

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

March 9, 2021

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**PSC Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach, Ben Bortolazzo, Jessica Gittemeier, Katie Larsell, Oriana Magnera (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Steph Routh, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak [1 open position]

**PSC Commissioners Absent:** Mike Houck

**City Staff Presenting:** Andrea Durbin, Donnie Oliveira, Joe Zehnder, Sandra Wood, Morgan Tracy, Brandon Spencer-Hartle

**Guest Presenters:** Maya Foty; Kristen Minor

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

*Chair Spevak* called the meeting to order at 12:31 p.m.

*Chair Spevak:* In keeping with the Oregon Public Meetings law, Statutory land use hearing requirements, and Title 33 of the Portland City Code, the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission is holding this meeting virtually.

- All members of the PSC are attending remotely, and the City has made several avenues available for the public to watch the broadcast of this meeting.
- The PSC is taking these steps as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need to limit in-person contact and promote social distancing. The pandemic is an emergency that threatens the public health, safety and welfare which requires us to meet remotely by electronic communications.
- Thank you all for your patience, humor, flexibility and understanding as we manage through this difficult situation to do the City's business.

### Director's Report

Andrea Durbin

- Council will appoint the Mayor's recommended candidates to the PSC tomorrow. Valeria McWilliams will join us starting immediately; Johnell Bell, Gabe Sheoships, and Erica Thompson will join as of June 1 when PSC terms are up for commissioners Houck, Schultz, and Smith.
- Council will adopt EOA-B tomorrow morning. This is the second part of how we pave the way for affordable housing for faith- and community-based organizations.

## Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the February 23, 2021 PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Bachrach* moved the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Routh* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Larsell, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

## BPS Requested Budget

Briefing: Andrea Durbin, Donnie Oliveira

### Presentation

The budget work sessions with Council started today. Final adoption will be in June.

Donnie provided an overview of the requested budget and next steps. It's difficult to have a conversation about budget cuts without talking about impacts to projects and programs – we are trying to align this so we can pinpoint exactly what will be eliminated or cut.

### *Revenue Review*

PCEF has a significant impact on the BPS budget structure, but it doesn't tell the story of BPS' revenue without PCEF part of the pie (slide 3 vs slide 4). From 2 years ago, each revenue stream has been slowly decreasing in all programs. This is the first time we've seen a reduction in the Solid Waste Management Fund (SWMF).

General Fun (\$9.8M) includes overhead (rent, etc). The majority of the grants are with Metro for working with SWMF.

*Commissioner Bachrach*: What is the bureau's contingency fund? Can restricted funding sources fund staff?

- Donnie: PCEF has a contingency – when the revenue tax is collected, it sits into the fund until the Revenue Division at the City confirms. In the budget process, we ask for authorization to use that money. PCEF and SWMF are funds BPS manages, so we have a contingency. SWMF has a reserve (\$500,000-\$1M). General Fund reserve is at a Citywide level. Funds are restricted (and less) so as shown on slide 6. PCEF has a 5% administrative cap (up to 5% can be used to fund staff). Grants and general fund have more restrictions on use for funding staff. SWMF commercial can only be for staff for waste-related work.

*Commissioner Smith*: Assuming the stimulus bill gets signed this week, do we have any idea how that would affect the City's General Fund?

- Donnie: The team that's been pulled together (bureau directors) is working. We'll know more soon but nothing at this point.

### *Mayor and CBO Budget Guidance*

- 5% General Fund reduction for all bureaus with 30+ employees
- Merit and COLA freeze

- Reduction Criteria for all Funds
  - Not serving those most in need
  - Little evidence of effectiveness
  - Not required by City Charter or Code
  - Duplicative of services provided by other bureaus or governments

*BPS Revenue Shortfall*

Slides 8-9 show the impacts of the budget shortfall

The total reduction for the bureau was \$1.5M (excluding PCEF). Our base funding for on-going, non-PCEF programs, continues to decline, and this is the biggest decrease in a year we've seen. We continue to see this decrease in funding, which has been for 10+ years. Long-range planning has historically been funded by one-time GF or IAs with other bureaus. This year is at 8 positions potentially being cut. This heavily impacts our work, particularly what comes before the PSC and Council in terms of code work.

*Commissioner Schultz:* Is there a feel for other cities our size and how many planning staff they have?

- Donnie: It's difficult because in Portland we have BPS and BDS. So land-use fees that other cities can use for long-range planning isn't available for BPS. If we were one bureau, we could negotiate that internally.

*Commissioner Routh:* I have a frustration with the percentage of funding provided by grants for staff. This is a troubling trend when we talk about meaningful community involvement.

*Decision Packages*

Two add-back requests: one for planning (2 planners) and one for EMS resources for climate. The City Budget Office is recommending these.

We also requested 1-time funding for the Smart City PXD program, which isn't recommended.

These speak to Council's stated priorities.

*Commissioner Magnera:* What is happening with the racial justice planner position?

- Donnie: This position is at the final stages of being recruited.

*Chair Spevak:* Is there opportunity to negotiate with Metro on the restrictiveness of their funds?

- Sustainable consumption work may influence this. Metro will have a significant rate increase, so that will be on the table next fiscal year.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* Is there input that we as a PSC should have? Should we have more of an active role as a Commission? We can talk about this in the future.

- *Commissioner Larsell:* The BAC itself should have a bigger role and start earlier. We need to have a full picture about if the cuts have significant impact on BPS' work and make Council see the decreased outcomes with the less amount of funding.

Donnie: After the budget is adopted in July, we can bring the budget and workplans back to the PSC.

## Residential Infill Project 2

Briefing: Sandra Wood, Morgan Tracy

### Presentation

Morgan reminded the PSC of the full RIP timeline and the passage of HB 2001.

It should also be noted that while RIP doesn't go into effect until August, the City is actively working to prepare for its implementation:

- BDS is developing a training series and materials designed to help applicants and developers
- BPS with help from the housing bureau and BDS and other community partners are working on Awareness Outreach to homeowners so that they understand how the changes affect their property and its potential value.

The goals of RIP2 are to increase the diversity of housing and community in Portland's low-density neighborhoods and increase access to ownership for first-time homebuyers. This focuses on the lower-end of the middle housing scale (duplexes and triplexes).

Single-dwelling zones account for almost ¾ of the available land for housing.

HB 2001 was passed in 2019. Administrative Rules were adopted last year, relating to middle housing guidelines for cities. Most cities in Oregon are addressing the minimum compliance requirements for middle housing, looking specifically at the 5 housing types noted on slide 6.

Portland as part of RIP 1 went a couple steps further with additional ADU allowances and the affordable 6-plex bonus. So for the higher density single dwelling zones, there are still a couple more housing types left that will need standards to be developed. For the low density R10 and R20 zones, all of these housing types will need to be evaluated, including the allowances for ADUs and the affordable 6-plex bonus.

As a reminder, Council adopted RIP 1 with 123,000 lots out of 132,000 that could qualify for triplexes and fourplexes and other middle housing types.

The 'z' overlay (or constrained sites overlay) is used to restrict middle housing types to 2 units (duplex or house with ADU). One of the factors that lead to a site being designated with the 'z' overlay is the presence of Goal 5 natural resources. One reason the City chose to use the NRI as the basis for the 'z' overlay instead of the e-zones themselves was the pending e-zone correction project. Staff didn't want to end up allowing higher middle housing types and then rolling back those allowances. This would create confusion. So instead, we opted to use a more conservative approach.

However, the state rules say that cities may not restrict middle housing in these resource areas unless they are both identified (like they are in the NRI) **and** protected (like they are by our e-zone regs). So we will need to revisit these areas with this project.

Cottage Clusters are allowed in Portland, but we require a Planned Development review, where many of the standards that apply are not codified. Townhouses are dwelling units with common walls, but each unit sits on its own lot. These provide for more simple ownership options than rentals or condos in a triplex or fourplex.

Unlike the higher density single-dwelling zones, most lots in the R10 R20 areas are constrained. Only 25% of the 16,000 lots would be eligible for middle housing. The infrastructure condition of the remaining 4,000 may present additional challenges. Slide 16 notes the sub-areas of study for these larger lot configurations (6 sub-areas).

The cost of providing infrastructure to serve development is borne by the developer and passed on to the owner or renter. But it is inefficient to incrementally upsize services with each development. And, there are legal limits to what agencies can require development to pay for. So when more development occurs in an area, agencies invest in projects to improve the overall infrastructure condition.

Slide 19 shows the housing opportunity map. Nearly the entire city is at 2 or higher. But the low-density zones are notably along the city periphery and consequently are not situated near as many services or amenities.

Slide 22 highlights the demographics and income information from the 6 study areas in the R10/R20 zones. There is a large discrepancy between west and east median home sale prices in R10/R20

For RIP2, the questions were:

Do we narrow the focus and duplicate the allowances from RIP to these neighborhoods and focus resources instead on other projects?

OR

Do we use this project to explore more/other ways to lower barriers to these exclusive, infrastructure deficient, underserved neighborhoods?

We'll explore different approaches for middle-housing (slide 25)... allowing, encouraging, or incentivizing.

Slide 26 highlights the timeline for RIP2 based on the HB 2001 requirements.

*Chair Spevak:* We asked staff to give this briefing today, not for suggestions on the code, but more if there is general direction and for the PSC to understand. This is big picture at this point.

*Commissioner Larsell:* I am interested in what is possible to come in East Portland from RIP. Morgan has been encouraging about things not moving as quickly than I was thinking they might, but I'm still poking at that a bit. Has the displacement study been redone since the original one?

- Morgan: Data we have in the displacement risk analysis was a 5-year average based on 2015 data. It's a little counter-intuitive particularly thinking about last year and what we think would have happened with interest rates, etc. We are tracking what's happening in Minneapolis, since they adopted a RIP-like package about a year before Portland. They are seeing some, but not a lot of middle housing development. It will take a bit of time for middle-housing to pick up being developed, even though we've addressed the zoning code issues. We want to be sure people are aware of their rights with new housing types, so some of that is included in our outreach with RIP1.
- Sandra: You are right at the economics have changed. We are working with BDS to be sure their services and website they provide to developers and homeowners is updated. We are also working with PHB and their homeownership program to work on a strategy to get the information out to community members.

*Chair Spevak:* I hope we can rename the zones from “single family” in this project – it is a misnomer. For SDCs, do we know how they will assess these fees? It’s an FAR-based formula, but for R10 or R20 lots, you could have really big townhomes since the lots are really big.

- Morgan: There is lots of variability in R10/R20 lot sizes, so the caution on FAR is relevant. PBOT is working on their fee structures for ADUs and waivers.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* Let’s rename the zones – it’s very logical to do. In terms of the R10/R20 focus, we deliberately excluded these last time. There is little “bang for the buck” for most of these sites, so it’s difficult for me that we have to spend time on this. Every bit of energy staff is spending on this is wasted instead of focusing on making RIP1 work.

- Morgan: There are some areas of the city that we question why they are such low-density zones. Other areas we wonder why they’re even in the city limits. The rezoning lift is too much for this timeline, but we can make a recommendation for later.

## **Historic Resources Code Project**

Work Session: Sandra Wood, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Shannon Buono; Maya Foty; Kristen Minor

### Work Sheet

Brandon reminded the PSC of the process and timeline for each discussion point in the

### **Disclosures**

Kristen Minor, HLC Chair: I reside in Irvington. I have put a number of historic properties and places in Portland on the National Register as part of my consulting work.

Maya Foty is the Vice Chair of the HLC. She is joining us specifically about the discussion about windows.

### **Proposal 3.A**

3. Concerns with the language that would allow proposals subject to Demolition Review, to be approved through Historic Resource Review if they meet certain exemptions which encompass everything other than total demolition but could alter a historic resource so substantially that it could lose its integrity and/or significance. (Bortolazzo)

*BPS staff support amending the demolition review threshold in 33.445.100.E.1.c and corresponding sections to read “...removal of more than 50 percent...”*

PSC members confirm staff’s direction on this – we will bring forward an amendment on this for voting.

8. Section 33.846.080.D 2 should be amended to provide: Demolition of the resource has been evaluated ... and, on balance, demolition has been found equally supportive of the goals and policies as would preservation, rehabilitation or reuse of the resource. (Bachrach)

9. For Demolition Review in National Register Districts, there should be more detailed examples to help HLC decide when other Comprehensive Plan goals, such as more housing at higher densities close-in, are more important than preserving a specific resource. (Bortolazzo)

*BPS staff support refining demolition review criterion D.2 to 1) use balancing language that's more consistent with language found in the Comprehensive Plan and 2) restore a non-exhaustive list of factors that may be considered by the decision-maker in evaluating the proposals under this criterion.*

PSC members confirm staff's direction on this.

### **Proposal 3.B**

4. Expand **window replacement** exemption option to include all residential buildings, when being replaced with efficient (or better?) windows, possibly exterior color-matched? Might be OK requiring historic review for street-facing above-grade windows on specific Landmark structures. (Spevak)

The 3x3 group had a lengthy discussion about window replacement, but they didn't come to a concrete conclusion.

*BPS staff are receptive to expanding the proposed window exemption for proposals located in single-dwelling zones in Historic and Conservation Districts. In such single-dwelling zoned districts, staff offer the following two alternatives for PSC consideration:*

- 1. Replacement of windows on rear-facing facades of contributing buildings with wood, metal-clad wood, or fiberglass windows; Replacement of windows on noncontributing buildings built ten or more years ago with wood, metal-clad wood, or fiberglass windows. (BPS staff preference)*
- 2. Replacement of windows on rear-facing facades with any window type; Replacement of windows on noncontributing buildings with any window type.*

*Chair Spevak:* I like the ideas staff has suggested. I want it to be fairly easy to do a window replacement for energy efficiency, particularly if it isn't street-facing. I like the idea of making this a Type 1 review in general. I'm leaning to option #1 above.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* The genesis of the concern was from testimony and people trying to do some remodeling that became costly and with hassles. I like the ease of #2.

*Maya:* The vinyl has to do with longevity and quality – when we can't replace in-kind, high-quality materials is the language we use. The window industry is evolving quickly. I understand that none of this applies to contributing buildings. Properly rehabilitated windows can be as efficient as new windows. You can get a comparable window for less money. There is so much good about having a conversation instead of just allowing this. It is incorrect to say that just replacing windows is the right thing to do.

*Kristen:* We are talking about the efficiency and ensuring people have a path to gaining efficiency. HLC notes this is critical. There is a path to do this while keeping the old windows. Windows also are a design feature. A Type 1 review is what we'd prefer – and added exemption is ok, but we still want a review. We want to discuss, assess,

*Brandon:* When something is exempt from review (Option 2), any proposal would not come before the HLC for review. Type 1 is intended for a smaller magnitude change and is a staff-level review without being able to be appealed. The fee structure is less.

*Commissioner Schultz* prefers Option 2.

*Commissioner Magnera:* Is the wood versus vinyl cost an issue?

- Brandon: More options are available in Option 2. The short-term and long-term cost-benefits are potentially a question. This is one where we have evidence without a concrete answer.
- Maya: Vinyl will be cheaper, but it definitely won't last as long and will go into a landfill much quicker. Manufacturing, carbon footprint should be looked at. Wood is a renewable resource, and that's important. Fiberglass is not cheap, but you can get a bit closer to historic profiles with it.
- *Chair Spevak:* Having bought vinyl, fiberglass and wood windows, there's definitely a cost increment as you move up this range. Some wood windows are surprisingly inexpensive (although that may rely on using standard sizes that wouldn't work in a retrofit situation). For small residential window replacement projects, permitting and review costs could easily be a bigger price burden issue than the differential cost between window types.

Brandon: When we looked at other typical changes, we looked at Type 1 as an opportunity to lower the barrier while being commensurate with the resource.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* I'm less concerned about the limitations and types of window. What is a big issue to me is the question about non-contributing being regulated as a historic structure. If we go with Option 1, I hope we will exempt a non-contributing house.

Sandra: On the cost of the window itself versus the cost of a review, a Type 2 review (house, duplex) is \$1392. A Type 1 tier A or B is \$315.

Maya: The cheapest is a storm on the inside – a review wouldn't be necessary. A window has many components, so there are a variety of options.

Kristen: There are quite a few people in historic districts who see reviews as a benefit. There are incentives, and it's nice to know there is a path to becoming a contributing structure.

*Chair Spevak:* It is a benefit and sometimes an imposition – we heard both sides in testimony.

Option 1 (7 commissioners)

Option 2 (2 commissioners)

For Option 1, are there additional things staff should explore?

*Commissioner Bachrach:* Should we exempt non-contributing houses? I would pull out the whole second sentence.

*Chair Spevak* thinks Type 1 is more valuable, so I'm inclined to Option 1 as proposed.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* I can see in part the argument for *Commissioner Bachrach's* suggestion. I'm interested in what Maya has to say about that.

- Maya: Why did the person move into the historic district? Integrity, fabric. People move to these areas for a reason. What's the point of having historic districts otherwise?
- *Chair Spevak:* I am worried historic districts get an elevated status – that speaks to me as an argument to have them treated more like the rest of the city.



Kristen: Historic districts are one form of keeping the feel of the neighborhood. That doesn't mean they are going to be a museum – they should not be that. But you should be able to understand who lived in a place, what they brought to the table, what they struggled with as part of a story we can learn from today.

*Commissioner Magnera: I'm starting to worry about the cost in the Type 2 approach.*

*Commissioner Schultz: If we aren't going to honor the difference for what it is, what does a non-contributing resource mean in a historic district? There has to be a reason a house is in the district versus another house. I would support a Type 1 review instead of Type 2.*

Brandon offered an explanation of non-contributing buildings within historic districts. Thinking aspirationally here, we want to think about protection and the right level.

Kristen gave the Ladd's Addition example.

In residential zones, there are about 20% non-contributing and 80% contributing in our historic districts.

Straw poll for Option 1 with no review for non-contributing buildings: 7 commissioners support. Staff will write this up as an amendment.

Type 1 versus Type 2 (can be appealed and can go to HLC for review) review: *Chair Spevak* notes he wants it to be inexpensive and trust the staff review for a Type 1 (less expensive, shorter, no appeal) that isn't included in Option 1.

- Brandon: We should have this discussion with BDS staff if this is of interest to PSC members. Staff will check in and bring back language on April 27.

#### **Proposal 4.B**

1. Recommend language be adjusted in the introduction to this section which notes "Historic resource review may be required for development taking advantage of an incentive" to clarify that this intended to mean that review would be required if triggered by another area of the Historic Resources Code, and not inherently by taking advantage of the incentives. (Bortolazzo)

*BPS staff support removing the sentence "Historic resource review may be required for development taking advantage of an incentive" as it is redundant with the other regulations of the chapter.*

*Commissioner Bortolazzo supports this amendment from staff.*

2. States "adaptive reuse in districts that were historically hostile towards Black, Indigenous, and Portlanders of Color provides a unique opportunity for healing by increasing residential and commercial opportunities..." We should be providing incentives to preserve and adapt existing historic structures across the board. (Bortolazzo)

*BPS staff are receptive to amending the staff report language but are hesitant to remove reference to such historical inequities.*

Kristen: I would like to counter the myth that racism only occurred in these few districts. It behooves us to remember there were real harms done to other communities, and we need to look at those communities and bolster them, not necessarily just point at other wealthy white districts.

*Commissioner Magnera:* I don't think that's what happening here – we are acknowledging redlining processes as a piece. We need to be conscious of that.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo* confirmed staff's suggestion.

3. Recommend one minor adjustment to C.1 to include CR zones, which occasionally limits unit density under certain circumstances. (Smith)

*BPS staff support adding the CR zone to the list of zones where the residential infill incentive is allowed.*

The CR zone is minimal in the city. Staff is comfortable adding this zone to the list of where the incentives can apply.

*Chair Spevak:* I am a huge fan of the CR zone.

PSC members confirmed this addition.

4. Please explain rationale for proposed max FAR in C.1.b. (Bortolazzo)

*Commissioner Bortolazzo* confirms this proposal with the further clarification.

5. 33.445.400.C.1. I think you can strike “are allowed on sites zoned R7, R5 ... at least one contributing resource.”, since this redundant with 33.445.400B1,2,3 from the prior page. (Spevak)

*Staff are receptive to refining this section of code, but support retaining the zone designations in the language of the incentive.*

This works for *Chair Spevak*.

6. Consider striking “In residential zones, if there was a ... or the historic resource is a Historic or Conservation Landmark.” The last part is covered by 33.445.400.B. And given the low likelihood of this being used, I'm not sure there's a need to limit it to places close to transit or buildings with prior nonresidential use. (Spevak)

*To provide consistency with other policy approaches and clarity for property owners, BPS staff support retaining the qualifying language as proposed (with an exception of a supported change in the scope of the incentive as described in issue #7.*

7. In discussing the "Retail Sales and Service and Office" incentive with staff, it sounds like there is a potentially problematic case with multifamily residential resources. I'd appreciate some thoughts from staff on this. (Smith)

*BPS staff support revisions to incentive C.6 and to the historic preservation incentive review approval criteria to limit the potential loss of housing located in Historic or Conservation Landmarks that today contain multi-dwelling housing.*

*Commissioner Smith* noted this came from a verbal discussion. I think we discussed CR. In this case, my initial concern was that we were going to allow commercial uses in residential where we otherwise wouldn't have them. I'm less concerned about that now than I am about unintended consequences.

Kristen also supports this.

### **Proposal 5.A**

1. Add maps to Chapter 33.445, Historic Overlay Zone. Add maps to the end of the chapter showing each of the Historic, Conservation and National Register Districts. If possible, show the Contributing Resources within the districts, or if that's not possible to include on the maps, then provide a link to where those designations can be found. Add a list or map of all Landmarks, or at least include a link to where that information can be found. (Bachrach)

*BPS staff do not support adding maps to the overlay zone or including links in the code text until such a time that a holistic approach to hyperlinks in the code is advanced. BPS staff support refining and expanding the public information available online and suggest PSC consider that opportunity at the March 23 future work discussion.*

*Commissioner Bachrach:* The ZC has an overlay section that lists overlay zones in the city. Almost all of them have maps at the end. What about conservation and historic districts?

Shannon: The different overlay zones have different kinds of maps. To have that level of detail, you'd have to have too many maps. The overlay maps are not what people should be looking at for zoning, and they wouldn't provide additional information from the zoning map itself. They wouldn't be comprehensive.

*Commissioner Smith:* Portland Maps notes this, correct? Yes.

*Commissioner Schultz:* I understand the ease of use factor. The point is that we want to make the information readily, easily available. I think there are options to do this.

*Commissioner Bachrach* is ok removing this amendment, but would like staff to discuss how we can make finding the district boundaries a little easier if there is time and resources.

2. Add Contributing Resource to the list of Types of Historic Resources in 33.445.040. Since the types of Historic Resources are well-described in 33.445.040, is there a reason it's necessary to include slightly different descriptions of those resources in the 33.910? (Bachrach)

*For consistency and ease of readability, BPS staff support consolidating the two sections into the definitions chapter, 33.910.*

PSC concurs this information should be in one location. At a minimum it has to be in 33.910. Staff will look to consolidate this.

3. Section 33.445.100.E.2.c. Reclassify Historic Landmark Trees as “Heritage Trees” so we don’t perpetuate 2 names for the same thing. (Spevak)

*BPS staff support retaining the Proposed Draft approach to avoid a designation removal process for these four trees, while ensuring the more appropriate protections (Title 11) are what apply to the trees going forward.*

*Chair Spevak* is fine with staff’s recommendation.

4. There is a reference to Portland Development Commission in the code. I don't know if we have a general posture on updating this to Prosper Portland in our code? (Smith)

*BPS staff support retaining the language as proposed.*  
*Commissioner Smith* confirmed staff’s explanation.

5. Technical amendments requested by BDS. (Routh)

*BPS staff supports providing the PSC with a slate of supported BDS-requested technical amendments.*

6. Remaining technical amendments. (BPS staff)

*BPS staff supports providing PSC with a slate of additional minor amendments supported by staff.*

PSC members confirmed both items 5 and 6.

### **Proposal 5.B**

1. Consider PHLC to include some members who are not necessarily ‘proponents’ of preservation, who are familiar with broader zoning and regulatory environment and the possible downsides of historic preservation. (Bortolazzo)

*BPS staff support retaining the Proposed Draft approach to membership on the Historic Landmarks Commission, allowing for a variety of personal and professional expertise to qualify for membership.*

*Commissioner Bortolazzo* elaborated on his comment. We are now keeping the membership language broader, and I’m considering withdrawing this. This allows enough variety for a healthier debate within the HLC.

Kristen: As a commission that deals with a broad range of decision making, we need expertise across lots of fields. And having an interest in historic preservation doesn’t mean we don’t take other factors into account.

*Chair Spevak* noted he likes keeping the Proposed Draft approach to membership. PSC members confirmed.

2. Landmark Commission should make recommendations to the Design Commission. Amend 33.720.030.B to require that the Landmarks Commission make recommendations to the Design

Commission on proposed design guidelines before they are submitted to the City Council for adoption.  
(Bachrach)

*BPS staff do not support requiring the Design Commission hold an additional public hearing and make an additional recommendation to City Council when Historic and Conservation District design guidelines are proposed.*

*Commissioner Bachrach* confirmed he is fine with dropping this proposal.

On March 23, we will have a discussion about what the ideal work program might look like for the Historic Resources Program... and what future work may entail. This will inform the PSC's letter to Council for this project. Please come prepared with your ideas for future work at that session.

We have one outstanding issue (review of height and FAR in historic districts) that the 3x3 will be discussing next week. We hope to have a full slate of amendments to consider at the late April meeting.

### **Adjourn**

*Commissioner Spevak* adjourned the meeting at 3:48 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken