

Line #	Page	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
	<b>General</b>						
1	various	Guidelines	Replace the existing CC Fundamental Design Guidelines with the Design Guidelines in Volume 3		Schultz	CC Fundamental Guidelines will be getting updated. This would be major policy shift	Discuss (?)
2	5	33.2218	Eliminate Chapter 33.218 altogether and place the design standards for historic properties in 33.445	It is inconsistent and confusing code structure to create new design standards for non-historic areas within Chapter 33.420 and change the Community Design Standards in 33.218 to only apply to historic properties but not move the standards for historic properties to 33.445 (Vol. 2)	Bertolazzi (from BDS)	Staff: Note this was discussed w/ BPS historic staff as that project is also moving forward. Staff made the decision to hold off moving/revising the historic standards until the time that they can also be updated.	Discuss (?)
	<b>Purpose Statement</b>						
3	13	33.420.010 Purpose	Suggested Change to Purpose Statement: "The Design overlay zone ensures that Portland is a city designed for people, <u>in harmony with nature.</u> "	This would be consistent with my comment on the Design Guidelines.	Houck	Staff: Note this is testimony to change both the text within the Design Guidelines document and within the purpose statement.	Discuss (?)
	<b>Map</b>						
4			No Changes				No change
	<b>Thresholds</b>						
5	15	33.420.021	At end of second paragraph, revise map sequence to be "maps 420-1 through <u>420-5</u> at the end of this chapter".	This is a technical fix to align with maps.	BPS/BDS		Consent
6	15	33.420.041.C When DZ applies	Add bridges to the list of non-standard improvements.	Bridges are significant infrastructure that contribute to the public realm and context, there is nothing standard about them	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: We may have to spell out bridges separately as PBOT is agency to determine what is a standard improvement in the right-of-way.	Discuss
7	15	33.420.041.E When DZ applies	Change minimum tree diameter. "Removal of trees <del>6</del> 3 or more inches in diameter.	A six inch tree is quite large. We need to be preserving large trees as well as those trees that will replace larger trees in the future. Given interest in growing our urban forest canopy, I feel 3 inches is more appropriate	Houck	Staff: Title 11 generally doesn't regulate trees under 6-inches in diameter. From a DZ standards/ review perspective, not sure DZ threshold provides any additional oversight. Base zones require maintenance and replacement of all required landscaping. Is this a DZ issue?	Discuss
8	17	33.420.045 (Exemptions)	Reorganize headings to Exemptions from Design Review and Design Standard for better use and clarity by adding subheadings for development types	It is too difficult to identify applicable exemptions and easy to miss exemptions that may apply, as currently proposed.	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: BDS provides an option for grouping by types of change/ development, but may need discussion.	Discuss / Consent?
9	17	33.420.045. A (Exemptions)	Separate out Exception A (Historic/Conservation) from the Exception list, then list the rest.	As written, someone proposing a 35' building in a Conservation district could utilize Exception E and avoid design review - which I don't believe is the intent	Spevak	Staff: Not sure this is an issue. Chapter 33.445 (Historic) applies regardless. Exemption A is an existing exemption.	Discuss / No change?
10	17	33.420.045.I (Exemptions)	Replace comma with semicolon at end of exemption	This is a typo.	BPS/BDS		Consent

Line #	Page	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
11	17	33.420.045.K (Exemptions)	Electric Vehicle Charging Stations - Consider adding an exemption specific to electric vehicle charging stations (kiosks) that meet sign code allowances.	These detached accessory structures are generally not located 20 feet from street lot lines, and they are not generally located within vehicle areas. Typically, they are proposed to be located within required parking lot perimeter or interior landscaped areas.	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: If the vehicle charging station is within the parking lot, it is exempt. They are often located within a parking lot, but couldn't be located in an area of required perimeter parking lot screening.	Discuss / No change?
12	19	33.420.045.N.3 (Exemptions)	Add that louver/vent color must match the storefront system or adjacent surface for coherency to align with Guideline 7 ("vents should be integrated into the façade design, using complementary color and materials").  As N applies to all facades of a building, to facilitate implementation please revise b to "at least 8 feet above the sidewalk adjacent grade" consistent with Standard PR6 and to address situations when vents or louvers are added to non-street facing elevations.	"Vents should be integrated into the façade design, using complementary color and materials"	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: Similar comment applies to the standards.	Consent
13	19	33.420.045.N.6 (Exemptions)	Add statement to "exclude 1-5 above".	The 200 SF exemption to façade alterations (N6) negates the prescriptive exemptions for awnings, louvers and storefronts immediately above.	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: Question to PSC: Do we allow a blanket 200 sq ft exemption outside of CC or is it only blanket beyond items #1-5?	Discuss
14	19	33.420.045.N (Exemptions)	Add exemption for radon mitigation systems on non-street facing facades.		Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: Radon system also considered for standards	Consent
15	19 & 53	33.420.045.O & Table 420-2 (Exemptions & Standards)	Consider Radon exemption and/or standard. Exemption for non-street facing mount, and standard for PR18.	This would allow commercial radon facilities not on street-facing facades. It is an addition to the exemptions and standards.	BPS/BDS	See above	Consent
16	19	33.420.045.O.1.a (Exemptions)	Include "protective railings that project up to 4 feet and are not sight obscuring" to the exemption	This is a technical fix to clarify that protective railings that are not sight obscuring are also exempt. They are often installed with ecoroofs and solar installations.	BPS		Consent
17	19	33.420.045.O.1.a(3) (Exemptions)	Change the wording ". . .and is painted to match the façade of the penthouse." to ". . .and is the same color as the existing façade of the penthouse."	Painted implies that the existing material is painted when it is possible that the underlying equipment color already matches the penthouse.	Schultz	Staff: Note that "painted to match" is similar to current exemption. Should review other exemptions to ensure consistency.	Consent
18	21	33.420.045.O.2.a (Exemptions)	Drop ".. and is set back at least 3 feet from the roof edges and ridge lines"	The 3' setbacks references here are already covered for PV panels by The fire bureau (international fire code 605.11.3.2.4). For other possible additions (e.g. solar water panels, ecoroofs...) unconstrained by fire code, the practicality of extending the installation to the full extent of the roof is challenging. But if someone wants to do it, we should let them - without triggering design review.	Spevak		Discuss
19	21	33.420.045.Q (Exemptions)	Add semi colon to end of exemption	This is a typo	BPS/BDS		Consent
20	31	33.420.050.B (When DZ Stds may be Used)	Add language to height threshold in B. 3 that accommodates base zone exceptions to height (e.g. antenna, 1st floor height bonus...)		Spevak		Consent

Line #	Page	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
21	31	33.420.050.B (When DZ Stds may be Used)	Clarify that the 55-ft and 35-ft height limits still allow for the projections allowed under the base zone. Clarify that Gateway limit for alterations only apply to additions that exceed the 35-ft height.	This is a technical fix to clarify intent.	BPS/BDS	See Spevak above. Same request.	Consent
22	31	33.420.050.B.3 (When DZ Stds may be Used)	Change the threshold for compulsory discretionary review to: (1) 75' of height or (2) 55' of height (adjusted upwards if base zone height bonuses are used for affordable housing and/or ground floor commercial ceiling heights) <i>and</i> the longest street-facing facade is 150' or greater.	RM3, RM4, CM3 can have taller buildings than 55', and we should provide a clear and objective path to create needed housing in these zones. Note: I'd be open linking the 55' height limit to a floor area square footage test (like the ones in Table 825-1) instead of the street-facing facade test if staff feels like this would better accomplish the objective	Spevak		Discuss
23	33	33.420.050.B (When DZ Stds may be Used)	Correct the lettering/numbering of items "E., H., I., J.", to numbers "5., 6., 7., 8."	This is a typo	BPS		Consent
24	133	33.825.025 (Review Procedure) Table 825-1 Exterior alteration	Change "lineal" to "linear" under item 2)	Typo	BPS/BDS		Consent
25	133	33.825.025 (Review Procedure) Table 825-1	Raise thresholds for 1 & 2 "exterior alterations to existing development" (staff to make proposal)	Thresholds are very low and should not require a Type3, which would be at Council on appeal.	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: BPS staff looking for direction. Current proposal doesn't trigger a Type III until at least 5,000 sq ft of façade altered (a 50' x 100' portion of a façade) or an entire ground floor block frontage.	Discuss
		<b>Process</b>					
26	83	33.526 (Gateway Plan District) Table of Contents	33.526.350 should be shown as "strikethrough", not "underlined"	This is a typo	BPS		Consent
27	113	33.710.050.B.2 (Design Commission)	Add that one member of the Design Commission must be a Sustainability professional.	This would add an additional technical field to draw the 5 people with experience in technical fields	Schultz		Discuss
28	117	33.720.030 (Legislative Land Use Reviews)	Establish the PSC as an additional recommending body in Design Guidelines for Historic, Conservation Districts, and Design overlay zones (and also for the creation of such overlays)	Guidelines could have equity implications (e.g. driving up costs to build or renovate a building; making it hard to build anything within these overlay areas). Although the PSC would probably not have the expertise for the guidelines, it could bring an equity lens to recommendations that might otherwise get missed. The same logic would apply to the establishment of new districts (I think Brandon might be working on that).	Spevak	Staff: This changes PSC role for consideration of guidelines	Discuss
29	117	33.720.030.C (Legislative Land Use Reviews)	Similar to above, require that the Design Commission provide a briefing and obtain a recommendation from the PSC for any design guideline changes	See above	Schultz	See above	Discuss
30	123	33.730.050.A (Pre-Application Conference)	The heading "A. Pre-ApplicationConference" should be underlined.	This is a typo	BPS		Consent
31	125	33.730.050.B (Design Advice Request)	Remove the limit for one DAR	Provide more opportunities for applicant input early in the design process	Bertolazzo (from BDS)		Discuss

Line #	Page	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
32	133-135	33.825.025 (Review Procedure) Table 825-1 Footnote #2	Consider maintaining the current requirement for a DAR if a lower land use process is chosen.	The current City process of requiring DARs for affordable housing projects that take advantage of a lower land use procedure is a successful way to set affordable projects on a path of certainty and predictability early in the applicant's design process. The current City process also allows the applicant to hear public feedback early in the applicant's design process.	Bertolazzo (from BDS)	Staff: As proposed, an applicant could go through an optional DAR before submitting the Type II review. The current process (reqd DAR & Type IIX process) is a unique process not relevant to any other reviews. Only 2 projects have taken advantage of this in nearly 4 years, implying a lack of incentive to use in its current form. A Type II without requiring a DAR reduces a land use step.	Discuss
33	139	33.825.035 (Factors Reviewed in DZ review)	Clarify what can and cannot be modified through Design Review through legislative adoption of a list of elements that can be modified. Consider adding height, setbacks and setbacks to parameters that cannot be changed by design review (as they are already regulated in base zone). Ok to allow additional façade articulation.  Question to staff: how often do developments run out of height before they run out of FAR?	Provide greater clarity to the process of review. Although design review is authorized by City code to look at many aspects of any building, such as "placement, dimensions, height and bulk, lot coverage and exterior alterations, including materials, color, parking areas, open space, landscaping and preservation of trees," there seems to be some degree of confusion about what are non-negotiable allowances and what may be modified.	Bertolazzo	Staff: Needs discussion. Height can often be changed w/o changing entitlements (FAR, Density)	Discuss
34	139	33.825.035 (Factors Reviewed in DZ review)	Consider removing the exception to the principle that zoning allowances for floor area ratios (FAR) cannot be reduced by decision-makers during the design review process.	The Proposed Draft contains an exception for the Central City related to transfers of FAR from non-historic properties, which would allow the Design Commission to consider whether the FAR transfer impacts the ability for the project to meet the design guidelines. (This exception should be removed - verify is this what Ben is asking?)	Bertolazzo	Need clarification of what is requested for removal. The exception to limits on FAR review, or the limit itself?	Discuss
35	139	33.825.035 (Factors Reviewed in DZ review)	Similar to above, delete the language allowing for reduction FAR when transferred. <del>"...except when floor area has been transferred to the site using the floor area within a sector transfer option in the Central City plan district. In this case, the review may require the proposed floor area to be reduced, but not more than the amount that was transferred from within the sector. In addition, The review body..."</del>	See above	Schultz	See above	Discuss
36	139	33.825.035 (Factors Reviewed in DZ review)	"may not require the applicant to reduce or increase the height or the total floor area..."	Height is an entitlement that should not be eligible for discretionary adjustment through design review	Spevak	Needs discussion. Height can often be changed w/o changing entitlements (FAR, Density)	Discuss
37	139	33.825.035 (Factors Reviewed in DZ review)	Similar to above request to limit ability to reduce height, consider the following alternative language: "While the review may evaluate the distribution of massing and placement of structures on the site, the review may not require the applicant to reduce or increase the maximum height and floor area proposed for the site"	The first sentence allows the reviewer to evaluate the distribution of massing and placement which would give them the authority to restrict a building from completely filling the entitled height box.	Schultz	See above	Discuss

Line #	Page	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
38	139	33.825.040.B (Modifications that Better Meet Requirements)	Under B., "Purpose of the Standard", revise language that the jurisdiction may require mitigation rather than provide mitigation.		Schultz	Staff: Note that the language is written from the point of view of the proposal/application, not from the regulatory agency. So, staff feels current language is correct, with the inclusion of the caveat "to the extent practical".	Discuss
39	147	33.855.020.A (Initializing a Zone Map Amendment - QJ)	Remove "Planning and Sustainability Commission" from the 1st sentence; remove the 2nd sentence entirely.	Is there any reason why the PSC, HLC or DC should be able to initiate quasi-judicial zoning map amendments? If not, scrap that ability for all of these review bodies.	Spevak	Staff: Do we remove commission allowance to initiate QJ map amendments?	Discuss
40	147	33.855.020.B (Initializing a Zone Map Amendment - Legislative)		In the 2nd to last paragraph, does 'these amendments' refer to <i>all</i> the amendments described in this paragraph (including those initiated by HLC)? I like that idea, but I'm not sure it matches with current practice or intent. Overall, I think this paragraph is kind of muddy and could use a little clarification.	Spviak	Staff: "These amendments" should refer to any amendment requested by any individual or agency.	Discuss