

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

February 14, 2017

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

Commissioners Absent: Maggie Tallmadge

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Sallie Edmunds, Rachael Hoy, Mindy Brooks, Debbie Bischoff, Nicolas Starin, Troy Doss; Karl Arruda, PBOT; Tim Heron, BDS

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner St Martin* commented on the joint Design Commission (DZ) / PSC subcommittee work session on the DOZA project. *Chair Schultz* added it was a great opportunity to express to the DZ what the PSC's mission and goals are and hear from them. We discussed some of their challenges that directly tie into our work. We didn't reach consensus on everything, but we were in alignment on lots of things. The consultant is collating our comments and we'll see where his recommendations go. *Commissioner Houck* noted DZ members are interested in joining the PSC meetings periodically. The consultant will bring the final report to the PSC in April.
- *Commissioner Spevak* participated in a session about the Multi-Dwelling Code Update Project. We are looking at this zone, which is mostly in East Portland. It will redefine yet another zone in Portland. Will there be a time for staff to brief us on this project?
 - We will look at adding a briefing for the PSC at an upcoming meeting.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- RICAP 8 is going to City Council tomorrow afternoon. As part of getting there, there are a number of amendments that the Mayor will introduce to clean up some errors, none of which change the policy intent of what we were doing with these items. One will clarify language around inclusionary housing (IZ) and how it's treated outside the Central City. This is based on the Council IZ direction on parking.
- *Commissioner Rudd* commented that she heard that we didn't anticipate senior housing where services are included and people are paying to include those services in the context of IZ and suggested including consideration of that issue in future review.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from January 24, 2017 PSC meeting
- RW #7652: SW Hall, Lincoln, Grant and Sherman streets at SW Naito Pkwy
- RW #7927: NE Couch Ct east of NE 3rd Ave

Commissioner Smith pulled RW #7652 from the Consent Agenda. This will be a separate vote.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the rest of the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.
(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Item RW #7652

Karl Arruda commented that these are several small segments of right-of-way that a few years ago PBOT thought had been vacated by a previous street vacation ordinance. But in looking at the ordinance, we realized these pieces had not yet vacated. This vacation will make the adjacent lands more feasible for development. Most are jointly owned by the City and ODOT. The north tip is owned 100 percent by ODOT. When these areas are vacated, the ownership will be joint between the City and ODOT. There are several sewer lines going through where BES has reserved easement rights. For Grant and Lincoln streets, PBOT development review have reserved rights for future pedestrian easements.

Commissioner Smith noted the relocation of the R2D2 rest area. There is a new proposal, and that area is just north of these locations. No portion of this vacation will be used for R2D2. The northern-most area is owned by ODOT, and they have not expressed interest in hosting R2D2. I wanted

- Karl: Correct. They are close together but quite unrelated.

Commissioner Smith moved. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.
(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Central City 2035 Plan

Work Session: Sallie Edmunds, Rachael Hoy, Mindy Brooks, Debbie Bischoff, Nicolas Starin, Troy Doss

Sallie introduced today's work session. This is our fifth work session on the CC2035. One note: there was a typo for the first item, so we will be discussing Q6 rather than Q9. We haven't heard from commissioners that they want to pull any additional items for today's discussion.

Commissioner Larsell would like to discuss the freeway covering, Item P2.

Bonuses and Transfers, Part 1

Packet Q

Rachael introduced the topic. We have two items for discussion today and have held the other Q items over until the February 28 meeting.

Item Q3

The proposal is that sites entirely used for surface parking can't be used as a site to transfer FAR. But we have a potential other approach: sites with [any] surface parking are prohibited from being sending sites for FAR. Another way we could write this is to say sites with surface parking would be prohibited from being a sending site for FAR (e.g. if there is a lots and a structure on the same lot). Remember that we've proposed minimum FARs so sites like this would at least need to meet their minimum FAR before and then they could transfer what is left. Expanding the proposal would cover more properties that are prohibited.

Commissioner Spevak asked if the market is robust enough that when they want to develop a surface lot they could purchase from another site at that time? Would this incentivize development of these vacant sites?

- Yes, they could find another site to purchase FAR to bring it back onto their site. We're just trying to leave the opportunity to redevelop the lots and leave FAR on the site.

Commissioner Houck: I want us to be as aggressive as possible to redevelop these sites.

Commissioner Rudd: If there is parking on part of a property, I wouldn't want them to not be able to sell FAR. What's the policy underlying what is a sending site? Why are we making some sites sending sites and some not? If I have two legal lots (one with development and one with surface parking), what does that do?

- We want to prohibit those sites with surface parking to be sending sites for FAR. With a development on the same site, if we go this route, we increase the number of prohibitions. In the proposed draft, we are proposing minimum FAR. So if a site that is going to 6:1, they would have a minimum FAR requirement at least 2:1. Another way to look at this is we have a proposal on the table with minimum FAR in the Central City. As a reminder, we define site by ownership.

Commissioner Rudd: Does ownership mean the same legal entity so if the building and parking lot are in different legal entities FAR can be transferred from the developed site?

- This discussion as raised questions for me, but in a situation with development and parking on the same site, it means none of the FAR from the site could be transferred. There is something to what *Commissioner Spevak* was saying about how the economics might work, but there is really a lag. There may be more unintended consequences from advancing our desired policies.

Commissioner Baugh is in favor of the policy if the site 100 percent surface lot. For the dual use, is there a percentage of the lot surface area that would change this policy? There seems to be a balance or threshold there.

- This was part of *Chair Schultz'* conversation with staff as well. FAR is based on the total site size, not building coverage. But we could look at adding a layer to minimum FAR for sites that have both development and surface parking. We'd have to think about this and bring back the proposal.

Commissioner Bachrach asked if staff is recommending to add that lots that are entirely used for parking are prohibited from transferring FAR.

- The recommendation is to clarify that sites entirely used for surface parking are prohibited from being sending sites for FAR. We'd have to clarify either "sites with surface parking" or "sites that are entirely surface parking".

Commissioner Spevak gave a counter proposal: if someone who owns a surface lot is contacted by someone who needs FAR, I'd like to see that as an option to develop FAR sooner. I would support increasing the minimums and let the free market determine transfers. I'd rather have someone be able to use FAR now than have to wait.

Commissioner Smith noted the West Quadrant process and his request to develop surface lots. I still don't think we should allow FAR transfer off surface lots. I understand the complexity of a site that is partially a lot and partially a building. I would say you can't transfer off the surface lot portion of the site.

- *Joe:* We need to think about how this effects the economics. If all FAR is stripped off, the site is worth less. So it doesn't necessarily reward keeping the parking lot.
- *Chair Schultz:* I'm working on a site that isn't able to pencil, and they're thinking it's more cost-effective to leave the lot. So why not transfer the FAR off? If you took some properties off the marking, FAR would be more expensive.
- *Joe:* In the planning we've done in the Central City, if FAR moves around and gets built sooner than later, we're accomplishing our density goals sooner. There are two transfers allowed: by historic buildings and within a geography. It's not clear how it effects the value of the transfer; the benefit is having the lot used more efficiently and sooner.

Commissioner Baugh: When we talked about surface lots before, Greg Goodman talked about the same thing. If the economics of parking a car is more than building a building, there isn't a reason for them to change the use. If we don't make some incentive out of trying to force these lots to develop, the economics of parking will dictate.

- Joe: The transfer is potentially more one-time revenue, but that's a short-term play. This isn't what the Goodmans were talking about. The tipping point will push development on these surface lots. We're talking about a longer-term timeline.

Chair Schultz went back to the point. We are trying to allow historic structures to transfer FAR to gain funds to upgrade seismically. If you allow more FAR on the market, it incentivizes development. But is this more important than incentivizing seismic upgrades on historic structures?

- We'd have to eliminate the transfer within subdistricts as well with this reasoning. Reducing the ability to transfer on any site does have this impact, but I think it will be slight in terms of the overall market.

Commissioner Spevak asked about prioritization and selling off a surface lot site. I'd rather see FAR being used and built around the site so at least someone else is using the FAR.

- *Commissioner Smith* commented this is about the immediate, local environment. There are a variety of benefits for not having surface lots, and I'm inclined to the micro view of not having the surface lots.

Commissioner Bachrach: Do we currently have an active market for FAR transfers? What problem are we addressing?

- It's private market, so we really only see transfers through permits. There are times during a land use review that a transfer becomes a condition of approval. We'd like to see these properties redeveloped, so prohibiting FAR transfer on these lots will get us there. We have heard there are definitely cases where FAR is being sold from these lots, so that's the goal of the policy.

Commissioner Oxman: When you transfer the FAR off the site, the current site then has less FAR for future development. So what we're doing with transfers, the long-term leaves less FAR on the sending site. Does it make sense to limit how much FAR can be transferred?

- The site could be replenished at the time of development, but they'd have to go and find FAR from other sites and receive more FAR then.
- If you have up to 3:1, you have to leave 1:1 on the site; 5:1-8:1 you have to leave 2:1 on the site. We could consider adding a layer of limitation for sites with surface parking.

Chair Schultz: Why not let the full lot sites transfer? I think it applies to both circumstances.

Commissioner Baugh moved that transfers are applicable to full sites only as noted in the staff proposal. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

(Y4 – Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd; N6 – Bachrach, Houck, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Schultz)

Commissioner Smith moved for staff to develop language to prohibit FAR transfer from any surface parking lot area without penalizing development that is already there. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Smith: I don't want to see economic gain on surface parking by selling off FAR.

Rachael: Because FAR is calculated by the site size, we'll need to figure out how much FAR you could sell off from the building. We'll come back to you with a proposal to add another layer of limitations within the FAR.

Commissioner Rudd: Is there a practical concern that you've made the amount of FAR you can send so small you no longer promote the incentive for seismic upgrades on historic sites?

(Y7 – Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Spevak; N3 – Bachrach, Rudd, St Martin)

Staff will return to the PSC with language about FAR transfer to and from surface lots.

Item Q6

Joe: This is related to a proposal from SEIU for a prioritized transfer related to paying a living wage in the Central City.

Their proposal in the Central City for a commercial building would be:

- Commercial FAR transfers of at least 1:1.
- Pay service workers a rate = 50 percent MFI.
- Record covenant on the property.
- Enforcement is thru court action.
- Historic property transfers still available.

Staff recommends maintaining the proposed draft and not adding this option. Mechanisms by which we can increase living wages and jobs in the Central City is certainly something we support. But when you think about a covenant on a property by a current developer that promises behavior by others in the future, it creates an uncertainty for the project and for the financiers of the project. This is a lot of unknown and risk to include in a development proposal. We think this is better implemented somewhere outside the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Spevak agrees and moved to not change staff's recommendation. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

Commissioner St Martin agrees. This is not the place to add this policy, even though I appreciate the ideas and creativity.

Commissioner Baugh also agreed. The intent is good, but it's the wrong tool and the wrong place to implement this.

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

Miscellaneous Code and Map Amendments

Ground floor active use

Staff proposed expanding the list of items that do not qualify as active uses:

- Display windows
- Bike parking
- Utility/mechanical rooms

Of note, the standard can be modified, and through the discretionary review process we know there are situations where amenity spaces have been created with bike parking to make the spaces more active. There were questions about bike parking being an active use. BPS will clarify within the standard that we don't think these items qualify as active use.

Commissioner Spevak supports staff's recommendation aside from the bike parking portion. I've heard many people say there are benefits to showing bikes in prominent display. And you want bikes on the ground floor. I would hope staff could craft language so bike parking could count for a percentage of active use on the ground floor to help cultivate a bike-friendly environment.

Commissioner Houck heard the option for a developer that can make the case for bike parking being considered an active use. If there is activity that goes along with the bike parking, I'd support that.

