



**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](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds)

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** June 1, 2015  
**To:** Portland Design Commission  
**From:** Hillary Adam, BDS, Land Use Services  
[Hillary.Adam@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Hillary.Adam@portlandoregon.gov) / 503-823-3581  
**Re:** 15-125245 DA – Block 290  
2<sup>nd</sup> Design Advice Request Memo June 11, 2015

Attached is a drawing set for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Design Advice Request for the proposal of a new mixed-use development consisting of 2-3 buildings arranged around a public square, all to be located at the southwest corner of the 460' x 460' property. Three options will be presented with one preferred option discussed in greater detail.

At the April 23<sup>rd</sup> Design Advice hearing, the Design Commission initially stated that they did not support development in the “pedway”, meaning the 60-foot-wide parcel at the west end of the neighborhood park. Eventually, the Commission softened their position and expressed a preference for a majority of the western 60-foot-wide portion of the Neighborhood Park to be designed as open space in order to continue the north-south circulation pattern of the Con-way Master Plan area. A summary of the April 23<sup>rd</sup> DA comments are attached for your reference. The applicant has revised the plans based on those comments. The character of the architecture is envisioned to be relatively the same as what was seen on April 23<sup>rd</sup> but is not rendered as such in order to focus on building location, massing, and open space character.

The review criteria are the Community Design Guidelines and the Con-way Master Plan Design Standards and Guidelines (copies of the guidelines are included with this memo).

Areas for discussion on April 23, 2015:

**North/South connection facing Neighborhood Park.** Map 05-8 of the Con-way Master Plan shows a 260' x 200' Neighborhood Park to be provided directly east of the 200' x 200' area dedicated for a “Square and Associated Development”. This map is provided on page 10 of the applicant’s drawing set. The applicant owns the western 60 feet of the area shown as Neighborhood Park and their current preferred option shows the eastern building edge extending 30 feet into this 60' wide parcel, with an upper-level overhang extending an additional 12' into this area; the previous DAR plan showed the building extending the full 60 feet. As noted previously, the Con-way Master Plan requires that any removal of dedicated open space, such as is currently proposed, must be processed through a **Master Plan Amendment**.

Staff notes that the current proposal allows for continuation of the pedestrian accessways to the north, provides a visual terminus for the accessways, and allows for the square to still achieve its desired qualities, although with a slight reduction in total area. However, staff wonders if the proposed 30'-wide path at the ground level, with a 12' overhang, is sufficient for this edge as it serves as both the edge to a yet-to-be designed park and a gateway to the north-south accessways, and will most likely have café seating along the building edge. Staff notes that this 60'-wide parcel is not an accessway and therefore is not subject to the standards and guidelines of the accessways. Therefore, this area of the development should be considered on its merits with an understanding of the existing and future context.

**Quimby.** With regard to Quimby, the applicant's proposal is relatively the same as was shown at the April 23<sup>rd</sup> DA. Staff notes that the Master Plan designated Quimby as a festival street, with the vision toward pedestrian and bicycle use, allowing for emergency and service vehicles. At the April 23<sup>rd</sup> DA, the Commission did not seem too concerned with the idea of allowing unrestricted vehicle access, stating either Quimby or Pettygrove could be used for garage access. However, staff cautions that if garage access is provided via Quimby rather than Pettygrove, occasional closures for festival use would be difficult, or perhaps not even allowed by future residents who require 24-hour access to the garage. The Commission did not feel they had enough information on Quimby to really discuss it at the prior DA, however, whether or not the applicant can build within this 60'-wide parcel is a critical Design Advice question. Staff notes that as Quimby is considered open space, building into this area would require a **Master Plan Amendment**.

The applicant has provided some information on the Quimby parcel (pages 39-40) and staff has requested additional views and precedent images be provided at the June 11<sup>th</sup> hearing. Staff notes that the proposal to build 11' to 15' into the 60' wide parcel would deviate from the established grid pattern in the rest of the neighborhood. As such, views through this area are critical to our understanding of how this would feel when approaching, passing through, and exiting this portion of Quimby. In addition, Staff would appreciate ideas on how to discourage a high number of vehicle trips on Quimby through either design or programming so that it can still be perceived primarily as a pedestrian and bicycle street.

**Top Floor Setbacks.** Standard 8F of the Con-way Master Plan requires that all buildings taller than 75' must be set back a minimum of 5' at the top floor; this would apply to the north and east buildings. In addition, Standard 10E requires that for any building *within the area restricted to the 47' maximum height limit* (map on page 10), the north facing elevation of the top floor must be set back from the main building facade a distance equal to the height of the top floor elevation; this would apply to the west building. At the prior hearing, the Design Commission noted that setbacks were desirable in order to have more exterior activity on the building. Staff notes that setting back the top floors of each of the buildings would dramatically change the architectural character of the proposed buildings (as implied on page 6); therefore, staff would like the Commission's perspective on whether this standard must be met or if a Modification reducing this setback requirement to 0' is reasonable.

**Public Square.** At the April 23<sup>rd</sup> DA, the Commission suggested that the design of the square should be simplified. While few details are available, due to the higher priority discussion items, the applicant has simplified the paving pattern; however precedents of relatively similar size have been provided to give a sense of the proposed square's size and level of enclosure.

At the April 23<sup>rd</sup> DA, the public and Commission agreed that maximum sun exposure on the square was desired and suggested the massing should be 6 stories at the north, 5 on the east, 4 on the south and 3 on the west. Solar studies have been provided that show there is minimal difference in the amount of sun on the square with the proposed massing versus a massing of 6-5-4-3. Staff appreciates any comments by the Commission on this aspect of the proposal.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.