



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: July 23, 2013
To: Ben White, Carlton Hart Architects (via email)
From: Chris Caruso, Development Review, 503-823-5747
Re: EA 13-157478 DA – Glisan Commons Phase 2
Design Advice Request Summary Memo

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 July 18, 2013 Design Advice Request. This summary was generated from notes taken at the public meeting and a subsequent review of the public meeting recordings.

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 July 18, 2013. 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 would like to return for a 2nd DAR (you indicated no desire for a 2nd DAR) or as you prepare your formal Type III Design Review application.

Form and Scale

- It is good that you are trying to push and pull the building to break up the massing and are not relying on color or materials to do all the work. The building does not read as a giant graphic, which is a good thing.
- Execute the materials-to-massing concept, which is very clear and successful in the white massing models, more strongly around the entire building. The concept seems to work on each individual façade but not yet as a whole. Be more rigorous.
- Perhaps the stair towers should match the recesses in color to make the building more coherent.
- Stepping down at the east end feels like just another thing that is happening on the building that does not hold up to the concept. It is creating a whole other level of complexity. Either go taller or clean up the rigor of materials at the tops of the stepped back areas.
- There is a lot of blank wall on the south and east elevations above the first floor.

Materials

- The material palette should be quieted down, edited, by using fewer colors and materials overall.
- Cement panels in recessed areas that are framed by other materials is a good use of this material.

- All Commissioners present did not support wrapping the columns in cement panels as it will not be a durable or quality solution. Look for other options at these locations mark balcony ends, either solid walls or exposed columns.
- The Commission did not support using metal siding at the ground level as it may not hold up over time and would be hard to repair. Look at using masonry units on the residential half of the ground level, even around portions of the parking walls that residents and pedestrians will experience up close.

Pedestrian Connection & Plaza Areas

- Look at creating a connection from the tuck-under parking to the lobby that is fully covered. Having people go out between the ADA spaces will not feel logical to the average person.
- Screen the bay ends of the parking on the east end of the building to connect the top part of the building to the bottom part.
- The large openings into the parking area seems counter to creating a pedestrian realm along the east-west connector. The connector seems a bit piecemeal, like it is an afterthought. Think about how the pedestrian realm can be successfully designed first and let the building enhance it. The walkway is particularly narrow and awkward at the ADA spaces. The landscape screening should be more generous between the parking and walkway.
- The third area of circular bench may not be the best arrangement. Residents and their guests could use some smaller, more intimate seating arrangements. Diversify the seating in this area.

NE 99th Facade

- The left side, the parking wall side with the completed upper story form is good. The right side seems awkward and incomplete with too many intruding pieces.
- The board-formed with trellises is a nice textural treatment at the parking garage wall.
- The at-grade planted area should be raised to create a planter with integral benches for a more pleasant pedestrian environment.
- The main entry may look better in the center of the front façade.
- Simplify the setbacks on this façade.
- The center balconies seem tacked on. Since you cannot see the door, they feel completely disconnected from the interior spaces and may remain vacant most of the time since there are other private balconies, interior common rooms, and the roof deck.
- If the center balconies remain, they should be a grander gesture with more views into active areas. The entire element would need to be more significant.
- Larger, more generous common areas tend to work better than lots of smaller ones. Look at creating better spaces inside and not having the center balconies.
- One Commissioner asked if there was a plan for consistent furnishings on the center balconies.

Parking Lot & North Walls

- Concrete at the north wall is okay but it should be visually more interesting along the lot line with textured panels, mosaic panels, or areas of tile. Create a more human scale along this wall. This will be a tall wall that may be viewed by the neighbors for many years. The scale does need to be broken down. Board-formed concrete was not suggested as an option as it could be very difficult to keep clean of graffiti.
- The majority of the Commissioners did not want to see any openings in the 99th Ave parking wall. One Commissioner thought that openings would be okay with the trellis screening creating a translucent look with added visual interest.

Modifications

- The front sidewalk paving modification was fully supported by the Commission in order to have a landscaped planter in front of the entire length of parking wall along NE 99th Avenue.
- The long-term bicycle parking reduction modification is supportable if data is provided about how many bicycles are used in active senior housing developments similar to this one. A reduction ratio should be selected, such as 33%, 50%, etc. and the space that would have been devoted to bike storage should be turned over to resident common use. The modification could be granted if the public/shared areas inside the building were really improved as mitigation for the modification.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: *Design Commission (via email)*
 Respondents (none)

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant Information
 - 1. Narrative
- B. Zoning Map
- C. 1. Site Plan
 - 2. 11" x 17" Drawings (19 pages)
- D. 1. Posting mailer
 - 2. Notice to be Posted
 - 2. Certification of Posting
- E. 1. Application form
 - 2. Staff memo
 - 3. Staff PowerPoint presentation
 - 4. HO Decision for LU 12-116420 MS
 - 5. Design Commission decision for LU 12-115245 DZ
 - 6. Pre-Application Conference information