- Yes, modifications are allowed as the provision is written now.

Commissioner St Martin asked about the display window prohibition. What's going on here?

- It depends on what the display window looks like and what it's setback is. It might be better for the modification tool. This is more like a window and a wall with a little depth... not a large

department store window. The proposal removes the option for a display window unless the modification shows this type of display case is an active space.

Commissioner Oxman: When you're talking about mechanical and utility areas, does this include common areas like lounges?

- This is purely about mechanical rooms.

Commissioner Smith: I am sympathetic about normalizing bike parking. What is the burden and what do you have to show for bike parking to be considered an active use?

- Tim Heron: We balance guidelines with modification requests. The current trend has been for bike lounges to allow for more of a residential amenity around bike parking.

If we have a window with the view into a bunch of racks with some people movement around, would these meet the guidelines?

- It's a balance of how much.

Commissioner Bachrach: What more are we asking from the code to change the discretion you already have?

- One of the main design guidelines is creating the vibrant streetscape. With many cases, what was brought to us through testimony from BDS and DZ is that the parking always goes to bike parking. By adding this to the standard, it's calling out that bike parking isn't considered automatically ok unless the applicant can show this is an active use.
- This allows a case-by-case analysis and clarifies the code. So the debate for every new applicant is nuanced based on the specific project.

Commissioner Spevak: Could we craft the code for bike parking versus car or mechanical accommodations? Could you say bike parking could only meet a certain percentage for glazing for active use on the ground floor? Something prescriptive?

- You'd like to see not putting bikes in the same sentence as vehicles; their parking is different from auto parking. If we were to have a percentage here about bike parking being allowed, you're still potentially going through a modification situation about what the bike parking is.

Commissioner Spevak: Bike racks in front of a window are better than a car garage or mechanical equipment, but I wouldn't want this to be the same as ground floor retail.

Commissioner Spevak moved to support staff's recommendation to exclude display windows and utility/mechanical rooms, with bike storage being able to be used by right for up to a quarter of the active ground floor window use. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Houck, Larsell, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N2 – Baugh, Oxman)

Ground floor space

Nicolas: The standards for ground floor active uses are very different. Ground floor windows refers to the percentage of glazing. Ground floor use defines the space. This amendment adds the bike ground floor parking. Because this is the design of the space, we don't you'd need to have the same percentage identified here since we just did in the ground floor windows.

Commissioner St Martin: Can you clarify the active use part? Is there something special about this?

- It is more of an update that we were asked by BDS to include. You currently can prepare the space but don't have to construct it. So it seems like an unnecessary and confusing piece of code we're trying to clarify.

Commissioner Baugh: We just voted to put bicycle parking as a percentage. But if you had a window with bike parking, is that then prohibited here?

- Nicholas: You were just talking about changing the standard for ground floor active use, not floor space. It wouldn't make sense to have a percentage here. So in active uses, I'd suggest in the spirit of your amendment above, we take out bike parking from the list of things that

don't qualify. There isn't anything to change in the standard about height and depth of the space.

Commissioner Rudd: In the Pac West building there is a vacant corner. So how would that change?

- Tim: This is an existing building. Part of why this standard was written when we were putting the Gateway Regional Center into code. There were areas that definitely weren't ready for retail. We said you can build structural minimums, but the genesis was to initiate construction and use.

Commissioner Spevak moved to support the proposed amendment excluding bike parking from staff's proposal. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N1 – Baugh)

Rachael: Just as a follow-up from the last meeting, if we look at Table I, when we spoke about the ecoroof standard, *Chair Schultz* asked about a parking structure and its applicability of the ecoroof requirement. We want to propose that areas used for parking on the top floor of structured parking would be exempt from the ecoroof standard.

Commissioner St Martin: Does parking include helicopter landing pads?

- We can double-check, but yes.

Commissioner Spevak: What's the policy rationale for this exception?

