



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

FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Amanda Fritz, Commissioner
Paul L. Scarlett, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 8, 2015
To: Paul Jeffreys, Ankrom Moisan Architects, Inc
From: Kara Fioravanti, Senior Planner, Development Review
Benjamin Nielsen, Planner, Development Review
Re: EA 14-234834 DA – Restoration Hardware
Design Advice Request Summary Memo April 13, 2015

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 Landmarks Commission at the April 13, 2015, 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: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7439712>.

These 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 April 13, 2015. 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 as you prepare for your second DAR on June 8.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Landmarks Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Landmarks Commission** design direction provided on April 13, 2015.

Commissioners in attendance on April 13, 2015: Brian Emerick, Jessica Engeman, Carin Carlson, Harris Matarazzo, Kirk Ranzetta, Paul Solimano

Building Character

1. The building seems more like a Palladian villa than an urban retail building.
 - a. Buildings with residential detailing in the district had/have a residential history.
 - b. The residential prototype is not appropriate for NW 23rd Avenue commercial buildings. The street is an urban street, but not in the same way as streets downtown. It's still very pedestrian-oriented with engaging storefronts. The building doesn't need to emulate buildings downtown or on Burnside in its commercial character, but it needs to be more engaging. It needs more entries, for example, and more of a storefront presence; level changes for ADA could be accommodated internally.
2. This building needs to activate the retail streetscape. What is it going to be in the future when Restoration Hardware moves out?
3. The quality of materials proposed and the quality of detailing overall looked very good. There are questions about whether they are truly appropriate for the district, however.
 - a. The cement plaster finish and color are nice, but it is hard to find a contextual example with that scale and color. How does this material fit into the neighborhood?
 - b. Sunscreens and Juliette balconies are nice but not appropriate to the district. The detailing needs to be more "Portland."
 - c. The sunshades on the north are also not functional.
 - d. Despite the quality, the current design feels like a branded product dropped into the district. It is more appropriate in another city, like Charleston, SC, LaJolla, or Santa Barbara. Need some changes to respond to the character of the Alphabet District.
 - e. Why is the Alphabet District significant? There are many eclectic styles and details in the district. The building's design and detailing should be more place-centered.
 - f. Ultimately, this building will be a part of the city for a long time, and it needs to be a part of the fabric and able to transcend time and users.

Building Height, Scale & Outdoor Display Modifications

1. A majority of the Commission believed the overall building height and scale seem appropriate for the district.
 - a. HM: Has concerns about the height—it needs to be complementary to the district and nearby buildings.
 - b. BE: Less concerned about the scale but would like to understand the project better. The height is probably ok if the penthouse isn't visible from across the street. The height Modification might have to be tied to providing an enduring public benefit.
2. The rooftop display Modification received general support, with some conditions.
 - a. The Modification may be approvable under the condition that goods displayed are not visible from the street and under the condition that the roof has to remain open to the public. It would be an opportunity for the public to view and engage the Historic District.
 - b. JE, CC: support the concept of allowing the outdoor display programming on the roof.
 - i. BE: It provides more activation of the property and more richness to the retail district.
 - ii. HM: Ok with the rooftop display as well, but concerned about what happens when the ownership changes. This needs to be resolved before granting the Modification.

Parking & Loading

1. Proposed open driveway and building setback on the east side seems like a good response to the adjacent contributing building because it allows for light and air between the two buildings. Need to see the courtyard/driveway in higher resolution to understand how the design is executed. Should feel like something more special than just a ramp.

2. Commission has no aesthetic concerns with the loading Modification.

Elevations

1. Glisan and NW 23rd Avenue facades need more active entries.
2. Would like to see more of a hierarchy of materials and detailing on the elevations. Street facades traditionally have a higher level of detail and finish than the rear and side elevations. Also need another step up in the hierarchy to identify the building entries.
3. Arches on the east elevation should probably go away. Not sure they belong on the other elevations either.
4. Level of hierarchy: 23rd is the primary frontage, Glisan is an important east-west frontage, east façade is less important and should be toned-down
 - a. JE: The language of other buildings in the district usually have the highest level of finish and detailing on the primary entry façade. Some of the features wrap around to the secondary façade (Glisan, in this case). Good not to make the east façade too plain, but should be toned down.

Right-of-way Dedication & Setbacks

1. Could provide more room for cafes, etc. Majority expressed concerns that the sidewalk dedication didn't seem appropriate.
 - a. BE: Ok with a 15' ROW, but the building needs to sit right up at the property line.
 - b. JE, CC, et al: Agreed that the 15' wide sidewalk doesn't seem appropriate. The existing street wall supports keeping the existing 12' sidewalk.
 - c. Staff will check with PBOT to see if they would like a letter from the Commission.
 - d. BE would like PBOT to have a lengthier conversation with the Commission about the greater policy question at a later date.
2. The landscape setback on Glisan Street and NW 23rd makes the building feel more disconnected from the streetscape and isn't an appropriate landscape treatment. Needs to be an active urban landscape, or building needs to be set right up to property line.

Other Issues

1. Don't forget about transformers, vaults, bike parking, signs, and exterior lighting. Commission will be looking for more information about this.

For the Next DAR Hearing

1. The Commission is not yet ready or able to give clear, specific advice on what the overall building design should be. Need to have second DAR where applicant presents 3 or 4 thumbnail-type sketches with broader concepts for the Commission to comment on. Would be a bigger-picture conversation.
2. Provide more contextual information (15-20 buildings) describing the type of buildings that are influencing the design concepts.
3. Provide street elevations of building and a few blocks north and south.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
 1. Original drawing set
 2. Revised drawing set for DAR hearing
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 1. See *Exhibit A-2*.
- D. Notification
 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 3. Applicant's statement certifying posting
 4. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments
 1. Bureau of Transportation EA appointment response
- F. Public Testimony

No testimony was given at this hearing.
- G. Other
 1. Application form

