



**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](http://www.portlandonline.com/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** October 17, 2013  
**To:** Philip Stewart, Myhre Group Architects  
**From:** Chris Caruso, Development Review, 503-823-5747  
**Re:** EA 13-186674 DA – 419 E Burnside  
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 October 10, 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 October 10, 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 2<sup>nd</sup> DAR or as you prepare your formal Type III Design Review application.

### Site

- This is the first thing you will see coming over the bridge to the east side of Portland.
- The site is extremely important and needs high design.
- Any design must coalesce into an idea worthy of this site. The Commission is not going to settle for just anything.
- A building here could strengthen the gateway experience at this location.
- The proposal cannot be a formulaic approach to this site.
- This site demands the highest level of architectural excellence of anywhere in the City.
- This area of town has some of the most forward-thinking work. The architecture bar is very high in this area. The styles are in fact quite united as simple, strong and powerful concepts.

### Design Concept

- Pare the design down to one or two strong ideas with a limited palette of few materials and not a lot of moves around the building. The building needs to be unified.
- There is no clear overarching idea of hierarchy and decision-making, just dispersed and frenetic activity that is going everywhere.
- A great design can be modest and quiet as well. Sublimity is possible.
- Edit the design down.
- Commission is concerned about the current design's lack of coherency. Make a coherent building that is not a graphic idea. Suggested themes include the auto-orientation of the site,

the bridge, and speed/movement/directionality. Really understand the context and streetscape here in this area.

- This needs a citywide scale assessment for the design concept.
- Generally, there are some good urban moves, such as the continuous canopy, the taller corner element at MLK, and the roof deck location.
- The roof garden precedent images are very exciting and the proposed roof should really reflect these ideas. Make the roof garden a real amenity for the residents. Spend time designing this space.

### **Arcade Option**

- Consider using the arcade option described in the Central Eastside Design Guidelines, stacking more building mass against the street, which may open up more space along the north property line.
- Projecting building floor area that cannot be modified thru the Oriel Windows exemptions would require an additional Major Encroachment Review before City Council plus a fee assessed by PBOT for the use of the area above the sidewalk. Both the Bside 6 project and the Rocket building received approval for arcade-type designs.
- If the project elects to design an arcade, planters along the sidewalk would not be desired.

### **North Facade**

- Concerned about windows on the north walls being allowed. Also very concerned about the real livability of the north-facing units. Commission does not believe these will be desirable units, particularly if a new building wall is erected 12 feet away.
- The crummy L-shaped unit, and other units that face north, could be service and support spaces such as bike rooms, fitness rooms, laundry rooms, mechanical rooms, etc.

### **Ground Level**

- The sense of entry to the apartments should be opened up as it warrants some sort of statement at the street. This entry also wants to have a significant awning over it.
- The lobby is in desperate need of an identity.
- Take advantage of the furnishing zone for buffering between Burnside traffic and the sidewalk if you do not develop an arcade. Do not put planters in front of the building that will reduce pedestrian travel widths as this sidewalk is up against a very busy street.
- The ground level has nice tall windows and open spaces with a good overall program, except for the live/work units which are not that desirable. The entire ground level should be solely commercial spaces.
- Top the parking lot with an extended slab so it is fully covered parking and then design a deck space on top of the slab that could either be active area for residents of these units and/or a nice garden space for residents to look down upon.

### **Materials**

- Consider what a metal panel really wants to be – probably not a projecting box or complex shape. Do not use a panel system on things that want to be solids. The design can be finished in materials that serve the purpose of the forms or the design can evolve from the selected materials' properties.
- The Arthouse project is an example of a successful use of metal panels.

### **Adjustment & Exception**

- Both the adjustment for parking access across a Parking Access Restricted Street and an oriel window exception could be supported if there was appropriate mitigation. A Modification to loading space movement would need to be vetted with PBOT if trucks are backing out of the garage. Requesting an Adjustment for no loading may be an option if supported by PBOT.

### **Future DAR**

- The Commission asked the applicant to return for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Design Advice Request. This would help avoid multiple Type III hearings which the current proposal would most likely require.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:*        *Design Commission*  
              *Respondents*

**Exhibit List**

- A. Applicant Information
  - 1. Narrative
- B. Zoning Map
- C.
  - 1. Site Plan
  - 2. 11" x 17" Drawings
- D.
  - 1. Mailing list
  - 2. Mailed notice
- E.
  - 1. Application form
  - 2. Staff memo
  - 3. Staff PowerPoint presentation
  - 4. Site images
  - 5. Early Assistance information