

DOZA PROCESS
PSC CODE AMENDMENT SUGGESTIONS

DZ Overlay - Process & Threshold Amendment Items

Line #	Page #	Direction	Code Section	PSC Amendment	Rationale / Discussion
General					
1	various	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	various	Amend various sections of the code/commentary where typos and other small edits are needed to clarify existing intent.	Several small edits have been proposed by PSC members and staff that are technical in nature and should be amended without further discussion
Map (No Changes)					
DZ Overlay Chapter - Purpose					
2	13	Discuss with 3x3 for possible amendment	33.420.010: Purpose	Explore a suggested change to the first sentence of the Purpose Statement: "The Design overlay zone ensures that Portland is a city designed for people, <u>in harmony with nature.</u> "	This makes the balancing of design, resilience and sustainability more apparent in the Purpose. A similar suggestion has been made for the intro to the Guidelines
DZ Overlay - Application					
3	14	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.420.021: Applying Commentary	Amend the Commentary to include more background about where the DZ overlay has been applied in the past over the years and not just to centers and corridors	The commentary needs to include more history on the application of the overlay prior to the recent update for centers and corridors
4	15	Discuss with 3x3 after internal decision.	33.420.041. C When DZ Applies	Add bridges to the list of non-standard improvements in the right-of-way, or make a special provision for bridges to be subject to design review.	Internal discussion with PBOT/BDS/BPS to follow. Initial rationale is: Bridges are significant infrastructure that contribute to the public realm and context, there is nothing standard about them.
DZ Overlay - Exemptions					
5	15	Amend and review with 3x3	33.420.045 Exemptions - General	Reorganize exemptions into more definable subcategories based on use and type of development.	As staff proposed, it can be difficult to identify applicable exemptions and easy to miss some exemptions
6	15	Follow up with Comm Spevak: Any change to be CONSENT	33.420.045.A Historic Exemption	Consider separating out Exemption A into a different applicability threshold, since it is more of a directional standard (go see historic) than an exemption for development	A PSC member found this confusing, but agreed to work with staff to see if there is an alternative listing
7	17	No change. Structures in parking lot are already exempt CONSENT	33.420.045.K Electric Charging Exemption	Electric Vehicle Charging Stations: Consider adding an exemption specific to electric vehicle charging stations that meet sign code allowances	These are often proposed within required parking lot perimeter or interior landscaped areas
8	19	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.420.045.N.3 Alteration Exemption - Louvers	Clarify that louvers should match in color to the adjoining material or storefront surface to align with standards and guidelines. Clarify how measuring grade for non street-facing vents.	Intent is to ensure that exemption works together with the standards and guidelines and to clarify all situations where a vent may be placed.
9	19	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.420.045.N. Alteration Exemption - Radon Systems	In alignment with suggestions for standards, consider an exemption for alterations for a radon system if it is placed on a non street-facing wall	Suggestions were made for radon standards to be part of the standards for utilities. However, there is support for a full exemption if it is not facing the street
10	19	Amend and review with 3x3	33.420.045.N. Alteration Exemption - Clarify outside CCCPD exemption	Add the word "and" between #4 and #5 to clarify that a development can potentially use several of these exemptions including the 'all inclusive' 200 sq ft exemption outside of CCCPD	This would clarify how exemption #6 relates to the first 5 exemptions

DOZA PROCESS
PSC CODE AMENDMENT SUGGESTIONS

11	19-21	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.420.045.O.1 Roof top Equipment on Flat Roof	Make the following two amendments: 1. Include protective railings to 1.a as long as they don't project over 4-ft above roof surface. 2. Under 1.b change 'paint to match' to state 'is the same color as existing façade of penthouse'	The first amendment recognizes that flat roofs generally have safety railings while the second one acknowledges that some equipment may already have an intrinsic color that matches the penthouse. Note that this suggestion is made for other areas (louvers, etc)
12	21	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.420.045.O.2 Rooftop Equipment on sloped roof	Drop the requirement that equipment on a sloped roof be set back 3-ft from roof edges or ridge lines.	Building code regulates things like solar installations, and other installations should allow some flexibility. The other standard limits the projection or the size.
DZ Overlay - Thresholds for Standards					
13	31	Amend and review with 3x3	33.420.050.B When DZ Standard Can Be Used	Raise the maximum height that can use the design standards from 55-ft to 75-ft. Consider whether this should be balanced with a frontage limitation. Also clarify that projections allowed within base zones can project without affecting the standards height limit.	Raising the threshold will allow a greater number of buildings whose height is allowed under the base zone to use the objective standards for construction. (note that BPS staff would also like to explore potential alternatives that allow a range of height limits)
DZ Overlay - Process (incl. Administration & Commission Makeup)					
14	113	Amend and review with 3x3.	33.710.050.B.2 Design Commission	Further amend the staff proposal regarding the Design Commission membership to consider requiring one or more members to be experienced in sustainability practices or natural resource management. This would reduce the number of members from design/planning/financing expert field from five to three or four`	Both of these subjects are important: sustainability to ensure development resilience under climate change and natural resource to consider the relationship between development and the environment.
15	117	Amend and review with 3x3.	33.720.030.C Legislative Land Use Reviews	Amend the code for the establishment/change to design guidelines to require that the Design Commission provide a briefing and/or obtain a recommendation from the PSC for any design guideline addition/changes. Another option would be to require a joint hearing for these legislative changes.	The PSC has a role, especially with the relationship between design guidelines and the zoning code (base zones and design standards) that are under the purview of the PSC>
16	125	Amend and review with 3x3.	33.730.050.B Design Advice Request (DAR)	Consider removing staff proposal to limit DARs to one meeting	The proposal considers the total design review process as a linear process, but more opportunities for feedback result in a better project
17	139	Discuss with 3x3 for final direction.	33.825.035 Factors Reviewed in DZ review	Consider the following three options for amendments to this code section: 1. Remove height (in addition to FAR proposal) as a standard that can be considered in design review. It would be considered an entitlement. 2. Remove the FAR qualifier that would allow non-historic FAR transfers in the CCPD to be subject to design review approval. 3. Consider whether other base development standards (setbacks, landscaping, building coverage, ??) should not be considered with design review.	There is a need to balance entitlements, cost of review, context as well as flexibility versus certainty in reviewing projects. These amendments were not universally supported among the PSC
18	139	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.825.040.B Modifications That Will Better Meet Design Review Requirements	Under approval criteria B, the second sentence should be clarified that mitigation for the cumulative impact of multiple modifications is not always necessary or required.	The language as stated reads as if mitigation is always needed if there are several modifications requested. This is often not the case especially if the modifications are not to standards that are related to each other or build off each other.
DZ Overlay - Review Thresholds					
19	133	Amend for PSC recommendation CONSENT	33.825.025 Review Procedure (Table 825-1)	Revise the table for alterations within the Central City plan district so that alterations that do not involve additional floor area are always processed through a Type II DZ review process	Alterations without increases to floor area do not have the same potential impact as new buildings or larger additions. General height and massing isn't changing in these cases, so they should be reviewed at a staff level.