

# Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

February 11, 2020

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Daisy Quiñonez (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Steph Routh, Katherine Schultz (arrived 1:30 p.m.), Chris Smith (by phone), Eli Spevak [one open position]

**Commissioners Absent:** Oriana Magnera

**City Staff Presenting:** Lora Lillard, Phil Nameny, Eric Engstrom, Nan Stark, Jeff Caudill, Debbie Bischoff, Ethan Brown; Kaitlin Lovell (BES)

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

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

## Director's Report

Andrea Durbin

- RIP work session with Council is tomorrow about amendments. Next month we have a scheduled hearing for people to comment on these amendments. As soon as we finish RIP I we can come back to the PSC with RIP 2.
- We are releasing the Climate Emergency Draft for public review, which will be available for comments for about 3-4 weeks. The hope is to bring it to Council in April.

## Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the January 28, 2020, PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to approve consent agenda. *Commissioner Routh* seconded.

(Y6 – Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

## River Plan / South Reach

Briefing: Jeff Caudill, Debbie Bischoff, Ethan Brown; Kaitlin Lovell (BES)

## Presentation

### Disclosures

- *Commissioner Schultz* has recused herself from the South Reach project.

Debbie introduced the project and today's overview of the River Plan / South Reach. Today's session is an overview about the project, background, and recommendation highlights in preparation for the February 25 public hearing.

The City's River Renaissance program of the 2000s, envisioned and strategized about the Willamette River as a clean and healthy river, a prosperous working harbor, Portland's front yard, with vibrant riverfront areas and partnerships to achieve positive outcomes.

The river was divided into 3 unique reaches. City planning for the North Reach happened in 2010. City planning in the Central Reach was accomplished with CC2035 Plan in 2018. Now it is South Reach's turn. The River Plan / South Reach is an update to the Willamette Greenway Plan. It is a 20-year plan that includes: a vision, policy framework, updated Comp Plan and zoning map and code, and implementation actions to be completed by City and other entities/groups.

There are a number of guiding documents that provide the framework for the River Plan/South Reach. A key one is the Statewide Planning Goal 15. The City is required to implement plans and development regulations that meet this goal. The City's primary implementation of SPG 15 happened in 1987 with the *Willamette Greenway Plan*.

We began this planning project 2 years ago and started off by understanding existing conditions. We communicated about and held numerous public events and meetings where we received comments that informed plan development. We targeted outreach and engagement with NW tribes who have long-standing interests in the South Reach's past, present and future, as well as the urban Native community. We produced two drafts of the River Plan/South Reach recently, an Intergovernmental Review Draft, which invited interested tribes and other governmental partners to review and comment on it. There were a number of outreach events along the way as well.

Jeff highlighted the Watershed Health and Resilience Objectives. Given the abundance of natural resources in the area, it is important that protections be applied to existing natural resources and that future development be designed to minimize impacts on those resources.

Additionally, the changes expected as a result of climate change, including increased flood and wildfire risk, required us to reduce these risks, wherever possible, and ensure resilience in design and development.

To respond to the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program Biological Opinion that you'll learn more about from Ethan a bit, the incorporation of steps to expand floodplain habitat for Threatened and Endangered species was a key component of our work.

Finally, to ensure long-term improvements in the river as well as within habitat corridors extending from the South Reach, the identification of habitat restoration opportunities was also a key part of this work.

We are suggesting replacing the Greenway overlay zones with River Environmental or River Recreational overlay zones. The currently-applied Greenway overlay zones will be replaced with the River overlay zones. The River Recreational overlay zone is applied to public properties with river-dependent or river-related recreational uses. The River General overlay is applied to all other properties.

In addition to the River General and Recreational, the River Environmental overlay zone will be applied to high- and medium-ranked riparian resources, the entirety of the floodplain and upland oak Special Habitat Areas. Jeff provided highlights of each of the new overlay zone proposals.

There are areas along the South Reach where riverbank vegetation is frequently cut back, preventing the establishment of larger trees and a more diverse riverbank. Updates have been made to limit vegetation removal on the riverbank so that habitat improvements can be achieved over time.

The first step in the multi-phase project of floodplain management is the application of new floodplain development regulations within the South Reach. In response to the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program Biological Opinion that was issued in 2016, Jeff highlighted the proposed updates.

Debbie highlighted the recreational aspects of the South Reach (both on land and in-river) as a regional hub of recreation. We want to ensure that there is adequate riverfront access for the public from adjacent neighborhoods to and along the riverfront and into the river. We want to see conflicts resolved between recreational users (on-land and in-river) that make for safer and more enjoyable experiences. We want to protect high quality scenic resources for public views. We want to pursue partnerships that enhance recreational facilities and services and ones that minimize the conflicts – such as through education, rulemaking, and enforcement.

A scenic resources protection plan was created as a part of the South Reach Plan. Archaeological Resources Protection is another aspect of the plan.

We are also working on collaborating with tribes, and the City of Portland is formalizing government-to-government relations with NW tribes that have an interest in Portland area. We invited tribal governments to review and comment on a first draft of the plan. We are proposing some Comprehensive Plan policy amendments that correct terminology, and add language that include tribal nations in an appropriate manner, for example under Intergovernmental Coordination policy 1.15, language is added that “supports the cultural practices and fiscal health of tribal nations”

Debbie continued to describe the transportation and development and design aspects of the South Reach plan.

This is a regional humanitarian issue and it exists in the SR with houseless campers and liveaboard boaters. This complex situation is larger than the limited focus, but there is an action in the plan for bureaus and others to coordinate with the Joint Office of Homeless Services on ways to assist.

There are additional minor updates for River General and River Environmental zoning as well as Scenic Resources.

Ethan highlighted floodplain planning for both the South Reach and beyond. The National Flood Insurance Program, managed by FEMA, provides subsidized flood insurance to property owners within the 100-year floodplain (nationwide). Portland has long participated in the program, and associated CRS program to reduce premiums by 20% currently. However, by making insurance widely available, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) was found to facilitate floodplain development and negatively impact protected salmon and steelhead species. NMFS found that the NFIP and associated floodplain development harm salmon and steelhead in Oregon. Because the City directly regulates such development, we remain at legal risk until we meet or exceed the recommendations found in the BiOp’s

Reasonable and Prudent Alternative. We expect to have FEMA guidance at the end of 2021, but we are working now to get the recommendations enacted in a reasonable time.

Salmon habitat generally coincides with the floodplains in Portland. This project will update regulations in the areas shown in the 100-year floodplain and the full extent of the 1996 flood. However, these areas do not represent anticipated increased risk from climate change and sea level rise.

BPS is leading the regulatory component in close coordination with BDS and BES. The program includes participation from Portland Prosper, Portland Parks and Rec, Office of Government Relations, City Attorney, and Office of Management and Finance. Developing regulations will occur in at least 3 phases, starting with the South Reach as previously discussed. In addition, the Program includes work to solidify our habitat restoration efforts and to explore options and opportunities for mitigation banking within the City, both led by BES.

The project includes a number of regulatory changes, both in Title 33 and Title 24, as highlighted on slides 53-55.

The River Plan / South Reach hearing at the PSC is at the next meeting on February 25, followed by work session and a potential PSC recommendation on April 14.

*Commissioner Houck:* I reminded myself that I did the first greenway inventory with planning staff 36 years ago. This is infinitely more complicated and thorough than what we could do, and I'm really impressed. Staff has been extremely responsive in addressing a number of issues. Trees are still a conversation to continue, particularly the issue of replacement trees. I'm really interested in BES' recommendations to BPS about the setback being 100 feet. Based on previous work on Metro's Title 3 and Title 13 and the city's own assessments a setback of 250-300 feet is justified, so given FEMA's and National Marine Fisheries Service recommendation on the riparian buffer zone at 170 feet and the vision of the plan, I don't know how the 50 feet recommendation from staff can be reconciled. I don't know how we're addressing resilience if we're allowing people to develop after flooding. Are we considering where significant damages after flooding prohibiting reconstruction? This would be especially relevant at SW Miles Place which has experienced repeated flooding.

*Commissioner Larsell:* Can you please keep us up to date on the Oregon Marine Board? Perhaps we should be writing a letter to them.

- Debbie is participating on the advisory committee and can provide updates.

*Commissioners Bachrach:* The tree regulations – are they on top of Title 11 and Title 33 regulations?

- *Commissioner Bachrach:* Environmental Zones supersede.
- *Commissioner Houck:* Stricter regulation, particularly in the riparian zone, are extremely important and need to be more stringent than in Title 11.

*Commissioner Quiñonez:* Do you have more details about coordinating with the Joint Office of Homelessness? What about engaging indigenous communities and environmental plans if they wish to participate? How do we continue to collaborate with them?

- *Debbie:* We know the houseless issues is bigger than this plan. We have just one action included in this plan, but coordination and appropriate services is what we're recommending. City bureaus are already engaging with some of the Northwest tribes on several plans and programs,

so our ongoing relationships continues to evolve and build. This plan endorses that and seeks to continue our work particularly about parks and natural areas in the South Reach.

*Commissioner Routh:* Reevaluating a new floodplain with climate change is beyond capacity. But what is the timeline for that?

- Ethan: We don't have a modeling estimate at this point. We know some general data so when we have new maps, we'll have a better grasp of protections.
- Kaitlin: I have new information about this. Corp of Engineers has a model that has been embargoed. We are working collaboratively to get the information we can to get a planning-level model to give a sense of how climate change and the dam operations influence flooding. We are hoping to accelerate the timeline for this information.
- *Commissioner Houck:* I want to be sure that we have ample time to continue this discussion with BPS and BES staff at our work session.

## **Design Overlay Zone Amendments**

Work Session: Lora Lillard, Phil Nameny

### **Disclosures**

While it's not clear whether the proposed changes create a potential conflict of interest for PSC members because the changes affect such a broad class of property owners, in the interest of transparency, we have the following declarations:

- *Commissioner Smith* owns property in the design overlay zone.
- Commissioners Schultz, Spevak, and Bortolazzo, work for architectural or development firms who conduct work in Portland.

Phil introduced the outstanding items from the last work session, which we're walking through first today.

*Item 38: 33.825.035 – factors reviewed in DZ review*

Staff is suggesting the review body states the mitigation as part of the discussion.

*Commissioner Schultz:* My experience is that sometimes DZ requests modifications or mitigations, and sometimes they don't. Mitigation seems subjective.

Modification is being driven by the applicant, and to get it granted, they make the argument. This is done from the point of view of the applicant.

*Commissioner Schultz:* If I'm following this correctly, it's the last sentence that I'm questioning. Just because you have multiple modifications, you don't necessarily cause more impacts. I don't think we need the second sentence.

Staff will work on language, which we'll bring back in the list of amendments at the next PSC meeting.

*Item 39: 33.855.020.A – remove "Planning and Sustainability Commission" from the first sentence and remove the second sentence entirely*

*Item 40: 33.855.020.B – initializing a zone map amendment*

We've pulled away from establishing design districts and have just been applying the 'd' overlay without establishing the design district. This is just a clean-up.

*Chair Spevak* will withdraw his suggestion for Item 39. I'm ok being a recommending body on Item 40, so I will withdraw this recommendation as well.

Staff moved on to the Context worksheet.

*C4: Grouping of Trees*

Staff had proposed 2 points for providing 5 evergreen trees in a group. The standards working group thought there could be a better way to group or measure (e.g. tree density).

*Commissioner Houck*: I'm interested in what arborists say. I don't know what this phrasing looks like ultimately.

*Commissioner Schultz*: A part of the discussion was a suggestion of a certain number of trees per size of the lot.

*Phil*: The way the language was presented is a set amount (number of trees, regardless of size of the lot). The concern I have for a tree density per site is that are we talking about density for a full site or just a set area.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo*: Proportionality in relationship to the site size makes sense.

*Commissioner Houck*: In kind on-site is the optimal way... basically to duplicate the structure and get back the lost feature (grove of Douglas firs).

Site size is important. Two points (and relooking at the various list of points at the end) looks about right. Staff will take this direction from the PSC to script language to bring it back for confirmation.

*C9: Building or Site History Plaque*

This relates specifically to neighborhood and site context. The PSC Working Group felt that more requirements are needed to warrant a point for a "history" sign. There should be more specificity about the make-up of the plaque... material, permanently affixed, etc.

*Commissioner Schultz*: It is an easy point, but I am a proponent of it. Walla Walla is a good example, and it's nice to see the history, architecture, etc. I want them to be consistent in their look.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo*: This may look like an easy point, but it helps create a connection to history. I do think we need some boundaries and examples of what the plaques can/should look like.

*Commissioner Larsell*: If there were a standard design, I would think that makes sense. Perhaps then personalizing by neighborhood or something as well.

*Lora*: There is an example on Sandy Blvd with a map that connects it to history (metal fastened onto a concrete wall).

Keep this point and provide some language about material and substance.

*C10: Building Adjacent to Historic Landmarks*

Phil noted the original requirement didn't apply to residential uses. The Standards work group had some clarification to be included about height relationship to the adjacent landmark. In some cases, it might be necessary for the new building to borrow some features from the historic site. The last bullet about the setback being **at least** 10 feet from the property line adjacent to the site with the historic landmark.

Lora: The tweaks to C10 aren't huge, but they are still only about commercial buildings. But we want to include something for residential to create a new standard if the PSC agrees (C10A).

*Chair Spevak*: Is historic landmark always a building or can it be a district?

- Phil: Landmark is a building; a district can have landmarks within it.

*Commissioner Schultz*: Perhaps we need to clarify Historic Landmark Structure then for item 1.

- Lora: We could add the word "building" to clarify.

*Commissioner Routh*: What is the purpose of the 10-foot setback? In NYC, some of my favorite landmarks are abutted by big new buildings.

- Lora: This is related to the last bullet.
- *Chair Spevak*: You're required to do one of the items on the bulleted list.
- Phil: By stepping down to the landmark, it provides deference to the history. It doesn't over-impose on the landmark
- *Commissioner Schultz*: You just said step-down, which is different from a setback. I agree with *Commissioner Routh*. But this is important to our Portland Historic Landmarks Commission.

*C10A: Add the context above for building adjacent to residential historic landmarks.*

*new C13: Building Massing Adjacent to River*

This came out of discussion with the River Plan South Reach team. This came out of public discussions. Areas along Macadam doing residential development can use standards. The sense was in keeping to create standards that work with our future guidelines about context in the area – the river setback and the river trail. This is to create massing requirements and façade articulation as well as potential bonus for providing specific amenities. Potentially require at least one tenant space or residential lobby facing the river.

*Commissioner Houck* is in favor of these. The neighborhood is interested in them. Walking along a river trail is quite different than walking along the street.

*Commissioner Schultz*: There are some instances with PP&R versus private property and who's policing what.

Commissioners are supportive to include these items in the list of context standards.

The conversation was mostly about if there is a requirement for a free and open access from the river trail, or if it's ok to have a fence to delineate private/public property. We are looking at the idea to be sure connections are there but we could leave it up to the property owner about closing it off.

*Commissioner Routh:* This assuages my concerns about lack of access to a major trail – making the gate optional. I like the options for the developer and future residents.

#### *new C14: Open Areas in River Overlay*

This new standard provides contextual standards to help activate the area between the river setback / Willamette Greenway trail and new development. The goal of this standard is to create year-round outdoor spaces along the riverfront and major public trails that enhance the experience of patrons, workers and residents. It also indirectly benefits trail users by visually expanding the sense of open area adjacent to the trail/river setback and can provide eyes on the trail” to increase public safety. In addition to requiring the outdoor space, additional standards (1-4), are intended to help further define the relationship this space has with the riverfront/trail (i.e. is it open with a public connection and commercial space or is more private/secluded with additional landscaping and covered areas. This should apply to all new development, regardless of grade differences, and additions landward of the river setback.

The applicant could choose aspects of the outdoor area with the intent to extend the river setback through the use of the outdoor area.

PSC members are supportive of this.

Staff is now putting all the loose ends and amendments together. We are calibrating and looking to see if there are disparities between standards and points. This will inform the discussion at the 3x3. We will let PSC officers know if we find any major discrepancies. At the February 25 meeting, we will confirm the final list of amendments.

## **Expanding Opportunities for Affordable Housing**

Hearing: Eric Engstrom, Nan Stark

### **Presentation**

#### **Disclosures**

- *Chair Spevak:* I have been in conversations with one church in my neighborhood. There may be specific zone changes that I might need to bow out of.
- *Commissioner Bachrach:* I represent a church on the eastside that has a land use application pending. This won't have a direct bearing on them. I have talked with the City Attorney's office, but they have confirmed I don't need to recuse myself (though I will).

Nan provided an overview of the project including the zoning language and map amendments.

Eric noted that since the initial proposed draft, we revised some explanatory language on page 2 (how we modified the plan based on the previous draft). Better Housing by Design (BHD) will be in effect on March 1, so we want you to authorize us to convert the zoning proposals to the new equivalent from that project, which we'll build into your approval language. One of the sites was in a real estate



transaction to be purchased by a community organization, but that has stopped, so we are asking to remove that site (Hacienda on 74<sup>th</sup> and Killingsworth). There are 11 new map requests, most of which we agree with, that we can discuss after testimony today or on March 10.

*Commissioner Schultz:* There was a lot of testimony about making the provision for 100% of parking to be removed. can you address this and why staff suggested just 50%?

- Eric: Current code says 50% for a conditional use. The required parking got there through a conditional use review. So we are trying to modify those past agreements. The 100% will be discussed when we talk about PSC amendments, which we have some language about and can pass out when we get to that discussion. The code also requires compliance with past conditions of approval, which typically includes parking. We haven't proposed to rethink the conditional use process with this project, so if we were really doing that, we would reconsider the approval process for conditional uses overall. There is an issue with the parking in terms of how it relates to unraveling previous conditions.

## **Written Testimony**

### **Testimony**

1. Doug Klotz: Support the draft as an obvious step to take in removing regulatory barriers. I think organizations should be able to remove 100% of the parking spaces for affordable housing. *see written testimony.*
2. Keith Edwards, Bethel Economic Development Corporation: We do housing, a food program, as well as education. We are planning on building at NE Jarrett (802 and 814 NE Jarrett) to have 12 units of affordable housing on the property. I hope the amendments will go through to allow us to build 25% more as we've proposed.
3. Martin Elfert, Grace Memorial Episcopal Church: Our church has been home to the arts and service to the poor, a center of faith in the broadest sense of the word. We are hoping to partner with Grace Institute and others to build an arts center and affordable housing on our campus near the Lloyd Center. We envision this as a place for housing and belonging. Please rezone to CM3 to allow Grace to more fully serve our neighborhood. *see written testimony.*
4. Julia Metz, Catholic Charities: We are in support of the proposed draft. Some of our project partners have submitted written testimony in support. We have been discussing affordable housing opportunities in Ladd's Addition. The site is currently zoned R5, but that doesn't support the number of sites necessary to make the project financially feasible. We are seeking a rezone. *see written testimony.*
5. Leesha Posey: Property at 4515 N Mississippi Ave – support of Dianne Clay, the property owner, who I met through my work at BDS. Consider the request to change to Commercial or Multi-Dwelling to align with much of the rest of Mississippi Ave and provide more options to her. Her story is shared by many in this area.
6. Brian Terrett, Legacy Health: In support for affordable housing at Russell/Williams/Vancouver/Knott. from Campus Industrial to CM3. *see written testimony.*

7. Stuart Schmaltz, Mt Scott Church of God: We are facing declining attendance, and our building needs lots of maintenance. We want to do church differently from in the past and have done a visioning plan. We want to sell a portion of our property to a housing provider. We had an offer that someone wanting to do a senior facility with memory care. We are excited to move this forward, but we do have some challenges. We do ministry outside of our church walls, working with neighbors, and how we take care of community members.
8. Dana Krawczuk, Stoel Rives, Mt Scott Church of God: We are enthusiastically supportive of the Mt Scott Church of God project. We are asking from R10 to R7 to resolve some split zoning issues. We are also asking for a property line adjustment. *see written testimony.*
9. Jerry Jones, Mt Scott Church of God: Support of the project but want to reiterate that this will unlock development potential and streamline the process.
10. CT Wells, Market Place Community, Emanuel Church: Cochrane Health and Wholeness Center, mostly for children and wealth recovery. Since 1988 we've had a number of projects and programs. We have the adjacent property and across the street that housed the former church. We envision developing on these two parcels that speak to working with children, health recovery, and wealth creation. We are going to need some zone considerations to allow us to develop these properties. Churches are facing major problems, and we need to speak to the needs in our communities. *see written testimony.*
11. Charles Kelly, ZGF: We support the great work and have been helping Emanuel Church the past few years. There are some limitations on the site – they need non-profit and for-profit health services to work for community needs regionally. R2.5 now and we need to go to a CM zone. Current zone has a height limit that restricts the amount of housing we can build, so we are asking a consideration for a CM3 for the height... or CM2 for use.
12. Dianne Clay: Request zoning change at 4515 N Mississippi Ave (see Leesha Posey testimony above) to create intergenerational wealth and offer affordable housing. Residential to multi-family zone change. *see written testimony.*
13. Leon Porter: Concern about being able to remove only 4% of parking, which will restrict replacing parking lots with housing. At least 50%, if not 100%, should be able to be removed by right. Also set up rules to allow for homeless navigation centers and transitional centers as well as housing. *Also see written testimony for Portland Neighbors Welcome.*
14. Andy Goebel, Portsmouth Union Church: We have been working on building 20 units of affordable housing on our property. We host a nightly overnight shelter in our sanctuary for up to 50 people experiencing houselessness. We have an empty lot that is ready for housing units since we tore down a third of our building in 2018. We haven't built because of the burden of the land use process. Make these code changes possible for us and others to do our work.
15. Medina Glenn: Support these code and zoning changes.
16. Elvia Janelly Carranza Valladares: We want to build housing on the land of faith communities. I can't afford to live here in Portland and will be moving to Woodburn because of this. I am one of many affected by housing injustices in Portland. I support the code and zoning changes to

remove barriers for faith communities to build affordable housing on their land.

17. Charles Kunert, Trinity Lutheran: 5520 NE Killingsworth, one of the 3 churches that received the Metro grant. Support the project, particularly about making the conditional use permit process easier. The PLA is also a big advantage to us in our particular project. *see written testimony.*
18. David Groff, Interfaith Alliance on Poverty: 14 congregations of various faiths. All member congregations are acutely aware of the crisis and have people seeking shelter on our property daily. No one should have to live unsheltered, and that is what motivates us. Many congregations have land that could be used for affordable housing, we strongly urge the PSC members to accept the proposed changes. The City should facilitate and not impede our efforts.
19. Anthony Bloker, St Johns Wesleyan Church: Support the zoning code changes because of the moral implications and my personal story.
20. Rev Lynne Smouse Lopez, Leaven Housing Coalition: Support the code changes as proposed by BPS. Our community is looking ahead at how we can help the housing crisis. I also need you to support this on a personal issue.
21. Jazmin Velez, Leaven Land & Housing Coalition: Shared her story and stories of other families who are going through the same situation with in-affordable housing. Congregations want to build affordable housing, and I support the code change that BPS is proposing.
22. Marja Selmann, First Immanuel Lutheran: 19<sup>th</sup> and Irving. Have looked at building affordable housing for a number of years now. House the Rose Haven Women's Shelter. We want to build proper housing but know there are many hurdles to doing so. Some our financial, and some are bureaucratic. The worst is when those hurdles converge. Removing some barriers through the conditional use process will be very helpful to getting our projects done.
23. Maria McDowell, St Philip the Deacon: 120 NE Knott St. We are an aging parish, originally founded by African Americans that have now dispersed. We now see people wanting to come back to the community and the neighborhood they grew up in and have the support they remembered as children in the neighborhood. Money and the review process are burdensome to complete our housing projects. Support the proposed changes.
24. Jaison Kirk, St Johns Wesleyan: Founding member of Hazelnut Grove. Almost 5 years later from the original housing crisis was affirmed, we still see so many projects that haven't been built. I urge that you change the conditional use zoning to allow housing on faith and community organizations' land.
25. John Calhoun, St Andreas Presbyterian Church: SW Sunset and Dauch Rd. Dozens of Presbyterian churches are trying to ease housing issues. We are interested in converted part of our parking lot for housing. We are disappointed that the current conversion of parking is too limiting for us to convert the parking lot as we want to. If the City is serious about adding housing, it needs to be more flexible on the ability of converting parking lots to housing.

