

From: [Greg Hathaway](#)
To: [Reynolds, Janice](#)
Cc: [Barry Cain](#); [Lita Grigg](#); [Boone, Evan](#); [Hamilton, Leslie](#); "GregHathaway@hkcllp.com"
Subject: Wiser Development Evidence
Date: Friday, February 07, 2014 3:01:02 PM
Attachments: [LTR-City of Lake Oswego-Massing Evaluation 2-140207.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.txt](#)

Janice,

On behalf of Save our Village and LO 138 LLC, please enter the attached letter into the record for the DRC's consideration from our architect responding to the Village Character and Lake Oswego Style chapter submitted by the applicant on February 5th.

Please confirm receipt of this email by 5 PM on February 7th.

Thanks.

Greg

Greg Hathaway
Hathaway Koback Connors
520 SW Yamhill Street, Suite 235
Portland, Oregon 97204

Sent from my iPhone

G-399
LU 13-0046

MACKENZIE.

DESIGN DRIVEN | CLIENT FOCUSED

February 7, 2014

City of Lake Oswego
Attention: Leslie Hamilton, AICP
380 A Avenue
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Re: **Wizer Block 137 Redevelopment**

Response to Applicant Submitted Material, dated February 5, 2014

City of Lake Oswego File No: LU 13-0046

Mackenzie Project Number 2140028.00

Dear Ms. Hamilton:

This letter addresses issues specific to the subject development proposal of Block 137 (the Wizer block) in Lake Oswego, Oregon. Items addressed in this letter are in response to the applicant-supplied graphic materials submitted into the public record on February 5, 2014.

The following items are more specifically addressed in this evaluation.

1. **Building Height and Massing as it relates to Village Character and Lake Oswego Style**
2. **Lake View Village-Is it really 6 separate buildings?**
3. **555 Building Comparison to Block 137**
4. **Response to Mackenzie's graphic on pedestrian circulation**

1. **BUILDING HEIGHT AND MASSING AS IT RELATES TO VILLAGE CHARACTER AND LAKE OSWEGO STYLE**

The applicant has submitted a series of survey measurements and graphic images of Lake View Village indicating the heights of various peaks and domes across the six buildings that encompass Lake View Village. It is assumed that these measurements are intended to show compatibility with the adjacent/surrounding building heights. While this is good information, and is valid data when looking specifically at whether a development meets a maximum allowable 'height requirement,' simply complying with the maximum height requirement does not meet the intent of village Character and Lake Oswego Style.

Interestingly enough, the applicant's graphic documentation does a good job of illustrating that, while each individual building at Lake View Village has a 'peak' that reaches between 41' and 63' (with each peak having an individual identity, and none of the peaks being identical in shape, mass, or height), the remaining rooflines of the building vary



P 503.224.9560 ■ F 503.228.1285 ■ W MCKNZE.COM ■ RiverEast Center, 1515 SE Water Avenue, #100, Portland, OR 97214
ARCHITECTURE ■ INTERIORS ■ STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING ■ CIVIL ENGINEERING ■ LAND USE PLANNING ■ TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ■ LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
Portland, Oregon ■ Vancouver, Washington ■ Seattle, Washington

G-399
LU 13-0046

dramatically in size and scale, such that they create an appearance of small scale buildings, as outlined in the definition of 'Village Character.' The height varies not only along each façade, but also with each street frontage such that it most appropriately addresses its surroundings. For example, the height of the buildings at Lake View Village along State Street reach peaks of 63'. These buildings (Buildings B/C) abut a state highway with a different road classification, significant grade change, less pedestrian activity, and a rail spur across the highway. Note that these buildings still remain at a maximum of three story structures, but with a height variation and scale that is in keeping with the adjacent development. As the development on Block 138 turns and is approached by either A Street or through the pedestrian link adjacent to the lake, the buildings step down in massing to be two-story structures that are more geared to a commercial/retail/pedestrian environment. Each of the six buildings has a 'peak' or other significant design element that helps anchor the building and establishes a variety of massing and scale. Noted in the diagram below is a 2D massing study that illustrates the rooflines/peaks for both Block 137 and 138 along 1st Street. It is clear that there is significantly more 'negative' space and variation in building form/massing on Block 138 than the development proposed on Block 137.



Not captured in the two dimensional study diagram above, but also very important to note, is the three-dimensional aspect of the building massing that must be taken into consideration when looking at massing. It appears that the applicant has taken great lengths to incorporate and identify specific elements of the 'Lake Oswego Style' in the development for each of the three buildings and has pointed these elements out individually in the most recently submitted exhibits. However, meeting those specific criteria and staying within the maximum height limitation does not appear to meet the full compliance of this code requirement. There is a significant three-dimensional character to the roof forms of the style options described in the code that doesn't appear to have been met. All of the images described in Appendix A under Lake Oswego Style incorporate steep roof forms that tie the buildings to the ground, and each building is broken up by significantly 'pushing and pulling' the building form to dramatically modify the form. The roof forms vary in height and scale and help create a hierarchy of building elements that give the structures more complex massing.

Is there a limit to the height upon which you could use the steep roof forms and still comply with the Lake Oswego Style? It would seem that the answer is yes. Based on the numerical criteria that must be met (with regards to three-, or possibly four-story buildings) being compatible in this district, it appears that the City of Lake Oswego Code was written

to have these styles and roof forms work with three-story buildings and, in some circumstances, with four-story buildings. Beyond that, the ability of the roof forms to significantly modify the scale and proportion of the structures, and for pedestrians to be able to see the roof, decreases to the point that it would be difficult to say it complied with code. As the building height increased, roof forms would need to even more dramatic and larger to have a similar effect.

2. LAKE VIEW VILLAGE: IS IT REALLY 6 SEPARATE BUILDINGS?

The question has been raised by the commission, and the applicant has submitted data that would suggest that the development on Block 138 is not 6 separate buildings, but rather should be considered as one larger building (A-C and F) with two separate smaller buildings (D and E). This is simply not accurate. An above-grade public parking garage exists on the development and is wrapped by 4 distinct buildings. Each building has its own character and has an independent back wall separating it from the parking structure. While the buildings abut the garage and occasionally each other (as buildings often do in commercial districts), they are separate and distinct buildings that were processed by the City as separate buildings with individual building permits. Additionally, the parking garage sits on its own lot of record.

The applicant has provided evidence suggesting that the FAR and building square footages for Block 138 should include the parking garage when comparing to the density of development on Block 137, and that the length of the 'building' on block 138 should include buildings A-C and F as one building length that is more compatible with the building lengths proposed on block 137. What has been provided on the record by Gramor Development, and remains accurate, is the comparison of usable, occupied space as identified in the building codes. The occupied, usable square footage of Block 138 is approximately 90,000 square feet total. None of the building facades along commercial/pedestrian streets run longer than 150', and each has its own specific and unique identity and massing, creating a 'Village Character'.

3. BUILDING 555 COMPARISON TO BLOCK 137

The applicant has provided evidence that would suggest that Block 137 should be compared to the 555 Building as a basis of comparison that meets the intent of Village Character and the Lake Oswego Code. The 555 Building is a residential building that is quite a bit smaller in size than the proposed development on block 137, containing less than 30 condominiums (from accessible, available public records). There is not a retail element or any mixed use element, and although it is nearby, it is not located in the downtown commercial core of Lake Oswego, and therefore would not seem to be truly applicable when comparing a mixed-use development in the commercial core district of the City. The question remains as to whether this proposed development, being 90% residential, and seemingly much more compatible with existing residential developments in the area, has the appropriate mix of uses for a downtown commercial core district with such a limited commercial element.

4. RESPONSE TO MACKENZIE'S GRAPHIC ON PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

The applicant has provided evidence with corrections made to Mackenzie's graphic that was used in the January 25th testimony suggesting that the diagram is not valid. The applicant has pointed out that the scale of the pedestrian walkway is inaccurate and that the roof forms are massed incorrectly. This document was used as testimony only to identify pedestrian circulation paths around the public streets and those proposed to be internal to the proposed development. The massing model itself was generated, out of house, from two-dimensional development plans and elevations available through public records for both block 137 and 138 and available City GIS files. It was used, in this instance, to illustrate public gathering spaces – commercial/pedestrian corridors, as well as the significant breaks in the

massing (between different buildings) at Lake View Village, as the applicant did not appear to generate a pedestrian circulation diagram that extended beyond their site highlighting the compatibility with adjacent and surrounding developments. The 'circle' that the applicant scaled off the drawing is not to scale and is a graphic representation, not intended to illustrate any specific dimension, but rather to identify areas on commercial frontages where pedestrians have been provided gathering spaces or dramatic breaks in building massing. It is important to note that this information was based solely on what was available through public records and, as noted in previous written testimony, it is unclear how the applicant is treating the corner elements at 2nd and Evergreen and 2nd and A Avenue and whether additional pedestrian areas are provided.

Sincerely,



Christine McKelvey, LEED AP
Architect/Land Use Planner

c: Greg Hathaway - Hathaway Koback Conners LLP
Matt Grady, Barry Cain - Gramor Development