- In part, the intent is to make sure coming in wouldn't be required to put a roof with an ecoroof on top of it. They are still responsible for managing stormwater on-site.
- *Chair Schultz:* Parking structures don't usually have roofs on them, so without the exception, they'd have to build a roof and an ecoroof on top of that.

Commissioner Houck moved to accept staff's proposal. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin; N1 – Spevak)

Policies and Related Actions

Troy highlighted policy amendments that have been proposed in the West End and in the Lloyd District. We also have a citywide policy that has some suggested amendments around complete neighborhoods and amenities that can fulfill the policy direction.

Item P2

Commissioner Larsell commented on how this freeway capping concept instead of doing basic things in East Portland, for example, is something I question. I also understand this is policy, but I want someone to address the discrepancy of resources going into Central City and not other areas.

- Joe: The CC2035 Plan sits within the Comp Plan. We are looking at all Comp Plan policies in an equity lens, so this sits in that context. We do not know in the overall policy regime for CC2035, this is to be evaluated to be evaluated with/against other projects outside the central city. The reason this cap keeps coming up is because it's more likely to have development on top of a cap in the Central City will have more of an economic benefit. So something over I-205 is not as viable right now.

Commissioner Baugh noted this was a conversation we had a few hours ago. My question is if this item adds anything into the TSP.

- It's not in the TSP. This is not an action, this is a policy. It would still have to be evaluated as other items that are looking to get on the TSP list are.

Commissioner Smith noted this policy would add emphasis to the Rose Quarter project, so this could be one more policy bullet supporting that.

- This doesn't require anything; it just supports the ability to do the project.
- The cap for Broadway-Weidler is part of the PSC discussion on February 28.

Commissioner Rudd: Who owned the development rights over the freeways... ODOT or the City? This would create land in the Central City and there is money associated with that.

- The I5 cap estimate is \$450M. The I-405 estimate was from back in Mayor Katz' day. For the I5 cap, it was seen as the low-cost solution instead of building additional viaducts over the freeway. We'll get into this in depth at the next meeting. We don't yet know if the City or ODOT would have the rights to develop over the freeway. What's motivating the I5 project, from ODOT's view, is solving a safety problem on the freeway.

Commissioner Baugh: When we talk at the next meeting, lots of these questions about air space and development rights are included. I would like to know the path that this project would have to go through to get on the TSP.

Item P1

Troy introduced the topic and the growth in the numbers of people are moving to the Central City with children. With this birth rate, we want to be sure we can maintain the families that are here and moving here. In 2008, we put in a bonus for units with 2+ bedrooms. The market has shifted so over 20 percent of the housing being built is 2+ bedroom and fitting the family housing. The IZ proposal included provisions to include larger units in the Central City. We also added two policies (2.7 and 2.8) to the Central City Plan to support family living. We want to continue to work with PPS on the redevelopment of the Lincoln High School site into more than just a high school. We're also working for PP&R to create active sites for recreation and with PHB to track how IZ works in terms of housing diversity.

In projects like The Ramona, for example, it could have been for anyone at 60 percent MFI or lower. There was an overwhelming response from families with children. So we are seeing a response to projects like this in the Central City.

Commissioner Bachrach asked about action item 5. I want to be sure this can be added to the rest of the city as well (tracking and reporting on housing diversity and development).

- Joe: our intent is to do this citywide in conjunction with PHB.

Commissioner Rudd: Do we have a sense of how many 2-bedroom units have kids versus how many are people with offices?

Commissioner Houck: I went to The Ramona with Ed McNamara. There are currently 130 children and a waiting list of 400 households. So this is really important.

Commissioner Spevak: I appreciate staff's work on this. On the public school item, is it appropriate to key the action item to Lincoln HS, or can it be more flexibly initiated? There is a demand for a school in the more northern part of the Central City.

- *Chair Schultz:* I've heard of people thinking about the potential as a private school coming to downtown that operates on providing scholarships. So we shouldn't limit the policy to just the Lincoln site and PPS.
- Troy: This did emerge from North Pearl District language initially. We wanted to reward public schools. But we could add a provision and continue to support PPS' work in the Central City.
- *Chair Schultz:* Why would we not try to get any schools going in the Central City?
- Troy: We could strike Lincoln from this and bring back additional language to support other schools as well.
- Joe: We can bring this language back... either in the policies or in an action. What motivated this initially was to think about redevelopment of the Lincoln site that is more than just a high school.

Commissioner Smith: I had flagged Item P7. From a PPS perspective, the Central City isn't the right "unit" for them. It's not clear to me that PPS has done the exercise that between the Central City and Inner Ring if they'll need more real estate for school facilities.

- *Joe:* The need for extra school capacity in the Central City is something on the PPS plan. There has been a greater awareness and acceptance that it's getting to this need. Thinking about this for multiple schools may be too far out on the PPS horizon for now.

Chair Schultz: We're asking staff to return with language around Action 1. P2 is now piggy-backing on the next meeting's discussion. We're challenging P7 a bit.

- *Commissioner Smith:* P7 sounds fine from a policy point-of-view.

There is PSC support for Item P1.

Actions

Nicholas introduced Decision Table R: Action Charts. These are adopted by Resolution, so they are statements of support but not binding policy. There are 5 sub-groups of changes proposed to the action charts:

- Actions to re-include
- Actions to delete
- Actions to revise
- New actions
- Other changes

Item R36

This is an action for the Lower Albina area to use under-utilized space. *Commissioner Baugh* had suggested additional language to flesh out the action further as shown in italics:

"Develop and implement a strategy to install community gathering spaces, trees, and other green infrastructure in existing streets and underutilized space within rights-of-way (e.g. freeway ROW, Broadway bridgehead, west end of Russell Street). Ensure improvements do not compromise operations for industrial businesses. *Also ensure that improvements help implement the City's equity goals and strategies, especially as they relate to the history of impacts to Portland's African-American community.*"

PSC members gave a head nod to these items. R43 will be discussed later today. *Commissioner Smith* confirmed he is good with the Morrison Bridge action item and Water Ave action based on responses he previously received from staff.

R53 is the action that Troy was just talking about (Action 1 noted from above).

Commissioner St Martin moved to accept these actions as supported by staff and amended by *Commissioner Baugh* in R36 noted above. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

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

River Review

Commissioner Rudd recused herself from this part of the discussion. Mindy summarized the items not marked for discussion.

Item M1

M1 is related to replacing existing structures within the river environmental overlay zone. The Proposed Draft code exempted replacement of existing structures above the ordinary high water from the river e-zone requirements, but below ordinary high water review would be required

Commissioner Houck asked that we discuss this further with BES. We had those discussions with BES and discussions with BDS and with the City Attorneys. We are continuing to recommend an exemption for replacement of existing structures because it is consistent with the environmental overlay zones, there is little in-water structure in the Central Reach and not exempting them would have very limited impacts in the Central Reach. If something was being done years ago, we shouldn't pass up opportunity to review. I agree with staff that in the Central City, the impact is fairly de minimus. But we should revisit when planning for the South Reach or North Reach.

Commissioner Houck: I move to accept staff's proposal on Item M1 with the caveat that we revisit for North and South reach because there is much more in-water structure in those reaches. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Scenic Resources

Mindy summarized the amendments related to how we map scenic resources. There are also a number of edits to clarify the relationship between chapters 33.480 and 33.430.

Item B2, Views from Vista Bridge

This was initially part of the PSC discussion in September. The 1991 SRPP established methodology for mapping and protecting views from viewpoints and from view streets. In both situations, the view is protected from a single vantage point. In 1991 a view of Vista Bridge from the I405/Jefferson St overpass was protected by limiting heights along Jefferson St. This update for the Central City keeps that methodology.

In addition to protecting the view of Vista Bridge from I405/Jefferson St but allowing some intrusion into the view; a second staff recommendation was discussed to add a new viewpoint at Collins Circle.

Commissioner Smith: I travel this corridor many weekends, so I check this out regularly. I changed my mind from the fall based on two factors: It's not just the view from the overpass, but as you're going down the hill, addition height would have more impact as you go down. Also, the idea of substituting Collins Circle as a viewpoint didn't go over well with the community. There is the question of what should happen at Collins Circle, but the trade-off of degrading the view versus getting one more story on the building isn't worth it. I wanted to correct my previous vote. I would stick with the current heights rather than the increased heights.

Mindy: Existing heights are 30-45'. Proposed are 40-60'. As-amended on September 27, we would see heights up to 75'.

- *Commissioner Smith*: I would at least want to go back to the proposed if not the existing.

Chair Schultz The philosophy for viewpoints and view streets (versus a scenic corridor) have been from one vantage point.

- *Commissioner Smith*: Yes, but you experience it from a linear path.

Commissioner St Martin: So is this mixed used here, commercial on the bottom and residential on top.

- Yes. That is what we are seeing along the corridor now.

Commissioner Baugh: If we change here, are we treating them differently from other view streets? I'm concerned if we're changing methodology here.

- Most streets we don't need to adjust heights because they're direct. We didn't discuss other streets at the fall meeting but there are two others that have heights limits or setback associated with the view street.

Commissioner Houck: I had discomfort when we voted before as well. Many of the views, particularly from sidewalks, were occluded by trees. I hope the trees mature over time, but that might mean you couldn't see the bridge from the sidewalks anyway.

- Different street trees and types will go in over time.

Commissioner Oxman: Are there economic feasibility issues with construction at 75'?

- There is a good price point at 5-over-1 at 75'. 60' is not infeasible but is one less story (potentially 1.5 stories), so developers prefer 75'. Also, projections, like mechanical equipment, cannot be taller than the height limit either.

Commissioner Bachrach: I half agree with *Commissioner Smith*. I don't think Collins Circle is a viable amenity. But what's more important, the view or the trees? Light rail density? Going from 75' to 60' is not easy for a developer; 5-over-1 is a standard development size. I'm going to stick with what we decided at the last vote on this.

Commissioner Rudd: I'm not ready to write Collins Circle off. You can access it without crossing the light-rail track.

- Even though there is no crosswalk here, lots of people are already using it.

Commissioner Spevak: I wouldn't write Collins Circle off, but I don't think adding a viewpoint is enough to activate it.

Commissioner Larsell: Collins Circle right now is hard to walk around and through. Whether it becomes a viewpoint or not, it would be great to improve the connectivity.

Chair Schultz: I am comfortable with the view as we left it last; I'm not comfortable with changing the methodology. In my perspective, Collins Circle isn't a substitute for the view street, but it would be an additional piece that could bring redevelopment of that area and a place to celebrate the view.

Commissioner St Martin: I think it would be nice to have some art at Collins Circle

- *Commissioner Smith:* There is some art there already and part of the problem with adding a viewpoint is displacing the art.
- There is art here that is also culturally important. We wrote the action (R43) such that we would need to consider the art when planning for the circle.

Commissioner Baugh: I'm in full agreement with *Commissioner Bachrach*. This is a transit street, and we should take advantage of the development opportunity.

Commissioner Smith: I move we return to the 60' height limit as in the Proposed Draft. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

(Y2 – Oxman, Smith; N8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Rudd, Schultz, Spevak, St Martin)

Item R43

Action to improve pedestrian connectivity and add amenities to formalize the viewpoint at Collins Circle. This would take quite a bit of planning and organizing to pull together to discuss what to do here. Public involvement effort and looking at funding options. There is currently no funding devoted for this. If there is a need to address the light rail line or other transportation functions, there would be an opportunity here to move this forward.

Commissioner Rudd: If nothing else, I would suggest PBOT look at a crosswalk here.

Next Steps

Our next discussion will be on February 28. Staff will meet with PSC officers on Thursday to prep for this session.

Adjourn

Chair Shultz adjourned the meeting at 3:43 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken