



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

FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 30, 2015
To: PHIL BEYL, GBD ARCHITECTS
From: Hillary Adam, Development Review
503-823-3581
Re: 15-203240 DA – Broadway Tower
Design Advice Request Summary Memo November 5, 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 Design Commission at the November 5, 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/webdrawer/search/rec?sm_class=uri_7547&count&rows=50

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 November 5, 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 your formal land use application, or if you desire another Design Advice Request meeting with the Commission.

Encl:
Summary Memo

Cc: Design Commission
Respondents

This memo summarizes **Design Commission** design direction provided on November 5, 2015.

Commissioners in attendance on November 5, 2015: David Wark, Tad Savinar, Julie Livingston, and Don Vallaster

Central City Master Plan.

- One Commissioner suggested that a shadow study be provided and that the shadows be considered for a distance extending a few blocks on each side from the site.
- The Commission noted that, with regard to demonstration of a public benefit, the permanency of the public benefit, the visibility, impact, and location of the public benefit, the community it serves, all need to be considered to ensure the public benefit is comparable and proportional to the FAR request.
- The Commission noted that Director Park is the best example of a public benefit achieved through the Central City Master Plan process, noting that it is accessible to all.
- One Commissioner noted that identifying and implementing a comparable public benefit is a critical issue. He noted that while FAR bonuses bring additional people in to activate an area, they also block access to light, change wind patterns, and impact views, which have an effect on the immediate area. Therefore, the public benefit should result in a direct improvement to the immediate area.
- With regard to the options presented, one Commissioner stated that the gesture has to be big, not necessarily measured in dollar value, but bigger and more meaningful than public art; another Commissioner agreed, adding that the Commission is moving away from accepting public art as a public benefit. He stated, and another agreed, that Director Park is pushing it a little bit for the scale of this particular proposed project, but a similar gesture would be appropriate. He acknowledged the need for income-restricted housing, but said that he didn't think that was the right solution in this case; the rest of the Commission agreed. With regard to the option involving the Armory, he noted that the Gerding Theater is a business and one has to buy tickets to get in so he didn't see any meaningful public benefit in that option; another Commissioner agreed. He indicated that with regard to public benefit, he is looking for something that is free and accessible to all that improves the immediate environment.
- One commissioner suggested that the location of the public benefit aspect should be on the RX-zoned parcel.
- One Commissioner stated that it seemed obvious to look to the Park Blocks and consider partnering with Portland Parks and Recreation to see what may be able to be done there. Another Commissioner suggested 24-hour security in the Park Blocks.
- One Commissioner noted that the 1% for Art bonus is the only financial measure related to the concept of public benefit in the code so that value could be used as a baseline, however to be used for the public benefit aspect rather than for art.
- One Commissioner noted that these requests may become more common and so he would like to set an equitable precedent to qualify the public benefit so that the process does not overburden the developer but provides the opportunity for a good design, such as that proposed, be able to move forward.
- One Commissioner noted that the overall sustainability of the public benefit should be a measure of the quality of the proposal, noting that the permanence of the building and the permanence of the public benefit should match. Therefore, something that is dependent on funds would have to consider how those funds are to be sustained in perpetuity.
- The Commission noted that the outline of the proposal is acceptable; the architecture appears to meet the guidelines, but the details of the public benefit need to be resolved. They suggested that a 2nd Design Advice would be appropriate to get feedback on the chosen public benefit option and that if that opportunity is taken, to come with shadow studies and any updated design drawings.

Architecture.

- One Commissioner stated that he thought the design of the building, was extraordinary and exceptional on the east side, but is a little stale on the west side. He stated that the building does not have to be shy on the west side, adding that the form, materials, glazing, and matrix used will not change the park so its presence on the west side, facing the Park Blocks, should be just as elegant as it is on the east side. While he understood the projection on the west with regard to the plan, he noted that the building should be

elegant on all sides. He noted that, due to the existing building frontages in this neighborhood, there are challenges with east-west pedestrian activity. He noted that it is really important to nurture pedestrian activity on the north and south sides of the building to support these pedestrians and warned the applicant to not focus all the attention on Broadway.

