

HRCP Issues Table for March 23 Work Session

*Note that some issue numbers have been revised from previous memos

PSC Issue	Code Citation(s)	Staff Response
Proposal 3.c. Refine historic resource review approval criteria (Cont. from Feb 9 Work Session)		
<p>1. Consider mimicking 33.825.035 for historic reviews to establish height and FAR as entitlements. (Spevak)</p> <p>2. For new development in districts (not modification to existing designated resources) I would appreciate if we could discuss a posture similar to what we arrived at in DOZA, i.e., height and FAR entitlements are by right but building massing and design features could be adjusted by the HLC. (Smith)</p> <p>3. Include clear, objective standards in terms of maximum height and FAR for affordable housing developments in historic districts. (Bortolazzo)</p>		<p>*An initial staff response to these issues can be found in the February 9 issues handout.</p> <p>These three interrelated issues were discussed by the 3x3 work group on March 16. The 3x3 reviewed zoning maps for each of the city’s Historic Districts. In addition to the maps, staff provided examples of recently approved new construction projects in the various districts, comparing the approved new buildings to the zoning allowances for the sites. Finally, staff provided summaries of the geographies where height and FAR allowances were recently refined in the Central City 2035 and Better Housing by Design projects.</p> <p>Citywide, staff identified a total of 12 blocks (all within the Central City Plan District) where Historic District height limits are demonstrably taller than the heights of nearby contributing buildings. Many of these blocks were extensively considered by the City Council in summer 2020 as part of adoption of the Central City 2035 Plan. Conversely, staff identified much larger geographic areas (all outside of the Central City Plan District) where existing Historic District height limits are set at or below the heights of nearby contributing buildings. The height limits in these larger geographic areas have not been refined since the areas were designated as Historic Districts.</p> <p>Staff recommend against a code amendment(s) to resolve these issues, but support addressing specific geographies of concern and opportunity through future mapping projects (see issue #4 below).</p>
Proposal 4.c. Streamline requirements and applicability for FAR transfer (Cont. from Feb. 9 Work Session)		
<p>1. FAR transfer for noncontributing resources in districts. (Routh)</p>		<p>*An initial staff response to these issues can be found in the February 9 issues handout.</p> <p>This issue was discussed by the 3x3 work group on March 16. The 3x3 explored options to allow noncontributing buildings—especially new construction—in Historic Districts to transfer unused Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to receiving sites similar to what is allowed for Landmarks and contributing buildings in Historic Districts. Following the 3x3 discussion, staff reviewed the FAR bonus and transfer provisions of the Central City Plan District that were adopted in summer 2020 to inform the full PSC’s reconsideration of this issue.</p> <p>The Central City Plan District FAR bonus and transfer options prioritize the use of certain bonus and transfer options over others. The intent of this prioritization is to encourage the use of bonuses and transfers that provide the greatest community benefit, such as affordable housing or the preservation and seismic upgrade of historic resources (landmarks and contributing resources). The prioritization requires that the first 3 to 1 of any increase in FAR on a site be obtained through one of the affordable housing bonuses, the historic resource transfer, or the riverfront open space bonus. After the first 3 to 1, additional FAR can be</p>

		<p>obtained through any bonus or transfer including transferring FAR within one of five Central City sectors (including from noncontributing resources in Historic Districts).</p> <p>The prioritization structure becomes less effective if additional bonus and transfers are added to the list. Specifically, if the list of options for obtaining the first 3 to 1 additional FAR gets longer by adding additional (and potentially less expensive) options for obtaining FAR, the less likely it is that the community benefit of affordable housing or seismic upgrade of historic resources will be achieved. Because the Central City Plan District FAR bonus and transfer options allow transfers within a sector, transfers of FAR from noncontributing buildings is allowed even though it is not at the top of the prioritization list.</p> <p>Due to the recently adopted Central City bonus and transfer provisions and the limited geographies outside of the Central City that would be affected by a new transfer provision for noncontributing resources, staff recommend against a code amendment.</p>
--	--	--

Discussion of Future Work

<p>1. Historic District Design Guidelines were not included as part of this Code Project. Many of these Guidelines have not been updated in many years. Prompt an update to Historic District Design Guidelines to clarify that they focus on design-specific topics rather than mass, scale, height, and other items that are clearly defined in the base zone and HRCP. (Bortolazzo)</p>		<p>Design guidelines have been adopted by the City Council for many of Portland’s Historic Districts. Excluding open space Historic Districts such as Mount Tabor and Washington Park Reservoirs, only Kenton Commercial Historic District and Irvington Historic District do not have adopted district-specific design guidelines. No projects are currently scheduled to develop design guidelines for those districts.</p> <p>The Ladd’s Addition and South Portland Historic Districts both have design guidelines that were adopted more than 30 years ago and no longer reflect approval criteria best practice. An update to the South Portland Historic District design guidelines is underway, with revised guidelines scheduled for consideration (and adoption) by the City Council later this year. No project is currently scheduled to update the guidelines for the Ladd’s Addition Historic District.</p> <p>The six existing Conservation Districts—Eliot, Russell, Mississippi, Kenton, Piedmont, and Woodlawn—rely on the Community Design Standards and Guidelines for review of alterations and new construction. While the Design Overlay Zone Amendments (DOZA) project proposes to replace the Community Designation Standards and Guidelines in areas of the city outside of Conservation Districts, no project is currently scheduled to update the design standards and guidelines in Conservation Districts. Both the HRCP and DOZA staff reports identify updating Conservation District standards and guidelines as a possible future work item.</p>
<p>2. Preservation of living resources, including legacy businesses and cultural districts. (Magnera)</p>		<p>Several American cities and a growing number of international cities are adopting programs to protect “intangible” historic resources, such as legacy businesses and cultural districts where the most significant features of the place are a continuity of lived experiences and not exclusively design expression. These preservation programs are often established in partnership with community organization and outside of land use and development regulations; however, in cities like San Francisco there are often overlaps between historic landmarks/districts and cultural districts/legacy businesses. Emerging legacy business and cultural district programs in the United States generally prioritize institutions and populations vulnerable to displacement through grants, tax relief, and other stabilization programs designed to respond to the unique circumstances of the business/community.</p>

3. Opportunities to advance justice in historic resource code/initiatives/program. (Magnera)		Include in each item in discussion topic #4 (below)
4. Ongoing collaboration with Historic Landmarks Commission (feedback from “3x3”)		<p>The Historic Resources Code Project Proposed Draft Staff Report suggests four areas of possible future work that could follow the adoption of zoning code changes. These topics can be found on page 43-44 of Volume I.</p> <p>The 3x3 work group discussed potential future work items on February 24 and March 16. Additionally, the Historic Landmarks Commission devoted their March 8 agenda to discussion of future work in anticipation of the March 23 work session. The items raised at the 3x3 work group for discussion with the full PSC were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selective zoning map refinements in existing Historic Districts 2. Targeted designations of underrepresented histories (in partnership with community) 3. Phased citywide Historic Resource Inventory updates (including new and revised Significant Resource determinations and Landmark/District designations, as appropriate) 4. Update existing Conservation District boundaries and associated design standards and guidelines (DOZA future work item) 5. New legacy business and cultural district programs outside of Title 33 6. Development of a historic resources strategic plan 7. Ongoing collaboration between HLC and PSC