

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
December 13, 2016
12:30 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (left at 4 p.m.), Andre' Baugh (left at 3:20 p.m.), Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Michelle Rudd, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge (left at 2:20 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Katherine Schultz

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Sandra Wood, Kathryn Hartinger, Jeff Caudill, Lora Lillard, Phil Nameny, Brandon Spencer-Hartle; Kristin Cooper (BDS)

Vice Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Spevak* noted his email from earlier today and asked to flag the Residential Infill Project for discussion soon.
- *Vice Chair Smith* again gave an update on traffic accidents in Portland. We've now had 41 fatalities this year, including 2 pedestrians on SE Division in 2 separate instances on the same day. Last year's count for the year was 36. We have a huge amount of work to do on the driving landscape.
- *Commissioner Houck:* As a citizen in NW Portland, I've had 4-5 incidents of close calls in one week, all involving distracted driving with cell phones. I sent a message to City Hall, which was quickly responded to. I got an immediate call back from a Captain in Portland Police. I pointed out my concern about the Zero Vision policy not focusing on increased enforcement due to concerns over profiling which would mean police not citing purely for distracted driving, but the Captain cited 2,500 citations, with one officer issuing 500 citations for cell phone use.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- It's been an especially busy time at Council... The IH hearing was this morning. Took PSC's recommendations and lowered inclusion rate in MUZ and will ramp up over the next few years. We expect this package to be adopted next week.
- Tomorrow is the Comp Plan code and related zoning (early implementation project package) for final amendments; vote is next week.
- Also tomorrow is the Fossil Fuel ordinance for a final vote; Home Energy Score vote; and the Electric Vehicle Strategy.
- Recently, there was a resolution that provides direction to BPS about the Residential Infill project; this will come before the PSC in 2017 before going back to Council for a vote.
- The Mass Shelters code changes went into effect last Friday.
- We'll have a new Mayor in a few weeks, and we'll be working on new issues and his priorities.
- Thank you again to all our PSC members. We appreciate your creativity and collaboration to create solutions and recommendations. Perhaps this Commission in the past year has dealt with more issues than any Planning Commission in the past. We are now getting to see the outcomes of your work in real development or protection from development. Thank you.

Commission Bachrach asked what Council changed from the PSC's recommendation on the Comp Plan and implementation projects.

- Staff will provide this in a memo to PSC members.

Vice Chair Smith: Additionally, the Centers and Corridors parking toolkit is at Council on Thursday. I have some niggling equity issues and minor things with it, but it's a positive step forward.

Commission Spevak: Council did a great job on listening to testimony about the Residential Infill Project (RIP). There was one issue that I'm concerned about, which is Council's directive to staff to bring back map changes early next year. We already took this project out of the normal legislative process, and by next year, we'll have a new Council. At this point, I think the code and the map should come through the PSC before going to Council.

- Susan clarified: There is an interest that we don't run ahead without providing great information, particularly to new Council members. They are open to the process, but they just need to be reminded a bit. Council suggested they have a work session to look at option to understand the map better. But if the PSC wants to help craft those options, I'm happy to have that discussion with Council members.
- We will look at the timing of this at a future PSC officer meeting.

Consent Agenda

Consideration of Minutes from November 8 and 16 PSC meetings.

Commissioner Houck moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge)

RICAP 8

Hearing / Recommendation: Phil Nameny, Kathryn Hartinger, Jeff Caudill, Brandon Spencer-Hartle; Kristin Cooper (BDS)

This package includes changes to both Title 33 (planning) and Title 11 (Trees). The Chair of the Urban Forestry Commission, Mark Bello, is here to provide comments from the UFC.

- Mark Bello, Chair, Urban Forestry Commission: The UFC supports the proposed RICAP 8 changes and appreciates staff's work. The UFC is tasked to preserve city trees, and this year we're focusing our work on under-served areas. There are a number of major plans the PSC has also been involved with regarding trees, so thank you for working on this. We appreciate the collaboration on working to preserve and enhance Portland's tree canopy. The UFC reviewed each tree-related item in this package at our meeting last week. We realize Title 11 is a new title, and we invite the PSC to work with us. *see written testimony*

Commissioner Houck: The UFC is unanimously in support of the Title 11 code changes?

We had consensus that these are the right items. Ground disturbance discussion (hand tools versus a trench system) and the definition of trees are the two items we've asked from more work from staff.

Phil introduced the overall project. Today is the hearing for RICAP 8 based on the work plan that was approved by the PSC in April 2015. Projects are chosen from a database (suggestions offered from staff, other bureaus, the public) about the Zoning Code. The items are ranked and reviewed, then we come up with the work plan of potential amendments. RICAP projects try to clarify code in a bundle.

Kathryn noted RICAP 8 covers 51 items including Title 33 and Title 11 changes. There are minor policy items (modify existing policy); technical and clarification items; no change amendments. There are two main bundles: land division and property lines; and trees.

Kathryn continued with an overview of the timeline and public involvement (slide 5). She provided definitions of items in the first bundle (land divisions, property line adjustments and lot consolidations).

Kristin and Kathryn highlighted 5 items in this first bundle, including the current issue and the proposed resolution in RICAP 8.

1. For land division density calculations in single-swelling zones, an automatic 15 percent is deducted when a street is created. A pedestrian connection is considered a type of street, even though it is very narrow. This can create situations where a pedestrian connection can preclude a land division. Pedestrian connections only need to be wide enough to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles - and the 15 percent deduction is, in most cases, excessive. The proposed amendment clarifies that for density calculations in single dwelling zones, a pedestrian connection is not considered a street, and the automatic 15 percent deduction is not triggered.

Commissioner Spevak: why don't we subtract the lesser of 15 percent or the actual area?

- The 15 percent came out of the land division re-write in 2002. This was to create a set number so people would know how much square footage they have left.

2. There have been a number of instances where property line adjustments continue to create irregular lot shapes, especially in some lower density zones where minimum lot size requirements dictate that appendages be created. This issue also comes up in some land divisions. The proposed amendment will require all lot lines to be straight and generally perpendicular to the street on which they front. Land Divisions are a discretionary process, so if there is a compelling reason to bend a line or create a jog in the line, it can be done. Property Line Adjustments are non-discretionary, so a little flexibility to this standard is built in (the new line may be up to 10 percent shorter or longer than the existing line), and further, the standard is adjustable.

Commissioner Bachrach: What's the problem we're trying to protect against here?

- The City has a long-standing policy of regular lot lines. The vast majority of single-family zones are in these single-family lots. Kathryn showed an example (slides 29-31).
- This has been a long-standing issue with old and pre-platted lots. Often people try to play with the existing lots

I own two R2.5 lots, one at 3000 and the other at 2000 square feet. Why can't I adjust the property line to two 2500 square-foot lots?

- The lines should be straight as much as possible to be clear for future owners.

I'm not sure I've heard a clear articulation of the problem.

3. If a subdivision or partition plat has been approved but not yet built, there is no simple process to vacate the approval rather than re-plat through the original process. Secondly, each consolidation procedure can only result in one lot. This can be cumbersome. This amendment would allow the creation of up to three lots as a final product in one procedure. So, for example (slide 11), this would currently require three separate Lot Consolidations. With the amendment, it could be done with one. Second, the amendment provides a process to remove conditions of approval that are no longer relevant. Currently, a lot consolidation must still abide by all previous conditions of approval, including those from the land division that created the original lots being consolidated. Often, these conditions are specific to the created lots and would not be applicable if the previous lots hadn't been created.

4. The approval standards for PLAs are poorly worded regarding utility services and are difficult to apply. The existing wording says that the "availability of services to the properties may not change" - when in reality, services may need to be moved or altered to provide services that remain complaint

with service bureau standards. The language can be interpreted differently. This amendment clarifies that the requirements of service bureaus (water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, transportation) apply to development on both properties subject to the PLA – and that the properties must not move out of conformance with service bureau requirements. The wording is less specific.

5. A recent Oregon Supreme Court decision interpreted a state law that applies to the designation of historic properties by local governments. Among other things, the law requires the City to wait 120 days before issuing a permit for modification or demolition of the historic resource. In response, BDS began enforcing a 120-day delay period on September 1 of this year for the removal of ranked resources from the City Historic Resource Inventory – but this is not in the Code. This amendment codifies what BDS is already doing and provides notice of the request to remove a ranked resource from the City’s Historic Resource Inventory. It requires posted notice on the site as well as mailed notice for all properties within 150 feet of the site, all recognized organizations within 1,000 feet of the site and the State Historic Preservation Office.

Jeff provided background about the Tree Code, Title 11, which was adopted in 2011 but only implemented initially in 2015. He highlighted four items in RICAP 8 about the Tree Code:

1. Heritage Trees – Damage and Removal:

It was recognized when a Heritage Tree on private property in the West Hills was removed in Dec 2015, that the maximum fee that could be applied in cases of unlawful removal or damage were not in line with the unique characteristics and value recognized as a part of the Heritage Tree designation. The proposal is to apply the same fee structure already in existence for City and Street Trees to private property. This will produce a more appropriate-scale deterrent for unlawful removal or damage of a Heritage Tree on private property.

2. Tree Protection – Construction Staging:

Currently this is only ground disturbance triggers tree protection requirements. Trees required to be preserved can be damaged by equipment and vehicles on larger projects, even with no ground disturbance. We are changing the code to require tree protection in cases where construction staging areas larger than 100 sf are to be placed on unpaved areas. This approach recognizes that placement of staging areas on existing paved areas are not expected to impact existing trees.

3. Ground Disturbance / Root Protection Zone Requirements

Currently, tree protection is required for all projects that involve ground disturbance, no matter how close the construction activity is to existing trees. Often applicants are shocked to find that they must protect trees on site that are nowhere near the construction activity. The aim is to provide additional flexibility in cases where the potential impact on trees is minimal. The changes will allow for some construction activities on site without triggering tree protection requirements when specific criteria are met, including replacement of fences and decks and work within 10 feet of an existing structure. We are also clarifying that it is acceptable to install landscaping within the Root Protection Zones of existing trees (when tree protection is required).

4. Tree Plan Requirements

Currently, an applicant is only required to provide documentation of dead, dying, or dangerous or nuisance species trees, via an arborist report, only if he/she would like to remove it from the total number of existing trees on site. The Tree Code implicitly recognizes that these trees are not expected to be included. The code updates will use the existing tree inspection process to ensure that these types of trees are not used to meet preservation requirements. New language makes clear that if dead, dying, or dangerous trees or nuisance species trees are identified during the inspection process a remedy – either a tree plan update or fee-in-lieu – will be required.

Testimony

- Jim Labbe, Urban Forestry Commission: I’m here to back up Mark’s comments from the UFC. We support this general package with the UFC’s tweaks. It’s been heavily vetted, and

addressing these housekeeping items help to refine Title 11. There are still concerns to address the unfinished work around exemptions and making sure we have equitable outcomes; adding flexibility for tree preservation; and strengthening Title 11 before December 2019, which is the end of the stop-gap provisions Council put in place last April. In thinking about the functions provided by trees after they die, we need to continue to look at this. Maybe we allow developers to preserve a snag.

Commissioner Houck: What is the time frame for addressing these yet-unmet changes in Title 11? What would be your recommendation for tree protection as part of RIP?

I was hoping Council would at least eliminate the provision for commercial tomorrow, but they aren't, so this will be an ongoing issue. Adding flexibility through RIP would be good. And taking a comprehensive look at street trees is another big project. The recommendations from the Title 11 Oversight Committee is to give developers flexibility to save trees (sometimes the code forces them to do otherwise); waive off-street parking requirements to allow more space for trees; and tree preservation in the unit bonus provisions in RIP.

- Gregg Everhart, Urban Forestry Commission: Chair of the Heritage Tree Committee. Spoke to items on pages 158-159. She clarified the process for how Heritage Trees are defined and the pricing structure. *see written testimony*
- Taizz Medalia: I want to be sure that you understand that nothing you're doing prevents clear-cutting on a property. Is that your intent? Is anyone here interested in preventing the clear-cutting of property? It's currently cheaper to remove trees via clear cut then build. This is a mockery of all the other work you've done if we don't protect from clear cutting.

Commissioner Houck: That is one of the problems with Title 11. It is not a tree preservation code. In the future we need to think if we need to move towards more preservation in the code.

Vice Chair Smith: We're charged with weighing many factors in our planning. We haven't put trees above all our goals, but they are definitely a consideration in our work.

- Sue Van Loon: I am concerned about trees and wonder how trees are counted when we're looking at a property. I would hope that future planning encourages the remuneration of equal canopy.

Vice Chair Smith: In most situations it is the breast-height diameter. There are minimum sizes for different situations that don't count.

The UFC is concerned about the protection of larger trees, and that's on their agenda for future work.

Vice Chair Smith closed the hearing at 1:53 p.m.

Written Testimony Received

Vice Chair Smith: We heard about construction staging and ground disturbance issues from the UFC.

- Jeff: there were a couple items that were raised at the UFC including trenching and the definition of removal of a tree. We are also adding a definition of "tree", but the UFC request was to add "structural integrity" – in addition to "physiological viability" – as a criterion for determining whether a tree was "removed", and we will make these changes.

Commissioner Oxman: On the transition from ¼ to ½ inch, this was about City and street trees. Does it apply to private trees as well?

- No. the requirements for private trees are totally separate.

Given the owners' responsibility to take care of street trees on or adjacent to their property, does the owner have to apply for a permit to remove a branch blocking a stop sign?

- Yes. This is a free, quick-turn around request. We aren't changing the policy, just the size threshold.

Commissioner Baugh: On the lot dimension issue, it says "as far as is practical". Is practical with built-in flexibility intentional?

- This is in 33.610, the land division process, which is a discretionary determination. This whole division process is a discretionary process. The criteria "as far as practical" is if you make a compelling argument, that is something that would be looked at as part of the review and approval. The property line is not discretionary.

Commissioner Bachrach: This is for a land division process. Is this also for a PLA?

- No, the PLA is a permitting issue, a non-discretionary process. We are aiming to discourage the not-straight lot line divisions. This is the language at the bottom of page 93.

The standards for an adjustment are to be consistent with the desired standard of the area and mitigating as necessary. PLA is an administrative adjustment.

Commissioner Spevak: What if we went to 20 percent instead of 10 on the line adjustment? This would allow for more flexibility to get around an existing structure or tree. It's the cumulative difference between the requested line and what a straight line would be.

Commissioner Baugh: You also want to consider the future owners, and the issue of when they come in is that the assumption will be your lot line is straight to the back without jogging out and back. We shouldn't put property owners in a position where they have to hire a lawyer to figure out where their property lines are. There is a balance here. I'm not sure what the percentage is. The intent is to have straight lines as property divisions. Providing flexibility is the goal in the land division context.

Kristin: While the City can approve property lines, we don't often enforce them if there are civil matters between neighbors. This is frustrating to people.

Commissioner Rudd: I want to clarify the process. When you get a property line adjustment approval, you have to get a survey done, and that gets recorded. So when someone buys a property, this information is included in the title report, and a lot of information is available. We expect people to know they have a heritage tree because it is recorded.

- *Commissioner Baugh's* concern is that people don't necessarily read all this information.

Commissioner Spevak: I hear these concerns. But sometimes if the lines are too hard to move around, the house comes down. An advantage of having flexibility is preservation, even if there is some complexity.

Motion

Commissioner Spevak moved to up the lot line change from 10 percent to 20 percent. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge; N – Baugh)

Commissioner Spevak asked to clarify the definition of Construction Staging Area in Item 47 on page 141. Over 100 feet would trigger the Tree Code, but I don't want this to include things like scaffolding along the side of the house. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge)
Commissioners asked staff to address this by updating the code language.

Commissioner Spevak: Signs in Historic Overlays. There is currently no minimum size threshold for the sign and requirement for review. This is number 13 on items without an amendment proposed. I was frustrated staff couldn't come up with anything. I would propose an 18x24" sign would be a threshold above which Historic Review would be required.

- Brandon noted we talked about this in Historic Districts. There isn't the same level of protection for individual buildings within a Historic District. So I think this is better addressed through a larger code project. The scoping of this is on my workplan in the next few months, and we'd do a briefing in early 2017 with the PSC to discuss and outline some of these issues.

Commissioner Spevak: On page 95, there is a call for services considered while doing PLA. Why does vehicle access have to be provided? I would be interested in striking this.

- Kathryn noted BDS staff is fine with this amendment.

Commissioner Spevak: In sections 33.675 and 33.667, I move to remove "vehicle access". *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Baugh: My concern is that you could theoretically take a driveway.

- Through the PLA process, if a property has off-street parking that is required and the PLA results in losing access to it, you have to replace the access before the PLA is approved.

Commissioner Oxman: asked about the ending phrase "adjustments are prohibited". What does this refer to?

- The intent is you can't ask for an adjustment to move a property line so you don't have access to water or sewer for example.

We should clarify this language to something like "adjustments to this standard".

- We could leave the language in the code as-is, which is consistent with how it is throughout the rest of the Zoning Code, but then clarify in the commentary.

(Y6 – Houck, Larsell, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N3 – Bachrach, Baugh, Oxman)

Commissioner Spevak: Trees in the Right-of-Way is an issue I'd like to see taken up in the upcoming year so we don't continue to lose trees.

Commissioner Houck moved to recommend that City Council adopt the Proposed Draft with the refined code and definition language and commentary staff has been asked to work on. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

Commissioner Baugh: I think there is a huge policy issue around our protecting people who don't have the opportunity to protect themselves in development. This is particularly an issue in East Portland. We want to provide protection for all individuals.

Commissioner Larsell: I voted on the amendment as I did, but this would have persuaded me otherwise. I don't know about this for the full package though.

Commissioner Spevak: I think it's the wild west out there right now, and I think the code changes help eliminate some of this.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N1 – Baugh)

Design Overlay Zoning Assessment

Briefing: Sandra Wood, Lora Lillard, Phil Nameny

Sandra introduced the project team, Lora Lillard and Phil Nameny, which has been working with an outside consultant, Walker Macy, on this project. Staff is also working with the Design Commission.

The ask of the PSC today is for if any members would like to be on a subcommittee for this project. This would be a small group of 4-5 members who could delve into the recommendations before staff returns to the consultant.

Sandra provided context and background about why we're working on this project. The goals are to undertake an independent and comprehensive assessment of the City of Portland's design overlay zone and make recommendations including:

- Evaluate what's working and what's not.
- Recommend ways to improve system and tools.
- Incorporate the new Comprehensive Plan and CC2035 Plan.
- Incorporate newly designated design overlay zones.

The *Assessment* will review areas within the Design Overlay Zone (current and proposed), and it may look at other comparable areas just outside the D overlay for comparative purposes. In order to keep the Assessment piece manageable, it will not include historic districts.

Final Recommendations will only apply to the areas with the Design Overlay Zone designation, either current or proposed as part of the Mixed Use Zone project.

Phil highlighted the map of design overlay zones and the proposed expansion of the zones. There is also a regulatory component to the process. The City has a 2-track system – discretionary versus clear and objective.

Phil gave some highlights of the effect of the design overlay on commercial projects from 2013 to 2015. He also gave a sampling of items from the Design Commission's report to Council about what can happen based on the positive effect design review can have.

Commissioner St Martin: Why did the Central City and Gateway not have the option to use the clear and objective standard?

- Based on State policy, the Central City and our Regional Centers only have to follow a discretionary track. This was a policy decision made many years ago in Portland. There are things that are exempt from design review (e.g. replacing awnings; restaurant venting). If you are subject to review, you go right to discretionary.

Commissioner Spevak: Can the Design Commission reduce the development capacity below base zones allow?

- Development standards need to be met, and the criteria also need to be met. These can be seen at odds with one another sometimes. The consultants speak to this in their findings as well as how this translates to historic districts.

Lora highlighted findings and some of the preliminary findings from the consultants. Staff is chewing on these findings and recommendations, and so we're presenting to you so that you can chew on them too.

There are three big clusters of ideas for design in Portland, which are reflected in the City's design guidelines. They have also identified by Design Commission and design review staff as three important design principles in their deliberations.

To have projects *Respond to Context* (“Portland personality”) – This doesn’t necessarily mean that projects blend in or fit in but it means that development needs to recognize that there’s stuff happening around them even if the styles and materials are different. This is a major thrust in Portland design ethos.

Public Realm and Ground Floor (“Pedestrian Emphasis”) is addressed extensively in design guidelines with “sidewalk level of buildings”. It’s what it feels like when you’re on foot, what you can touch, see, experience. Portland has developed a reputation for a fine-grained street environment and it needs to keep working that and elevating this so that it remains important.

Quality and Sense of Permanence is about the long-term existence of projects that it’s not just looking at projects at a single point of time but rather that we want projects to endure.

The Consultant team looked at Peer Cities. They conducted interviews with stakeholders. They did a public questionnaire; it wasn’t a random sample scientific survey, but an open-ended invitation to comment on design overlay and what’s working/what’s not, and they got about 300 replies. They looked at 70 or so example projects built in the last six years or so, all across the city, under different review processes and using different tools.

The consultant team has shaped a number of key findings that were presented and to Design Commission in September and fine-tuned and presented again in November as each of the three research pieces have evolved.

There are 9 key findings, and these will form a basis for the recommendations:

1. Portland is a model of good urban design but needs a refresh.
2. The current d-overlay doesn’t prevent good design, but it doesn’t guarantee it.
3. There is public support for good design, but perception of the results is mixed.
4. The current system doesn’t reflect different scales of development.
5. Central City has benefitted from d-overlay, but outer areas less so.
6. Current standards and guidelines applied outside the Central City are impeding better design.
7. The high volume of projects is thwarting good intentions.
8. There has been a shift toward details and away from the big picture.
9. An attitude of collaboration is important for successful outcomes.

Commissioner Houck noted the big picture versus fine-grained decisions.

The PSC subcommittee could meet jointly with the Design Commission as they give feedback to the consultant. We need the commissions to be in alignment to set the expectation for collaboration to advance our goals.

Vice Chair Smith: Was there any analysis of if this process is acting as a break? Would we have more housing if we didn’t have as much process?

- At this point, it’s more about the volume and the bogging down of the system, not the standards.

Commissioner Spevak: I heard that along the Mississippi Corridor you can see where the Piedmont line exists. So that might be a way to get information: are developers avoiding areas where there are discretionary reviews required?

Commissioner Bachrach: Did they do a qualitative comparison of discretionary versus standards versus no review?

- Yes. That’s in the appendices to this initial report. From there, they drew these findings. You’ll see some of the recommendations and how they point to one process versus another.

Lora shared the preliminary recommendations from the consultants. This was a first cut; they may have missed some things, or they may have not gotten things quite right. We want to leave room for modification. But this is a result of the research and findings some of the direction that they are contemplating in their recommendations.

Initial Recommendations

Review Process:

1. Adjust thresholds for review.
2. Improvements to the review process.
3. Align review process with the design process.
4. Consider a second commission.
5. Improve public notification.
6. Document responses to neighborhood input.

Tools:

Generally

1. Sync Standards and Guidelines
2. Simplify, consolidate, and revise Standards and Guidelines

Community Design Standards

1. Replace current standards with shorter, focused set
2. Provide optional ways of meeting standards

Community Design Guidelines

1. Rewrite, update, and focus
2. Emphasize the public realm
3. Recognize the changing nature of the city

Central City Fundamentals

1. Modest refinements
2. Greater focus
3. Revisit some to see if still relevant and useful
4. Broaden the subject of Quality and Permanence

Special District Guidelines

1. Updates
2. Coordinate formats

Commissioner Oxman asked staff how the report feels to you as staff. Is it on target?

- Some of the findings, particularly about collaboration, are hard to hear. Some Design Commissioners are newer, so it gives them opportunity to understand more about expectations. The concepts of consolidating and clarifying will be lots of work but it's good.
- There are good, bold concepts that I like. This is a good time for a reset as we look to expand and review what we're trying to accomplish. This is a good opportunity for us even if they are causing a bit of angst.

Commissioner Spevak likes the bold ideas in the report. I would like to prioritize the public realm and ground floor design if we had to pick only one of the three to work on. I look forward to seeing how this evolves. Is square footage of the property (versus frontage on the street) the right metric?

Commissioner Larsell likes the idea of big signs. I'll need convincing about the small projects. We need something different for East Portland.

Commissioner St Martin: The goal to stimulate good design is important. Is this achievable in terms of regulations?

- It's something with the guidelines, which can be aspirational, rather than working with standards.

Commissioner Rudd: In terms of the process here, we're getting input from the consultants and will provide our input to them. Will they be involved in the next stage?

- They aren't necessarily going to change their recommendations based on our input. They have examples and will share their report with Council in spring of 2017.
- The PSC can provide input at the Council session about your ideas. And then Council will direct staff to come up with the revisions using the consultant's and the commissions' input. The PSC should look at how this effects equitable housing, opportunities for growth, and the bigger picture, but that's now exactly what the Design Commission is looking at.

Does the report highlight where other cities did good work in various aspects?

- The peer review was more objective.

Commissioner Houck: I totally understand the need to prioritize. I still have this gut reaction to cumulative impact of small projects over time. Good design at a small scale is also important.

Commissioner Spevak: It's hard to not think about Landmarks Commission in this discussion. There are some parallel processes. We have about 16,000 units coming through based on inclusionary housing. Is Portland about to be even more overloaded? Is there a triage that needs to happen? I'm afraid about what's going to happen at BDS and Design Commission between those reviews and projects not being built. Is there something in the interim to help projects get through more quickly before market demand drops?

Vice Chair Smith: We heard about not being too top-down in our planning. There is a role for the more chaotic, unplanned stuff, and I don't want to be overly-prescriptive with our standards that would eliminate this.

PSC Subcommittee for DOZA

Sandra noted the time commitment would probably be 6-8 hours in January, attending the joint session in February and then going to Council in April. We don't yet know if the subcommittee would continue to work with staff after that.

- December – PSC Subcommittee formed
- January – January 6 is when we get the full report from the consultants, and the PSC Subcommittee would meet
- February 9 – Joint session with Design Commission
- April 25 – Consultant reports final report to full PSC
- April 26 – Consultant reports to City Council

Chair Schultz had previously confirmed she will be a part of the subcommittee. She is also interested in having more PSC subcommittees more often to delve into projects.

Commissioner Houck is interested but wondered what expertise was being asked for with regard to urban design.

Commissioners are asked to respond to Susan about their interest in being on the Subcommittee within the next week. Staff will send a reminder email.

Adjourn

Vice Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:19 p.m.