

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, August 12, 2014

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Karen Gray

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson, Sallie Edmunds, Eric Engstrom, Kathryn Hartinger, Roberta Jortner, Karl Lisle, Barry Manning, Nicholas Starin, Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton, Joe Zehnder

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Smith asked to amend the record regarding his involvement with other committees. To the list he gave previously, he wishes to add: the Climate Action Plan update, TSP update and City Budget Advisory.

Commissioner Schultz thanked *Commissioner Houck* for the invitation to the Ride of the Visionaries. It was great: great contacts, great conversations, easy ride.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Nothing to report at this time.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 7/22/14 PSC Meeting

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

Commissioner Houck moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved.

(Y9 — Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Comprehensive Plan Update: Maps

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Roberta Jortner, Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton

Documents:

- [Down Designations](#)

Presentation:

http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927653/view/PSC_compplan_maps.PDF

This is the second of three briefings about the Comprehensive Plan Update; the third will be in September. We want to touch on some mapping issues you'll be hearing about.

With regard to the Map App, even though items are presented in a fragmented way, it's important to remember that it's actually a cohesive whole. You will be adopting the entire map, not just the changes. You'll be recommending adoption of 100 percent of the map.

Through all of our analysis, the city has an enormous amount of capacity. We are making sure that where we add capacity makes the most sense. We want to encourage growth where it can most effectively support complete neighborhoods, active healthy living, meet demand for jobs, reduce carbon emissions, etc. We also have the opportunity to deemphasize growth.

We think we'll be hearing some testimony on some of these areas: job growth, natural hazards, residential densities further from centers, and jobs and housing in East Portland.

What's the difference between the Comprehensive Plan Map and zoning? Essentially the difference is that the map is looking in to the future, while zoning is what is allowed today. For the most part, these match up, but in some areas they don't. That difference may be due to a longer range vision of what that place might be but other things need to happen before it can realize that vision.

Staff gave an overview on proposed map changes to add capacity for job growth. This is one of the core things that is part of the process — if we accomplish nothing else, we need to hit our projected job need, housing needs and supporting infrastructure.

- Colleges and hospitals: There's an effort to take the larger colleges and hospitals and give them employment designations. Lewis and Clark, Reed, U of Portland. PSU and OHSU already have employment designations.
- Gateway District employment area: There's a small change in Gateway. Gateway is the city's largest Center outside of the Central City. Much of Gateway was subject to a lot of up zoning in anticipation of Gateway becoming a second downtown to serve East Portland. A small section there is currently light industrial and we're proposing to move that back to an employment designation with a thinking that as places like the Central Eastside increase in value and become denser, some of that activity could move out to Gateway and create an environment similar to what's there now.
- 82nd Avenue: There's a similar change South of Montavilla north of the PCC campus. Currently, existing uses are auto uses and light manufacturing - and we are proposing to retain that strip as a more employment focused area. This is a preliminary step in terms of taking a much more focused look at 82nd after the Comprehensive Plan work is complete.
- Additional new employment sites in East Portland: At what's currently Rossi Farm, we are looking at rezoning away from high density housing and change the mix to include more employment. We know there's a mismatch of jobs/housing, particularly in East Portland. We're looking at that balance.
- Golf courses: There aren't many places where we're looking at additional industrial land. But there is one place where we're suggesting some conversion (see the map). Changing the designation to a mix of employment and industrial land would create an opportunity should property owners want to take advantage of that. Zoning changes would wait until future agreements are reached.
- West Hayden Island: The Comp Plan covers Portland's urban services boundary, so in some cases, this goes beyond the city boundary. The thinking is that we have an existing policy framework that represents a status quo situation on Hayden Island. It's been brought into the Urban Growth Boundary, it has not been taken up by Council.

What we've done here is establish a special designation for West Hayden Island that embodies that policy mix; we believe it represents that status quo policy. This is not an annexation decision, but it is consistent with the 2010 recommendation of 300/500 acre split. Putting it in the Comp Plan does not cause annexation but it sets up a policy/mapping basis for what we do next if a proposal comes back. This is not a zoning decision. This is a placeholder designation.

Discussion

Commissioner Shapiro asked if the college map change reauthorized large institutional "creep" into neighborhoods, particularly hospitals.

- *Staff:* The proposal is to map the existing boundaries of the campus. It would address issues within the existing boundaries, not change the boundaries.

Commissioner Smith: Help me understand the distinction between the Institutional Campus designation and the underlying zoning and what that allows. My interest is in seeing a more holistic knitting of these institutions into the community, instead of a hard edge. How will that designation translate into zoning?

