

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

May 23, 2017

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived 5:35 p.m.), Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katie Larsell, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Teresa St Martin

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Ryan Curren, Sallie Edmunds, Mindy Brooks, Rachael Hoy

Other Presenters: Pam Phan, Community Alliance of Tenants; Rachael Duke, Community Partners for Affordable Housing

Vice Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Spevak* noted the photos on the screen, which he took along the waterfront on his way in.
- *Commissioner Oxman* shared a few words about this being his last meeting as a member of the PSC. It's been an honor to serve on the Commission, and I appreciate the perspectives of all members. This is a model for what government service can be about. Thank you to staff for their thoughtful and high-quality work.
- *Commissioner Tallmadge* noted today is her last meeting as well. I came in without any experience in zoning and planning, but I have learned a lot from everyone. I appreciate all the staff support as well.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted that on Thursday there is a panel at PSU speaking about California's development review standards looking at reduction of VMT. I am the PSC liaison to the parking and zoning code project, and some of the big questions we're looking at is about bike parking in terms of if it's enough and if it's high enough quality to be used.
- *Commissioner Rudd:* ULI had a presentation last week about the resiliency of different cities. Portland ranks pretty well in terms of being proactive about being able to react to change. Sometimes we have a tension between community and development side, but this was a good example of people together from the development side being interested in these issues.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Thank you to *Commissioner Oxman* and *Commissioner Tallmadge*, whose last PSC meeting is tonight, at least on this side of the table. She shared her appreciation for each of the commissioners and the perspectives and experience they have brought to the PSC.
- *Chair Schultz* echoed Susan's comments, particularly about *Commissioner Tallmadge's* "qualification" as a youth commissioner and that being a misnomer because of her great contributions to the PSC. Thank you so much. Having the participation of health in a planning commission setting has been phenomenal, so thank you to *Commissioner Oxman* for your thoughtfulness and thoroughness.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from May 9, 2017 PSC meeting.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

SW Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Ryan Curren; Pam Phan, Community Alliance of Tenants; Rachael Duke, Community Partners for Affordable Housing

Eric introduced Rachael and Ryan. This is an overview of the project and some input for the strategy of the plan including housing targets.

Planning in this corridor has been underway for a number of years. In terms of the transit project, there are still several options for alignment and where the stations will be. This is part of a regional plan that lays out expansion of the regional transit system, and it is the final spoke out from Portland. It's now in the DEIS phase, which will lead to the LPA in 2018, which will include a specific alignment. There were a number of decisions made earlier, with light rail being the preferred mode (over bus rapid transit). If approved and funded, it would be under construction in 2020-24. So now is the time to be doing the housing planning.

The genesis of the housing strategy came from Portland Council, Metro Council and the other jurisdictions. The Portland-Tigard housing strategy is separate from the transportation project, but it's within the circle of the project.

Rachael introduced herself and the projects in the Community Partners for Affordable Housing portfolio. We know lots about the community, and we care about what happens there. I'm also on the Citizen Advisory Committee looking at the route for this transit line. We want to make sure we plan for folks who already live in the corridor and support anti-displacement initiatives. Low-income residents are spending 30 percent of income on transit, and light rail increases land value and rents rise; we need to be conscious of this as we plan.

Ryan gave an overview of the scope of the equitable housing strategy. We'll also be back in front of the PSC with the draft strategy in about 9 months. This looks at both Portland and Tigard, so both City Councils will be looking at this. It looks at the full spectrum of housing needs along the corridor, not just affordable housing.

There are 4 components of the equitable housing strategy as shown in slide 8 of the [presentation](#). A large piece is the community partnerships. The Equity and Housing Advisory Group is core to this; their first meeting will be tomorrow.

Rachael noted the importance of two cities and two counties working to address regional housing issues. This is a great opportunity to look at this as a region. People move around the area, so having a regional strategy makes lots of sense. About 50 percent of the people along this corridor are immigrants, refugees and/or low-income.

One of the things we've noted is funding for new housing. There is a lot of naturally-occurring affordable housing along the corridor right now, so we need to preserve this and be thoughtful about creating enough choice for housing for all incomes. The market will take care of lots of this, but it won't take care of poor people.

Major issues for the housing component of the corridor planning include:

- New funding for housing
- Displacement
- Equitable housing choice
- Engaging low-income tenants and communities of color
- Place making and connection to transit

Commissioner Spevak was on the Metro group that started the Equitable Planning Grant. This was the first round they funded, and it's the only project with two jurisdictions included. I'm hopeful that when we make zoning and financial commitments both sides are set to do this. Are there any hooks on the funding sources that make sure jurisdictions follow-through?

- Eric: Typically with Metro grants you have to bring something to your City Council to adopt. Grants can be loose about what that "something" is, but the deliverable here is bringing a housing strategy that spells out how we will capitalize on the funds we are seeking to build the housing. We don't have a compact spelled out yet.

Commissioner Houck commented about Interstate Light Rail and Coalition for a Livable Future's policy work. We pushed through a Racial Impact Statement, and I'm curious if that worked as intended to address displacement and if it's something you're looking at here.

- Ryan: I don't know of that tool or impact. Our emphasis on organizational capacity building is a lesson learned from past housing strategies. For the recommendations within the strategy, we are applying an equity lens that look at explicit disparities. Along the way, the advisory group will apply this lens to the recommendations. This language could fold into a compact, but this is self-imposed accountability for both Portland and Tigard.

Commissioner Larsell noted the lessons from past planning corridor and housing work. I'll be interested in what you're using as measures of success. What will you track in terms of the changes? I'll be interested in seeing this and how it could work in East Portland as well.

- We're modeling some of the work on a project and experiences in Minneapolis. We've also learned from the Interstate Corridor light rail work.

Pam introduced herself and the work of CAT. This is the only tenant-led state-wide organizations. There are about 2000 tenant members state-wide. We've done some work already along the Southwest Corridor, most recently in Tigard. We're seeing more and more no-cause full-building evictions, so we're working with many tenants. We're excited to participate in this project to get ahead of the issues of displacement and looking at solutions for keeping people in place as development happens.

Eric shared some of the initial housing data including: current housing supply and expected 2035 housing stock; existing and 2035 housing by type by station walkshed; and annual population growth by race 2000-2015. There is not a large stock of affordable housing or use of housing vouchers in this corridor.

Commissioner Spevak: Lack of utilization of housing vouchers sometimes depends on the issue. Do you have a sense of why vouchers aren't being used?

- This is something we haven't looked into yet.
- CAT does housing voucher workshops. We are finding that most vouchers go to 97230, which has to do with affinity and where people know housing is available and they can afford. But we need to look into why.

We will set targets for the SW Corridor. Ryan shared the data from Minneapolis - St Paul's Central Corridor and their SW Corridor.

The preliminary targets include:

- Preservation
- New units

- Rental and homeownership
- By income (60% MFI or 80%?)
- 10-year timeframe (2018-2028)

Commissioner Oxman: How applicable is the Minneapolis - St Paul experience? I don't think housing has accelerated there as quickly it has here.

- Ryan: They led with preservation of affordable housing. Their ability to raise funds definitely was distinct, but their affordable housing community is similar to ours in terms of funding. In terms of land use, there were 6 cities on the corridor, which was different from here. but Tigard is a partner, and they've been stepping forward well with Portland.

Commissioner Smith: In terms of the targets, I'd say "all of the above, please". I'm curious about resources and whether we think about calibrating housing and part of the transit investment.

- Eric: We're thinking about how we can increase the funding. We know we didn't have enough in the Comp Plan to meet the identified need. We are broadening with working with other jurisdictions. We know we need to bring in regional resources. We're looking at this beyond mitigation and to diversifying housing choice.

Commissioner Tallmadge: I echo "all of the above". Plus we want to see demographic and racial preservation of the area as well.

- Eric: Yes, the question we'll ask is: "Are we successful in not seeing displacement of immigrant communities that are unique to this corridor?"

Commissioner Baugh: I support the affordable at 60 MFI as stated in the Comp Plan. This is about development. I'm worried about development outpacing housing. How do you manage the balance of housing and development within the 10-year time frame so housing isn't too expensive at the end? Finances need to be tied with housing and building the rail line together.

- Ryan: This is why we're putting in some early implementation sites. We know we can't come in the last year to build housing. Work is already being done in parallel with this strategy.
- Eric: The community intelligence on the ground is something we're working with CAT on. And with Portland Housing Bureau.

Strategy guidance (slide 28):

- Pam described the Safe Housing Project. This dealt with habitability in individual apartments.
- If anyone has thoughts about these initial strategy suggestions, please follow up with staff.

Commissioner Rudd: If light rail gets federal funding, and the EIS says loss of housing is an impact, can you use funds for mitigation and/or land the City has banked for part of the local share?

- Eric: If it's a building that is impacted in terms of the physical rail, yes. The grey area is more along the lines of land around the rail line.

Commissioner Spevak: I'd add "duration of affordability" to the targets list.

Commissioner Baugh: I'll send staff comments, but I'd also add that on Metro's website for the project, there isn't a mention of housing. They have \$800k for housing, but there is nothing mentioned on their site. I'm concerned there is bifurcation. There is a bond measure coming to pay for part of this: how does it account for housing in this funding? What can Portland do to look at additional affordable housing bonuses here about inclusionary zoning? The targets must be set at a stretch, and not as a City scope. The strategy should be under implementation and spending money in 2018. Early funding is critical. Racial impact strategy in the Comp Plan should be included here as well.

- Eric: There is a tab on their website waiting to be populated with the equitable housing strategy. They just got funding for this, so it's coming soon!
- This will be presented to both City Councils as well.

Commissioner Spevak: Will this be a zoning code update?

- This is not a code project unless we find something specific that needs to be changed.

Chair Schultz: I don't disagree that 60 percent MFI needs to be the target, but I think total housing production and 80 percent helps in the discussion as well.

Central City 2035 Plan

Work Session / Recommendation: Joe Zehnder, Sallie Edmunds, Mindy Brooks, Rachael Hoy

Sallie introduced today's session and gave an overview of the agenda to get to today's PSC recommendation for the CC2035 Plan.

Floating Platforms (decision table M)

Mindy introduced the topic. In your updated memo you have the commentary for the Zoning Code. It describes the legislative intent of the standard and serves as the purpose statement. I also want to note that *Commissioner Spevak* just submitted an amendment we will discuss as well.

One concern was that floating platforms should be for recreation only. There can't be hot dog carts (or the like) on platforms. The OS zone is for recreational uses. Many uses, like residential, are not allowed in the OS. Some limited commercial uses are allowed in OS.

However, no commercial would be allowed on a floating platform because the River General Overlay requires that all uses that are not river-dependent or river-related be located 50 feet landward of the top of bank. Commercial uses would have to obtain a Greenway Goal exception from the state to be located in the river.

Another question was about who can install these platforms and if anyone just put one in. This is specified in the Zoning Code in 33.236.050.A: "the owner of the floating structure must own or lease enough of the upland lot to meet all of the applicable regulations." The OS land is primarily owned by the city. OMSI owns a little as well. So the City or OMSI could use this provision.

Commissioner Smith: The commentary serves as a purpose statement. Would someone at the BDS counter use this?

- You should be able to do a plan check without discretion around the plan standard itself. You would only look at the commentary to clarify the intent if there is a question or if you're figuring out if a review would be necessary.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted that in practice, when you bring up the purpose statement, it can be interpreted in more than one way.

There is a process in the Code to do an exception, but there is one at the state as well.

Commissioner Rudd: A hot dog stand would never get a goal exception!

Commissioner Spevak: To provide floating structures for a swimming area, it might be better to have multiple structures. So I'd propose something like: 33.475.440.N.3. Development Standards: "There are no more than 4 structures in the Central Reach at one time; *except that up to 4 structures within 300 feet of one another and with total area of 100 square feet or less shall count as a single structure.*"

- Mindy: I understand the intent. We were thinking about it in terms of making sure the standard is easy and clear for BDS to implement. I thought we could allow for more than 4 structures total but decrease the size of each individual structure.
- *Commissioner Houck:* Are you talking about 20-25 structures for 4 different areas?
Commissioner Spevak: Under the current code, you could have 12x100 feet in each area. My proposal would be a max total of 16 structures.

- *Commissioner Rudd*: Are there congestion or other issues we'd have with lots of little docks (e.g. fire boats maneuvering)?
- *Mindy*: This would still have to go through multiple reviews at the state and federal levels. Most of this is PP&R controlled property, so they'd undertake safety studies before placing docks all over.
- *Commissioner Houck*: I suppose you could argue that smaller docks would have more light penetration, so less impact on fisheries. The bigger the structure, the less likely it will be permitted.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: What's the danger if we don't have limitations on the number of floating docks, particularly if PP&R works with the state and feds? We don't have a basis, so we're just guessing, and I'd defer.
- *Commissioner Houck*: I think we're going the right direction for having a number.
- *Mindy*: Shallow water areas are critical habitat, and they are where people want to swim. State and fed look at endangered species, but we look more comprehensively. We're trying to balance impact on habitat with knowing we have to look at the overall cumulative impact and/or size requirements. If people are comfortable with the general approach, you could direct staff.

Commissioner Spevak moved the language he proposed with the option for staff to clarify this language between now and when it's taken to Council. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Oxman: Under this, 4800 square feet would be allotted. How many total square feet of habitat are there?

- *Mindy*: There is no specific data about what the threshold is overall. There is about size of structures and area you need for light penetration. The 12' width is based on this. Length is based on flexible use.

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

North Pearl Setback (decision table 1)

Commissioner Rudd recused herself from this vote.

Rachael highlighted (slide 2) the existing Central city plan district code there is a provision for waterfront development in the Pearl District, specifically for the area highlighted in red in the slide. The maximum height allowed in this area is 100 feet. There is no option for bonus height.

Currently:

- The existing river setback is 25 feet. You could build a 35-foot tall building at that distance.
- If you want to build a 75-foot tall building, you need to setback one foot for every foot over 35ft in height. That would result in setting back a total of 65 feet.
- At the maximum height of 100 feet, you'd need to setback 90 feet.

This provision was put in place in 2008 as a place holder until the Central City updated river setbacks for the whole area.

Now the proposed requirement is to increase the river setback to 50 feet throughout the Central City. Buildings could develop to the full height, which is proposed to be 100 feet with an option to bonus to 250 feet.

Staff thinks the North Pearl regulation should be eliminated because:

- The proposed setback meets the intent of the North Pearl regulation to maintain space for the Greenway Trail and natural resource enhancement.
- The North Pearl regulation was not designed to work with the new 50-foot set back. For example, with the 50-foot setback, a 100-foot-tall building would have to set back total of 115

ft. A 250-foot-tall building would have to set back 265 feet. The sites in the North Pearl range from 200 to 300 feet (site depth is measure from top of bank).

The West Quadrant plan called for an urban riverfront with commercial spaces and high density development to bring more people, events and activities to the riverfront. We are still stepping down to the river, heights behind this are unlimited.

Commissioner Houck: I wanted to support this amendment, which will make it consistent with the 50 feet being proposed for the Central City. That said, 50 feet isn't enough to accommodate a trail and other uses including habitat but that is what is being proposed. This should be consistent throughout the Central City as is supported here.

Commissioner Spevak: There is lots of middle ground on this, and we could write that the first 25 feet has a height limit and beyond that "the sky is the limit".

We saw an issue with an existing regulation and the new provision, so this is something we know we needed to fix. We felt that the 50-foot setback is something we felt comfortable with across the Central City.

Commissioner Houck: I'm willing to support staff recommendation. But I want to note that 50 feet is not set in stone for the South or North reach, where we have more opportunities for better treatment that the river deserves.

Commissioner Baugh: Can you make the 50 feet absolute?

- Yes, but we wanted some flexibility built in. The 50 feet is from top of bank, which changes within the site. You can encroach up to 5 feet as long as you expand by the same elsewhere.

Commissioner Houck moved to support staff's recommendation. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y7 – Bachrach, Houck, Larsell, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge; N2 – Baugh, Oxman)

Interstate I-5 (memo J2)

Commissioner Smith: In his State of the City address, the Mayor revived the idea of burying the Eastbank Freeway. I asked staff to confirm that this was not incompatible with the Rose Quarter freeway widening project, and staff has confirmed that this was analyzed during the N/NE Quadrant process. I also reviewed the original 2005 report of the group that recommended burying the freeway. That report recommends that before any improvements are made to the freeway loop, a master plan for the whole loop should be completed. That master-planning exercise has never occurred and I'd like the record to reflect an objection that we are planning the Rose Quarter project without having done that master plan.

Green Loop Amendment

Commissioner Tallmadge: I have been receiving increasing community push-back to the Green Loop's inclusion in the Central City Plan, particularly as it relates to staff time. By including this, it detracts from investments in East Portland. So my problem is that we're including this and spending time on it instead of prioritizing and spending time on projects in East Portland. I'm amenable to discussing amendments to prioritizing as opposed to pulling it completely from CC2035.

I don't believe this will serve communities of color and low-income communities outside of the Central City. Even if the City is not committing funds at the moment, the City is committing staff time to a project that will, in all likelihood, be funded by the City at a later date and largely benefit businesses and residents in the Central City.

A truly equitable approach is to dedicate City time and money to investments on the East side (prior) coupled with anti-displacement mitigation measures and investments.

Commissioner Smith: This is similar to arguments I made about the freeway project. But the difference is that freeway is counter to many of our policies, but the Green Loop enforces many of our policies. I would be happy to make the point in our letter to Council that the benefit we're looking for with the Green Loop should be similar to others around the city.

Commissioner Baugh echoed *Commissioner Smith's* comments. We want investment in East Portland, but the Green Loop does fit our goals here; we need to make the same investment commitments outside of the Central City as well.

Commissioner Houck: I would strongly oppose taking the Green Loop out of the plan. I think it's fine to include this commentary about it in the letter to Council about the necessity to invest in East County.

Commissioner Spevak: I would like to keep the Green Loop in. The PSU study didn't look at how much staff time is actually spent on projects. I don't know what our role on the PSC is. There may be an argument for the bureau to prioritize resources to be ahead instead of reactive. But the CC2035 Plan includes the Green Loop, and I hope we have new projects coming to support parts of the city where less affluent people live. We can also be proactive on this.

Commissioner Larsell: Some of the quotes in the report resonated with me a lot in terms of where resources are allocated and where things are built. It's a mixed picture. I want to see emphasis on the Green Loop tendrils connections out to the rest of the city.

Commissioner Rudd: More and more we are paying attention to East Portland and devoting resources there. We need to do better at publicizing the work though. For example, the work being done in Lents around the floodplain, jobs and housing is a great project. A group met with Metro COO and President on the Lents project last week. Things are happening in other areas of the city. The Green Loop is ultimately a benefit to everyone.

Commissioner Houck: A similar argument was made with the Eastbank Esplanade, which is now one of the most spectacular things we have in the city. We need to do both: work in the Central City and throughout the city. The Green Loop is an amazing urban design opportunity, but we need to make a statement that we strongly support investments throughout the city, particularly in East Portland.

Chair Schultz: Other commissioners have mostly covered things on my mind. There are individuals in the Central City who don't have what they need but do need the services here; they will benefit from the Green loop as well. And we know it is so much more successful with the connections to other areas of the city.

Commissioner Tallmadge: There is a deficit in other areas of the city that need to be emphasized. I want to ensure that including the Green Loop doesn't limit investment in other areas.

Commissioner Baugh: I've argued long and hard for investment in East Portland, particularly around transportation. What I look at for this project is that it's great for downtown; but I like to see the excitement of the design community to go to East Portland now and have a competition similar to the Green Loop project there. That type of investment shows people in East Portland about the care, time and effort we put there.

Commissioner Bachrach: Thank you for bringing this up, *Commissioner Tallmadge*. The concern about funding and prioritization isn't one we can control as a PSC. But we might have ability to weigh in on what our bureau works on and what we want to support them on in terms of new projects, etc.

- Susan: You do, and you have. The PSC has a member on BPS' Budget Advisory Committee every year. You're right that portions of the budget have been pretty fixed on what we have been

required to do. Now we might have some choices, so the PSC could have more members on the BAC, or we could bring the next year's workplan to the PSC for suggestions. PBOT, PHB and BES are also all your bureaus. So we should think about how we can include them in your work as well.

Commissioner Oxman: The thing that stood out to me in the PSU report is the perception of what the City is doing downtown and/versus not in East Portland. It indicates a real disconnect between the government and the governed. The PSC could do more intensive listening about where these feelings come from and how positive actions are not being perceived similarly in East Portland.

Chair Schultz: We will add something to the transmittal letter about equitable funding for projects throughout the city instead of pulling the Green Loop from the Central City 2035 Plan.

Vote 1: Approve the following chapters, as amended, within the Revised Proposed Draft Volume 2A2:

- 33.440 Greenway Overlay Zones.
- 33.475 River Overlay Zones.
- 33.865 River Review, and forward to City Council as part of CC2035.

Commissioner Rudd recused herself from this topic.

Commissioner Smith moved Vote 1. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.
(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

Vote 2: Approve the following amendments:

- Riverplace FAR (Map 510-2).
- Chinatown and Riverplace height (Map 510-3).
- Master Plan code (33.510.255), and forward to City Council as part of CC2035.

Chair Schultz recused herself from this topic. *Vice Chair Smith* presided.

Commissioner Bachrach moved Vote 2. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.
(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

Vote 3: Approve all remaining portions of Volumes 1-6, as amended that were not included in prior votes 1 and 2, direct staff to make any remaining non-substantive changes to the package, and forward to City Council as the PSC's Recommended Draft.

Commissioner Baugh moved Vote 3. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

Commissioner Smith: This includes the TSP project list. I continue to believe the freeway project is a major flaw. I don't want to tar any other part of the plan, so my no vote is specifically for this issue.

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

Chair Schultz: Thank you to Sallie and all the staff. This is a tremendous project.

Letter to City Council

Sallie shared the draft outline of the PSC's letter to Council. We will add comments about the Green Loop and TSP.

Commissioner Houck: I think the set-back from the river is the largest focus of the Supported Amendments section; it's a much larger issue than the others.

Chair Schultz: Could we have an environmental section in the letter in terms of efforts throughout the area as well as ones specific to the river?

Commissioner Baugh: Is there a section we can include costs of development downtown?

- We would include this in what we have outlined as Green Building and related costs; we can edit the phrasing to encompass all costs of development.

Commissioner Spevak: What strikes me is how many people are going to be living in the Central City. The plan reflects this as a big idea of the Central City being inclusive.

Commissioner Bachrach: In terms of Inclusionary Housing, didn't we already do that as part of the amendment that Council already adopted? I just want to be sure we're not overstating this as something we've changed substantively here. When we sent our IH letter, we emphasized the need to reassess this in a year. I'd like to remind Council that we're expecting this as part of how IH is doing.

- *Chair Schultz:* I support this, but I'm not sure exactly how we'd phrase this relative to the CC2035 Plan.

Commissioner Bachrach: Regarding height in the historic district, if I were redoing it, I would want to make clear that some decisions where we agreed to lower height, it was in response to the Historic Landmarks Commission (PHLC). I want to point this out to Council.

- *Chair Schultz:* I can't say that's why I voted to lower heights, and I don't know why other members of the PSC voted how they did. Yes, PHLC provided testimony, but I'm not sure this is something we'd include.
- *Commissioner Baugh:* I wouldn't call into question the role of another commission. There is a decorum I don't want to push.
- *Commissioner Spevak:* We recognize some of the height limits are some that Council will have to resolve (something like this). We can't resolve this as the PSC.
- *Joe:* *Commissioner Spevak's* suggestion is the closest version to what your discussion really was. We did lower heights to a degree on the principle that it's more within a realm, and there is an important role for PHLC in terms of discretion. This is a discussion at the state level right now, too, so we might see this return to the PSC in the future.

Commissioner Houck: As *Commissioner Spevak* stated we have a huge number of people living in the Central City. It's even more important that there are parks, open space, urban tree canopy and access to amenities. We need to be careful about how we analyze the so-called negative impact on development. We routinely only look at the negative side of the ledger when it comes to negative impacts on development. We have to also include how green features increase value. People living in a denser situation need access to these things.

Adjourn

Chair Shultz adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.