January 21, 2010. 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.

At the end of the hearing, the offer was made for the bridge and Centennial Mills to return for another DAR, if desired, after the project progresses in its design. Please coordinate with me as you continue with your design work.

Also, it was agreed that a second Design Commission briefing on the Fields Park will happen as design details are figured. Please contact me to schedule a second briefing date that fits your schedule.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Design Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes Design Commission design direction provided at the **January 21, 2010** DAR.

Advisory comments on Fields Park

- Thank you for putting the park process on hold to integrate the projects' designs.
- Park is elegant and rich around the edges.
- Great to have a main, unprogrammed space.
- Ensure the dog park area is large enough for dogs to run. This should keep the dogs in the dog park and ultimately avoid conflicts among users. Keep the park dog-free.
- It is important that the experience along the boardwalk route, due to its length, is rich and includes a variety of spaces including stopping places.
- Having a bowl helps the park feel bigger – rationale for the long boardwalk route.
- West wall of the bridge as it rises must be considered and designed, and treated to diminish its impact on the neighbors to the West, on the Park, on the sidewalk, etc.
- How strong/successful is the view of the River from the Park? This view is a necessary view; make it work as you plan for trees, grades, etc.
- Have you considered working with the BTA for a bike share/rental? Reference to Millennium Park.
- Please return for a second briefing. We would be interested in you sharing more of the details – some specific areas called out: materiality of the plant selections (make the plant selections appropriate for year-round), paths, structures (restrooms, canopy), more on the specificity of the various spaces including the play area, etc.

Bridge

- The bridge is not an option. It connects the park to the river, it connects the neighborhood to the river – it is key and fulfills the intent of this larger project. Don't forget about priorities and values.
- The bridge is a significant visual element and its design and quality should not be compromised. Infrastructure should not be cheaply designed.
- The curved form is important with the bridge's relationship to the park. A curve is interesting. It is fitting with the River. With the curved form it becomes evident that the design teams are headed in a similar direction, and that is positive.
- Support for the asymmetrical section of the curve.
- Study the views of the bridge and the views from the bridge, and utilize those opportunities. At least one no vote on the proposed geometric shapes; the elegance of the corten steel in your "precedent projects" is rich and simple enough. Take advantage of the rise and fall of the structure to focus views north from the bridge. Support for the bridge being as simple as possible.
- Including holes in the north rail could be interesting; it would provide dramatic views. Including plants in those holes is a fine idea, but the design would be fine without plants.
- There was no support for the bridge including a cage/throw barriers anywhere, including over the railroad. The bridge should be as open as possible.
- West wall of the bridge as it rises must be considered and designed, and treated to diminish its impact on the neighbors to the West, on the Park, on the sidewalk, etc.
- Is the cantilever too long?
- Not critical to spend a lot of money treating bridge stormwater. Spend that money on good bridge design.
- If no bridge – where do you cross?
- Great way to bring a neighborhood to the River.
- The boardwalk route to Centennial Mills is the longest possible route and the bridge lands in a private development. Most Commissioners at the previous DAR were hesitant about the length of the route and where it lands in Centennial Mills. The previous DAR comments encouraged you to consider other options for the route and bridge landing. Comments on this issue were mixed at the second DAR. To begin, comments from the first DAR were repeated, and a suggestion was made that a bridge in front of the Encore may work better for Centennial Mills' economic success. However, it was also mentioned although the route may be better shorter, a long route could be compelling and interesting – it is important that the experience along the route is rich and includes a variety of spaces including stopping places.

Also, it makes sense the bridge starts rising at Pettygrove, given the classification of Pettygrove. And, once the Pearl grows North (and assuming a rich experience along the entire boardwalk path) the length may not be as much of a problem. On the issue of the bridge, landing, landing in an interior space and/or ending at a gate is an issue still unresolved. An unsuccessful sequence could be detrimental to Centennial Mills. A strong statement was made that the bridge needs to be public 24/7. Public money is being used here. Don't forget values of the project. (Reference to a museum in Stuttgart.)

Centennial Mills

- Program concerns were raised. How do you make it lively all the time? With so little office, what is happening on a typical Monday at 10AM? How viable is the office space – hard to get to and no parking. What about parking? Have you conducted an economic analysis of this project without parking?
- Concerns about its success because the boardwalk route to get to Centennial Mills is long.
- Wharf concerns raised at the first DAR still apply.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Narratives
 - 1. 10-28-09
 - 2. 11-5-09
 - 3. 1-11-10
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 - 1. Drawings mailed to DZC in preparation for 12-3-09 DAR (25 pages)
 - 2. Drawings presented to DZC at 12-3-09 DAR (25 pages)
 - 3. Drawings presented to DZC at 1-21-10 DAR [14 pages] – *site plan attached*
- D. Notification
 - 1. Mailing list, 11-16-09
 - 2. Mailed notice, 11-16-09
- E. Bureau Responses
- F. Public Testimony
- G. Other
 - 1. Application form
 - 2. Land use history
 - 3. Memo to DZC, 11-24-09
 - 4. Excerpts from 2006 Framework Plan
 - 5. List of Issues for 12-3-09 DAR hearing
 - 6. Staff notes from 12-3-09 hearing
 - 7. Staff presentation for 12-3-09 hearing
 - 8. Summary notes from 12-3-09 hearing
 - 9. Staff presentation for 1-21-10 hearing
 - 10. List of Issues for 1-21-10 hearing
 - 11. Staff notes from 1-21-10 hearing