- *Staff:* Many campuses have low density residential zoning underneath and have to go through a Master Plan conditional use update process every few years. By designating these with an employment use, we create a different approach than the conditional use approach. We wouldn't change everything at once. We would implement things as existing Master Plans sunset out. At that time, campuses would have the opportunity to switch to the new zone - but there would still be a review process and Master Planning processes. These are trailing the policy and map proposal by 6 months to a year. We are hoping to have public review documents out for review this winter.

Commissioner Baugh: On the hospital, this change gives them the right to update the Master Plan without going through the Conditional Use process, but they also wouldn't have to engage the community in that large process?

- *Staff:* The process for updates are just being updated. It won't be a conditional use process, but there will be required community engagement. We are not moving to a blank check, by-right approach.

Commissioner Baugh: Before you get to zoning, during the Comp Plan process, is there a way to build the community engagement in?

- *Staff:* The policies do have statements about the intent - there is material that talks about that in the Comp Plan policies.

Staff gave an overview of proposed map changes to address natural hazards and drainage constraints.

[VIDEO]

To add a little more detail, the areas that you just heard about make up about 720 acres, which is less than 1 percent of the city. The areas on the map represent a unique convergence of areas with a lot of development potential and those with natural hazards and infrastructure constraints, making down designations an appropriate tool. We expect some property owners to be concerned about reduced development potential and impacts on property values. We know that some neighborhoods will actually support the proposal - Linton, areas near Oaks Bottom, etc.

You're going to hear a lively mix of comments. We know that this tool won't eliminate all risks or improve current conditions - the city will need to continue to invest in green and grey infrastructures, and continue to work on natural hazard mitigation strategies into the future.

Staff reviewed proposed map changes in residential areas further from Centers and Corridors. We do expect to hear a great deal of testimony from advocates and opponents of these changes.

Commissioner Houck: What I thought I heard was that by being very strategic, we won't run into the conversation of expanding the UGB while protecting natural resources. What I'm hearing is that we have the opportunity to get out of that lose-lose conversation we've had over the years about not protecting natural resources because we need to expand the UGB. Is that an accurate understanding?

- *Staff:* Yes, we do have enough residential capacity, largely because we're seeing dense, mixed use, transit oriented development that makes this possible.

Commissioner Houck: You're going to hear a lot of comments about West Hayden Island. When I look out ten or 15 years, my experience in the past is that somebody will point to that map and say West Hayden Island was designated for jobs. In my opinion, you noted that, through the language and map designation, we have gone to the status quo, which was the City Council proclamation. In my opinion, the status quo is all of the work we did that resulted in the recommendation from the PSC that put specific requirements on mitigation should the island be developed. I don't know how we convey the intent of the status quo to future decision makers.

- *Staff:* The Map App is a communication device. We simplified things for the App. The actual Comp Plan Map is a little different and there will be discussion of the policies that go with that.

Commissioner Houck: Seems to me there could be more blue up there related to industrial lands. Why was there no discussion of brownfields and intensification of uses?

- *Staff:* The map doesn't show everything. For example, the Central City is not included. We didn't map the brownfield program but we do know where they are.
- *Director Anderson:* You need to look at the policies and the map. That's how you get the complete picture.
- *Commissioner Houck:* Roberta's presentation talked about hazards but I didn't hear reference to flood plain. It seems to me that is an issue as well.
- *Staff:* There is one significant area (Powell Butte South) that is in the floodplain, but again, we were looking for the convergence with development density. These are mostly residential areas. In industrial areas, down designations aren't really the right tools. We are interested in looking at impervious area limits, and broadening those to other areas.

Staff reviewed proposed map changes in East Portland.

We are also proposing a number of residential down designations in East Portland that are designed to reduce development pressures in areas where the infrastructure hasn't caught up to the existing densities (122, 136th Avenue), we're seeing strains on the David Douglas School District and we'd like to reduce some of that pressure and allow infrastructure to catch up.

As you know, East Portland has about 25% of Portland's population, but 40% of the city's children, so we really need to look at infrastructure as well as things like Safe Routes to School. As you also may know, we're working with all of the large school districts to make sure we're sharing data about enrollment projections, etc. Some in David Douglas are significantly over capacity. We will be having MOUs and IGAs with each of the school districts to work together over time.

Commissioner Oxman: In East Portland, what's the venue to discuss policy approaches to this problem? How do we consider the demographics? How do we educate kids? How do we create

housing in a better fashion? How do we get to that conversation?

- *Staff:* The housing policies and the public facilities policies both address this. The public facilities chapter defines public schools as public facilities, which changes their relationship to land use.

Commissioner Baugh: I am concerned about conflict policies in East Portland — transportation and investment policies — we have transportation policy that says we're going to target dense areas for investment, and this leaves the low density folks who already don't have sidewalks to continue being a low priority for transportation investments. How do we balance?

- *Staff:* We're doing at least two things to balance. We're not taking away all the growth for one. There's already quite a bit of density out there. We're making small downward adjustments, but there will still be transit-supporting density. We're also making it more explicit in the policies that we need to look at the equity component in addition to the density. This is a way to catch up the places that aren't caught up.
- *Director Anderson:* Part of this too, we can really pull it apart for you if there are only a certain number of these big questions. We can help you really get down to what it is we are proposing.

Commissioner Baugh: I want to make sure people have access to things like sidewalks - those things are connected to bigger things like the Climate Action Plan. I would appreciate you breaking things down.

CC2035 West Quadrant Plan

Briefing: Sallie Edmunds, Karl Lisle

Documents:

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Briefing Packet](#)
- [Proposed Draft](#)

Presentation:

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927655/view/>

Commissioner Schultz introduced the plan. She gave an overview of the SAC process: 33 people, 16 meetings. Staff did a great job. We have a number of "big ideas" — the riverfront, the "Green Loop," capping of I-405, a Times Square on Burnside. There were some great ideas that came out of that. In general, the committee had pretty good consensus. Some concerns were expressed: strengthening of the environmental goals, a fair amount of discussion about building heights, especially with regard to the West End, and also a lot of testimony about a more holistic historic preservation strategy.

Staff reviewed previous planning efforts and the project timeline, the Concept Plan and the idea of a Center of Innovation and Exchange

Commissioner Shapiro: We are also a Central City that is recognized as a center of creativity. I'm wondering if "creativity" could be added to that language.

- *Staff:* It's a great point.

Staff gave an overview of the West Quadrant boundary and each of the seven districts.

Commissioner Smith: In the beginning of this process, there was some consideration of including some areas of the Northwest District Association area. What happened with that?

- *Staff:* Yes, we had an earlier version of the map that included some areas, like Conway and Kelly Triangle. These areas were dropped, largely because Conway moved on

separately on its own; with regard to the southern area, we dropped it because we don't have ODOT fully engaged in this process and at the table.

Staff reviewed the process, the stakeholder advisory committee selection process, and the plan outline.

Director Anderson: The way we're doing this process, is that we adopted the N/NE Q Plan and Concept Plan by resolution, not by ordinance. It's an iterative process, we're learning things as we go, and we're feeding those back in to the earlier processes. By next fall, we'll have put it all together for your review and eventual adoption by City Council. It will eventually become part of the Comprehensive Plan. We know that not every detail is in the plan.

Staff reviewed issues on which the Commission is likely to hear testimony:

- **Building Heights:** staff reviewed existing and proposed height maps, highlighting areas of proposed change, both increases and decreases, and gave rationales for each. There are not changes proposed in Goose Hollow, the West End, most of South Downtown, and most of downtown except at the bridgeheads.
- **Old Town/Chinatown:** what you'll hear most about is this one little three block section, related to RC4 in the Old Town/Chinatown draft. People are somewhat split on this, but the language is in the plan as a "study," to reflect that we need to think about this. We did some modeling of heights in OT/CT, and met with members of the community a lot. Opinions are really split. There are also action items in the plan about updating the Nation Historic designation, etc. There's more going on than just height, but that's probably what you'll hear most about.

Commissioner Smith: My neighborhood paper has made this the cause of the day. What kind of skyline do you want to have? But two questions that come up were related to social isolation and building efficiency if you go above a certain height.

Commissioner Houck: Shade and wind tunnel impacts too.

- *Staff:* We're not completely convinced by the social isolation argument.

Commissioner Shapiro: This is a much richer conversation. This is very important to set aside this conversation.

Commissioner Bough: Is there information you can get to us on the different sides of the argument?

- *Staff:* Yes.

Commissioner Baugh: Can we also get them [the other Commissioners] the Skidmore work? Many of these issues are the same issues. Can we get copies of those documents out to people?

Commissioner Houck: There are some really interesting visualization tools out there. I don't know if they've come down in cost. There are some pretty sophisticated tools that would give you a better idea of what things would look like. Are these drawing online in color?

- *Staff:* It's all online. And we're trying to create this flexible box to show people the size - but we need to be careful about showing too much detail and stepping on the role of design review.

Other issues:

- **Parking:** There is a desire to see surface lots redevelop - there are a number of items that look at this. There were some items proposed - the idea of taxing operational income and phasing out the legal use of these lots for parking. These were soundly

rejected by the SAC, but I don't think they're gone and you may hear about them again.

- Bridgehead height: It's not getting rid of the old policy of step-down, but it is a new interpretation of it, in a specific area. As one way to encourage more development and signature development in the Morrison Bridgehead area.
- Environmental stewardship: You have a minority report that states that we missed the boat on environmental issues. My response to that is that most of these things are in Chapter 4 and are identified in Chapter 4 as items we need to work on - but not to the level of specificity that those SAC members would like. This being an interim step kind of creates this problem. In some ways we agree with parts of the criticism. We have also added some new language (p. 144) that we think helps with this discussion.
- West End heights: We are not proposing to change heights in this district. It is an interesting mix of taller, new buildings and lower, older buildings. As we look at the targets in terms of jobs and housing, we are likely to see some taller buildings and some lower buildings. Staff was not interested in looking at an eight story West End. We think the existing taller buildings have added some vitality. We do agree that there are risks for historic preservation and there are some unprotected properties. There are some improvements we could make in terms of design. We do have several actions about historic preservation. We also have an action about increasing flexibility. We have also committed to looking at design standards and zoning tools to ensure good development.

Staff reviewed the next steps: the PSC hearing on September 9, a City Council hearing likely in October, and then a lot of work to do over the next year - to integrate the Concept Plan, quadrant plans, and a whole bunch of code work. We also have additional efforts (height/bonus study, scenic resources study, code development, including parking, and Willamette Greenway Code Development) that we need to work on.

Commissioner Shapiro: I never thought I could sit in a deck chair in Times Square, but I can. That idea resonated with me. We have a few existing centers - Powell's, and Providence Park - these might be better Times Square options. The other comment I want to make is that I have friends in Old Town/Chinatown, and they say that the City has been dragging its feet in this area - and what I see here is a lot of general, good stuff, but not a lot of specifics. I'd like to see a little more attention paid here.

Commissioner Houck: The overriding question I have - is related to changes to the draft. In the minority reports there were references to major changes between the last to versions. In order to make a judgment whether these were appropriate or not I'd like to see what language changes were made on the environmental issues. I think it would be helpful for all of us.

Commissioner Hanson: We've done three quadrants that form the Central City plan. Has the Central City gotten bigger?

- *Staff:* It was expanded a little bit over the years - Goose Hollow, Burnside. At this time, we're not proposing to expand the boundary but it could happen through the SE Quadrant.

Commissioner Rudd: The issue of activating the Waterfront has been an issue for a long time. People aren't waiting for us - they're touching the water now. We're starting to see more and more conflicts. If there are some test areas you could look at to identify where some of these difficulties are coming up and how this might be addressed in the policies, that would be helpful.

Commissioner Houck: Ross Island never makes its way into these plans. If we're talking about animating the river and bringing more people to the river. Over the past several weeks, I've been hearing a lot about incredible incursions on Ross Island, including camping, fires, toilets, littering. This is a huge issue we're going to have to deal with. At some point, we're going to have to be very explicit about impacts on these natural resources. I'm all for getting people to the river in a respectful way, meaning addressing potential negative environmental impacts before they happen.

Commissioner Hanson: On Chinatown, it's an incredible reservoir of land. Of sites that are underutilized and also some that are really unique. It's also very transit rich. The more we can do there the better.

Commissioner Shapiro: Tourism — we're seeing more and more — Times Square speaks to that. I want to look at "walking streets," like they do in Europe. As we develop Times Square areas, and walking streets, we're also looking at bringing a lot of people into these areas.

Commissioner Baugh: Great job — thank you for your efforts. Great presentation.

Director Anderson: I think we'll have an opportunity - after the hearing on September 9 - to make a decision on that date, but there might also be very differing opinions. I want to keep this on schedule. How do we get there? How can we raise the issues we know are going to come up - and can we start having those conversations offline because if we do them here, it's always rushed. Let's talk about how you want to do that. You have 3 or 4 weeks, it's not a lot of time. It's a commitment to diving in early and getting us comments early.

Commissioner Baugh: Let's take these home and dig in to it. If we can get our comments to you, and also if we can aggregate comments — you know where the public is going to come from — but we can get some background on the thinking behind the plan. How did we think about height and the Waterfront, and Ross Island, 5 years ago? Some of these things have been thought about before. Why would my decision change? Or my thinking process change? If you could refresh our memory on that work, it would be great.

- *Staff:* The height opportunity sites on the edge of Skidmore District- those are not in here.

Commissioner Baugh: But there were some discussions about height and why we wanted it in some places and not in others, that would be helpful.

Commissioner Houck: There won't be a work session on this?

Director Anderson: At this point, we were just planning on having the hearing, and then a discussion after that. If you can make a decision great, we don't want to rush things, but I want you all to understand that we spent a lot of time thinking big picture with the Portland Plan - you need to jump in and look at the issues. If anyone needs a pep talk, call me.

Commissioner Baugh: Is the opportunity there at the officer's briefing to preschedule the work session if we think we're going to need it?

- *Director Anderson:* Sure.

Commissioner Shapiro: This is an incredibly important piece of work. I'm concerned that other bureaus are all at the table, and I want to make sure what we advance is supported. I want our endorsement to reflect PDC's excitement and PBOT's excitement.

Commissioner Rudd: We're going to look at heights separate from design guidelines in Old Town/Chinatown?

- *Staff:* Yes, they would come after. We don't think we can get them both done.

Commissioner Baugh: This gives general direction to the future work — the height maps, the environmental work, etc.

Director Anderson: Yes, but that being said, details are important, so get your comments to us early.

Commissioner Baugh: In terms of partners — PDC, PBOT, BES, and Multnomah County — will these folks be available at the hearing?

- *Staff:* Yes, we can work on that. They have been engaged, and we can do what we can to get them here.

Commissioner Baugh: Let's get comments to Karl in the next week and a half, two weeks.

Mixed Use Zones Project

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Barry Manning

Presentation:

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927651/view/>

Project context (Urban Design Framework, Comp Plan Maps, Mixed Use Codes Project, and Refinement Plans): This is a necessary tool to implement the Comp Plan Map. This project is not doing the mapping. This project looks at the different regulations that might apply once those places have been identified.

Staff reviewed the Urban Design Framework, the proposed Comprehensive Plan Designation - Mixed Use Change Areas map, as well as highlights of future refinement work.

Much growth is directed at housing and employment growth in centers and corridors and our job is to figure out how to make that work. We want to fine tune our tools to be a better fit with the Comprehensive Plan.

The project has its roots in the Complete Neighborhoods concept, as well as the direction of encouraging job growth and successful neighborhood business districts. Some of the things we're thinking about in this work include building scale, transitions, required retail areas, residential areas, design, affordability and equity.

Things not addressed in the project: parking, Central City development zoning, mapping of various areas, and residential development and design standards for single and multi-dwelling residential zones.

Staff continued by reviewing the public outreach process: PAC, community meetings, walks, roundtables, open houses, PSC and City Council hearings

Commissioner Houck: Do you include landscape architects when you talk about design?

- *Staff:* We didn't include them specifically in this roundtable, but we will include them in the future. They provide a unique perspective.

A few highlights from the outreach process:

- Common themes from walks: address building scale and articulation; provide scale transition; encourage continuity of retail; preserve or protect significant building and key places; incentives for open space and plazas that are open to the public; improve design and use better materials; encourage housing mix; promote affordability of

commercial space as well as housing; address parking; consider allowing more intensity on key large opportunity sites.

- Roundtable highlights
 - Developers: certainty, flexibility, simplicity; incentives; lot size sensitivity; ground floor commercial/active use; predictable design system; other city requirements that conflict with zoning objectives
 - Architects/Designers: clear, concern about regulating materials choices, height, FAR; “setback budget”; design system needs overhaul to work better
 - Affordable housing developers: certainty, flexibility, simplicity; incentives don’t work the same; concern about expanding design review; mixed use development/ground floor commercial uses add costs - BOLI wage regulations apply for commercial development.
 - Neighborhood business: Parking; regulations that support compatibility; not every place is ped/mixed-use district – some places should remain flexibly for autos; concerned about loss of affordable commercial space; desire for commercial/active ground floor uses in key places.
- Assessment Report: Staff reviewed components of the report, would like Commission to review and provide feedback.

Discussion

Commissioner St. Martin: Does active ground floor use include community use space?

- *Staff:* Yes, active use doesn’t only mean retail space - it can mean community space or even lobby space. We want to make sure that when buildings are built, they can accommodate those uses in the future.

We are still in the assessment phase of the project. We’ll be back with the concept work once we get into that, and then probably again as we transition into code work. It was important to brief you now because you’re about to hear a lot about the mixed use map designations.

Commissioner Schultz: You have a lot of mixed zone blocks in Portland. As you’re talking about transitions, are you looking at these mixed zone blocks? Is that more of a Comp Plan issue?

- *Staff:* Those are more of a Comp Plan mapping issue. In our work, we will be looking at the transitions between these zones. How might we transition on site? This is kind of a tool box approach. You have areas where it will be difficult to get rid of the mixed zone blocks - such as SE Division.

Commissioner Schultz: Is there a focus on alleviating the pressure on the mixed zone blocks? Are you cleaning it up? Design Commission constantly gets in a battle on those mixed zone blocks between the residential community and what’s happening on those corridors. Stepback and transitions might help, but developers design something based on what’s allowed and then the community comes in and says no and goes to Design Commission.

- *Staff:* We’re not cleaning all that up. Part of the problem is that that back half block is often zoned for multi-dwelling housing but it hasn’t developed that way.

Director Anderson had to leave the meeting; Chief Planner Joe Zehnder replaced her in the Director Chair.

Joe Zehnder: What we’re seeing with Comp Plan is that some of these half blocks in particular centers get refined on a case by case basis. What staff will be working on is those transitions.

Staff: And we’re not alone in this problem. We’re hoping to learn from other cities and come up with good tools.

Commissioner Schultz: At the intersection of zoning code and guidelines, there's this issue of quality of materials. It's such a subjective thing. You hate to list them, but what's quality to you might be different for me. It's that intersection between these two things that make things really confusing for both communities and Design Commission.

- *Staff:* The community would like to have more opportunity for review, the development community would like more of a clear path. We're going to have to see where that balance falls. We did hear a lot about materials - but also that they change all the time - and maybe there's a threshold level that we agree with as a community, but not go into a lot of detail.

Commissioner Schultz: I don't know how you address this in the code to allow for this transition of material quality over time. Also, retail requires greater height and that's challenging getting floors on top of that retail height.

- *Staff:* We heard about that - and allowing for more flexibility.

Commissioner Hanson: We're going to be making decisions about code and about mapping. Are those going to run together? Are they on track? In parallel?

- *Staff:* You're first getting the concept map and the urban design framework. Then we're going to review the palette of zones that could be applied there - and then you'll be getting maps to look at. One process can inform the other.

Director Zehnder: Within these areas that you're broadly designating as centers and corridors, there's going to be a different set of new zones with new standards that we'll apply through a separate process later - but for a certain type of center, we want to choose between this and that - and what's the best way to apply that?

- *Staff:* For example, looking at Division, what kind of place is this? A Center? A Civic corridor? Then, are we looking at smaller scale zones? Bigger? What kind of place do you have? What kind of zones are appropriate there?

Commissioner Baugh: Regarding Powell-Division Transit - when I looked at Powell, it didn't seem like there were a lot of changes on Powell. Is this looking at the transit oriented development and then we're trying to enhance that in some way?

- *Staff:* On the mapping side, Powell and Division already have fairly intense mixed use zoning, so there wasn't a lot of change proposed there and it's a little early to do some of the refinement work. On the code side, there will be a need to make sure the more intense zones in the palette work well with transit, etc.

Director Zehnder: With this project, you're kind of building the toolkit. It's easier to figure out how to apply things in areas that are already Centers. We're starting to look at places like 82nd with Powell/Division, Montavilla, etc., as centers and stations along the larger corridor. When we identify these areas, then you'll have a toolkit for those places.

- *Staff:* Most of the places we're talking about are pretty well served by transit - so I'm guessing most of these zones will be transit friendly, so then there's just the question of intensity.

Commissioner Baugh: As I look at the cultural diversity of the businesses in the City - how do you preserve those businesses? Many of those lots are very small, and someone will just amass those smaller lots into a larger lot and price out those small businesses, changing the face of that neighborhood. How do we create a mechanism to prevent this? How do we ensure prosperity for all?

- *Staff:* There are some examples out there to look at, and we did hear about it, and it's something we'll work to address in this work.

Commissioner Schultz: There are communities today that don't have mixed use zones, and it's

important to remember that Portland is at the leading edge of this. This is great work.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 4:11 p.m.

Submitted by Kathryn Hartinger