- Another Commissioner stated that it was a very handsome building and would be a great addition to the neighborhood. He agreed with the other Commissioner that more should be done to activate the west side of the building, such as introducing recesses or balconies.
- Another Commissioner agreed and stated that some of the most interesting parts were the niches created in the glazed crystalline building, adding that it would be great to have more opportunities for people to come out and activate the west façade facing the park. He added that it would be really great to provide an opportunity for people to come out of the building at the 2nd level on Broadway and become part of the cityscape. He suggested that it would be great to have these outdoor opportunities on the ends too.
- One Commissioner noted concerns that a future development on the NW RX-zoned corner, and its relationship to the proposed hotel rooms, could potentially compromise the success of the west side of the building.
- One Commissioner suggested that it would be nice if the hotel units on the west side of the 3rd level had the opportunity to access the outdoors, particularly at the corners.
- One Commissioner stated that if it's a crystalline glass building, it should be crystalline on the ground level, wondering why a different material would be introduced. He stated that given the activities proposed – hotel lobby, restaurant, retail - the more transparent, the better, especially on this particular street. Acknowledging the change in slope, he suggested that a consistent canopy, or something, across the length of the building might be an option, noting that the horizontal canopy element needs to be just as graceful, and perhaps continuous, as the vertical element of the building. Recalling other hotels in the City with grand canopies, he noted that the hotel entrance should really celebrate the arrival of visitors, rather than being understated.
- One Commissioner stated that the slab tower massing is really attractive.

Public Comments.

- Lewis and Jeannette Horn, on September 22, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit F-1) in opposition, stating that the proposed building is too large for the neighborhood and is unimpressive, adding that they are concerned about impacts to the already congested flow of traffic.
- Julie Sheppard, on September 25, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit F-2) in opposition, stating concerns with the traffic impact during and following construction.
- Karl Maggard, on October 1, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit F-3) in opposition, stating that the building is too tall for the Park Blocks, which should be protected, adding that the additional traffic, which is already a problem, will add to pollution and safety problems.
- Ken Pirie, on November 5, 2015, wrote in support of the concept (Exhibit F-4).
- Mark Hammer, on November 5, 2015, provided oral testimony, noting that while the proposed building was beautiful, he was concerned about the massive impacts on the Park Blocks, rush hour traffic on SW Clay, and worried about the extension of hours of operation in the vicinity. He stated that the idea of providing a public benefit in exchange for additional FAR does not make sense.
- Peter Bailey, on November 5, 2015, provided oral testimony, stating that the proposed building was a giant shiny box which isn't very interesting, and noted that rush hour traffic on SW Clay is awful and the proposal would compound that problem. He stated that an FAR increase through a Central City Master Plan should benefit the immediate community but did not support any of the potential proposals suggested.
- Greg Moss, on November 16, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-6) in opposition, with concerns about increased traffic on SW Clay, the requested additional FAR diminishing the skyline and blocking sunlight, increased crime, lack of adequate utility infrastructure, and the ability for trading of FAR.
- Pam Halstead, on November 17, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-7), suggesting that, with regard to the public benefit aspect of the proposal, something considerable should be provided and that infrastructure improvements to address the gridlock on SW Clay and Jefferson should be included as part of the proposal.

- Michael Cummings, on November 17, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-8) objecting to the decision to not reschedule the Design Advice as was indicated would happen if the hearing did not begin by 6:30pm and in opposition to the concept of allowing additional density per vague Code language.
- Ray Bodwell, on November 17, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-9) noting concerns with the proposed size of the building, noting that additional traffic from the office use would add to the existing problem and, therefore, he could see no public benefit associated with the additional 60,000 square feet requested.
- Ken Smith, on November 17, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-10) noting concerns about increased density and traffic, and noting that the public benefit aspect of the proposal should address safety and livability concerns in the Park Blocks in a way that makes them more pleasant and safe for residents, tourists, and children, suggesting full-time policing, new benches, or art.
- Alan Newbauer, on November 17, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-11) in support of the proposal.
- Sylvia Stevens, on November 17, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-12) in support of the proposal.
- Janet Hammer, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-13) in opposition, noting that the building would crowd the Park Blocks, add traffic to the overburdened Clay Street, seeming to go against public benefit, and suggesting the airy experience of the Park Blocks should be protected by not allowing the additional floors.
- Mark Hammer, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-14), stating that due process was affected by not postponing the hearing per the published statement on the agenda, with concerns about the quality of the public benefit proposed to offset the impacts of the additional FAR, and with concerns on the impacts to the Park Blocks and additional traffic.
- Lewis Horn, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-15), with concerns about the impacts to traffic and on-street parking, and stating that the building has very little eye appeal and will detract from the cultural district and cast long shadows on the Park Blocks, suggesting the building should be no more than 10 floors.
- Larry and Shirley Fester, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-16) in opposition, stating that the additional floors would be detrimental to the neighborhood and those who use the Park Blocks.
- Jeannette Horn, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-17) in opposition, stating the proposed building would add more traffic to gridlocked SW Clay Street, and more foot traffic negatively impacting the serenity of the Park Blocks.
- Alan Newbauer, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-18) in support, stating the proposed building would add to the downtown experience.
- Sylvia Stevens, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-19), in support of the proposal, including the additional floors.
- Alan Newbauer, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-20) in support of the proposal, including the additional floors, stating that the proposed building would improve downtown.
- Les Stoessl, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-21) with concerns about the impacts of this building on surface street traffic and the associated exhaust negatively impacts the Park Blocks and the livability of the area. He noted that the construction boom has resulted in a significant increase in traffic with no upgrades in infrastructure to address this problem and the city should address these issues.
- John W. Marling, on November 18, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-22) in opposition, stating that the public benefit has not been defined and therefore additional floors are not justified, additional traffic on Clay Street is unacceptable, off street parking is at a premium, and the proposed size, scope, and design of the building does not fit with the Park Blocks.
- Gretchen Olson, on November 19, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-23) in opposition, stating that the proposed building is a glassy grey monolith with no interest and that the additional floors will harm the public and surrounding neighborhood.
- Eustacia Su, on November 19, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-24) in opposition, stating concerns with additional traffic on SW Clay, negative impacts of a monolithic building on the nearby Park Blocks.

- Maureen McCartin, on November 19, 2015, provided written testimony (Exhibit G-25) with concerns about the impacts of the building on existing intolerable traffic and onstreet parking.

Exhibit List

- A. Applicant’s Submittals
 1. Original drawing set
 2. Project Description
 3. Complete Revised Drawing Set
- B. Zoning Map
- C. Drawings
 1. Drawing set for November 5, 2015 Design Advice
- D. Notification
 1. Posting instructions sent to applicant
 2. Posting notice as sent to applicant
 4. Applicant’s statement certifying posting
 5. General information on DAR process included with e-mailed posting/notice
- E. Service Bureau Comments: none (see EA 15-203216 PC notes)
- F. Public Testimony
 1. Lewis and Jeannette Horn, on September 22, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 2. Julie Sheppard, on September 25, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 3. Karl Maggard, on October 1, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 4. Ken Pirie, on November 5, 2015, wrote in support.
- G. Other
 1. Application form
 2. Staff Memo to Design Commission, dated October 26, 2015
 3. Staff Presentation to Design Commission, dated November 5, 2015
 4. Applicant Presentation to Design Commission, dated November 5, 2015
 5. Testifier Sign-In Sheet for November 5, 2015 Design Advice
 6. Greg Moss, on November 16, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 7. Pam Halstead, on November 17, 2015, wrote with public benefit suggestions.
 8. Michael Cummings, on November 17, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 9. Ray Bodwell, on November 17, 2015, wrote with concerns.
 10. Ken Smith, on November 17, 2015, wrote with concerns and public benefit suggestions.
 11. Alan Newbauer, on November 17, 2015, wrote in support.
 12. Sylvia Stevens, on November 17, 2015, wrote in support.
 13. Janet Hammer, on November 18, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 14. Mark Hammer, on November 18, 2015, wrote with concerns.
 15. Lewis Horn, on November 18, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 16. Larry and Shirley Fester, on November 18, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 17. Jeannette Horn, on November 18, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 18. Alan Newbauer, on November 18, 2015, wrote in support.
 19. Sylvia Stevens, on November 18, 2015, wrote in support.
 20. Alan Newbauer, on November 18, 2015, wrote in support.
 21. Les Stoessl, on November 18, 2015, wrote with concerns.
 22. John W Marling, on November 18, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 23. Gretchen Olson, on November 19, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 24. Eustacia Su, on November 19, 2015, wrote in opposition.
 25. Maureen McCartin, on November 19, 2015, wrote in opposition.