26. Michelle DePass: In favor of the project. Ava Gordly's house at 4511 N Williams is the property I'm most interested in supporting.
27. Trell Anderson, Northwest Housing Alternatives: Affordable housing development. 75-100 units with Grace Memorial Church at 1535 NE 17<sup>th</sup> Ave for CM3 for consideration of elimination of 'd' overlay. Supportive of Leaven Housing Coalition and the initiative. *see written testimony.*
28. Tonino Pacifico, Habitat for Humanity: 2401 Taylors Ferry Road change R7 to R5 to allow more housing. 2.3 acres of land between the two sizes. We hope to build 15-20 new homes on the property. *see written testimony.*
29. Hope Keller: St Phillips Episcopal and Leaven Housing Coalition. I live near The Grotto, and there are lots of houseless people living around there. I know we have to do something to help so people have somewhere to live. We have too many restrictions about what we can do. We have to do more.
30. Byron Davis, Williams & Russell Project Working Group: Brian Terrett from Legacy Health noted our piece of land that is being transferred in support of the project we're building. The key component of that work is affordable housing to address the displacement of people and the rising costs of living in this neighborhood. Campus Institutional to CM3 is our rezone request. This is partially a symbolic move and partially allows us to do more affordable housing on this lot. It shows that we're serious about making this project a reality in transferring the land from Legacy to this project. *see written testimony.*
31. Joy Alise Davis, PAALF: Support the proposed draft, particularly a change for 4511 N Williams Ave from R1A to CM3d. The families hope to develop the property for affordable housing and to be a community center. This is an opportunity to use power and privilege to do the right thing. Put our well-intended plans to the test.
32. Holden Leung, Portland Chinese Christian & Missionary Alliance: Request zone change from CG to CM2 at our Lents church. We have properties at 7435 SE Foster, 7407-7415 SE Foster, other addresses. We see our opportunity to help create space for language groups, daycare, and possibly affordable housing to support Asian families in our area. CM2 will allow us up to 55 feet with the affordable housing bonus. *see written testimony.*
33. Sean Green: Encouraged that the project will help the Comp Plan by removing zoning barriers. More affordable housing can be created if parking lots can be fully utilized.

*Chair Spevak* closed testimony at 4:22 p.m.

Eric noted the zone change requests that we received and looked through in testimony that staff can highlight today.

We've heard from people about the parking issue. Property line issue. Request from BDS for a small collection of potential code amendments and changes.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo*: What about the request from R2.5 to CM2 with CM3 provisions for height? That is a big jump, but I am curious what this looks like.

*Commissioner Schultz:* I would like to understand if there is a process for reducing hurdles for community organizations moving forward to go to BDS later if they miss this opportunity.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* As we work through these questions, I want to err on the side to accommodating everything and everyone we've heard from today.

With the 11 sites we heard testimony on, we looked at them for infrastructure or red flags (slide 15). Generally we did not find anything that would tell us they can't be rezoned. Some have substandard streets or 'e' overlays, but that can be worked on. Map changes (slide 14) were a bit different and somewhat outside of the scope (individual property owners). That was our only catch in terms of our original criteria.

For the Emmanuel Temple side (the R2.5 to CM2/CM3 request), we suggest going to CM2 since we can't do a combined zone designation.

On the Grace Memorial site, the request to remove the 'd' overlay is unlikely as that is standard with this zone.

The individual residence at 4505 and 4515 N Mississippi is currently a generational wealth-building opportunity for the family. It is mission-based, but it's not quite a community-based organization. She has been working with Prosper Portland.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* Could they have a letter of support from Prosper Portland to somehow get them into this package?

- Nan: In my role as NE district liaison, which this property is in my district, this change is in the scope of my work. They could get a letter from MESO, a community-based organization that she is working with, that supports small businesses as they grow.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* The one item you're not supporting is not removing the 'd' overlay. Why?

- Eric: The Comp Plan description says that CM3 is always accompanied by a 'd'. DOZA is changing the criteria.

*Commissioner Smith:* Requests for uses other than pure housing. do they fit within the zone changes we're looking at?

- Nan: Some are going to mixed-use zoning. There is the possibility that when there is a new development being proposed that they add on programs as well.

Eric: We have another project this summer looking at additional uses coming to the PSC. So this project doesn't necessarily solve all those problems, but we are looking more holistically with that other project.

The written record will be open until 5 p.m. on Friday, February 14, 2020.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Spevak* adjourned the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken