



**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 15, 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 June 8, 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 June 8, 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 June 8, 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 move forward with the project.

*Encl:*  
Summary Memo

*Cc:* Landmarks Commission  
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Landmarks Commission** design direction provided on June 8, 2015.

Commissioners in attendance on June 8, 2015: Brian Emerick, Jessica Engeman, Carin Carlson, Harris Matarazzo, Kirk Ranzetta, Paul Solimano

### **Massing/Courtyard Scheme**

- At least one Commissioner outright enjoys a courtyard direction in general - it breaks down scale, adds more glass and active retail, eliminates a hard and relentless street wall. However, changes noted below would be required to get a vote of approval.
- One Commissioner is simply not in favor of a courtyard, it is too residential.
- The remainder of the Commission could accept a courtyard if all other requests were embraced in the redesign.
- An overwhelming majority would require removal of the piers/wing walls at the courtyard – it must be a public active space, this site needs a commercial building that can accommodate multiple users over time, if restaurant then the courtyard allows active spill out. Removal of piers and wing walls reduces the sense of a monumental palazzo. The courtyard must be an extension of sidewalk; gates are a “non-starter”.
- Next time we will need to understand the courtyard design and elements. The paving should be concrete to express an extension of the public sidewalk.
- Concern with the visible 2<sup>nd</sup> floor retail activity.
- A courtyard could achieve a majority vote if: it is a public space and sidewalk extension; it cannot be gated/exclusive; other elements canopies and lighting are resolved (see below); it must feel more urban/less residential; holistic changes.
- Each Commissioner did discuss their preferred alternatives if no courtyard: 1 for sketch D because it looks the most commercial, but prefers a courtyard; 2 for sketch B because of massing, more glass, and no courtyard; 1 for sketch A because there is a break down in massing, no courtyard, clear entry, and removes 2<sup>nd</sup> floor roof activity.

### **North and East Elevations**

- In general, the hierarchy of facades is good, storefront at 23<sup>rd</sup> is supportable.
- Glisan composition and hierarchy is acceptable.
- It is OK for not as much storefront at Glisan because 23<sup>rd</sup> is where storefront goes. The Glisan Street ground floor window modification could be supported because there are many windows at the elevation, they are just higher than Code allows.
- No landscaping at first bay off 23<sup>rd</sup>; support for landscaping at the rest of the frontage.
- The east elevation needs more windows at the middle section. It is OK if the stairs read in the elevation because of different alignments – this is commonly the case with historic buildings. Windows in a stairwell are nice for users inside. Hesitation for a green wall and whether this would be a good long-term solution for the blank wall area.

### **Sunshades/Canopies/Roof covers/Railings/Lights**

- Overall, the various applied elements make the proposal too busy. There are too many things going on – tall roof cover, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor roof covers, sunshades, glass storefront canopies, lights, railings. They also add to the monumental feeling of the building – e.g.. oversized lighting.

- Roof covers are not temporary – they are required to go through Historic Review and building permit review.
- Little to no support for the sunshades. One commissioner mention that there are a few buildings in the Central City that have sunshades; however, they are flat and in-keeping with canopies at the storefront level – i.e. these buildings to not have multiple types of canopies and shades, which is a problematic component of the proposed RH design. However, many Commissioners are concerned with the inclusion of any type of sunshade in the design.
- Support for the glass storefront canopy.
- The two-story building wings should be simplified. One commissioner suggested a change in color.
- Retail area at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is strange and multiple canopies – very busy with visible display area, too. One commissioner was not opposed to the second-story roof covers, as they are seasonal and add vibrancy. The variety of elements, though, requires they be redesigned for a quieter and more cohesive building. Other commissioners were uncertain or opposed to the covers at the second-floor roofs of the wings.
- Remove railings at front building wings and don't break cornice with railings. Cornice should be continuous.
- Lights are too large scale.
- Reduce the number of elements for an elegant package. The ornamentation seen on historic buildings (of a similar scale to the proposed development) in the district is found in the masonry patterning/color, use of plaster ornamentation on stucco buildings, detailed cornices, and selective use of balconies and different window types/groupings (e.g. oriel windows) to punctuate the design. Adding many types of applied and projecting elements, especially in a manner that is fairly ubiquitous across the facades, is not consistent with how buildings are detailed in the district. Additionally, new infill should not strive to be as elaborate or ornamented as our grandest historic buildings in the district. New development should support the context of the historic buildings.

### **Height**

- Height Modifications are not a given. Though, the zoning in the area is confused because it allows 65'/75' at 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue closer to residential, and only 45' at commercial streets where the neighborhood would like taller ground levels.
- Be very clear why height here is OK, and not elsewhere.
- One reason to allow the Modification is for the step down at the wings.
- Another reason is that it allows for a high ground floor.
- Allowing Modifications sets the bar lower; we allow them in unusual circumstances. There needs to be a give and take –respond to our comments and give a little more next time.
- Show the height of Kitchen Kaboodle next door next time.

### **Loading**

- As long as PBOT is supportive of the proposal, it is supported by the PHLC. Show the design, details, and surfaces next time.

### **Exterior Display**

- At least one commissioner was very concerned about approving multiple levels of outdoor display area, especially at the sidewalk-level and second story.

- It should be low profile and not visible to street at upper floors; we don't want a billboard for product visible from street. We also do not want to preclude a restaurant in a courtyard in the future.
- Can we dictate what gets displayed? Staff will investigate.
- We need to find balance between display and control.
- Some commissioners are concerned about landscaping on the roof – would typically require that it be set back from the parapet to ensure no visibility or very minimal visibility from the street.

### Windows/Stucco

- Regarding the proposed windows, one commissioner stated the square proportion of the divided lights seemed awkward, as neighborhood steel windows are more vertically-oriented rectangles.
- Some commissioners found the large windows on the NW 23<sup>rd</sup> façade to be over-sized. Breaking these into window groupings or have more of a hierarchy with some heavier mullions is needed.
- Stucco should be steel trowel, integral color, not a veneer.
- Think about two-tones for the stucco or a lighter color. Dark color adds to the monumental feeling.

### Exhibit List

- A. Applicant's Submittals
  1. Original drawing set
  2. Draft drawing set for DAR hearing on April 13, 2015
  3. Drawing set for DAR hearing on April 13, 2015
  4. Drawing set for DAR hearing on June 8, 2015
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings for June 8, 2015 hearing
  1. See *Exhibit A-4*.
- 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
  5. Posting instructions sent to applicant for June 8, 2015 hearing
  6. Posting notice as sent to applicant for June 8, 2015 hearing
- E. Service Bureau Comments
  1. Bureau of Transportation EA appointment response, dated April 10, 2015
- F. Public Testimony
  1. Don Genasci on behalf of NWDA Planning Committee, June 8, 2015
- G. Other
  1. Application form
  2. Memo to Commission, April 3, 2015
  3. Staff presentation for April 13, 2015 hearing
  4. Summary comments from April 13, 2015 hearing
  5. Memo to Commission, May 29, 2015
  6. Staff presentation for June 8, 2015 hearing